

An Experimental Study of a 1-planarity Testing and Embedding Algorithm ^{*}

Carla Binucci, Walter Didimo, and Fabrizio Montecchiani

Università degli Studi di Perugia, Italy

{carla.binucci,walter.didimo,fabrizio.montecchiani}@unipg.it

Abstract. The definition of 1-planar graphs naturally extends graph planarity, namely a graph is 1-planar if it can be drawn in the plane with at most one crossing per edge. Unfortunately, while testing graph planarity is solvable in linear time, deciding whether a graph is 1-planar is NP-complete, even for restricted classes of graphs. Although several polynomial-time algorithms have been described for recognizing specific subfamilies of 1-planar graphs, no implementations of general algorithms are available to date. We investigate the feasibility of a 1-planarity testing and embedding algorithm based on a backtracking strategy. While the experiments show that our approach can be successfully applied to graphs with up to 30 vertices, they also suggest the need of more sophisticated techniques to attack larger graphs. Our contribution provides initial indications that may stimulate further research on the design of practical approaches for the 1-planarity testing problem.

1 Introduction

The study of sparse nonplanar graphs is receiving increasing attention in the last years. One objective of this research stream is to extend the rich set of results about planar graphs to wider families of graphs that can better model real-world problems (see, e.g., [27,28,29,30,31]). Another objective is to create readable visualizations of nonplanar networks arising in various application scenarios (see, e.g., [23,39]). Both these motivations are embraced by a recent research topic in graph drawing and topological graph theory, which generalizes the notion of graph planarity to *beyond-planar graphs*, informally defined as those graphs that can be drawn in the plane such that some prescribed edge crossing patterns are forbidden (see [11,24,36,38] for surveys and reports).

One of the most studied families of sparse nonplanar graphs, whose definition naturally extends that of planar graphs, is the family of 1-planar graphs; refer to [41] for a survey. A graph is *1-planar* if it can be drawn in the plane such that each edge is crossed at most once. An n -vertex 1-planar graph has $O(n)$ edges [43], $O(\sqrt{n})$ separators and hence $O(\sqrt{n})$ treewidth [25,30], and $O(1)$ stack and queue number [4,8,26].

^{*} Work partially supported by MIUR, under Grant 20174LF3T8 AHeAD: efficient Algorithms for HArnessing networked Data.




Fig. 1. (a) A 1-planar drawing Γ whose embedding is computed by our algorithm. (b) A drawing Γ' of the same graph computed through a planarization approach. Both drawings contain six crossings (small circles), but Γ' has two edges crossed twice.

Despite these (and other) similarities with planar graphs, recognizing whether a graph is 1-planar is an NP-complete problem, in contrast with the well-known efficient algorithms for testing planarity. A first proof was by Grigoriev and Boadlander [30], and was based on a reduction from the 3-partition problem. Another independent proof was later given by Korzhik and Mohar [42], who used a reduction from the 3-coloring problem for planar graphs. The recognition problem for 1-planar graphs is NP-complete even for graphs with bounded bandwidth, pathwidth, or treewidth [7]; for graphs obtained from planar graphs by adding a single edge [17]; and for graphs that come with a fixed rotation system [6]. The problem becomes fixed-parameter tractable when parameterized by vertex-cover number, cyclomatic number, or tree-depth [7]. Polynomial-time testing algorithms have been designed only for subfamilies of 1-planar graphs (see, e.g., [5,15,16,34] and refer to [24,41] for additional references and results).

As witnessed by the above-mentioned literature, the problem of recognizing 1-planar graphs has been studied by several authors aimed at drawing clear bounds between tractable and intractable instances. Nevertheless, there is a lack of general algorithms that can be effectively implemented and adopted in applications. The research presented in this paper goes in the direction of filling this gap by investigating practical approaches and by providing indications for further advances. Our contribution can be summarized as follows.

