

# FPT Algorithms for Crossing Number Problems: A Unified Approach

Éric Colin de Verdière ✉

LIGM, CNRS, Univ Gustave Eiffel, F-77454 Marne-la-Vallée, France

Petr Hliněný ✉ 

Masaryk University, Brno, Czech republic

---

## Abstract

The basic *crossing number problem* is to determine the minimum number of crossings in a topological drawing of an input graph in the plane. In this paper, we develop fixed-parameter tractable (FPT) algorithms for various generalized crossing number problems in the plane or on surfaces.

Our first result is on the *color-constrained crossing problem*, in which edges of the input graph  $G$  are colored, and one looks for a drawing of  $G$  in the plane or on a given surface in which the total number of crossings involving edges of colors  $i$  and  $j$  does not exceed a given upper bound  $M_{ij}$ . We give an algorithm for this problem that is FPT in the total number of crossings allowed and the genus of the surface. It readily implies an FPT algorithm for the joint crossing number problem.

We also give new FPT algorithms for several other graph drawing problems, such as the skewness, the edge crossing number, the splitting number, the gap-planar crossing number, and their generalizations to surfaces.

Our algorithms are reductions to the embeddability of a graph on a two-dimensional simplicial complex, which admits an FPT algorithm by a result of Colin de Verdière and Magnard [ESA 2021].

**2012 ACM Subject Classification** Theory of computation → Computational geometry; Theory of computation → Fixed parameter tractability; Mathematics of computing → Graph theory

**Keywords and phrases** graph drawing; graph embedding; crossing number; two-dimensional simplicial complex; surface; color-constrained crossing problem

**Funding** *Petr Hliněný*: Part of this work was done while this author was invited professor at LIGM, Marne-la-Vallée, supported by Paris-Est Sup.

## 1 Introduction

The *crossing number* problem, minimizing the number of pairwise edge crossings in topological drawings of an input graph,<sup>1</sup> is a long-standing and central task in graph drawing and visualization, see, e.g., the extensive discussion by Schaefer [26, Section 1]. This problem is, moreover, NP-hard even in very restrictive settings [4, 11, 14, 16] (such as cubic graphs, bounded path-width graphs, and planar graphs augmented with a single edge) and APX-hard [3].

In practical drawing applications, however, not every crossing or crossing pattern of edges may be “equal” to other crossings. For instance, one may want to avoid mutual crossings of the important edges. Or, to allow crossings only within specific parts of a graph, and not between unrelated parts. Or, to exclude crossings of edges of some type; for example, one may wish to forbid crossings between edges of the same color. Or, to allow only certain crossing patterns in order to avoid confused local areas in the visualization. This is the primary focus of the recent research direction called “beyond planarity”; see, e.g., [9, 18].

While computing the crossing number is, as noted above, generally hard even in very restricted settings, there are two notable exceptions to this. First, Chuzhoy and Tan [5] provided a subpolynomial approximation algorithm for the crossing number of graphs

---

<sup>1</sup> We defer the formal definitions to Section 2.

of bounded degree. Second (but chronologically earlier), Grohe [12], later improved by Kawarabayashi and Reed in an extended abstract [20], gave FPT algorithms (one computing in time  $f(r) \cdot n^{O(1)}$  where  $f$  is a computable function of the parameter  $r$ ) for computing the exact crossing number of a graph parameterized by the number of crossings. In other words, we can efficiently (at least in theory) compute the exact crossing number of any graph if the crossing number is bounded.

Very recently, Münch and Rutter [23] extended Grohe’s approach [12] to provide an FPT algorithm for computing the exact crossing number of several types of beyond-planar drawings of graphs — here meaning the minimum number of crossings over all topological drawings of a respective kind of the input graph, again parameterized by the number of crossings. The cases include the exact crossing numbers of  $k$ -planar,  $k$ -quasi-planar, min- $k$ -planar, fan-crossing, and fan-crossing free drawings of a graph for any constant  $k$ .

Both aforementioned approaches of Grohe [12] and of Münch and Rutter [23] have one minor drawback — after a preprocessing step, they apply Courcelle’s metatheorem [8] about efficient solvability of properties formulated in MSO logic on graphs of bounded tree-width. This results in non-explicit algorithms with runtime  $f(r) \cdot n^2$  where  $f(r)$  is an exponential tower of height four in the number  $r$  of crossings.

**Our contributions.** In the spirit of the research on beyond-planar graphs, and primarily of differentiating between kinds of crossings in a drawing, we introduce in Section 3 the COLOR-CONSTRAINED CROSSING problem (see Definition 3.1) which considers an input graph  $G$  with a colored edge set, and a symmetric integer matrix  $M$ , and the task is to decide the existence of a drawing of  $G$  in the plane such that for each color pair  $i, j$  the number of crossings between edges of color  $i$  and those of color  $j$  is at most  $M_{i,j}$ .

The COLOR-CONSTRAINED CROSSING problem is at least as hard as the traditional crossing number problem; just choose one edge color and the  $(1 \times 1)$ -matrix  $M = (k)$  (allowing  $k$  crossing of any edges). Moreover, as we shall see, it extends the concept of simultaneous planarity. We will give, in Section 3, an FPT algorithm for the COLOR-CONSTRAINED CROSSING problem parameterized by the sum of entries of the matrix  $M$  (i.e., by the total number of allowed crossings). Our algorithm is also quadratic in the size of the input graph, and largely improves over the dependence on the parameter  $r$  as compared to Grohe’s [12]. Moreover, it extends to the case where the host space is not the plane, but an arbitrary surface; in that case, the genus of the surface becomes an additional parameter.

Using reductions to the COLOR-CONSTRAINED CROSSING problem, in Section 4, we address the NP-hard JOINT CROSSING NUMBER problem (of two disjoint embeddable graphs in a surface), and a homeomorphic variant of it (Definition 4.1); for each of them, we provide an FPT algorithm in surfaces (Theorem 4.2).

Along the same lines, we find solutions also to some other established problems in the graph drawing area, such as to the *skewness* (a.k.a. the edge-deletion distance to planarity), the *splitting number*, the *edge crossing number*, and the  *$k$ -gap crossing number* of graphs. We refer to Section 5 for formal problem definitions. All these problems are NP-hard in the plane, and while some of them have FPT algorithms with respect to the solution value, such algorithms are restricted to the planar case (skewness [20] and  $k$ -gap crossing number [23]) or are nonuniformly FPT (splitting number [25]). We deal with these problems extended to an arbitrary fixed surface, and we give uniform FPT algorithms parameterized by the solution value and the genus of the surface.

While referring to the subsequent sections for formal definitions, we summarize our new results:

► **Theorem 1.1.** *The following problems have explicit uniform FPT algorithms parameterized by an integer  $s$  (commonly the solution size) plus the genus  $g$  of a surface  $\mathcal{S}$ :*

- a) (Theorem 3.2) *The COLOR-CONSTRAINED CROSSING problem in an arbitrary surface  $\mathcal{S}$  with constraint matrix  $M$  and  $s = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq c} M_{i,j}$ .*
- b) (Theorem 4.2) *The JOINT CROSSING NUMBER problem in an arbitrary surface  $\mathcal{S}$ , and the HOMEOMORPHIC JOINT CROSSING NUMBER problem in an orientable surface  $\mathcal{S}$ , with the number of crossings at most  $s$ .*
- c) (Theorem 5.1) *The  $\mathcal{S}$ -SKEWNESS problem in an arbitrary surface  $\mathcal{S}$  with a solution of size at most  $s$ .*
- d) (Theorem 5.2) *The  $\mathcal{S}$ -SPLITTING NUMBER problem in an arbitrary surface  $\mathcal{S}$  with a solution of size at most  $s$ .*
- e) (Theorem 5.3) *The EDGE CROSSING NUMBER problem in an arbitrary surface  $\mathcal{S}$ , with the number of crossing edges at most  $s$ .*
- f) (Theorem 5.4) *The  $k$ -GAP CROSSING NUMBER problem in an arbitrary surface  $\mathcal{S}$ , with an integer  $k$  as an additional parameter and the number of crossings at most  $s$ .*

*The algorithms are quadratic in the size of the input graph, and the dependence is exponential in a polynomial of the parameter.*


Moreover, for positive instances, we can compute representations of the corresponding drawings; see Section 6.

**Main tool.** All our results are proved by a reduction to the problem of embedding a graph in a two-dimensional simplicial complex (see Section 2), which is FPT in the complex size by a result due to Colin de Verdière and Magnard [6] (here Theorem 2.1); actually, for a fixed complex, the algorithm is quadratic in the size of the input graph. It was already known [7, Introduction] that, by a simple construction, the classical crossing number problem reduces to the embeddability of graphs in such 2-complexes, so that [6] implies an FPT algorithm for the crossing number problem, and that this argument extends to the case of graphs on surfaces.

