

Exact and fixed-parameter algorithms for metro-line crossing minimization problems

Yoshio Okamoto¹, Yuichi Tatsu², and Yushi Uno²

¹ Department of Communication Engineering and Informatics, Graduate School of Informatics and Engineering, The University of Electro-Communications, 1-5-1 Chofugaoka, Chofu, Tokyo 182-8585, Japan. okamotoy@uec.ac.jp

² Department of Mathematics and Information Sciences, Graduate School of Science, Osaka Prefecture University, 1-1 Gakuen-cho, Naka-ku, Sakai 599-8531, Japan. sr301023@edu.osakafu-u.ac.jp, uno@mi.s.osakafu-u.ac.jp

Abstract. A metro-line crossing minimization problem is to draw multiple lines on an underlying graph that models stations and rail tracks so that the number of crossings of lines becomes minimum. It has several variations by adding restrictions on how lines are drawn. Among those, there is one with a restriction that line terminals have to be drawn at a verge of a station, and it is known to be NP-hard even when underlying graphs are paths. This paper studies the problem in this setting, and propose new exact algorithms. We first show that a problem to decide if lines can be drawn without crossings is solved in polynomial time, and propose a fast exponential algorithm to solve a crossing minimization problem. We then propose a fixed-parameter algorithm with respect to the multiplicity of lines, which implies that the problem is FPT.

1 Introduction

A visual representation of graphs greatly helps to understand what they model and stand for, and one of the objectives of graph drawing research is to design such algorithms that generate informative drawings. Among several targets to draw, metro maps have attracted much research interest, and the quality of drawn maps are often measured by the number of crossings of metro-lines and the goal is to minimize it. To model this, a graph is defined by regarding stations and rail tracks as vertices and edges, respectively, and by regarding a metro-line as a path on the graph, those paths are required to be drawn with fewer crossings. This model consists of two problems; one to draw a graph with fewest crossings of edges on the plane, and the other to draw paths with fewest crossings on a fixed drawing of a graph. The former is a classic problem well known as crossing number minimization of graphs, but the latter is a recently proposed problem as metro-line crossing minimization problem (MLCM) by Benkert et al. [4].

This paper studies a variation of MLCM with a restriction that line terminals have to be drawn at a verge of a station, which is called MLCM-P. It is known to be NP-hard even when its underlying graphs are paths, and we focus on such cases of MLCM-P. We first show that a problem to decide if lines can be drawn without crossings can be solved in polynomial time by reducing it to the graph planarity problem. Then we propose a fast exponential-time exact algorithm to solve a crossing minimization problem by utilizing the properties of the possible relative positions of lines. Nöllenburg [7] posed as an open problem for MLCM-P if it is fixed-parameter tractable, and also pointed out that the multiplicity of lines is a possible parameter. From this point of view, we propose a fixed-parameter algorithm with respect to this parameter based on dynamic programming approach. This is designed by carefully observing properties of optimal solutions of MLCM-P. This result

partially solves his open problem affirmatively, and such an algorithm should run practically fast since the multiplicity of lines is considered to be small in reality.

In Sect. 2 we give terminology and definitions for MLCM, and explain MLCM-P with its related research results. Sect. 3 shows that MLCM-P, which is NP-hard in general, is polynomially solvable for deciding if lines are drawn without crossings when underlying graphs are restricted to paths. Sect. 4 gives a fast exponential algorithm for MLCM-P and Sect. 5 establishes a fixed-parameter algorithm by introducing multiplicity as its parameter, both for MLCM-P when underlying graphs are paths.

2 Metro-line Crossing Minimization Problems

This section gives terminology for modeling metro-line problems and an overview of related research results.

2.1 MLCM and the Periphery Condition

An *underlying graph* of a metro map is a graph $G = (V, E)$ embedded on the plane whose vertex set V and edge set E denote stations and rail tracks between two stations, respectively. In metro-line crossing minimization problems, we assume that a drawing of an underlying graph is fixed as an input (Fig. 1(a)). Each metro-line to be drawn on the underlying graph G is called a *line*, and is assumed to be a simple path on G . For a line $l_i = (v_{i_0}, v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_k})$, vertices v_{i_0} and v_{i_k} are its *ends*. We denote by \mathcal{L} the set of lines to be drawn, and we assume that lines l_i in \mathcal{L} are distinct. In drawing metro maps in reality, we assume that each station has its area, like a rectangle or an oval for example, and we usually omit drawing the edges in E (Fig. 1(b)).




Fig. 1. (a) An underlying graph, and (b) lines drawn on the underlying graph whose edges are omitted.

For edge $(u, v) \in E$, we denote a set of lines in \mathcal{L} that pass along (u, v) by \mathcal{L}_{uv} ($= \mathcal{L}_{vu}$, by definition). We define the *order* \prec_{uv}^u (\prec_{uv}^v) of two lines $l_1, l_2 \in \mathcal{L}_{uv}$ at each end of edge (u, v) by regarding (u, v) as a directed arc, that is, when we see v from u we say that $l_1 \prec_{uv}^u l_2$ ($l_1 \prec_{uv}^v l_2$) if l_1 lies on the right side of l_2 on u (v). Then two lines l_1 and l_2 cross on edge (u, v) if $l_1 \prec_{uv}^u l_2$ and $l_2 \prec_{uv}^v l_1$ (or $l_2 \prec_{uv}^u l_1$ and $l_1 \prec_{uv}^v l_2$) hold (see Fig. 2 in Appendix). We denote by s_{uv}^u (s_{uv}^v) the sequence of lines in a line subset \mathcal{L}_{uv} sorted according to the order \prec_{uv}^u (\prec_{uv}^v). To draw a line subset $A \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ on an underlying graph G is to determine s_{uv}^u and s_{uv}^v with respect to the lines in A on every edge $(u, v) \in E$, and it defines a *layout* of A . A station is supposed to be drawn with painting its inside, and therefore, we make an assumption that lines which come into vertex v from u have to go out along edges incident

to v (except (u, v)) without crossing inside of v . Formally, let edges incident to v (except (u, v)) be vw_1, \dots, vw_k in counterclockwise order. Then the sequence formed by deleting the lines one of whose end is v from s_{uv}^v must be a subsequence of the sequence $s_{vw_1}^v, \dots, s_{vw_k}^v$ concatenated in this order. When this condition holds for all edges incident to v , such a vertex is called *admissible* (see Fig. 3 in Appendix). If all the vertices of a graph are admissible, such a layout is also called admissible. For an admissible layout of a line set \mathcal{L} on an underlying graph G , its *crossing number* is the total number of crossings of lines that occur on the edges of the graph.




Fig. 2. Lines on edge (u, v) .




Fig. 3. Two vertices (stations) that are (a) not admissible, and (b) admissible.

Now the problem MLCM is formally defined as follows [4].

MLCM

Input: an underlying graph G (embedded on the plane) and a line set \mathcal{L} on G .

Output: an admissible layout of \mathcal{L} whose number of crossings is minimum.

In an output of MLCM, it is allowed that an end of a line in a station is drawn between lines that pass through that station. However, recent research proposes a model that forbids such drawings since they may introduce some confusion [7]. Such a restriction (on a line end) is called the *periphery condition* and is formally defined as follows: an end v_{i_0} (v_{i_k}) of line $l_i = (v_{i_0}, \dots, v_{i_k})$ satisfies the periphery condition if l_i appears either in a leftmost or rightmost position with respect to $\langle_{v_{i_0} v_{i_1}}^{v_{i_0}}$ ($\langle_{v_{i_{k-1}} v_{i_k}}^{v_{i_k}}$) among all the lines in $\mathcal{L}_{v_{i_0} v_{i_1}}$ ($\mathcal{L}_{v_{i_{k-1}} v_{i_k}}$) except the ones whose end is v_{i_0} (v_{i_k}) (Fig. 4). A variation of MLCM where each line of its output satisfies the periphery condition is called MLCM-P (P stands for periphery), and is described as follows [3].