(i) We describe an easy to implement strategy based on a backtracking approach (Section 3). It takes as input a general graph G and decides whether G is 1-planar by exploring a search tree that encodes the space of candidate 1-planar embeddings for the graphs. If the test is positive, the algorithm returns a 1-planar embedding of G (see, e.g., Fig. 1(a)). We remark that several algorithms designed for 1-planar graphs assume that the input graph comes with a given

1-planar embedding (see, e.g., [3,10,12,22,35,37]), thus our algorithm can be used as a preliminary routine to compute such an embedding.

(ii) We report the results of an experimental study on a large set of instances with up to 50 vertices, taken from two well-established real-world graph benchmarks, the so-called ROME and NORTH graphs [1,21] (Section 4). The experiments indicate that while our approach can be successfully applied to the majority of instances with up to 30 vertices, more sophisticated techniques are needed to attack larger graphs. In terms of total number of edge crossings, our algorithm computes embeddings that on average contain no more than 1.8 times the number of crossings of a state-of-the-art planarizer [32], which is allowed to cross an edge more than once; see, e.g., Fig. 1.

(iii) As a byproduct of our experiments, we make publicly available [2] the solved instances of the ROME and NORTH graphs, with a labeling that specifies whether each instance is 1-planar or not. An interesting finding is that the vast majority of the solved instances in these sets are 1-planar, which corroborates the interest on 1-planar graphs from an application perspective.

2 Preliminaries

A *drawing* Γ of a graph G maps each vertex of G to a point of the plane and each edge of G to a Jordan arc connecting its two endpoints. We only consider *simple* drawings, where adjacent edges do not cross and where two independent edges cross at most in one of their interior points. A graph G is *planar* if it admits a *planar* drawing, i.e., a crossing-free drawing. A planar drawing subdivides the plane into topologically connected regions, called *faces*. The unbounded region is the *outer face*. A *planar embedding* of G is an equivalence class of planar drawings of G with a homeomorphic set of faces and the same face as outer face. A *plane* graph is a graph with a given planar embedding. If G is not planar, the *planarization* of a drawing of G is a plane graph obtained by replacing every crossing point with a *dummy vertex*. An *embedding* of G is an equivalence class of drawings of G whose planarizations yield the same planar embedding.

A graph is *1-planar* if it admits a *1-planar drawing*, that is, a drawing where each edge is crossed at most once. A *1-planar embedding* is the embedding induced by a 1-planar drawing. A *1-plane* graph is a graph with a given 1-planar embedding. A *kite* is a 1-plane graph isomorphic to K_4 , in which the outer face is bounded by a cycle composed of four vertices and four crossing-free edges, called *kite edges*, while the remaining two edges cross (see, e.g., [14,22]). Similarly to planar graphs, a graph G is 1-planar if and only if all its subgraphs are 1-planar; also, the following property holds.

Property 1. G is 1-planar if and only if every biconnected component of G is 1-planar. If G is 1-planar, a 1-planar embedding of G can be obtained in linear time by suitably merging the 1-planar embeddings of its biconnected components.




Fig. 2. (a) A graph G and an ordering σ of \overline{E} . (b) A planarization G^* of G (dummy vertices are gray squares) with the corresponding **TRUE** solution. (c) The search tree T .

3 Algorithm Design

We call our 1-planarity testing and embedding algorithm **1PlanarTester**. In the following we first give an overview of this algorithm and then describe its backtracking procedure in detail (Section 3.1). Finally, we describe some further optimizations made to speed-up the algorithm.

1PlanarTester takes as input a connected graph G and works as follows. First, based on Property 1, it computes the biconnected components of G and processes each of them independently. For each biconnected component C , it executes some preliminary tests in order to verify whether C can be immediately labeled as 1-planar or as not 1-planar. In the former case, **1PlanarTester** processes the next biconnected component, while in the latter case it halts and returns that G is not 1-planar. Namely, if C is planar or it has less than 7 vertices (K_6 is 1-planar), then **1PlanarTester** labels C as 1-planar and computes a 1-planar embedding of C . Otherwise, if $m_C > 4n_C - 8$, where n_C and m_C are the number of vertices and edges of C , then **1PlanarTester** labels C as not 1-planar because it exceeds the maximum number of edges for a 1-planar graph [43]. If none of these conditions applies, **1PlanarTester** proceeds to the next step, which runs a backtracking procedure described in the following. The output of this step is a 1-planar embedding of C , if it exists, or a negative answer. In the positive case, **1PlanarTester** processes the next biconnected component, otherwise it halts and returns that G is not 1-planar. At the end of this process, **1PlanarTester** will either output an embedding for each biconnected component of G , or it will return a component that is not 1-planar.

