

# Exercices

## Exercice 1. Skewness: Cycle vs. Paths

We are given a non-planar biconnected graph  $G = (V, E)$  without multiple edges or self-loops as an input. Recall that in the Skewness ILP we have a binary variable  $s_e$  for each  $e \in E$  that is 1 if and only if  $e$  is deleted to obtain a planar graph. Thus, edges in the computed maximum planar subgraph have  $s_e = 0$ . Furthermore, there is a constant  $D \in \mathbb{N}$  such that we have binary variables  $c_\alpha$  for each cycle  $\alpha$  with  $|\alpha| \leq D$ . Variable  $c_\alpha$  is 1 if and only if  $\alpha$  represents a face in the computed maximum planar subgraph.

Consider a cycle  $\alpha$  in  $G$  with  $|\alpha| \leq D$ . Let  $a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2$  denote four of its distinct (but not necessarily neighboring) vertices in this cyclic order around  $\alpha$ . Assume that there are two vertex-disjoint paths  $A = a_1 \rightarrow a_2$  and  $B = b_1 \rightarrow b_2$ , both of which are internally-vertex-disjoint from  $\alpha$ .

What can you say about feasible solutions w.r.t. the variables involved in this subgraph? Try to write your insight as a linear constraint.

### ► Sketch of solution.

If the cycle is realized as a face, then both paths  $A, B$  need to be outside. But then they would cross. Thus, either the cycle is not chosen as a face, or at least one edge in one of the paths needs to be removed. As a linear constraint we may write:

$$c_\alpha \leq \sum_{e \in A \cup B} s_e.$$

We call these the *cycle-two-paths constraints*; they are part of the mentioned zoo. ◀

## Exercice 2. Skewness: Paths vs. Cycles

Consider a vertex  $v \in V$  with incident edges  $F \subset E$ ,  $|F| \geq 3$ . Let  $e_1, e_2 \in F$ . Assume that  $G$  contains two cycles  $\alpha, \beta$  of length at most  $D$ , both of which traverse  $v$  exactly once. Cycle  $\alpha$  enters  $v$  via  $e_1$  and leaves via  $e_2$ . Inversly,  $\beta$  enters via  $e_2$  and leaves via  $e_1$ .

- (a) Assume that the maximum planar subgraph would be biconnected. What could you say about feasible solutions w.r.t. the variables involved in the subgraph  $F \cup \alpha \cup \beta$ ?
- (b) How does the fact that the MPS may be non-biconnected ruin this argument?
- (c) Consider a path internally-vertex-disjoint from  $\alpha \cup \beta$  that connects  $v$  to another vertex on  $\alpha \cup \beta$ . How and why can you now use the insight of (a) (and (b))? Try to write it as a linear constraint.

### ► Sketch of solution.

ad a) If both  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  constitute faces, the fact that they both use  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  in different orientations tells us that  $v$  has to have degree 2 in the MPS; this means that under these circumstances every single edge of  $F' := F \setminus \{e_1, e_2\}$  needs to be deleted. We may write this as multiple constraints:

$$c_\alpha + c_\beta - 1 \leq s_e \quad \forall e \in F'.$$

ad b) In a non-biconnected graph, we may have faces that are not (simple) cycles, but closed walks—i.e., some vertices/edges may be repeated. Since we only want to consider cycles in the ILP,  $\alpha$  may be the “representative” of a closed walk  $\beta$  with  $\alpha \subset \beta$ . In  $\beta$ , the edges  $F'$  may be traversed but we simply “forget” this when only looking at  $\alpha$ .

ad c) Let  $P$  be any path as described in the question. Now, the argument from (a) holds in the following sense: if all of  $P$  would be in the MPS, as well as (all of)  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , then no edge of  $P$  can be traversed twice by a single face; this would constitute a contradiction. Thus, either  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  or  $P$  needs to have one edge removed in the solution. We may write this as

$$c_\alpha + c_\beta - 1 \leq \sum_{e \in P} s_e.$$

We call these the *path-two-cycles constraints*; they are part of the mentioned zoo. ◀

### Excercise 3. Skewness: Faces and Kuratowski

Recall the Skewness ILP requires  $\sum_{e \in K} s_e \geq 1$  for every Kuratowski subdivision  $K$  in  $G$ .

- (a) Assume there is a cycle  $\alpha \in K$  with  $|\alpha| \leq D$ . Can you rewrite the above Kuratowski constraint to use  $c_\alpha$ ?
- (b) Generalize the constraint to not consider a single cycle, but an (arbitrary) set of cycles  $C$ .

#### ► Sketch of solution.

ad a) Either some edge of  $K$  outside of  $\alpha$  needs to be removed, or  $\alpha$  needs to be broken. We may thus write

$$\sum_{e \in K \setminus \alpha} s_e \geq c_\alpha.$$

ad b) If all cycles are chosen, we need to remove at least one remaining edge in  $K$ . But a single non-chosen cycle *may* invalidate that:

$$\sum_{e \in K \setminus \bigcup_{\alpha \in C} \alpha} s_e \geq \sum_{\alpha \in C} c_\alpha - (|C| - 1).$$

We call these *Kuratowski-cycle constraints*; they are part of the mentioned zoo. ◀

### Excercise 4. Genus: Closed Walks with Simplicial Elements

In embeddings, in particular those on a higher genus surface, a face may have *simplicial* edges or vertices, i.e., they appear multiple times along the facial walk around a face (face tracing).

- (a) What is the minimum length of a closed walk that contains a simplicial edge? What for a simplicial vertex? Try to argue as concisely as possible.
- (b) Answer the above question in dependency on the graph’s girth.

#### ► Sketch of solution.

a) 8 and 6 edges, respectively: 

b) Let  $g$  be the girth of  $G$ . The cycles at the left/right need to have length at least  $g$ . Thus  $2g + 2$  and  $2g$ , respectively. ◀