MLCM-P

Input: an underlying graph G and a line set \mathcal{L} on G .

Output: an admissible layout of \mathcal{L} where each line satisfies the periphery condition, and whose crossing number is minimum.




Fig. 4. Two layouts: (a) one that does not satisfy, and (b) the other that satisfies the periphery condition.

When we determine the position of line $l = (v_{i_0}, v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_k})$ to be leftmost (rightmost) with respect to $\prec_{v_{i_0} v_{i_1}}^{v_{i_0}}$ in $\mathcal{L}_{v_{i_0} v_{i_1}}$ (so that its end v_{i_0} satisfies the periphery condition), we say that we *assign* the end v_{i_0} to left (right) (similarly to v_{i_k}). On the other hand, a problem to find a layout under the condition that such assignments are given as inputs is proposed as MLCM-PA (A stands for assignment) [3].

MLCM-PA

Input: an underlying graph G , a line set \mathcal{L} on G and assignments (to right or left) of both ends of the lines in \mathcal{L} .

Output: an admissible layout of \mathcal{L} whose crossing number is minimum, where the position of each line end satisfies the given assignment.

2.2 Related Results and Our Problem Setting

This subsection introduces the related results on MLCM and its variations MLCM-P and MLCM-PA. Benkert, Nöllenburg, Uno and Wolff [4] started to study the problem MLCM, and proposed an $O(|\mathcal{L}|^2)$ algorithm that determines an order of lines for an edge when underlying graphs are planar. Bekos, Kaufmann, Potika and Symvonis [3] showed that MLCM-P is NP-hard even when underlying graphs are paths, and proposed an $O(|\mathcal{L}||V|)$ algorithm for MLCM-PA when underlying graphs are paths or trees and every station are restricted to have at most two sides (2-side model). Asquith, Gudmundsson and Merrick [2] designed an $O(|\mathcal{L}|^3|E|^{2.5})$ algorithm for MLCM-PA when underlying graphs are planar. For MLCM-P, they proposed a method to obtain an optimal assignment of each line end first by formulating and solving it as an integer program and then solving MLCM-PA by giving those assignments as inputs. Argytiou, Bekos, Kaufmann and Symvonis [1] proposed an $O(|V|(|E| + |\mathcal{L}|))$ algorithm for MLCM-PA when underlying graphs are planar and stations are restricted to 2-side model, and Nöllenburg [7] showed an $O(|\mathcal{L}|^2|V|)$ algorithm for MLCM-PA when underlying graphs are planar. Moreover, Nöllenburg [7] listed some open problems, e.g., that ask if MLCM is NP-hard for planar graphs, if MLCM-P is fixed-parameter tractable and if approximation algorithms for MLCM-P exist. As we saw, for metro-line crossing minimization problems, the main concern so far was to design efficient algorithms for MLCM-PA which is tractable, and not so many results can be seen for MLCM and MLCM-P.

Now, in this paper, we discuss MLCM-P which is intractable in general, and focus on the case that its underlying graphs are paths, which is still intractable. We name this problem setting MLCM-P_PATH for short. In the subsequent discussions, an input underlying graph G is always a path, and therefore we express its vertex set by $V(G) = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and edge set by $E(G) = \{(i, i + 1) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n - 1\}$, and a line is denoted by a pair of its two ends as $l = [i, j]$ ($i < j$) instead of a sequence of vertices. We call i and j left and right end of line l , respectively. For simplicity, we assume that an underlying path is a horizontal

line segment and that its left (right) end corresponds to station 1 (n). Therefore, stations become two-sided, and for each station i we call the side to which station $i - 1$ ($i + 1$) exists the left (right) side. Also for intuition, when we see station $i + 1$ from i , we say that we assign the end i (j) of line $l = [i, j]$ to top (or bottom) instead of left or right, respectively.

3 MLCM-P_PATH Crossing Problem

Even when a minimization problem is NP-hard, there are some cases where its decision version, e.g., to determine whether its minimum value is 0, belongs to class P. For example, a problem to compute the minimum number of crossings $cr(G)$ when a graph G can be drawn on the plane (CROSSING NUMBER) is NP-hard, while a problem to ask if $cr(G) = 0$ (PLANARITY) is solvable in linear time [6]. Also a problem to draw binary tanglegrams with minimum number of crossings is NP-hard, while to ask if it is 0 is solved in linear time [5]. Although MLCM-P_PATH is NP-hard, we can consider its decision version, that is, to determine if the number of crossings of its optimal layout is 0, which we name MLCM-P_PATH CROSSING, and we have the following fact for this problem.

Theorem 1. MLCM-P_PATH CROSSING is in P.

We will prove Theorem 1 by reducing MLCM-P_PATH CROSSING to PLANARITY. To this end, we introduce the following artificial problem, CIRCLE INSIDE CROSSING (CIC), and take two steps: first reduce MLCM-P_PATH CROSSING to CIC, and then reduce CIC to PLANARITY.

CIRCLE INSIDE CROSSING (CIC)

Input: a graph $H = (V, E)$ and a bijection $\delta: V \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, |V|\}$.

Output: draw vertices of V on a single line in the order defined by δ and a circle that passes through $\delta^{-1}(1)$ and contains all the other vertices: then if all the edges in E are drawn within the circle without crossings, output yes; otherwise no.

For example, for a graph shown in Fig. 5(a) and $\delta(i) = i$, since there exists a drawing shown in Fig. 5(b), the output is yes.




Fig. 5. (a) An input graph for CIC, and (b) its drawing within a circle without crossings.

First Step: In the first step, we transform an instance $I = (G, \mathcal{L})$ of MLCM-P_PATH CROSSING to an instance $I' = (G', \delta')$ of CIC in the following manner. Remember that G in I is defined by $V(G) = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $E(G) = \{(i, i+1) \mid 1 \leq i < n\}$, and $l \in \mathcal{L}$ is defined

by $[i, j]$. We define G' by letting $V(G') = V(G)$ and $E(G') = E(G) \cup \{(i, j) \mid [i, j] \in \mathcal{L}\}$. We also define $\delta'(i) = i$. For an instance I' obtained from I in this way, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 1. The minimum number of crossings of an instance I of MLCM-P_PATH CROSSING and of an instance I' of CIC are equal.

Proof. Once we determine an admissible layout for an instance I of MLCM-P, we have its corresponding assignments to top or bottom of both ends of lines in \mathcal{L} . Let such an assignment be \mathcal{A} and let an instance of MLCM-PA be $(G, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{A})$ defined by $I = (G, \mathcal{L})$ together with \mathcal{A} . Below, to prove Lemma 1, we construct a graph $G^* = (V^*, E^*)$ from an instance $(G, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{A})$ of MLCM-PA and observe its properties. Let $V^* = \{1_\uparrow, 1_\downarrow, \dots, n_\uparrow, n_\downarrow\}$, where i_\uparrow and i_\downarrow correspond to top and bottom, respectively, of each vertex i of $V(G)$, and let E^* be an edge set each of whose edge connects two vertices of V^* corresponding to both ends of each line in \mathcal{L} with assignment to top or bottom of its ends. For G^* constructed in this way, a *circular drawing* of G^* is to draw a circle and put vertices $1_\uparrow, 2_\uparrow, \dots, n_\uparrow, n_\downarrow, (n-1)_\downarrow, \dots, 1_\downarrow$ in this order on the circle counterclockwise, and to draw each edge in E^* as a chord to connect two end vertices on a circle (Fig. 6(a) and (b)).