3.1 Backtracking Procedure

This procedure takes as input a biconnected graph $G = (V, E)$ with n vertices and $m \leq 4n - 8$ edges. We define as *candidate solution* for the 1-planarity testing problem on G a set of pairs of crossing edges. Namely, let \overline{E} be the set of all (unordered) pairs of edges that can cross in some embedding of G , i.e., the pairs

$\{e_1, e_2\}$ such that $e_1 \in E$ and $e_2 \in E$ are independent (we only consider simple drawings). Let $k = |\overline{E}|$ and observe that $k = O(n^2)$ because $m \leq 4n - 8$. Let σ be any ordering of \overline{E} , and let $\sigma(i)$ denote the i -th pair of edges in such an ordering. We encode a candidate solution by a binary array y of length k such that $y[i] = 0$ (resp. $y[i] = 1$) means that the two edges $\sigma(i)$ do not cross (resp. cross) in a 1-planar embedding of G (if it exists). Refer to Fig. 2(a) for an illustration. We say that y is a **TRUE** solution of G if: (1) Each edge is crossed at most once, and (2) by replacing each crossing with a dummy vertex, the resulting graph G^* is planar (see also Fig. 2(b)). Otherwise we say that y is a **FALSE** solution. Observe that Condition (2) is well defined because each edge is crossed at most once and hence we do not need to know the order of the crossings along the edges.

Lemma 1. *G is 1-planar if and only if the set of candidate solutions contains a **TRUE** solution.*

Proof. If G is 1-planar, take a 1-planar drawing Γ of G . Consider a candidate solution y such that $y[i] = 0$ (resp. $y[i] = 1$) if the two edges $\sigma(i)$ do not cross (resp. cross) in Γ . Since each edge of Γ is crossed at most once, Condition 1 holds. Also, the planarization of Γ induces a planar embedding of the graph G^* obtained by replacing each crossing with a dummy vertex. Hence Condition 2 holds.

Conversely, let y be a **TRUE** solution. By Conditions 1 and 2, graph G^* is planar and no two dummy vertices are adjacent. Let Γ^* be a planar drawing of G^* . Consider a dummy vertex d of G^* that corresponds to a crossing of two edges $e_1 = (u_1, v_1)$ and $e_2 = (u_2, v_2)$ of G . In a clockwise visit of the neighbors of d , starting from u_1 , the second vertex is either an end-vertex of e_2 or v_1 . In the first case we replace d with a crossing between e_1 and e_2 (Fig. 3(a)). In the second case, d does not really correspond to a crossing, thus we just remove it and redraw e_1 and e_2 without crossings, as in Fig. 3(b). Applying this transformation to every dummy vertex of Γ^* we obtain a 1-planar drawing of G . \square




Fig. 3. Replacement of a dummy vertex d : (a) d is a crossing between (u_1, v_1) and (u_2, v_2) ; (b) d is not a crossing between (u_1, v_1) and (u_2, v_2) .