## 2 Preliminaries

**Graphs and surfaces.** In this paper, graphs are finite and undirected, but not necessarily simple unless specifically noted. A *surface* [22] is a topological space obtained from finitely many disjoint solid, two-dimensional triangles by identifying their edges in pairs. Up to homeomorphism, a surface is specified by whether it is orientable or not, and by its *genus* (for orientable surfaces, it is the number of “handles”, and for non-orientable ones, it is the number of “crosscaps”).

A *curve* in a topological space  $\mathcal{X}$  is a continuous map from the unit segment into  $\mathcal{X}$ . In a *drawing* of a graph  $G$  in a space  $\mathcal{X}$ , vertices are represented by points and edges by curves such that the endpoints of a curve are the vertices of the corresponding edge. All drawings of a graph  $G$  on a surface  $\mathcal{S}$  are implicitly assumed to be *good*: no edge is self-intersecting, no three edges intersect in a point other than an endpoint, no curve contains a point that represents a non-incident vertex, each intersection point of two edges other than a common endpoint is actually a *crossing* (no tangential intersections allowed), and the number of crossings is finite. The minimum number of crossings over all (good) drawings of a graph  $G$  in  $\mathcal{S}$  is called the *crossing number* of  $G$  in the surface  $\mathcal{S}$ .



■ **Figure 1** An example of a two-dimensional simplicial complex, or 2-complex for short.

**2-complexes.** In this paper, a *2-complex* (or two-dimensional simplicial complex) is a topological space obtained from a simple graph (without loops or multiple edges) by attaching solid, two-dimensional triangles to some of its cycles of length three; see Figure 1.<sup>2</sup> An *isolated vertex* of a 2-complex  $\mathcal{C}$  is a vertex that is itself a connected component of  $\mathcal{C}$ ; an *isolated edge* of  $\mathcal{C}$  is an edge incident to no triangle. The class of 2-complexes is rather general; it contains all graphs, all surfaces, all  $k$ -books (although in this paper, we only need 2-complexes in which every edge is incident to at most two triangles), and any space obtained from a surface by identifying finitely many finite subsets of points and by adding finitely many edges between any two points.

In a drawing  $\varphi$  of  $G$  in a 2-complex  $\mathcal{C}$ , vertices of  $G$  may lie anywhere on  $\mathcal{C}$ , and edges of  $G$  as curves may traverse several edges and triangles of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Formally, for  $v \in V(G)$  this means  $\varphi(v) \in \mathcal{C}$ , and for  $e = \{u, v\} \in E(G)$  we have  $\varphi(e) : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  a continuous map and  $\varphi(e)(0) = \varphi(u)$ ,  $\varphi(e)(1) = \varphi(v)$ . An *embedding* is, intuitively, a crossing-free drawing; formally,  $\varphi$  is an embedding of  $G$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  if it is a drawing such that (1)  $\varphi$  is injective on the vertex set  $V(G)$ ; (2) if  $\varphi(e)(t) = \varphi(e')(t')$  for  $e, e' \in E(G)$ , then either  $e = e'$  and  $t = t'$ , or  $t, t' \in \{0, 1\}$ ; (3) if  $\varphi(e)(t) = \varphi(v)$ , then  $t \in \{0, 1\}$ .

A key property is that if  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{C}'$  are homeomorphic 2-complexes, then  $G$  embeds in  $\mathcal{C}$  if and only if it embeds in  $\mathcal{C}'$ . (Actually, this property is valid not only for 2-complexes, but for any topological space.)

**Embeddability of graphs on 2-complexes.** The *embeddability problem* takes as input a graph  $G$  and a 2-complex  $\mathcal{C}$ , and the task is to decide whether  $G$  has an embedding in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Our algorithms will be reductions to the embeddability problem, which is fixed-parameter tractable in the size of the input 2-complex:

► **Theorem 2.1** (Colin de Verdière and Magnard [6, arXiv version, Theorem 1.1]<sup>3</sup>). *One can solve the embeddability problem of graphs into 2-dimensional simplicial complexes in  $2^{p^{O(1)}} \cdot n^2$  time, where  $p$  is the number of simplices of the input 2-complex and  $n$  is the number of the vertices and edges of the input graph.*

(For bounded branchwidth, this can be done in time linear in  $n$  [6, Theorem 1.2].) In case of positive instances, a representation of the corresponding embedding can be computed; we

<sup>2</sup> Our definition of 2-complex slightly departs from the standard one; it is the same as a geometric simplicial complex of dimension at most two, realized in some ambient space of dimension large enough.

<sup>3</sup> The conference proceedings version of [6] gives a slightly worse bound on the running time, cubic in  $n$ . The theorems that we state take into account the improvement in the latest arXiv version.

defer this discussion to Section 6.

### 3 Color-Constrained Crossing Problem

► **Definition 3.1** (COLOR-CONSTRAINED CROSSING problem). An instance  $(\mathcal{S}, c, M, G, C)$  of the COLOR-CONSTRAINED CROSSING problem is composed of

- a surface  $\mathcal{S}$ , specified by its genus  $g$  and by whether it is orientable,
- an integer  $c$  and a symmetric matrix  $M$  of size  $c \times c$  with nonnegative integer values,
- a graph  $G$ , and
- a map  $C$  from the edges of  $G$  to  $\{1, \dots, c\}$ ; usually we say that  $C(e)$  is the *color* of edge  $e$ .

The question is whether  $G$  has a good drawing in  $\mathcal{S}$  such that, for every  $(i, j) \in \{1, \dots, c\}^2$ , the total number of crossings involving two edges, one colored  $i$  and the other  $j$ , is at most  $M_{i,j}$ .

For a quick illustration of this new concept, we outline how it captures the standard problem of *simultaneous embedding with fixed edges* [27, Chapter 11]<sup>4</sup> in  $\mathcal{S}$  — the problem to find simultaneously embeddings of two graphs  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  such that these embeddings coincide on the common subgraph  $G = G_1 \cap G_2$  ( $E(G)$  is the set of fixed edges, and the embeddings of  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  may cross each other). We consider the graph  $H := G_1 \cup G_2$  and use  $c = 3$  colors such that  $C$  gives color 3 to  $E(G)$  and color  $i$  to  $E(G_i) \setminus E(G)$  for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . We set  $M_{1,2} = M_{2,1} = k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $M_{i,j} = 0$  for remaining  $\{i, j\} \neq \{1, 2\}$ . Then, clearly,  $(\mathcal{S}, c, M, H, C)$  is a positive instance for some (sufficiently large) choice of  $k$ , if and only if the simultaneous embedding problem with fixed edges for  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  has a solution in  $\mathcal{S}$ . This setup, moreover, allows to minimize the number  $k$  of crossings in a simultaneous drawing of  $G_1 \cup G_2$ .

Our main new result is the following:

► **Theorem 3.2.** *There is a reduction that turns any instance  $(\mathcal{S}, c, M, G, C)$  of the COLOR-CONSTRAINED CROSSING problem into an equivalent instance  $(G', \mathcal{C})$  of the embeddability problem. Moreover, if  $k = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq c} M_{i,j}$ , then the size of  $G'$  is  $O(k^2(|V(G)| + |E(G)|))$ ; the number of simplices of  $\mathcal{C}$  is  $O(k^2 + g)$  where  $g$  is the genus of  $\mathcal{S}$ ; and the reduction takes linear time in the output size.*

*Consequently, the COLOR-CONSTRAINED CROSSING problem can be solved in uniform FPT time parameterized by the genus  $g$  and the sum  $k = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq c} M_{i,j}$ . The algorithm is quadratic in the size of the input graph, and the dependence is exponential in a polynomial of the parameter.*


The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 3.2.

#### 3.1 Preprocessing step

In the course of proving Theorem 3.2, we first of all observe that we can without loss of generality assume that each of the vertices of  $G$  has at least three neighbors; we simply add a suitable planar gadget (a 4-clique) to each other vertex:

► **Lemma 3.3.** *For the COLOR-CONSTRAINED CROSSING problem, we can assume that each vertex of  $G$  has at least three distinct neighbors, without loss of generality and up to a linear-time preprocessing step and a linear blowup in the size of the graph.*

<sup>4</sup> For simplicity, we outline only the case of two graphs, but the general case of any fixed number of graphs can be captured in a similar way with more colors.



■ **Figure 2** Illustration for the proof of Theorem 3.2. Top: A  $(3, 1)$ -chain in the case  $c = 3$ ,  $k = 1$ . Bottom: The gadget for the case  $c = 2$ ,  $M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  (red-red and blue-blue crossing are forbidden), and  $k = 1$ . The horizontal and vertical edges inside the gadget do not cross; the blue (color 1) and red (color 2) chains are attached only to the frame. Intuitively, a blue part of the graph cannot be mapped inside a red chain of the gadget because the loops would not fit, and a red part of the graph cannot be mapped on a blue chain of a gadget because the parallel edges would not fit.