Fig. 6. (a) A layout of I of MLCM-P without crossings and its corresponding instance $(G, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{A})$ of MLCM-PA, (b) a circular drawing of G^* without crossings constructed from $(G, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{A})$, (c) a transformation into a half-circle drawing of I' , (d) a circle-inside drawing of I' .

Then the following lemma holds.

Lemma 2. The minimum number of crossings of an instance $(G, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{A})$ of MLCM-PA and the crossing number of the circular drawing of G^* are equal.

Proof. By transforming a layout with minimum number of crossings of an instance $(G, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{A})$ of MLCM-PA in the following manner, we will obtain a circular drawing of G^* with the same number of crossings. For such a layout of MLCM-PA (Fig. 7(a)), we first generate vertices i_\uparrow and i_\downarrow that correspond to top and bottom of each station i , and locate them to the top and the bottom of station i , respectively. Then connect the ends of lines that are assigned to top or bottom at either side of station i to i_\uparrow or i_\downarrow , respectively, with keeping their relative

positions. Further, draw a rectangle to make its perimeter pass vertices $1_\uparrow, \dots, n_\uparrow, 1_\downarrow, \dots, n_\downarrow$ in this order and to contain all stations and lines in it (Fig. 7(b)). Next remove ovals that represent stations, and transform the circumference of the rectangle continuously into a circle by keeping relative positions and connections of vertices, lines, and their crossings (Fig. 7(c)).

Now in addition to vertices $1_\uparrow, \dots, n_\uparrow, 1_\downarrow, \dots, n_\downarrow$, by viewing line ends as vertices and connectors between vertices as edges, we regard all of these elements to constitute a graph. In this graph, contract vertex i_\uparrow (i_\downarrow) and those connected to it into one, and then draw all the edges as a straight line segment (chord of a circle). Finally, flip the entire graph by axis line $1_\uparrow n_\downarrow$, and we obtain a circular drawing of G^* whose number of crossings is equal to the minimum number of crossings of a layout of MLCM-PA (Fig. 7(d)).

Conversely, by doing this transformation in the reverse order, we obtain a layout of MLCM-PA whose number of crossings is the same as that in a circular drawing of G^* . \square




Fig. 7. (a) A layout of an instance for MLCM-PA with minimum number of crossings, (b) draw a surrounding rectangle, add vertices on it and connectors to them, (c) remove stations and transform the rectangle into a circle, and (d) contract each set of vertices related to i_\uparrow (i_\downarrow).

Now we can see that the assignment of each end of lines is determined once we fix a layout with minimum number of crossings for an instance I of MLCM-P_PATH CROSSING. So let $(G, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{A}^*)$ be an instance of MLCM-PA, whose input is defined by $I = (G, \mathcal{L})$ together with such assignment \mathcal{A}^* . By Lemma 2, the number of crossings in a circular drawing of G^* constructed from $(G, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{A}^*)$ coincides with the minimum number of crossings of $(G, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{A}^*)$. Then we obtain a drawing with the same number of crossings of an instance I' of CIC by transforming a circular drawing of G^* in the following manner. For a circular drawing of G^* , put its vertices $1_\uparrow, 2_\uparrow, \dots, n_\uparrow, n_\downarrow, (n-1)_\downarrow, \dots, 1_\downarrow$ on a straight line from left to right in this order, and ‘extend’ each chord and a circle in the form of half-circle accompanied by this operation (Fig. 6(c)). Setting the midpoint of n_\uparrow and n_\downarrow to be a center, we ‘fold’ the part of $n_\downarrow, \dots, 1_\downarrow$ by rotating it 180° clockwise, and contract each i_\uparrow and i_\downarrow to make vertex i (Fig. 6(d)). Such a drawing (of I') obtained in this way has the same number of crossings as the minimum number of crossings of $(G, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{A}^*)$, by regarding the arc segments of a drawing of G^* as parts of $E(G')$ of I' of CIC.

Conversely, starting from a drawing with minimum number of crossings of I' , we have a circular drawing of G^* with the same number of crossings by executing this transformation in the reverse direction. Then we have a layout of I with the same number of crossings by making assignments of ends of lines in \mathcal{L} of I based on this circular drawing. \square

By Lemma 1, we have the following fact that tells about the relationship between two problems MLCM-P_PATH CROSSING and CIC.

Corollary 1. The output of an instance I of MLCM-P_PATH CROSSING is yes if and only if the output of an instance I' of CIC.

Second Step: Corollary 1 ensures the correctness of the reduction from MLCM-P_PATH CROSSING to CIC. However, we notice that the drawing in CIC is restricted in the point that edges cannot pass across a circle. In the next step to reduce CIC to PLANARITY, we force this restriction in the reduction. To this end, it suffices to construct a graph, which contains G' of I' , can be planar only if it contains G' and should be drawn within a cycle that corresponds to a circle in a drawing of G' of CIC. To attain this, we adopt K_4 , which is a minimal non-outerplanar graph.

Now we construct an instance I'' of PLANARITY in the following way. For an instance $I' = (G', \delta')$ of CIC obtained from an instance I of MLCM-P_PATH CROSSING, we ‘pad’ vertex 1_\uparrow of G' onto each vertex of K_4 which is drawn on the plane without crossings, and we make it G'' of an instance I'' of PLANARITY (Fig. 8 in Appendix).




Fig. 8. A graph G'' for PLANARITY obtained by a graph G' of CIC, where G' is in Fig. 6(d). A dashed cycle corresponds to the circle in CIC.

Then we have the following lemma with respect to an instance I' of CIC and an instance I'' of PLANARITY.

Lemma 3. The output of an instance I' of CIC is yes if and only if the output of an instance I'' of PLANARITY is yes.

Proof. Since K_4 is planar but not outerplanar, at least one of its vertex is not on the outer boundary of its planar drawing. Therefore, if we assume that G'' is planar, at least one of four ‘padding’ of G' onto each vertex of K_4 has to be drawn inside of a cycle of a planar

drawing of K_4 . Then if we regard a cycle as a circle, a subgraph of G'' composed by G' is a drawing of G' inside a circle without crossings. Conversely, if we have a non-crossing drawing of G' of I' within a circle, we have a non-crossing drawing of G'' of I'' simply by drawing K_4 without crossings and padding such a drawing of G' onto each vertex of K_4 so that their edges do not cross with already drawn edges. \square

Combining Lemmas 1 and 3, we see that the output of an instance I of MLCM-P_PATH CROSSING is yes if and only if the output of an instance I'' of PLANARITY is yes, and this shows the correctness of the reduction in two steps.

Based on the reductions, we show by an algorithm how we can solve MLCM-P_PATH CROSSING. In lines 1–2 of the algorithm, since it generates $O(|V|)$ vertices and $O(|E| + |\mathcal{L}|)$ edges to construct I' from I and then I'' from I' , it requires $O(|V| + |E| + |\mathcal{L}|)$ time. Then for solving PLANARITY for I'' in line 3, by using a linear-time algorithm [6], it takes $O(|V| + |E| + |\mathcal{L}|)$ time. Therefore, the overall computational time of this algorithms is $O(|V| + |E| + |\mathcal{L}|)$, and this completes the proof of Theorem 1.