The backtracking procedure generates the set of candidate solutions incrementally, by computing a binary search tree T as follows, see also Fig. 2(c). Each

Algorithm 1: Pseudocode of the VerifyNode routine.

```
1 VerifyNode( $y_\nu, G$ )
  Input : An array  $y_\nu$  encoding a partial candidate solution and a graph  $G$ .
  Output: One of SOL, CUT, CNT.
2
  /* We start by checking the number of crossings per edge */
3  $cr\_pe \leftarrow$  CountCrossingsPerEdge( $y_\nu, G$ )
4 if  $cr\_pe > 1$  then
5   | return CUT // Too many crossings per edge
6
  /* We compute the sets of crossed edges and of kite edges */
7  $cross\_edges \leftarrow$  FindCrossedEdges( $y_\nu, G$ )
8  $kite\_edges \leftarrow$  FindKiteEdges( $y_\nu, G$ )
9 if  $cross\_edges \cap kite\_edges \neq \emptyset$  then
10  | return CUT // We don't want crossed kite edges
11
  /* We compute the graph induced by the saturated edges and then
  we replace its crossings with dummy vertices */
12  $G_\nu \leftarrow$  ComputeInducedGraph( $y_\nu, G$ )
13  $G_\nu^* \leftarrow$  CreateCrossVertices( $y_\nu, G$ )
14 if  $isPlanar(G_\nu^*)$  then
15   | if  $G_\nu \equiv G$  then
16     | /* In this case the candidate solution is complete and a
17       | 1-planar embedding is computed */
18     | return SOL
19   | else
20     | /* We try to complete the partial candidate solution */
21     |  $y_\nu^+ \leftarrow$  Complete( $y_\nu, G$ )
22     |  $C_\nu^* \leftarrow$  CreateCrossVertices( $y_\nu^+, G$ )
23     | if  $isPlanar(C_\nu^*)$  then
24       | /* A 1-planar embedding is computed */
25       | return SOL
26     | else
27       | return CNT
28     | end
29   | end
30   | else
31     | /* The array cannot be extended to a TRUE solution */
32     | return CUT
33   | end
```

node ν of T is equipped with an index $i_\nu < k$ and with an array y_ν of length i_ν that represents a partial candidate solution. Also, node ν has two children, ν_0 and ν_1 , such that $i_{\nu_0} = i_{\nu_1} = i_\nu + 1$, $y_{\nu_0}[i] = y_{\nu_1}[i] = y_\nu[i]$, for $i < i_\nu$, $y_{\nu_0}[i_\nu] = 0$, and $y_{\nu_1}[i_\nu] = 1$. We say that an array y_μ *extends* y_ν if y_μ is associated with a node μ that is a descendant of ν in T . The search tree T is traversed following a top-down order of the nodes starting from the root. When visiting a node ν of T , the backtracking procedure runs a routine called $\text{VerifyNode}(y_\nu, G)$, whose pseudocode is described by Algorithm 1 (some lines of this routine will be explained in the next subsection). This routine returns one of three possible values: SOL, CUT, CNT. If the return value is SOL, y_ν is a TRUE solution (or can be extended to a TRUE solution) and the algorithm returns a 1-planar embedding of G . If it is CUT, the algorithm will not visit the children of ν (i.e., the whole subtree of T rooted at ν will be pruned) because y_ν is either a FALSE solution or it cannot be extended to a TRUE solution. If it is CNT, we cannot conclude anything about y_ν and the procedure adds the two children ν_0 and ν_1 of ν to the set of nodes to be visited.

To describe in detail the $\text{VerifyNode}(y_\nu, G)$ routine, we need some definitions. An edge is *crossed in* y_ν if it is in a pair of edges $\sigma(j)$, with $j < i_\nu$, such that $y[j] = 1$. An edge e is *saturated in* y_ν if at least one of the following conditions applies: (a) e is crossed in y_ν ; (b) the greatest index j such that $\sigma(j)$ contains e is smaller than i_ν ; (c) every pair of edges of \bar{E} that contains e is such that the other edge of the pair is crossed in y_ν .