**Proof.** Let  $(\mathcal{S}, c, M, G, C)$  be an instance of the COLOR-CONSTRAINED CROSSING problem. For each vertex  $v$  of  $G$ , we create a 4-clique and identify one vertex of it with  $v$ . (The edges of the 4-clique are colored arbitrarily.) If the new instance is positive, then so is the original one, because the new graph contains the original graph. Conversely, if the original instance is positive, then so is the new instance, because the 4-cliques can be drawn planarly close to the attaching vertex, and thus without crossing any other edge. ◀

### 3.2 Description of the reduction

In this section, we describe the reduction for the proof of Theorem 3.2. See Figure 2. For  $\ell \geq 1$  and  $i \in \{1, \dots, c\}$ , an  $(\ell, i)$ -chain is a graph obtained as follows: start with a path of length  $\ell$ ; replace each edge with  $4k + i$  parallel edges (recall that  $k = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq c} M_{i,j}$ ); finally, add  $c - i + 1$  loops to all vertices except those that are the endpoints of the original path.

Let  $(\mathcal{S}, c, M, G, C)$  be an instance of the COLOR-CONSTRAINED CROSSING problem; by Lemma 3.3, we assume that each vertex of  $G$  has at least three distinct neighbors. We transform it into an instance  $(G', \mathcal{C})$  of the embeddability problem as follows (see Figure 2).

The graph  $G'$  is obtained from  $G$  by replacing each edge of color  $i$  with a  $(6k + 1, i)$ -chain. In particular,  $G'$  has size  $O(k^2)$  times that of  $G$  (because we can assume from the beginning that  $c \leq k + 1$ , as there is no reason to distinguish between colors that are not allowed to cross at all). The complex  $\mathcal{C}$  is described as follows. For each  $i$  and  $j$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq j \leq c$ , we consider a set  $D(i, j)$  of  $M_{i,j}$  open disks on  $\mathcal{S}$ ; we do this in such a way that any two such open disks have pairwise disjoint closures (besides, their mutual positions are irrelevant, because all that matters is their locations up to homeomorphism of the surface, and up to homeomorphism all the possibilities are equivalent). Then, for each disk in  $D(i, j)$ , we remove it from  $\mathcal{S}$  and select four points  $p_1, p_2, p_3$ , and  $p_4$  along its boundary, in this cyclic

order. Next, we attach a  $(2, i)$ -chain to  $p_1$  and  $p_3$ , and a  $(2, j)$ -chain to  $p_2$  and  $p_4$ . The union of these two chains forms a *gadget* of *type*  $(i, j)$  of  $\mathcal{C}$ .

The preceding construction views  $\mathcal{C}$  as a topological space, but it can easily be represented as a 2-complex with a number of simplices that is linear in  $k^2$  plus the genus of  $\mathcal{S}$ . Indeed,  $\mathcal{C}$  is a union of chains with  $O(k^2)$  vertices and edges in total, and of a surface of genus  $g$  with  $k$  boundary components, which can be triangulated using  $O(g + k)$  vertices, edges, and triangles. The reduction takes clearly linear time in the output size.

### 3.3 Validity of the reduction

We conclude the proof of Theorem 3.2 by proving that the reduction of Section 3.2 is valid.

**Proof of Theorem 3.2.** We refer to the instance  $(G', \mathcal{C})$  constructed above. Assume first that  $(\mathcal{S}, c, M, G, C)$  is a positive instance of the COLOR-CONSTRAINED CROSSING problem. We can prove that  $G'$  can be embedded in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Indeed, from the drawing of  $G$  on  $\mathcal{S}$  satisfying the constraints, we can define open disks with pairwise disjoint closures, one containing each crossing, and none of them having a vertex of  $G$  in its closure. If the crossing involves an edge of color  $i$  and an edge of color  $j$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq j \leq c$ , we say that the disk has *type*  $(i, j)$ .

We now replace each edge of  $G$  of color  $i$  by an  $(\ell, i)$ -chain with  $\ell = 6k + 1$  to obtain  $G'$ , and draw  $G'$  on  $\mathcal{S}$  as follows: Each chain of  $G'$  is drawn in a neighborhood of the original edge of  $G$ ; the intersection of each disk of type  $(i, j)$  is exactly (1) if  $i \neq j$ , a  $(2, i)$ -chain of  $G'$  and a  $(2, j)$ -chain of  $G'$ ; (2) if  $i = j$ , two  $(2, i)$ -chains of  $G'$ . We can achieve this because each edge of  $G$  of color  $i$  enters a gadget at most  $2k$  times and is replaced with a  $(6k + 1, i)$ -chain in  $G'$ .

If necessary, we add more open disks of type  $(i, j)$  on  $\mathcal{S}$ , whose closures are pairwise disjoint and disjoint from the image of  $G'$ , to make sure that there are  $M_{i,j}$  disks of type  $(i, j)$ .

Now, we replace each disk of type  $(i, j)$  with a gadget of type  $(i, j)$ . The resulting topological space is (homeomorphic) to  $\mathcal{C}$ , and we have built an embedding of  $G'$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ , as desired.

Conversely, we now assume that  $G'$  embeds in  $\mathcal{C}$ , and we have to prove that  $(\mathcal{S}, c, M, G, C)$  is a positive instance of the COLOR-CONSTRAINED CROSSING problem.

Assume first that  $v$  is a vertex of  $G$ ; we claim that  $v$  cannot be mapped to the interior of some chain  $C$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Indeed,  $v$  has degree at least three, so it must be mapped to the middle vertex of  $C$  (i.e., not to an interior point of an edge of  $C$ ). Moreover,  $v$  has at least three distinct neighbors  $v_1, v_2$ , and  $v_3$  in  $G'$ , and each of them has degree at least three in  $G'$ ; thus, none of  $v_1, v_2$ , and  $v_3$  is mapped in the interior of  $C$ . But, starting from  $v$  at the middle vertex of  $C$ , there does not exist three disjoint paths going to the outside of  $C$ , a contradiction.

Assume now that a vertex  $v$  of  $G'$  is mapped to the interior of some  $(2, i)$ -chain  $C$  of  $\mathcal{C}$ . We claim that there is an  $(\ell, i)$ -chain  $C'$  of  $G'$  such that the part of  $G'$  mapped to  $C$  is a subset of  $C'$ . Indeed, by the previous paragraph,  $v$  is not a vertex of  $G$ , and thus is an interior vertex of some  $(\ell, j)$ -chain of  $G'$ , for some  $j$ . Moreover, it has degree at least three, so it is mapped to the middle vertex of  $C$ . This middle vertex of  $C$  is connected to each of its two distinct neighbors by  $4k + i$  parallel edges, and is incident to exactly  $c - i + 1$  loops. Moreover,  $v$  is connected to each of its two distinct neighbors, each having degree at least three, by  $4k + j$  parallel edges, and is incident to exactly  $c - j + 1$  loops. Using considerations similar to those from the previous paragraph, it follows that  $i = j$ , which implies the claim.

Assume now that an edge  $e$  of  $G'$  uses the interior of a  $(i, 2)$ -chain  $C$  of  $\mathcal{C}$ , in such a way that its endpoints are not inside  $C$ . Note that each gadget can be entered by at most four edges of  $G'$  whose endpoints are not inside the gadget. Because  $G$  contains at least  $4k$  edges



other than  $e$  and with the same endpoints as  $e$ , one of them, say  $e'$ , must avoid all gadgets in  $\mathcal{C}$ , and thus all isolated edges of  $\mathcal{C}$ . We may thus reroute  $e$  along  $e'$  while preserving the fact that we have an embedding of  $G'$  into  $\mathcal{C}$ . After this step, the interior of each  $(2, i)$ -chain of  $\mathcal{C}$  can only be used by a part of some  $(\ell, i)$ -chain of  $G'$ .

Now consider a subgraph  $G''$  of  $G'$  that contains exactly one path of length  $\ell$  for each  $(\ell, i)$ -chain; we say that the color of the path is  $i$ . Thus,  $G''$  is a subgraph homeomorphic to  $G$ , and the color of each path in  $G''$  matches the color of the corresponding edge of  $G$ . Let  $i$  and  $j$  be such that  $1 \leq i \leq j \leq c$ . By the previous paragraph, each of the  $M_{i,j}$  gadgets of type  $(i, j)$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  is used by at most two paths, one of color  $i$  and the other of color  $j$ . By attaching back a disk to each gadget, we recover the surface  $\mathcal{S}$ . Furthermore, whenever a disk  $\delta_0$  is attached back to a gadget of type  $(i, j)$ , we know that the boundary of  $\delta_0$  is hit by at most one path of color  $i$  and at most one of color  $j$  (or by at most two paths of color  $i$ , if  $i = j$ ). We can draw such paths of  $G''$  in the interior of  $\delta_0$  with at most one crossing between them (in a picture, we “flatten” the two paths from the gadget onto  $\delta_0$ ). This results in a drawing of  $G''$  (which is a subdivision of our graph  $G$ ) with at most  $M_{i,j}$  crossings between paths of color  $i$  and paths of color  $j$  for all pairs  $(i, j)$ , and hence implies that  $(\mathcal{S}, c, M, G, C)$  is a positive instance of the COLOR-CONSTRAINED CROSSING problem.  $\blacktriangleleft$

#### 4 Joint Crossing Number in Surfaces

An established problem closely related to Definition 3.1 is the *joint crossing number* problem in a surface  $\mathcal{S}$  with variants by Negami [24]:

► **Definition 4.1** (JOINT CROSSING NUMBER problems). The input of the JOINT CROSSING NUMBER problem consists of an integer  $k$  and two graphs  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ , each embeddable in a given surface  $\mathcal{S}$ . The question is whether there exists a good drawing of the disjoint union  $G_1 \dot{\cup} G_2$  in  $\mathcal{S}$  with at most  $k$  crossings, such that this drawing restricted to each one of  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  is an embedding in  $\mathcal{S}$ .