Algorithm MLCM-P_PATH CROSSING

Input: an underlying graph $G = (V, E)$ and a line set \mathcal{L} .

Output: if there exists a layout of \mathcal{L} on G without crossings YES, otherwise NO.

- 1: construct an instance $I' = (G', \delta')$ of CIRCLE INSIDE CROSSING from $I = (G, \mathcal{L})$;
 - 2: construct an instance $I'' = (G'')$ of PLANARITY from I' ;
 - 3: solve PLANARITY for I'' by using an existing algorithm;
 - 4: **if** the output for I'' is yes **then**
 - 5: **return** yes;
 - 6: **else**
 - 7: **return** no;
 - 8: **end if**
-

4 An Exact Exponential Algorithm for MLCM-P_PATH

In this section, we propose a fast exponential exact algorithm for MLCM-P_PATH which is NP-hard.

To solve MLCM-P_PATH exactly, a naive approach is to compute the number of crossings for all possible layouts of lines in \mathcal{L} by using an $O(|\mathcal{L}||V|)$ time algorithm for MLCM-PA [3], and then to output the layout with minimum number of crossings among them. Since the number of different assignments of two ends (to top or bottom) of a line is four, this idea yields an algorithm whose running time is $O(4^{|\mathcal{L}|} \times |\mathcal{L}||V|) = O^*(4^{|\mathcal{L}|})$.[†] We propose a faster exponential algorithm that works in $O^*(2^{|\mathcal{L}|})$ time.

For the purpose of computing the number of crossings when the assignment of lines to top or bottom, we classify the relationship of the positions of two lines $l = [i, j]$, $l' = [i', j']$ as follows, that is, type A: $i < i' < j < j'$, type C_l: $i = i'$, type C_r: $j = j'$, type I: $i' < i < j < j'$, and type D: $j < i'$. Here we assume without loss of generality that either $j < j'$, or $j = j'$ and $i > i'$ holds. Fig. 9 shows these five types. We use Type C to denote both types of C_l and C_r.

For types A, C and I, since two lines of these types have a common interval, there are some cases in which crossings of two lines cannot be avoided to satisfy the periphery

[†] The O^* -notation ignores a polynomial factor, commonly used in the exponential-time algorithm literature.




Fig. 9. Five types of relative positions of two lines.

condition, depending on the assignment of line ends. On the other hand, MLCM-PA with these assignments of line ends can be drawn only with unavoidable crossings [3], the number of those is equal to the minimum number of crossings for the given assignment.

Here, we denote an assignment a_l of the left end i and the right end j of a line $l = [i, j]$ by a pair of up and down arrows $\{\uparrow, \downarrow\} \times \{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$, where \uparrow and \downarrow imply top and bottom, respectively. For example, if both left and right ends of a line l is assigned to top, its assignment is denoted by $a_l = (\uparrow, \uparrow)$. We also denote by $a_l = (\uparrow, *)$ to imply $a_l = (\uparrow, \uparrow)$ and $a_l = (\uparrow, \downarrow)$. The number of different assignments of four line ends of two lines is $2^4 = 16$, and for example for type A (Fig. 10), we see that the following assignments among those must have a crossing, by examining all possible cases. We can similarly find these assignments for types C and I, and obtain the following observation.




Fig. 10. All the assignments of a pair of two lines in type A that have a crossing: (a) $a_l = (\uparrow, \uparrow)$ and $a_{l'} = (\uparrow, *)$, (b) $a_l = (\uparrow, \downarrow)$ and $a_{l'} = (\downarrow, *)$, (c) $a_l = (\downarrow, \uparrow)$ and $a_{l'} = (\uparrow, *)$, and (d) $a_l = (\downarrow, \downarrow)$ and $a_{l'} = (\downarrow, *)$.

Fact 1. For types A, C and I, a pair of lines has a crossing in the following assignments of their ends.

Type A: (1) $a_l = (\uparrow, \uparrow)$ and $a_{l'} = (\uparrow, *)$, (2) $a_l = (\uparrow, \downarrow)$ and $a_{l'} = (\downarrow, *)$, (3) $a_l = (\downarrow, \uparrow)$ and $a_{l'} = (\uparrow, *)$, or (4) $a_l = (\downarrow, \downarrow)$ and $a_{l'} = (\downarrow, *)$.

Type C_l: (1) $a_l = (\uparrow, \downarrow)$ and $a_{l'} = (\downarrow, *)$, or (2) $a_l = (\downarrow, \uparrow)$ and $a_{l'} = (\uparrow, *)$.

Type C_r: (1) $a_l = (\uparrow, \downarrow)$ and $a_{l'} = (*, \uparrow)$, or (2) $a_l = (\downarrow, \uparrow)$ and $a_{l'} = (*, \uparrow)$.

Type I: (1) $a_l = (\uparrow, \downarrow)$, or (2) $a_l = (\downarrow, \uparrow)$.

The basic idea of the algorithm we propose is to try all possible assignments of left ends of lines and to greedily determine the assignments of right ends for each assignment of left ends so that the number of crossings becomes minimum. Fact 1 guarantees the correctness of this greedy strategy. We show our algorithm, which we call FixLeftEnd for MLCM-P_PATH, below.

In line 8 of the algorithm, it determines for each line l_j the assignment of the right end of l_j so that it has fewer crossings with line l_k (of types A, C_l or I) whose right end is right

Algorithm FixLeftEnd for MLCM-P_PATH

Input: an underlying graph $G = (V, E)$ and a line set \mathcal{L} .

Output: assignments of left and right ends of each line to \uparrow or \downarrow to minimize the number of crossings.

```
1: main{
2:   min_cross =  $\infty$ ;
3:   assign(1);
4:   return currently saved assignment; }
5: assign(i){
6:   if  $i = |\mathcal{L}| + 1$  then
7:     for  $j = 1$  to  $|\mathcal{L}|$  do
8:       determine the assignment of right end  $t_j$  of line  $l_j = [s_j, t_j]$  so that the number of crossings with
          lines  $l_k = [s_k, t_k]$  satisfying  $s_k < t_j < t_k$  becomes minimum (tie breaks by assigning it to top);
9:     end for
10:    crossing_number = the number of crossings generated by the determined assignment;
11:    if crossing_number < min_cross then
12:      min_cross = crossing_number;
13:      save the current assignment;
14:    end if
15:  else
16:    assign the left end of line  $l_i$  to top;
17:    assign( $i + 1$ );
18:    assign the left end of line  $l_i$  to bottom;
19:    assign( $i + 1$ );
20:  end if
21: }
```

to the right end t_j of l_j . Here, according to Fact 1, since whether l_j and l_k cross or not is determined by the assignments of both ends of l_j and the left end of l_k , the assignment of the right end of l_k does not affect it. Therefore, to determine the assignment of the right end of l_j in line 8 does not affect to the crossings with the lines whose right ends are left to t_j , and is not affected by the assignments of right ends of lines whose right ends are right to t_j . This implies that the output by the algorithm has minimum number of crossings except the ones caused by pairs of lines of type C_r . Notice that the algorithm assigns a right end to top when the numbers of crossings caused by its assignment to top and bottom are equal. Now we can show that any pair of lines of type C_r do not cross in the output of this algorithm.

Lemma 4. Any two lines of type C_r do not cross in the output of Algorithm FixLeftEnd for MLCM-P_PATH.