Lemma 2. *Let e be a saturated edge in y_ν . Then e is either crossed in y_ν or it is not crossed in every array y_μ that extends y_ν .*

Proof. If Condition (a) holds the lemma follows, so assume that it does not hold. If Condition (b) holds, e will never appear in a $\sigma(j)$ with $j \geq i_\nu$, hence e crosses in y_μ if and only if it crosses in y_ν . Finally, if Condition (c) holds then e cannot cross any other edge, thus it is not crossed in any y_μ that extends y_ν . \square

First of all, the $\text{VerifyNode}(y_\nu, G)$ routine verifies that there is no edge crossed twice in y_ν . Next, the routine computes the graph G_ν induced by the edges saturated in y_ν , and the graph G_ν^* obtained from G_ν by replacing each crossing with a dummy vertex. The following holds:

Lemma 3. *Let y_μ be an array that extends y_ν (possibly coinciding with y_ν) and that is a TRUE solution. Then G_ν^* is planar.*

Proof. If $y_\mu = y_\nu$, the statement follows, because G_μ corresponds to G by construction, and thus $G_\nu^* = G_\mu^*$ is planar by definition of TRUE solution. If $y_\mu \neq y_\nu$, G_ν^* is a subgraph of G_μ^* by Lemma 2. Namely, G_ν only contains the edges saturated in y_ν , thus such edges either already cross in y_ν or cross neither in y_ν nor in y_μ . Since G_μ^* is planar, it follows that G_ν^* is also planar. \square

The routine verifies whether G_ν coincides with G . This is the case if $|y_\nu| = k$, but it may happen even if $|y_\nu| < k$ and all edges of G are part of G_ν because are all saturated in y_ν . If G_ν coincides with G , based on Lemma 3, the routine tests

if G_ν^* is planar. In the positive case, it returns **SOL** and a 1-planar embedding of G is obtained from a planar embedding of G_ν^* by replacing the dummy vertices with crossing points. In the negative case, the algorithm returns **CUT** because y_ν cannot be extended to a **TRUE** solution. If G_ν does not correspond to G , then the algorithm computes an arbitrary extension of y_ν and verifies whether it is a **TRUE** solution. This corresponds to exploring a leaf of the subtree of T rooted at ν . If such a leaf is a **TRUE** solution, a 1-planar embedding is computed and returned. Else **CNT** is returned and the traversal of T continues.

Further Optimizations. The main issue for the scalability of our algorithm is the quadratic length of the arrays representing the candidate solutions of our problem, which implies that the size of the search tree T is $2^{O(n^2)}$. In order to reduce the search space, we first test whether there exists a small subset $S \subset E$ of edges of G , which we call *skew edges*, whose removal yields a planar graph, i.e., we test whether G is a $|S|$ -skew graph (see, e.g., [17,19]). The size of S can be set as a parameter of our algorithm. If this is the case, **1PlanarTester** first executes the backtracking procedure by restricting the set \overline{E} of pairs of edges that can cross to those pairs that contain at least one skew edge. This reduces the length of a candidate solution to $O(n \cdot |S|)$. If a solution exists, then G has a 1-planar embedding with at most $|S|$ crossings. Otherwise, we cannot conclude that G is not 1-planar because it may have a 1-planar embedding where 2 edges of $E \setminus S$ cross each other, and hence we execute the standard backtracking procedure.

As a further optimization, we consider kite edges, defined as follows. An edge is a *kite edge in y_ν* if it is a kite edge with respect to a pair of edges that cross in y_ν . In the **VerifyNode** routine, we extend the definition of a saturated edge e by adding a fourth condition: (d) e is a kite edge in y_ν . In fact, an array y_μ that extends y_ν and in which a kite edge is crossed can be discarded by the routine (see Algorithm 1), because kite edges can always be redrawn without crossings. This allows us to increase the number of edges in G_ν and hence to increase the probability that G_ν coincides with G or that G_ν^* is not planar.

4 Implementation and Experimental Analysis

We implemented **1PlanarTester** in the C# language. Our implementation exploits some planarity testing subroutines of the OGDF library [18] (written in C++). We experimentally tuned the following parameters of our algorithm, which have an impact on the running time: (a) The strategy used to traverse the search tree T ; (b) the size of the set of skew edges; (c) the probability that an arbitrary extension of a partial candidate solution is executed. Based on preliminary experiments, we chose the following settings. The search tree T is traversed by a depth-first search, which guarantees that the space complexity of the algorithm is $O(n^2)$; note that with a breadth-first-search the space requirement may be $2^{\Omega(n^2)}$. We consider a set of skew edges of size one. The completion subroutine is executed with probability 0.8.