In the related HOMEOMORPHIC JOINT CROSSING NUMBER problem in  $\mathcal{S}$ , the input graphs  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are cellularly embedded in  $\mathcal{S}$  and the solution must be composed of embeddings of  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  that are each homeomorphic to the input one (the rotation systems must be the same, possibly up to reversal).


All variants in Definition 4.1 were shown NP-hard for any fixed orientable genus  $g \geq 6$  of  $\mathcal{S}$  by Hliněný and Salazar [17] (later improved to  $g \geq 3$  [15]). By assigning the edges of  $G_1$  color red and the edges of  $G_2$  color blue, possibly “fixing” the rotation systems, and allowing only red-blue crossings, Theorem 3.2 easily implies:

► **Theorem 4.2.** *Consider an integer  $k$  and two graphs  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  embeddable in a surface  $\mathcal{S}$  of genus  $g$ .*

- a) *The JOINT CROSSING NUMBER at most  $k$  problem of  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  in  $\mathcal{S}$  can be in linear time reduced to one call to the algorithm of Theorem 3.2 with the underlying graph  $G_1 \dot{\cup} G_2$  and the same parameter value  $k$ .*
- b) *The HOMEOMORPHIC JOINT CROSSING NUMBER at most  $k$  problem of  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  in  $\mathcal{S}$ , assuming the surface  $\mathcal{S}$  is orientable, can be in linear time reduced to one call to the algorithm of Theorem 3.2 with a graph that is of linear size in the size of  $G_1 \cup G_2$ , and with the parameter value  $4k$ .*

*Consequently, both problems can be solved in uniform FPT time parameterized by  $g + k$ . The algorithms are quadratic in the size of the input graphs, and the dependence is exponential in a polynomial of the parameter.*





■ **Figure 3** The hardening of a graph (fixing the rotation system in an orientable surface).

**Proof.** The task is trivial in a); we assign all edges of  $G_1$  color 1 and all edges of  $G_2$  color 2, set  $M_{1,1} = M_{2,2} = 0$ ,  $M_{1,2} = M_{2,1} = k$ , and then apply Theorem 3.2 to the disjoint union  $G_1 \dot{\cup} G_2$ .

In the homeomorphic joint crossing number variant b), we reduce to the case a) using the reduction sketched in Figure 3. This is formally achieved by the hardening operation and Lemma 4.4 stated below. ◀

For a graph  $H$  cellularly embedded in an orientable surface  $\mathcal{S}$ , let the *hardening* of  $H$  be the graph  $\bar{H}$  constructed as follows (Figure 3):

- For each edge  $e = uv \in E(H)$ , we replace  $e$  with two new internally disjoint paths  $P_e$  and  $Q_e$  of length three, called the *twin paths* of  $e$ , with the new vertices denoted in such a way that  $P_e = (u, w_{u,e}^1, w_{v,e}^2, v)$  and  $Q_e = (u, w_{u,e}^2, w_{v,e}^1, v)$ .
- For each vertex  $v \in V(H)$  with the cyclic order of adjacent edges  $(e_1, e_2, \dots, e_p)$  in the given embedding in  $\mathcal{S}$ , we add the edges of a cycle (the *hardening cycle* of  $v$ ) on  $(w_{v,e_1}^1, w_{v,e_1}^2, w_{v,e_2}^1, w_{v,e_2}^2, \dots, w_{v,e_p}^1, w_{v,e_p}^2)$  in this cyclic order.

In relation to the operation of hardening, we prove the following technical lemma:


► **Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $H^2$  be the graph constructed from a graph  $H$  by replacing each edge with a pair of parallel edges (called a twin edge pair). If  $D$  is a drawing of  $H^2$  in a surface  $\mathcal{S}$  with at most  $4k$  crossings (but no self-crossings), then there is a subdrawing  $D' \subseteq D$  isomorphic to  $H$ , obtained by selecting one edge out of each twin edge pair of  $H^2$ , with at most  $k$  crossings.*

**Proof.** We choose  $D' \subseteq D$  by selecting one out of each twin edge pair of  $H^2$  independently at random. The probability that a crossing  $x$  of  $D$  is a crossing in  $D'$  is  $\frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{4}$  (both edges of  $x$  are selected), and so the expected number of crossings in  $D'$  is  $\frac{1}{4} \cdot 4k = k$  and there has to be a choice of  $D'$  with at most  $k$  crossings. ◀

► **Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  be two graphs cellularly embedded in an orientable surface  $\mathcal{S}$ , and let  $\bar{G}_1$  and  $\bar{G}_2$  denote their hardenings. The homeomorphic joint crossing number of  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  in  $\mathcal{S}$  is at most  $k$  if and only if the joint crossing number of  $\bar{G}_1$  and  $\bar{G}_2$  in  $\mathcal{S}$  is at most  $4k$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $G := G_1 \dot{\cup} G_2$ . The ‘ $\Rightarrow$ ’ direction is easy. Assuming  $D$  is a drawing of  $G$  with at most  $k$  crossings solving the homeomorphic joint crossing number problem of  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ , one may draw the twin paths of each edge of  $G$  closely along this edge in  $D$  (and each old crossing hence generates 4 new crossings), and the hardening cycles of all vertices of  $G$  can be drawn there without crossings thanks to having homeomorphic subdrawings of  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  in  $D$ .

In the ‘ $\Leftarrow$ ’ direction, let  $\bar{D}$  be a drawing witnessing a solution to the joint crossing number problem of  $\bar{G}_1$  and  $\bar{G}_2$  with at most  $4k$  crossings. Restricting to only the subdrawing of  $\bar{D}$  formed by the twin paths of all edges of  $G$  and suppressing degree-2 vertices, we may apply Lemma 4.3 and conclude that there is a subdrawing  $D' \subseteq \bar{D}$  with at most  $k$  crossings which



■ **Figure 4** Illustration of the reduction for Theorem 5.1. The input graph  $G$  is the one that will be tested for embeddability, and the figure shows the 2-complex in the case  $k = 4$ .

is isomorphic to (a subdivision of)  $G$ . It remains to verify that, for  $i = 1, 2$ , the subdrawing of  $D'$  representing  $G_i$  (which is an embedding by the definition of the joint crossing number problem) is homeomorphic to the given embedding of  $G_i$ .

It is well known that two cellular embeddings of the same graph in an orientable surface are homeomorphic (mirror image of the whole embedding allowed) if and only if their rotation systems are the same. For the embedding of  $G_i$  represented by  $D'$ , this is ensured by embeddings of the hardening cycles of  $\bar{G}_i$  within the solution  $\bar{D}$ . This finishes the proof. ◀

## 5 More Applications on Crossing Number Variants

We add several more cases in which Theorem 2.1 can be applied in a way analogous to a solution of the color-constrained crossing problem in Section 3.

### 5.1 Skewness

The *skewness* of a graph  $G$  is the smallest number of edges whose removal from  $G$  leaves a planar graph. The problem to decide whether the skewness of  $G$  is at most  $k$  is NP-complete [21], and a linear-time FPT algorithm with respect to  $k$  is known in the planar case [20, Conclusion]. Let, for a surface  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}$ -SKEWNESS be the problem to decide whether deleting some  $k$  edges from  $G$  leaves an  $\mathcal{S}$ -embeddable graph.


Using, informally, a 2-complex obtained by adding  $k$  “bridge edges” to a 2-complex of the surface  $\mathcal{S}$  (see Figure 4), we derive the following generalization:

► **Theorem 5.1.** *For any  $k$  and a surface  $\mathcal{S}$  of genus  $g$ , the  $\mathcal{S}$ -SKEWNESS problem with parameter  $k$  and input  $G$  can be in time  $O(k + g)$  reduced to one call to the algorithm of Theorem 2.1 with the same graph  $G$  and a 2-complex of size  $p = O(k + g)$ .*

*Consequently, one can decide whether  $G$  is of  $\mathcal{S}$ -skewness at most  $k$  by a uniform FPT time algorithm parameterized by  $k + g$ . The algorithm is quadratic in the size of the input graph, and the dependence is exponential in a polynomial of the parameter.*

**Proof.** See Figure 4. We choose arbitrarily  $2k$  distinct points of  $\mathcal{S}$ , and make a topological space by adding  $k$  disjoint arcs  $a_1, \dots, a_k$  with their ends in the chosen points. This space can easily be represented as a 2-complex  $\mathcal{C}$  with  $O(g + k)$  simplices: indeed, a surface of genus  $g$  with  $k$  boundaries can be triangulated using  $O(g + k)$  vertices, edges, and triangles; and it then suffices to collapse each boundary component to a single vertex and to connect pairs of vertices using a single edge.