Proof. Assume that left ends of two lines $l = [i, j]$ and $l' = [i', j]$ ($i' < i$) of their position are assigned both to top. Then according to Fact 1, l and l' cross if and only if $a_l = (\uparrow, \downarrow)$ and $a_{l'} = (\uparrow, \uparrow)$. Let c_u (c_d) denote the number of crossings of line l and a line in a position of type A, C_l or I when the right end of l is assigned to top (bottom) by Algorithm FixLeftEnd. We define c'_u (c'_d) similarly. Since the position of l and l' is of type C_r , $c_u \leq c'_u$ and $c'_d \leq c_d$ hold. Now if the algorithm assigns right ends of l and l' to bottom and top, respectively, so that they cross, $c_d < c_u$ and $c'_u < c'_d$ hold. This implies $c_u \leq c'_u < c'_d \leq c_d < c_u$, which is a contradiction.

Similarly to this argument, in cases of left ends of l and l' are assigned to top and bottom, bottom and top, and bottom and bottom, we can obtain a similar contradiction if the algorithm assigns the right ends of l and l' so that they cross. Hence, two lines of type C_r do not cross in the output of the algorithm. \square

By Fact 1 and Lemma 4, since determining the assignment of the right end of line l_j greedily achieves the minimum number of crossings for a given assignment of left ends, we have the following result.

Theorem 2. Algorithm FixLeftEnd for MLCM-P_PATH outputs an assignment of line ends that achieves the minimum number of crossings.

The assignment of the right end of line l_j is determined by counting the numbers of crossings when it is assigned to top or bottom and comparing them in $O(|\mathcal{L}|) \times O(1)$ time. Therefore, it takes $O(|\mathcal{L}|^2)$ time for all the lines. Also, since there are $2^{|\mathcal{L}|}$ ways of assigning left ends of all the lines, Algorithm FixLeftEnd for MLCM-P_PATH takes $O(2^{|\mathcal{L}|} \times |\mathcal{L}|^2) = O^*(2^{|\mathcal{L}|})$ time in total. To obtain an actual layout, we can use the algorithm of Bekos et al. [3] for MLCM-PA by giving the output of Algorithm FixLeftEnd for MLCM-P_PATH as its input. Thus we have the following theorem.

Theorem 3. MLCM-P_PATH is solved in $O^*(2^{|\mathcal{L}|})$ time.

5 Fixed-Parameter Algorithms for MLCM-P_PATH

Nöllenburg [7] asked as an open problem if MLCM-P is fixed-parameter tractable, and also pointed out that the ‘multiplicity’ of lines is a possible parameter. Here, the *multiplicity* of a line set \mathcal{L} is defined to be $\max\{|\mathcal{L}_{uv}| \mid (u, v) \in E\}$, that is, the maximum number of lines on an edge of an underlying graph. In the real metro maps, the multiplicity is relatively small, therefore fixed-parameter algorithms with respect to the multiplicity are considered to run fast.

Let the multiplicity of an input line set be k . Then the number of possible permutations of lines on left and right sides of each station are both $O(k!)$. Since a layout for MLCM-P_PATH is determined by those permutations on both sides of all stations, a naive algorithm that enumerates all possible permutations of lines on $2|V| - 2$ sides of $|V|$ stations and outputs a layout with the minimum number of crossings after checking if each layout is admissible can run in $O(k!^{2|V|})$ time. However, this is not a fixed-parameter algorithm since its running time is not expressed in a form of $O(f(k) \cdot |V|^{O(1)})$. In this section, we first explain a fixed-parameter algorithm for computing an *optimal* layout that determines permutations on left and right sides of stations from 1 to n by using dynamic programming, and then accelerate it by using properties of optimal layouts or devising efficient ways of computing.

5.1 A Naive Fixed-Parameter Algorithm

Let sets of permutations of lines on the left and right sides of station i be $\widehat{\Pi}_i^\ell$ and $\widehat{\Pi}_i^r$, respectively. For an input (G, \mathcal{L}) of MLCM-P_PATH, let $\mathcal{L}_i^r (= \mathcal{L}_{i+1}^\ell)$ denote the set of lines that pass edge $(i, i+1)$, and denote by \mathcal{T}_i^ℓ and \mathcal{T}_i^r the set of lines that have their right ends on the left side and left ends on the right side, respectively, of station i . We now define two functions f_ℓ and f_r with respect to the minimum number of crossings of a layout:

- $f_\ell(\pi, i)$: the minimum number of line crossings from station 1 to i when the lines in \mathcal{L}_i^ℓ are in the order of $\pi \in \widehat{\Pi}_i^\ell$ on the left side of station i ;
- $f_r(\pi, i)$: the minimum number of line crossings from station 1 to i when the lines in \mathcal{L}_i^r are in the order of $\pi \in \widehat{\Pi}_i^r$ on the right side of station i .

Then the minimum number of crossings for MLCM-P_PATH is denoted by $\min\{f_\ell(\pi, n) \mid \pi \in \widehat{\Pi}_n^\ell\}$.

We can confirm the substructure optimality property of MLCM-P_PATH as follows. When the lines in \mathcal{L}_i^ℓ are in the order of $\pi \in \widehat{\Pi}_i^\ell$ on the left side of station i , let permutations from on the right side of station 1 to the right side of station $i - 1$ in $\widehat{\Pi}_1^r, \widehat{\Pi}_2^\ell, \dots, \widehat{\Pi}_{i-1}^\ell, \widehat{\Pi}_{i-1}^r$ that achieves $f_\ell(\pi, i)$ be $\pi_1^r, \pi_2^\ell, \dots, \pi_{i-1}^\ell, \pi_{i-1}^r$, respectively. Here $f_\ell(\pi, i)$ is the sum of the number of crossings caused by $\pi_1^r, \pi_2^\ell, \dots, \pi_{i-1}^\ell, \pi_{i-1}^r$ to the left side of station $i - 1$, and by π_{i-1}^r on the right side of station $i - 1$ and π on the left side of station i . If $\pi_1^r, \pi_2^\ell, \dots, \pi_{i-1}^\ell$ from on the left side of station 1 to the left side of station $i - 1$ do not achieve $f_r(\pi_{i-1}^r, i - 1)$, then there exist other permutations that achieve it, and replacing $\pi_1^r, \pi_2^\ell, \dots, \pi_{i-1}^\ell$ with them decreases $f_\ell(\pi, i)$. Therefore $\pi_1^r, \pi_2^\ell, \dots, \pi_{i-1}^\ell$ must be permutations that achieve $f_r(\pi_{i-1}^r, i - 1)$.

Similarly, when the lines in \mathcal{L}_i^r are in the order of $\pi \in \widehat{\Pi}_i^r$ on the right side of station i , let permutations from on the right side of station 1 to the left side of station i in $\widehat{\Pi}_1^r, \widehat{\Pi}_2^\ell, \dots, \widehat{\Pi}_{i-1}^r, \widehat{\Pi}_i^\ell$ that achieve $f_r(\pi, i)$ be $\pi_1^r, \pi_2^\ell, \dots, \pi_{i-1}^r, \pi_i^\ell$, respectively. Then, since $f_r(\pi, i) = f_\ell(\pi_i^\ell, i)$ holds for a layout to be admissible, $\pi_1^r, \pi_2^\ell, \dots, \pi_{i-1}^r, \pi_i^\ell$ must be permutations from the right side of station 1 to the right side of station $i - 1$ that achieve $f_\ell(\pi_i^\ell, i)$.

As we observed, since MLCM-P_PATH has a substructure optimality, we can derive the following recurrence with respect to f_ℓ and f_r .

$$f_r(\pi, i) = \begin{cases} 0 & (\text{if } i = 1), \\ \min\{f_\ell(\pi', i) \mid \pi_{\mathcal{L}_i^r \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^r} = \pi'_{\mathcal{L}_i^\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^\ell}\} & (\text{if } i > 1), \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

$$f_\ell(\pi, i) = \min\{f_r(\pi', i - 1) + t(\pi', \pi)\}. \quad (2)$$

Here, for a permutation π of the lines in \mathcal{L} and a subset $A (\subset \mathcal{L})$, we define π_A to be a subsequence of π obtained by deleting the lines of $\mathcal{L} \setminus A$ from π . In equation (1), $\mathcal{L}_i^r \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^r$ denotes the set of lines that pass the right end of station i except the lines whose left end is on the right side of station i , and $\pi_{\mathcal{L}_i^r \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^r}$ is a permutation consists of those lines. (Similarly for $\mathcal{L}_i^\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^\ell$ and $\pi_{\mathcal{L}_i^\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^\ell}$.) Therefore, $\pi_{\mathcal{L}_i^r \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^r} = \pi'_{\mathcal{L}_i^\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^\ell}$ implies that lines do not cross within stations so that layouts are admissible. In equation (2), $t(\pi, \pi')$ denotes the number of inversions of π and π' , that is, the number of pairs (i, j) that satisfy $\pi(i) < \pi(j)$ and $\pi'(i) > \pi'(j)$.

We now estimate the complexity of computing f_r and f_ℓ based on these recurrences. Let the multiplicity be k . Then $|\widehat{\Pi}_i^r| \leq k!$ and $|\widehat{\Pi}_i^\ell| \leq k!$ hold. For computing f_r for a single station, since it checks if the condition for min is satisfied in $O(k)$ time for each of $O(k!)$ f_ℓ 's, it takes $O(k \cdot k!)$ time. Similarly, computing f_ℓ for a single station takes $O(k^2 \cdot k!)$ time, since it computes the number of inversions in $O(k^2)$ time for each of $O(k!)$ f_r 's. Finally, since there are $O(k!)$ f_r 's and f_ℓ 's for every station and there are $|V|$ stations, the overall time becomes $O(k^2(k!)^2|V|) = O(2^{O(k \log k)}|V|)$. This dynamic programming approach leads to a fixed-parameter algorithm with respect to the multiplicity k whose running time is $O(2^{O(k \log k)}|V|)$.

5.2 Accelerate the Fixed-Parameter Algorithm

The naive algorithm explained in Subsect. 5.1 considered permutations that do not satisfy the periphery condition on both sides of stations. Still, there may exist other permutations

that are not necessary for finding an optimal layout. In this subsection, we show a series of lemmas that can restrict permutations to be considered for deriving an optimal layout. Furthermore, we design a faster fixed-parameter algorithm by implementing an efficient way of computing a DP table.

Lemma 5. Among optimal layouts for MLCM-PA when underlying graphs are paths, there exists one that satisfies the following condition: if two lines $l = [i, j]$ and $l' = [i', j']$ ($j < j'$) cross, the crossing occurs on edge $(j - 1, j)$ of its underlying graph.

This is shown by the fact that the algorithm which solves MLCM-PA [3] outputs a layout satisfying this property. By using Lemma 5, we can show a similar property on an optimal layout for MLCM-P_PATH.

Lemma 6. Among optimal layouts for MLCM-P_PATH, there exists one that satisfies the condition that, if two lines $l = [i, j]$ and $l' = [i', j']$ ($j < j'$) cross, the crossing occurs on edge $(j - 1, j)$ of its underlying graph.

Proof. An optimal layout for an instance (G, \mathcal{L}) of MLCM-P is also that of an instance $(G, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{A})$ of MLCM-PA where \mathcal{A} is the corresponding assignment of line ends of that layout. By Lemma 5, there exists a layout in which crossing two lines $l = [i, j]$ and $l' = [i', j']$ ($j < j'$) cross on edge $(j - 1, j)$ among optimal layouts for $(G, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{A})$. Since an optimal layout for an instance $(G, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{A})$ of MLCM-PA is also an optimal layout for (G, \mathcal{L}) , the lemma holds. \square

The algorithm to solve MLCM-PA when underlying graphs are paths [3] determines a layout of each line from its left end to right end. This works correctly if we change the direction, that is, if it determines from right end to left end. This and Lemma 6 lead to the following corollary.

Corollary 2. Among optimal layouts for MLCM-P_PATH, there exists one that satisfies the condition that, if two lines $l = [i, j], l' = [i', j']$ ($i < i'$) cross, the crossing occurs on edge $(i', i' + 1)$ of its underlying graph.

Based on Lemma 6 and Corollary 2, we have the following lemma with respect to crossings in optimal layouts.

Lemma 7. In optimal layouts for MLCM-P_PATH, two lines of type C (C_1 and C_r) do not cross.

Proof. First consider type C_r . Assume that two lines l_1 and l_2 whose right ends are on station i cross in an optimal layout. Then by Fact 1, assignments of their right ends are different. Also by Lemma 6, we may assume that any two lines cross on edge immediately before the right end of a line whose right end is left to the other's.

Now we classify the lines in $\mathcal{L}_{i-1, i} \setminus \{l_1, l_2\}$ as follows (Fig. 11(a)). For the lines passing through station i , let those above l_1 and l_2 on the right side of station $i - 1$ be T , those between l_1 and l_2 be M , and those below l_1 and l_2 be B . For the lines whose assignments of right ends are top, let those above l_1 and l_2 on the right side of station $i - 1$ be T_\uparrow , those between l_1 and l_2 be M_\uparrow , and those below l_1 and l_2 be B_\uparrow . For the lines whose assignments of right ends are bottom, we define $T_\downarrow, M_\downarrow$ and B_\downarrow similarly.

Then we can see, in Fig. 11(a), that the crossings created by l_1 and l_2 in an optimal layout are those by l_1 and l_2 , by l_1 and lines in $M_\uparrow, M, B_\uparrow$ or B , and by l_2 and T, T_\downarrow, M or

M_\downarrow . Therefore, the number of crossings c_1 becomes $c_1 = 1 + |M_\uparrow| + |M| + |B_\uparrow| + |B| + |T| + |T_\downarrow| + |M| + |M_\downarrow|$. On the other hand, if we change the assignments of right ends of both l_1 and l_2 (Fig. 11(b)), the crossings created by l_1 and l_2 are those by l_1 and lines in T_\downarrow or T and by l_2 and B_\uparrow or B , and thus the number of crossings c_2 becomes $c_2 = |T_\downarrow| + |T| + |B_\uparrow| + |B|$. Then $c_1 - c_2 = 2|M| + |M_\uparrow| + |M_\downarrow| + 1$, and the number of crossings decreases at least by 1, which contradicts the assumption that the original layout is optimal. Therefore, lines of type C_r do not cross in an optimal layout.

Next consider type C_1 . Again assume that l_1 and l_2 whose left ends are on station i cross in an optimal layout. Then by Fact 1, assignments of their left ends are different. Also by Lemma 6, we may assume that any two lines cross on edge immediately after the left end of a line whose left end is right to the other's. Now by flipping lines in $\mathcal{L}_{i,i+1}$ horizontally, we can do similar arguments as above, and finally lines of type C_1 do not cross in an optimal layout. \square




Fig. 11. (a) Relative positions of lines in $\mathcal{L}_{i-1,i}$, and (b) those after changing assignment of right ends of l_1 and l_2 . Black lines are l_1 and l_2 , blue lines are T , T_\uparrow and T_\downarrow , green lines are M , M_\uparrow and M_\downarrow , and red lines are B , B_\uparrow and B_\downarrow .