Assume that  $G - E_1$  has an embedding  $D$  in  $\mathcal{S}$ , for some set of edges  $E_1 = \{e_1, \dots, e_k\}$ . For  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , we subdivide  $e_i$  into three edges  $f_i, f'_i$ , and  $f''_i$ , and let  $F' := \{f'_1, \dots, f'_k\}$ . Then  $G - F'$  has an embedding  $D'$  in  $\mathcal{S}$ , because we can draw the edges  $f_i$  and  $f''_i$  very short. For  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , we add an arc  $a_i$  to  $\mathcal{S}$ , connecting the endpoints of each  $f'_i$ . The resulting



■ **Figure 5** Illustration of the reduction for Theorem 5.2. The input graph  $G$  is the one that will be tested for embeddability, and the figure shows the 2-complex of one of the reduced cases in the case  $k = 3$ , together with the graph  $G$  embedded on it. In this particular reduction gadget, we anticipate one vertex of  $G$  (drawn top left) to be split into two, and another one (drawn top right) to be split into three vertices. In general, for every unordered partition  $k = k_1 + k_2 + \dots + k_a$ , we make one reduction gadget similar to the depicted one.

space is homeomorphic to  $\mathcal{C}$ , and we can embed  $G$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  by extending  $D$  as follows: each edge  $e_i$  is drawn as the concatenation of  $f_i$ ,  $a_i$ , and  $f_i''$ .

Conversely, assume that  $G$  embeds in  $\mathcal{C}$ . If a vertex  $v$  of  $G$  is embedded in the interior of an arc  $a_i$ , then it has degree at most two, and we can easily modify the embedding by “pulling”  $v$  outside the arc (if a vertex of  $G$  is drawn on an endpoint of  $a_i$ , we need to move it slightly as well). Now, let  $E'$  be the set of edges intersecting the set of arcs  $a_1, \dots, a_k$ . Then  $E'$  has size at most  $k$ , and  $G - E'$  embeds in  $\mathcal{S}$ . ◀

## 5.2 Splitting number

The minimum integer  $s$  such that a graph  $G$  can be obtained from a graph embeddable in a surface  $\mathcal{S}$  by  $s$  successive identifications of vertex pairs is called the *splitting number* of  $G$  in  $\mathcal{S}$  [13, 19]. We denote by  $\mathcal{S}$ -SPLITTING NUMBER the corresponding decision problem, which is known to be NP-complete [10] already in the plane. Nöllenburg et al. [25] proved that the property of having the splitting number at most  $k$  is minor-monotone in any fixed surface, and so  $\mathcal{S}$ -SPLITTING NUMBER has a nonuniform FPT time algorithm parameterized by  $k$  using the Graph Minors theory.

We improve the latter result to a uniform FPT time algorithm, using an exhaustive collection of natural reductions sketched in Figure 5:

▶ **Theorem 5.2.** *For any  $k$  and a surface  $\mathcal{S}$  of genus  $g$ , the  $\mathcal{S}$ -SPLITTING NUMBER problem with parameter  $k$  and input  $G$  can be in time  $O(2^{O(k)} \cdot g)$  reduced to  $2^{O(k)}$  calls to the algorithm of Theorem 2.1 with the same graph  $G$  and a 2-complex of size  $p = O(k + g)$ .*

*Consequently, one can decide whether the splitting number of  $G$  in  $\mathcal{S}$  is at most  $k$  by a uniform FPT time algorithm parameterized by  $k + g$ . The algorithm is quadratic in the size of the input graph, and the dependence is exponential in a polynomial of the parameter.*

**Proof.** The reduction is illustrated in Figure 5.

We need some definitions. Consider  $k \geq 1$  disjoint closed disks  $D_1, \dots, D_k$  in the plane with respective centers  $c_1, \dots, c_k$ . Identifying all the  $c_i$ s to a single point  $c$  results in a topological space  $S_i$ ; the sets  $D_i \setminus \{c_i\}$  are the *link components* of  $S_i$ . We say that a point  $p$  in a 2-complex  $\mathcal{C}$  is a *pinchpoint* if some neighborhood of  $p$  is homeomorphic to some  $S_i$ , and furthermore the homeomorphism maps  $p$  to  $c$ . This homeomorphism also partitions the neighborhood of  $p$  into *link components*.

Let  $\{k_1, \dots, k_j\}$  be an unordered partition of  $k$ , namely, a multiset of positive integers summing up to  $k$ . We consider the topological space obtained from  $\mathcal{S}$  by taking a set  $P$  of  $k + j$  distinct points in the interior of the disk and by identifying  $k_1 + 1$  points of  $P$ , then  $k_2 + 1$  points of  $P$ , etc. (See Figure 5.) Thus, the singular points have  $k_1 + 1, k_2 + 1, \dots$  link components. Doing this for the  $2^{O(k)}$  partitions of  $k$ , we obtain a set of  $2^{O(k)}$  topological spaces, each of which is clearly homeomorphic to a 2-complex made of  $O(k)$  simplices. We claim that  $G$  embeds into one of these 2-complexes if and only if it has splitting number at most  $k$ , which concludes, by Theorem 2.1.

Assume first that  $G$  has splitting number at most  $k$ . Each vertex  $v$  of  $G$  is split into a number  $d_v$  of new vertices after the splits. For each  $v$ , let  $d'_v := d_v - 1$ , and let  $d' := k - \sum_{v \in V(G)} d'_v$ . Then  $G$  embeds into the 2-complex obtained from the process above using the partition given by the multiset composed of the numbers  $\{d'_v \mid d'_v \geq 1, v \in V(G)\} \cup \{d'\}$  (the singular point with  $d' + 1$  link components being actually not used; of course, if  $d' = 0$ , the partition is simply  $\{d'_v \mid d'_v \geq 1, v \in V(G)\}$ ).

Conversely, assume that  $G$  embeds into the 2-complex  $\mathcal{C}$  defined as above by the partition  $\{k_1, \dots, k_j\}$ . Let  $S_1$  be the set of singular points of  $\mathcal{C}$  containing a point of the relative interior of an edge of  $G$ , and let  $S_2$  be the set of singular points of  $\mathcal{C}$  containing a vertex of  $G$ . We do the following:

- While some point in  $S_1$  contains a point of the relative interior of an edge  $e = uv$  of  $G$ , we do the following. First, we perform a vertex split of one of its incident vertices (say,  $v$ ), by replacing  $uv$  with  $uv'$ , where  $v'$  is a new vertex. Second, we shrink edge  $uv'$  without moving  $u$ , so that in the new drawing of  $G$ , edge  $uv'$  does not contain any singular point of  $\mathcal{C}$  in its relative interior. The number of vertex splits performed so far is at most the size of  $S_1$ , and after this step, the embedding of  $G$  avoids the set  $S_1$ .
- For each point  $p$  in  $S_2$ , with  $k_i + 1$  link components, and containing vertex  $v$  of  $G$ , we do the following. The edges incident to  $v$  are naturally partitioned into at most  $k_i + 1$  parts, depending on the link component used to leave  $p$ . We replace vertex  $v$  by as many new vertices as there are parts, naturally reconnecting each edge originally incident to  $v$  with the new vertex in the same link component. This corresponds to at most  $k_i$  vertex splits.

The resulting embedding of  $G$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  avoids the singular points and thus belongs to a topological space homeomorphic to  $\mathcal{S}$ . Moreover, at most  $k$  splits were performed. ◀


### 5.3 Edge crossing number

One can also consider the following variant of crossing numbers: the *edge crossing number* of a graph  $G$  in a surface  $\mathcal{S}$  equals the minimum  $k$  such that  $G$  can be drawn in  $\mathcal{S}$  with at most  $k$  edges involved in the crossings. The corresponding decision problem EDGE CROSSING NUMBER with  $k$  on the input is NP-complete [2], and according to Schaefer [26], no FPT algorithm parameterized by  $k$  is known.


Here, with an iterated approach similar to that of Theorem 5.1, we get:

► **Theorem 5.3.** *For any  $k$  and a surface  $\mathcal{S}$  of genus  $g$ , the EDGE CROSSING NUMBER problem in  $\mathcal{S}$  with parameter  $k$  and input  $G$  can be in time  $O((3k)! \cdot g)$  reduced to at most  $(3k)!$  calls to the algorithm of Theorem 2.1 with the same graph  $G$  and  $p = O(k + g)$ .*

*Consequently, one can decide whether the edge crossing number of  $G$  in a surface  $\mathcal{S}$  of genus  $g$  is at most  $k$  by a uniform FPT time algorithm parameterized by  $k + g$ . The algorithm is quadratic in the size of the input graph, and the dependence is exponential in a polynomial of the parameter.*



■ **Figure 6** Illustration of the reduction for Theorem 5.3. The input graph  $G$  is the one that will be tested for embeddability. The figure shows the 2-complex of one of the reduced cases when  $k = 9$ . The black chords are pairwise disjoint in the complex. In this particular reduction gadget, we anticipate a particular configuration with 5 crossings (and one of the  $k = 9$  edges is actually not forced to cross). In general, we make one reduction gadget similar to the depicted one for every anticipated crossing configuration with  $k$  edges.



■ **Figure 7** Illustration of the proof of the reduction for Theorem 5.3. Left: The set  $F$  of crossing edges in a drawing of  $G$  on  $\mathcal{S}$  is partitioned into two clusters  $F_1$  and  $F_2$ . Middle: After removing small disks around the vertices, we build a spanning tree of the image of  $F_1$ , and similarly for  $F_2$ . Right: We cut  $\mathcal{S}$  along these spanning trees (topologically, this removes disks) and add suitable edges with endpoints on the boundaries of these disks, obtaining a 2-complex  $\mathcal{C}$  on which  $G$  embeds.

**Proof.** See Figure 6. Let  $P = (k_1, \dots, k_c)$  be an unordered partition of  $k = k_1 + \dots + k_c$ ; for  $i = 1, \dots, c$ , let  $M_i$  be a perfect matching on the vertex set  $\{1, 2, \dots, 2k_i\}$ . We define a 2-complex  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(P, M_1, \dots, M_c)$  as follows:

- Cut out  $c$  open disks  $D_1, \dots, D_c$  from the surface  $\mathcal{S}$ , such that their closures are pairwise disjoint.
- For each  $i \in \{1, \dots, c\}$ , choose  $2k_i$  distinct points on the boundary of  $D_i$  and label them  $1, 2, \dots, 2k_i$  in order. For each matching edge  $e = uv \in E(M_i)$ , add a new edge between the points  $u$  and  $v$  on the boundary of  $D_i$ .

Altogether, exactly  $k$  edges have been added to the cut-out surface  $\mathcal{S}$ , and the total number of simplices of  $\mathcal{C}$  is  $O(k + g)$ . The 2-complex  $\mathcal{C}$  is constructed in linear time by standard means.

For each such 2-complex  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(P, M_1, \dots, M_c)$ , we call the algorithm of Theorem 2.1 for our graph  $G$  and complex  $\mathcal{C}$ . We claim that  $G$  embeds into (at least) one of these 2-complexes if and only if  $G$  has a drawing on  $\mathcal{S}$  with at most  $k$  edges crossed, which concludes.

If for one of the complexes  $\mathcal{C}$  the answer is YES, then we can “flatten” the embedding of  $G$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  onto a drawing on  $\mathcal{S}$  with at most  $k$  edges crossed, as follows. For  $i \in \{1, \dots, c\}$ , and for each edge  $s$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  added between boundary points of  $D_i$ , we pull any possible vertex of  $G$  embedded in the interior of  $s$  towards one of the ends of  $s$ . Then we project all edges between boundary points of each  $D_i$  onto  $D_i$  itself, resulting in the desired drawing of  $G$  on  $\mathcal{S}$ .

On the other hand, assume that  $G$  has a drawing  $D$  on  $\mathcal{S}$  with at most  $k$  edges crossed. See

Figure 7. Let  $F \subseteq E(G)$  be the set of the edges with crossings in  $D$ , and let  $F_1, \dots, F_c \subseteq F$  be the partition of  $F$  into the vertex sets of the connected components of the geometric intersection graph of  $F$  in  $D$  (informally, two mutually crossing edges belong to the same set  $F_i$ , and the partition is the transitive closure of this relation).

Furthermore, for every vertex  $v \in V(G)$ , we choose a small open neighborhood  $\delta_v$  of  $v$  in  $\mathcal{S}$ , homeomorphic to an open disk, such that the boundary of  $\delta_v$  intersects only edges incident to  $v$ , and does so exactly once (or twice in case of loops); moreover, we assume that no crossing of  $D$  occurs in  $\delta_v$ . For  $e = uv \in F$ , viewing  $e$  as the curve within our drawing  $D$ , denote by  $\bar{e}$  the point set  $\bar{e} = e \setminus (\delta_u \cup \delta_v)$ , and by  $x_e^1$  and  $x_e^2$  the points of intersection of  $\bar{e}$  with the boundaries of  $\delta_u$  and  $\delta_v$ . For  $i \in \{1, \dots, c\}$ , let  $Y_i := \bigcup_{e \in F_i} \bar{e}$ ; each  $Y_i$  is thus the image of some graph embedded on  $\mathcal{S}$ . Furthermore, let  $Y'_i \subseteq Y_i$  be an inclusion-minimal connected subset still containing all points  $x_e^1$  and  $x_e^2$  ranging over  $e \in F_i$ ; in other words,  $Y'_i$  is a spanning tree of these points in  $Y_i$ .

Since  $Y'_i$  is a tree embedded on  $\mathcal{S}$ , there exists an open set  $D_i \subseteq \mathcal{S}$  homeomorphic to an open disk, such that the closure of  $D_i$  contains  $Y'_i$ , all points  $x_e^1$  and  $x_e^2$  ranging over  $e \in F_i$  lie on the boundary of  $D_i$ , and  $D_i$  is disjoint from the subdrawing of  $G - F$ . Now, we construct a 2-complex  $\mathcal{C}_0$  by, for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, c\}$ , cutting out the open disk  $D_i$  from  $\mathcal{S}$ , and for each  $e \in F_i$ , removing  $\bar{e}$  from the drawing  $D$  and adding instead a new edge with the ends  $x_e^1$  and  $x_e^2$  into the complex  $\mathcal{C}_0$ .

Since  $\mathcal{C}_0$  is homeomorphic to one of the 2-complexes  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(P, M_1, \dots, M_c)$  considered above, our routine answers YES for the instance.

It remains to prove that there are at most  $(3k)!$  choices of the complex  $\mathcal{C}(P, M_1, \dots, M_c)$ . We simply show that every choice of a partition  $P$  into  $c$  parts and of corresponding matchings  $M_1, \dots, M_c$  can be injectively mapped to some permutation  $\pi$  of the set  $\{0, 1, \dots, 3k-1\}$ , as follows. We set  $\pi(0) = 2k_1 + 1$  and let  $\pi$  on  $\{1, 2, \dots, 2k_1\}$  “follow” the matching  $M_1$ , that is, for every  $uv \in E(M_1)$  let  $\pi(u) = v$  and  $\pi(v) = u$ . Then we set  $\pi(2k_1 + 1) = 2k_1 + 2k_2 + 2$  and let  $\pi$  on  $\{2k_1 + 2, \dots, 2k_1 + 2k_2 + 1\}$  analogously “follow” the matching  $M_2$  (with vertex indices shifted by  $+2k_1 + 1$ ), and so on. . . For  $2k + c \leq i \leq 3k - 1$ , we set  $\pi(i) = i$ . Obviously, the tuple  $P, M_1, \dots, M_c$  can be uniquely “decoded” from such  $\pi$ .  $\blacktriangleleft$



## 5.4 $k$ -Gap crossing number

The concept of gap-planarity has been introduced by Bae et al. [1]. For an integer parameter  $k$ , a drawing  $D$  of a graph  $G$  in the plane is  *$k$ -gap-planar* if  $D$  admits a mapping from each crossing in  $D$  to one of the two involved edges such that at most  $k$  crossings are mapped to each edge of  $G$ . The  *$k$ -gap(-planar) crossing number*, studied, e.g., by van Beusekom et al. [28] from the combinatorial point of view, asks for the minimum number of crossings over all  $k$ -gap-planar drawings of  $G$ . This concept straightforwardly generalizes to  *$k$ -gap crossing number* in an arbitrary surface  $\mathcal{S}$ .

Let  $k$ -GAP CROSSING NUMBER in a surface  $\mathcal{S}$  denote the problem to decide whether a graph  $G$  has a  $k$ -gap drawing in  $\mathcal{S}$  with at most  $r$  crossings. Since already testing whether  $G$  admits a 1-gap-planar drawing is NP-complete [1], the  $k$ -GAP CROSSING NUMBER problem with  $r$  part of the input is NP-hard for  $k = 1$  in the plane. Münch and Rutter [23] remark without a proof that their approach can be extended to an FPT algorithm for  $k$ -GAP CROSSING NUMBER in the plane parameterized by  $r$ .

We prove that the problem has an FPT solution in any surface  $\mathcal{S}$ :

**► Theorem 5.4.** *For any  $k$  and  $r$  and a surface  $\mathcal{S}$  of genus  $g$ , the  $k$ -GAP CROSSING NUMBER problem in  $\mathcal{S}$  with parameter  $k$  and input  $G$  can be in time  $O(kr^2(|V(G)| + |E(G)|) + g)$*



■ **Figure 8** Illustration for the proof of Theorem 5.4 in the case  $r = 3$ ,  $k = 2$ . Top: A 7-thick 9-path; there is one copy of it per edge of  $G$ . Bottom: A gap gadget. The horizontal (blue) and vertical (red) edges inside the gadget do not cross; they are only attached to the frame.

reduced to one instance  $(G', \mathcal{C})$  of the embeddability problem of Theorem 2.1, where the size of  $G'$  is  $O(kr^2(|V(G)| + |E(G)|))$  and the number of simplices of  $\mathcal{C}$  is  $O(r^2 + g)$ .