We introduce some notation about the properties satisfied by permutations of lines. For a permutation π of lines in \mathcal{L}_i^r on the right side of station i , we define a function $P_r(\pi)$ as follows: $P_r(\pi) = 1$ if left ends of all lines of $\mathcal{T}_i^r (\subseteq \mathcal{L}_i^r)$ satisfy the periphery condition; $P_r(\pi) = 0$, otherwise (Fig. 12). We define similarly a function $P_\ell(\pi)$ for a permutation π of lines of \mathcal{L}_i^ℓ on the left side of station i . For a permutation π of lines in subset $A (\subset \mathcal{L})$, we define a function $Q_r(\pi)$ as follows: $Q_r(\pi) = 1$ if all right ends of lines of A satisfy the periphery condition when they are layout in parallel in the order of π ; $Q_r(\pi) = 0$, otherwise (Fig. 13). We define similarly a function $Q_\ell(\pi)$ for a permutation π of lines in A , that is, $Q_\ell(\pi) = 1$ if all left ends of lines in A satisfy the periphery condition when they are layout in parallel in the order of π ; $Q_\ell(\pi) = 0$, otherwise.

By Lemmas 6 and 7, we restrict the permutations on the left and right side of stations to be considered in order to obtain optimal layouts. We first restrict permutations on the left side of each station i . Due to the periphery condition, a permutation π on the left side of a station satisfies $P_\ell(\pi) = 1$. By Lemma 7, since lines in \mathcal{T}_i^ℓ do not cross in optimal layouts, only permutations satisfying $Q_\ell(\pi_{\mathcal{T}_i^\ell}) = 1$ need to be considered. In addition, by Lemma 6, since we may assume that lines passing through station i do not cross before station i , we have only to consider permutations that satisfy $Q_\ell(\pi_{\mathcal{L}_i^\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^\ell}) = 1$ to find an




Fig. 12. A permutation π on the right side of a station: (a) $P_r(\pi) = 1$, and (b) $P_r(\pi) = 0$.




Fig. 13. A permutation π on the right side of a station: (a) $Q_r(\pi) = 1$, and (b) $Q_r(\pi) = 0$. Circled line ends are between the other lines.

optimal layout. We let the set of permutations that satisfy these conditions be Π_i^ℓ , that is, $\Pi_i^\ell = \{\pi \mid P_\ell(\pi) = 1, Q_\ell(\pi_{\mathcal{T}_i^\ell}) = 1, Q_\ell(\pi_{\mathcal{L}_i^\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^\ell}) = 1\}$.

We then restrict permutations on the right side of each station i . Due to the periphery condition, a permutation π on the right side satisfies $P_r(\pi) = 1$. By Lemma 7, since lines in \mathcal{T}_i^r do not cross in optimal layouts, only permutations satisfying $Q_r(\pi_{\mathcal{T}_i^r}) = 1$ need to be considered. In addition, by Lemma 6, since we can assume that lines passing through station i do not cross before station i , we have only to consider permutations that satisfy $Q_\ell(\pi_{\mathcal{L}_i^r \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^r}) = 1$ to find an optimal layout. We let the set of permutations that satisfy these conditions be Π_i^r , that is, $\Pi_i^r = \{\pi \mid P_r(\pi) = 1, Q_r(\pi_{\mathcal{T}_i^r}) = 1, Q_\ell(\pi_{\mathcal{L}_i^r \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^r}) = 1\}$.

Now we can change the recurrence equation (2) in Subsect. 5.1 in the following form by incorporating these restrictions on permutations on the left and right sides of every station:

$$f_\ell(\pi, i) = \min\{f_r(\pi', i-1) + t(\pi', \pi) \mid \pi_{\mathcal{L}_i^\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^\ell} = \pi'_{\mathcal{L}_{i-1}^r \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^\ell}, \pi_{\mathcal{T}_i^\ell} = \pi'_{\mathcal{T}_i^\ell}\}. \quad (3)$$

In equation (3), $\pi_{\mathcal{L}_i^\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^\ell} = \pi'_{\mathcal{L}_{i-1}^r \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^\ell}$ implies by Lemma 6 that lines that pass through station i do not cross, and $\pi_{\mathcal{T}_i^\ell} = \pi'_{\mathcal{T}_i^\ell}$ implies by Lemma 7 that lines that have their right ends on the left side of station i do not cross. Now we have the following lemma with respect to the sizes of Π_i^ℓ and Π_i^r .

Lemma 8. Let k be the multiplicity of lines. Then $|\Pi_i^\ell| \leq 2^k$ and $|\Pi_i^r| \leq 2^k$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$) hold.

Proof. First we consider any permutation $\pi \in \Pi_i^\ell$. Since $Q_\ell(\pi_{\mathcal{L}_i^\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^\ell}) = 1$, lines in $\mathcal{L}_i^\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^\ell$ are sorted by their positions of left ends and are located in this order at the left side of station i either above or below line l whose left end is the leftmost among them. Such ways correspond to those of partitioning lines in $\mathcal{L}_i^\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^\ell$ (except l) into two subsets, and the number is not greater than $2^{|\mathcal{L}_i^\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^\ell|}$. Also, since $P_\ell(\pi) = 1$ and $Q_\ell(\pi_{\mathcal{T}_i^\ell}) = 1$, lines in \mathcal{T}_i^ℓ are sorted by their positions of left ends and are located in this order at the left side of station i either above or below lines in $\mathcal{L}_i^\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^\ell$. Such ways correspond to those partitioning lines in \mathcal{T}_i^ℓ into two subsets, and the number is not greater than $2^{|\mathcal{T}_i^\ell|}$. Thus the size of Π_i^ℓ is not greater than $2^{|\mathcal{L}_i^\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^\ell|} \times 2^{|\mathcal{T}_i^\ell|} = 2^{|\mathcal{L}_i^\ell|}$. Since $|\mathcal{L}_i^\ell| \leq k$, we have $2^{|\mathcal{L}_i^\ell|} \leq 2^k$.

Next we consider any permutation $\pi \in \Pi_i^r$. Since $Q_\ell(\pi_{\mathcal{L}_i^r \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^r}) = 1$, lines in $\mathcal{L}_i^r \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^r$ are sorted by their positions of left ends and are located in this order at the right side of station i either above or below line l whose left end is the leftmost among them. Such ways correspond to those of partitioning lines in $\mathcal{L}_i^r \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^r$ (except l) into two subsets, and the number is not greater than $2^{|\mathcal{L}_i^r \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^r|}$. Also, since $P_r(\pi) = 1$ and $Q_r(\pi_{\mathcal{T}_i^r}) = 1$, lines in \mathcal{T}_i^r are sorted by their positions of right ends and are located in this order at the right side of station i either above or below lines in $\mathcal{L}_i^r \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^r$. Such ways correspond to those partitioning

lines in \mathcal{T}_i^r into two subsets, and the number is not greater than $2^{|\mathcal{T}_i^r|}$. Thus the size of Π_i^r is not greater than $2^{|\mathcal{L}_i^r \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^r|} \times 2^{|\mathcal{T}_i^r|} = 2^{|\mathcal{L}_i^r|} \leq 2^k$. \square

According to Lemma 8, we can estimate, by a similar argument to the one in Subsect. 5.1, that f_r and f_ℓ can be computed by recurrence equations (1) and (3) in $O(k^2 4^k |V|)$ time.