Consequently, one can decide whether the  $k$ -gap crossing number of a graph  $G$  in  $\mathcal{S}$  of genus  $g$  is at most  $r$  by a uniform FPT time algorithm parameterized by  $r + g$ . The algorithm is quadratic in the size of the input graph, and the dependence is exponential in a polynomial of the parameter.

**Proof.** First of all, observe that we may assume  $k < r$ , since otherwise we are solving the ordinary crossing number problem parameterized by  $r$  only. Furthermore, we may, analogously to Lemma 3.3, assume that every vertex of  $G$  has at least three neighbors.

We refer to Figure 8 for an overview of the reduction. The graph  $G'$  is constructed from  $G$  by replacing every edge  $e$  of  $G$  with a  $(2r + 1)$ -thick  $r(k + 1)$ -path  $R$ , which is the graph obtained from a path of length  $r(k + 1)$  by turning each edge into a bunch of  $2r + 1$  parallel edges. Then, a loop is added to every internal vertex of  $R$  except those whose distance from the ends of  $R$  is a multiple of  $r$  (hence, exactly  $k$  internal vertices of  $R$  remain without a loop), and the resulting graph replacing the edge  $e$  is denoted by  $S_e \subseteq G'$ .

The complex  $\mathcal{C}$  (viewed as a topological space) is constructed from  $\mathcal{S}$  as follows: We select arbitrarily  $r$  open disks  $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_r$  in  $\mathcal{S}$  such that their closures are pairwise disjoint, to be removed from  $\mathcal{S}$ . Then, for each  $1 \leq i \leq r$ , we choose  $4(2r + 1)$  points  $p_1, \dots, p_{8r+4}$  on the boundary of  $\delta_i$  in this cyclic order, and introduce two new points  $q$  and  $q'$ , the *central points*. For  $j = 1, \dots, 2r + 1$ , we attach a segment with ends  $p_j$  and  $q$ , a segment with ends  $p_{4r+2+j}$  and  $q$ , a segment with ends  $p_{2r+1+j}$  and  $q'$ , and a segment with ends  $p_{6r+3+j}$  and  $q'$ . We



also attach a loop segment with both ends to the point  $q'$ . All these segments incident to the boundary of  $\delta_i$  and the central points  $q$  and  $q'$  form our *gap gadget*  $\gamma_i$ .

Assume first that  $G$  has a  $k$ -gap drawing  $D$  in  $\mathcal{S}$  with at most  $r$  crossings. We may, up to homeomorphism, assume that the crossings in  $D$  are one-to-one mapped to interior points of the disks  $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_r$ . An embedding of  $G'$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  is constructed as follows. For each disk  $\delta_i$  of  $\mathcal{S}$ , hosting a crossing of edges  $e$  and  $e'$  of  $G$  such that this crossing is mapped to  $e$ , we locally embed  $S_e$  into the gap gadget  $\gamma_i$  such that the appropriate internal loop-free vertex  $s$  of  $S_e$  (sequentially assigned from all  $k$  loop-free vertices in  $S_e$  as  $e$  traverses mapped crossings from one its end to another) coincides with the point  $q$  of  $\gamma_i$ . Regarding local embedding of  $S_{e'}$  in  $\gamma_i$ , any internal vertex of  $S_{e'}$  (as needed) may be chosen to coincide with the point  $q'$  of  $\gamma_i$ . This makes a valid embedding in  $\mathcal{C}$  if  $D$  was a  $k$ -gap drawing in  $\mathcal{S}$ .

Conversely, assume an embedding of  $G'$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then vertices of  $G'$  that come from  $G$  cannot be mapped into our gap gadgets, because the vertices of  $G$  have degree at least three, and are thus vertices of degree at least  $6r + 3$  in  $G'$ , while each vertex of a gap gadget is incident to only  $4r + 2$  segments.

From every thick path  $S_e$  of  $G'$  where  $e \in E(G)$ , we select a simple spanning path  $P_e \subseteq S_e$  such that the image of the interior of each edge in  $P_e$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  avoids the central points of all gap gadgets. This is indeed possible by the pigeon-hole principle since we have only  $r$  gap gadgets with two central points each, and  $S_e$  consists of bunches of  $2r + 1$  parallel edges. Now, we recover the surface  $\mathcal{S}$  by adding back the open disks  $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_r$ . By using embeddings of the paths  $P_e$  for  $e \in E(G)$  (“flattened” onto  $\mathcal{S}$ ) as the curves representing  $e$  we get a drawing  $D$  of  $G$  in  $\mathcal{S}$  that has at most  $r$  crossings altogether (one per each disk  $\delta_i$ ). It remains to show that  $D$  is a  $k$ -gap drawing. For this, we assign the crossing in  $\delta_i$  between edges  $e$  and  $e'$  to  $e$ , if and only if the image of  $P_e$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  passes through the point  $q$  of the gadget  $\gamma_i$ . Since, according to the vertex degrees in  $P_e$  and the definition of gap gadgets, only loop-free internal vertices of  $S_e$  (there are  $k$  of them) may use the  $q$ -points of the gap gadgets in the embedding of  $G'$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ , the number of crossings mapped to every edge  $e$  in the drawing  $D$  is at most  $k$ . The proof is finished.  $\blacktriangleleft$

## 6 Computing Drawings for Positive Instances

► **Theorem 6.1.** *In each decision problem above for which we provide FPT algorithms, for positive instances, we can compute a representation of the corresponding drawing without overhead in the asymptotic running time.*

*The output drawing of a graph  $G$  is represented by the combinatorial map of a cellular embedding, on  $\mathcal{S}$ , of a graph  $H$  obtained from  $G$  by the following steps:*

1. *for each crossing point between two edges  $e$  and  $e'$  of  $G$ , subdivide  $e$  and  $e'$  and identify the two new vertices together (the new vertex corresponds to the crossing between  $e$  and  $e'$ );*
2. *take a supergraph of the resulting graph by subdividing edges and by adding vertices and edges, increasing the number of vertices and edges by a factor that is at most polynomial in the parameter of the problem.*

Ideally, one would like to get the combinatorial map after Step 1 only; the main reason why Step 2 is necessary is that combinatorial maps (in the basic version) are restricted to cellular graph embeddings, in which each face is homeomorphic to a disk, while some faces of the drawing of  $G$  on  $\mathcal{S}$  may fail to be disks.

The idea of the proof of Theorem 6.1 is the following. Colin de Verdière and Magnard [6] not only gave a decision algorithm for the problem of embedding a graph on a 2-complex (Theorem 2.1), but for positive instances their algorithm can compute a representation of an

embedding [6, arXiv version, Theorem 9.1]. There remains to turn this embedding into  $\mathcal{C}$  into a drawing.

In order to prove Theorem 6.1, we need more definitions related to 2-complexes. The *surface part* of a 2-complex  $\mathcal{C}$  is the union of all the triangles, together with the vertices and edges incident to at least one of them. A *singular point* of  $\mathcal{C}$  is a vertex that has no neighborhood homeomorphic to an open disk, a closed half-disk, or an open segment.

The following result is obtained by a careful inspection of the proof of Theorem 2.1.

► **Theorem 6.2** (Colin de Verdière and Magnard [6, arXiv version, Theorem 9.1]). *In Theorem 2.1, if  $G$  has an embedding into  $\mathcal{C}$ , and  $\mathcal{C}$  has no edge incident to three triangles, and no isolated vertex, an embedding of  $G$  can be computed without overhead in the asymptotic running-time. In detail, an embedding of a graph  $H$  is computed where:*

- *$H$  is obtained from  $G$  by augmenting it with at most  $2p$  vertices and at most  $3p + 2u$  edges, and performing at most  $p$  edge subdivisions, where  $u$  is the number of connected components of  $G$ ;*
- *the images of the vertices of  $H$  cover the singular points of  $\mathcal{C}$ ;*
- *the restriction of  $H$  to the surface part of  $\mathcal{C}$  is specified by its combinatorial map, and by which point is mapped to which singular point of  $\mathcal{C}$ ;*
- *the restriction of  $H$  to the isolated edges of  $\mathcal{C}$  is specified by the sequence of vertices and edges of  $H$  appearing along each isolated edge of  $\mathcal{C}$ .*

Some comments on this theorem are in order. First, the requirements on the 2-complex  $\mathcal{C}$  are satisfied for all 2-complexes considered in this paper. Second, it is necessary to add vertices to  $H$  in order to cover the singular points of  $\mathcal{C}$ , to add edges in order to make the graph cellularly embedded on the surface part of  $\mathcal{C}$ , and to subdivide edges in order to ensure that edges of the graph are either entirely inside, or entirely outside, the surface part of  $\mathcal{C}$ .