We further improve this time complexity by computing the recurrence forward, that is, by generating only possible permutations from left to right, starting from $\pi \in \Pi_1^r$ to compute $f_r(\pi, 1)$. We consider possible permutations of lines in \mathcal{L}_{i+1}^ℓ on the left side of station $i+1$ that can be generated from π , where π is a permutation of lines in \mathcal{L}_i^r on the right side of station i . By Lemma 6, they are exactly the permutations where lines in \mathcal{T}_{i+1}^ℓ are deleted from π and lines in \mathcal{T}_{i+1}^ℓ are added either to the head or the tail of π . By Lemma 7, since lines of type C do not cross in optimal layouts, the number of ways to add lines in \mathcal{T}_{i+1}^ℓ either to the head or the tail is $|\mathcal{T}_{i+1}^\ell| + 1 \leq k + 1$ (determine the position for division of \mathcal{T}_{i+1}^ℓ by keeping its order in π , as shown in Fig. 14).

Next, we consider possible permutations of lines in \mathcal{L}_i^r on the right side of station i that can be generated from π , where π is a permutation of lines in \mathcal{L}_i^ℓ on the left side of station i . Since $\mathcal{L}_i^r = (\mathcal{L}_i^\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^\ell) \cup \mathcal{T}_i^r$ and lines do not cross inside of a station (to be admissible), they are exactly the permutations where lines in \mathcal{T}_i^ℓ are deleted from π and lines in \mathcal{T}_i^r are added either to the head or the tail of π . Again, by Lemma 7, since lines of type C do not cross in optimal layouts, the number of ways to add lines in \mathcal{T}_i^r either to the head or the tail of π is $2^{|\mathcal{T}_i^r|}$ (partition \mathcal{T}_{i+1}^ℓ into two, and add one to the head and the other to the tail with avoiding crossings of lines of type C, as shown in Fig. 15).

Here we define a binary relation R on the set of permutations on the left side of station i by $(\pi, \pi') \in R \iff \pi_{\mathcal{L}_i^\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^\ell} = \pi'_{\mathcal{L}_i^\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^\ell}$ ($\pi, \pi' \in \Pi_i^\ell$). Then R is an equivalence relation, and all permutations on the right side of station i generated from permutations (on the left side of station i) in an equivalent class $[\pi]$ whose representative is $\pi \in \Pi_i^\ell$ are the same. Among permutations on the right side of station i , a permutation that achieves minimum number of crossings can be generated from a permutation π^* that satisfies $f_\ell(\pi^*, i) = \min\{f_\ell(\pi, i) \mid \pi \in [\pi^*]\}$ in each equivalent class. Therefore, we do not need to generate permutations for all permutations on the left side of station i but for the ones that make f_ℓ minimum in each equivalent class. Notice, by Lemma 8, that the number of different equivalent classes is $2^{|\mathcal{L}_i^\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^\ell|}$.




Fig. 14. Generate permutations on the left side of station $i+1$ from ones on the right side of station i .




Fig. 15. Generate permutations on the right side of station i from ones on the left side of station i .

We then estimate the complexity for computing each f_ℓ and f_r in the algorithm. First, we consider the time for computing f_ℓ by generating possible permutations on the left side of station $i+1$ from the ones on the right side of station i . Since each permutation $\pi \in \Pi_i^r$

generates $O(k)$ permutations in $O(k)$ time for each and computes the number of inversions with π in $O(k^2)$ time, all possible permutations on the left side of station $i + 1$ for each π can be generated in $O(k \times (k + k^2)) = O(k^3)$ time. Since $|II_i^r| \leq 2^k$ by Lemma 8, computing f_ℓ for station $i + 1$ by generating permutations from all permutations on the right side of station i takes $O(2^k \times k^3) = O(k^3 2^k)$ time.

Next, we consider the time for computing f_r by generating possible permutations on the right side of station i from the ones on the left side of station i . When we compute $2^{|\mathcal{L}_i^\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^\ell|}$ equivalent classes and a permutation that minimizes f_r in each class, we assume that all classes are stored in the lexicographic order of lines, and therefore we have access to each class in $O(\log 2^{|\mathcal{L}_i^\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^\ell|}) = O(|\mathcal{L}_i^\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^\ell|) = O(k)$ time by using a binary search. Hence computing equivalent classes takes $O(k 2^k)$ time. We then generate $2^{|\mathcal{T}_i^r|}$ possible permutations on the right side of station i in $O(k)$ time for each of $2^{|\mathcal{L}_i^\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^\ell|}$ equivalent classes. Therefore, it takes $O(k 2^k + 2^{|\mathcal{L}_i^\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_i^\ell|} \times k 2^{|\mathcal{T}_i^r|}) = O(k 2^k)$ time for generating all possible permutations on the right side of station i from permutations on the left side of station i . Finally, since there are $|V|$ stations, the algorithm takes overall $O((k^3 2^k + k 2^k)|V|) = O(k^3 2^k |V|)$ time for computing all f_ℓ 's and f_r 's, and we have the following theorem.

Theorem 4. MLCM-P_PATH is fixed-parameter tractable with respect to the multiplicity k of lines. It is solved in $O(k^3 2^k |V|)$ time.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we studied an NP-hard problem MLCM-P_PATH, that is, MLCM-P whose underlying graph of the input is a path. On this problem, we show that its decision version belongs to P, and proposed an $O^*(2^{|\mathcal{L}|})$ -time exact algorithm. We also proposed a fixed-parameter algorithm that runs in $O(k^3 2^k |V|)$ time with respect to the multiplicity k of lines. This implies that MLCM-P_PATH is fixed-parameter tractable, and partially solves the open problem posed in [7] affirmatively.

It is still an important open problem if MLCM-P is fixed-parameter tractable for more general input graphs, such as planar graphs. Furthermore, MLCM-P may be fixed-parameter tractable with respect to the other parameters than the multiplicity of lines. For example, for the problem to ask if there is a layout with line crossings no more than k , the fact that the decision version belongs to P may help to show that it is fixed-parameter tractable with respect to the minimum number of crossings k . We also point out that it is significant to determine if MLCM-P CROSSING for general graphs belongs to P.

References

1. E. Argytiou, M. A. Bekos, M. Kaufmann and A. Symvonis. Two polynomial time algorithms for the metro-line crossing minimization problem. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Vol. 5417, pp. 336–347, Springer (2009).
2. M. Asquith, J. Gudmundsson and D. Merrick. An ILP for the metro-line crossing problem. *Proc. 14th Computing: The Australasian Theory Symposium*, pp. 49–56 (2008).
3. M. A. Bekos, M. Kaufmann, K. Potika and A. Symvonis. Line crossing minimization on metro maps. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Vol. 4875, pp. 231–242, Springer (2008).
4. M. Benkert, M. Nöllenburg, T. Uno and A. Wolff. Minimizing intra-edge crossings in wiring diagrams and public transportation maps. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Vol. 4372, pp. 270–281, Springer (2007).
5. H. Fernau, M. Kaufmann and M. Poths. Comparing trees via crossing minimization. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Vol. 3821, pp. 457–469 (2005).

6. J. Hopcroft and R. Tarjan. Efficient planarity testing. *J. ACM*, Vol. 21(4), pp. 549–568 (1974).
7. M. Nöllenburg. An improved algorithm for the metro-line crossing minimization problem. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Vol. 5849, pp. 381–392, Springer (2010).