**Proof of Theorem 6.1.** In all the problems that we consider, the instance with input graph  $G$  is turned into one or several instances of the embeddability problem of a graph  $G'$  into a 2-complex  $\mathcal{C}$  in which the size of  $G'$  is that of  $G$  times a factor that is at most polynomial in the parameter, and the size of  $\mathcal{C}$  is at most polynomial in the parameter. Thus, the size of the graph  $H$  obtained from Theorem 6.2 is that of  $G$  times a factor that is at most polynomial in the parameter.

We claim that, from the embedding of  $H$  obtained in Theorem 6.2, we can compute a graph  $H'$ , whose size is that of  $H$  multiplied by a factor that is at most polynomial in the parameter, that is cellularly embedded on  $\mathcal{S}$ , and that contains the desired drawing. The precise computation depends on the actual problem studied, but it essentially corresponds to “flattening” the gadgets and inserting vertices at the resulting crossing points. In detail:

- For the COLOR-CONSTRAINED CROSSING problem, including the special cases of the JOINT CROSSING NUMBER and the HOMEOMORPHIC JOINT CROSSING NUMBER problems, we insert a crossing between any two edges inside a given gadget that cross when the gadget is “flattened”; we also insert edges on the boundary of each gadget; the resulting graph is cellularly embedded on  $\mathcal{S}$ .
- For the skewness, we simply remove the edges passing through an isolated edge of  $\mathcal{C}$ ; we have a cellular embedding on  $\mathcal{S}$ .
- For the  $\mathcal{S}$ -splitting number, the task is actually to compute an embedding of a graph obtained from the input graph by splitting some vertices. From the embedding of  $H$  on  $\mathcal{C}$ , we do the following for each singular point  $p$  of  $\mathcal{C}$ : If  $p$  is used by a vertex of  $H$ , we split that vertex in the way prescribed by the embedding of  $H$ ; if  $p$  is used by an edge of  $H$ , we split one of the incident vertices, detaching only that edge, and pull it so that it

- avoids  $p$ . Eventually, no singular point of  $\mathcal{C}$  is used by the embedding, which is thus a cellular embedding on  $\mathcal{S}$ .
- For the edge crossing number, we proceed as in the COLOR-CONSTRAINED CROSSING problem.
  - For the  $k$ -gap crossing number problem, we proceed as in the COLOR-CONSTRAINED CROSSING problem. ◀

## 7 Conclusions

We have vastly extended the set of variants on the crossing number problem that admit FPT algorithms parameterized by the solution size, and included their surface variants with the surface genus as an additional parameter. All our results are obtained through reductions to the embeddability problem of graphs in 2-complexes, which is known to be FPT by Theorem 2.1 [6]. We expect that we can, furthermore, extend our arguments, specifically those from the proofs of Theorem 5.3 and Theorem 5.4, to provide such algorithms to other crossing-number variants covered in Münch and Rutter [23], namely to  $k$ -planar,  $k$ -quasi-planar and fan-planar crossing numbers.

Relying on Theorem 2.1 has the additional benefit that the solutions work not only in the plane, but in general surfaces as well, which is typically not the case of existing crossing-number algorithms. Theorem 2.1 thus appears to be a versatile tool, and we plan to look for further applications of it. Specifically, we aim to develop a unified FPT framework covering many of the existing topological crossing-number variants and all problems dealt with in this paper. In this regard, one should mention that Münch and Rutter [23] developed a powerful framework of “forbidden crossing patterns” for their variants on crossing number problems in the plane, but this framework covers none of the problems in our Theorem 1.1 even when restricted to the plane.

---

## References

- 1 Sang Won Bae, Jean-François Baffier, Jinhee Chun, Peter Eades, Kord Eickmeyer, Luca Grilli, Seok-Hee Hong, Matias Korman, Fabrizio Montecchiani, Ignaz Rutter, and Csaba D. Tóth. Gap-planar graphs. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 745:36–52, 2018.
- 2 Martin Balko, Petr Hliněný, Tomáš Masařík, Joachim Orthaber, Birgit Vogtenhuber, and Mirko H. Wagner. On the uncrossed number of graphs. *CoRR*, abs/2407.21206, 2024. To appear in GD’24.
- 3 Sergio Cabello. Hardness of approximation for crossing number. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 49(2):348–358, March 2013.
- 4 Sergio Cabello and Bojan Mohar. Adding one edge to planar graphs makes crossing number and 1-planarity hard. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 42(5):1803–1829, 2013.
- 5 Julia Chuzhoy and Zihan Tan. A subpolynomial approximation algorithm for graph crossing number in low-degree graphs. In *STOC*, pages 303–316. ACM, 2022.
- 6 Éric Colin de Verdière and Thomas Magnard. An FPT algorithm for the embeddability of graphs into two-dimensional simplicial complexes. In *Proceedings of the 29th European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA)*, pages 32:1–32:17, 2021. Full improved version in arXiv:2107.06236v2.
- 7 Éric Colin de Verdière, Thomas Magnard, and Bojan Mohar. Embedding graphs into two-dimensional simplicial complexes. *Computing in Geometry and Topology*, 1(1):Article 6, 2022.
- 8 Bruno Courcelle. The monadic second-order logic of graphs. I. recognizable sets of finite graphs. *Inf. Comput.*, 85(1):12–75, 1990.

- 9 Walter Didimo, Giuseppe Liotta, and Fabrizio Montecchiani. A survey on graph drawing beyond planarity. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 52(1):4:1–4:37, 2019. doi:10.1145/3301281.
- 10 Luérbio Faria, Celina M. H. de Figueiredo, and Candido Ferreira Xavier de Mendonça Neto. Splitting Number is NP-complete. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 108(1-2):65–83, 2001.
- 11 Michael R. Garey and David S. Johnson. Crossing number is NP-complete. *SIAM J. Algebr. Discrete Methods*, 4(3):312–316, September 1983.
- 12 Martin Grohe. Computing crossing numbers in quadratic time. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 68(2):285–302, 2004.
- 13 Nora Hartsfield, Brad Jackson, and Gerhard Ringel. The splitting number of the complete graph. *Graphs and Combinatorics*, 1:311–329, 1985.
- 14 Petr Hliněný. Crossing number is hard for cubic graphs. *Journal of Comb. Theory, Ser. B*, 96(4):455–471, 2006.
- 15 Petr Hliněný. Complexity of anchored crossing number and crossing number of almost planar graphs. *CoRR*, abs/2306.03490, 2023.
- 16 Petr Hliněný and Liana Khazaliya. Crossing number is NP-hard for constant path-width (and tree-width). *CoRR*, abs/2406.18933, 2024. To appear in ISAAC'24.
- 17 Petr Hliněný and Gelasio Salazar. On hardness of the joint crossing number. In *ISAAC*, volume 9472 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 603–613. Springer, 2015.
- 18 Seok-Hee Hong and Takeshi Tokuyama, editors. *Beyond Planar Graphs, Communications of NII Shonan Meetings*. Springer, 2020. doi:10.1007/978-981-15-6533-5.
- 19 Brad Jackson and Gerhard Ringel. Splittings of graphs on surfaces. *Proceedings of the 1st Colorado Symposium on Graph Theory*, pages 203–219, 1982.
- 20 Ken-ichi Kawarabayashi and Bruce A. Reed. Computing crossing number in linear time. In *STOC*, pages 382–390. ACM, 2007.
- 21 P.C. Liu and R.C. Geldmacher. On the deletion of nonplanar edges of a graph. In *Proceedings of the Tenth Southeastern Conference on Combinatorics, Graph Theory and Computing (Florida Atlantic Univ., Boca Raton, Fla., 1979)*, pages 727–738, 1979.
- 22 Bojan Mohar and Carsten Thomassen. *Graphs on surfaces*. Johns Hopkins Studies in the Mathematical Sciences. Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.
- 23 Miriam Münch and Ignaz Rutter. Parameterized algorithms for beyond-planar crossing numbers. To appear in GD'24, 2024.
- 24 Seiya Negami. Crossing numbers of graph embedding pairs on closed surfaces. *J. Graph Theory*, 36(1):8–23, 2001.
- 25 Martin Nöllenburg, Manuel Sorge, Soeren Terziadis, Anaïs Villedieu, Hsiang-Yun Wu, and Jules Wulms. Planarizing graphs and their drawings by vertex splitting. In *GD*, volume 13764 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 232–246. Springer, 2022.
- 26 Marcus Schaefer. The graph crossing number and its variants: A survey. *Electron. J. Comb.*, Dynamic Surveys, #DS21, 2024.
- 27 Roberto Tamassia. *Handbook of Graph Drawing and Visualization*. Discrete Mathematics and Its Applications. Taylor & Francis, 2013.
- 28 Nathan van Beusekom, Irene Parada, and Bettina Speckmann. Crossing numbers of beyond-planar graphs revisited. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.*, 26(1):149–170, 2022.