Experimental Goals. The experimental analysis has two main objectives:

- **G1: Performance Analysis.** Evaluating the running time of our algorithm and the size of the largest instances it can handle in a reasonable time. Moreover, for those instances that are 1-planar, we want to compare the total number of crossings produced by `1PlanarTester` with respect to a state-of-the-art planarizer that is allowed to cross an edge more than once.
- **G2: Labeling of Popular Graph Benchmarks.** Labeling as 1-planar or not 1-planar the instances of well-established real-world graph benchmarks in graph drawing, namely the ROME and the NORTH graphs [1,21]. Our ultimate goal is to stimulate further practical research on beyond-planar graphs.

Experimental Setting. We ran the experiments on a set of computers with uniform hardware and software features, namely computers with 16 GB of RAM, an Intel i7 CPU, and the Windows 10 operating system. We used the ROME and the NORTH graphs as benchmarks for answering both **G1** and **G2**. We preliminarily removed the planar instances from these two sets of graphs, as they are of no interest for us. Table 1 reports some information about the considered nonplanar instances grouped by size. The first columns contain the number of instances in each sample, the average density (i.e., the average ratio between number of edges and number of vertices), and the average number of biconnected components, called blocks (recall that the algorithm processes each block independently). We halted the computations that took more than 3 hours. As state-of-the-art planarizer, we used an implementation available in the OGDF library and discussed in [32], which makes use of heuristics described in [33,40]. To give an idea of the experimental effort, we report that, by summing up the running time of all computers, the experiments took more than 800 hours (i.e., more than one month). The output of the experiments in terms of labeling of the instances as 1-planar or not 1-planar is publicly available [2].

Results and Discussion. Concerning **G1**, Table 1, Table 2, and Table 3 summarize the performance of `1PlanarTester` in terms of number of solved instances, running time, and number of crossings, respectively. As it can be observed in the fifth and sixth columns of Table 1, our algorithm could solve a high percentage of instances up to 20 vertices (91.2% of ROME and 73.6% of NORTH). For the larger instances up to 40 vertices, the NORTH graphs become more challenging, with a percentage of solved instances that is stable around 39%. On the other hand, the percentage of solved instances on the ROME graphs is higher, namely above 69% for the instances with 21-30 vertices, and above 43% for the instances with 31-40 vertices. We also ran our algorithm on instances with 41 to 50 vertices. `1PlanarTester` could solve 37.8% of these instances in the ROME set and 18.8% in the NORTH set. The better performance of our algorithm on the ROME graphs is partly justified by their lower density with respect to the NORTH graphs (see Table 1). Due to time constraints, we were able to process only a random subset of the non-planar instances with 31-50 vertices of the ROME set.

About running time, Table 2 reports the average, maximum, and standard deviation over all solved instances in each sample (we recall that the unsolved instances are those that took more than three hours). On average, a computation took less than 4 minutes, while the slowest instance took about 115 minutes.

Table 1. Instances and Labeling.

	#	AVG	AVG	SOLVED		LABEL	
	INSTANCES	DENSITY	# BLOCKS	Number	%	1-PLANAR	NOT 1-PLANAR
ROME 10-20	91	1.49	5.8	83	91.2%	100.0%	0.0%
ROME 21-30	164	1.37	12.4	114	69.5%	100.0%	0.0%
ROME 31-40	388	1.31	15.7	170	43.8%	100.0%	0.0%
ROME 41-50	119	1.29	25.1	45	37.8%	100.0%	0.0%
NORTH 10-20	121	2.05	4.6	89	73.6%	88.8%	11.2%
NORTH 21-30	69	2.07	12.4	27	39.1%	77.8%	22.2%
NORTH 31-40	55	2.00	14.0	21	38.2%	57.1%	42.9%
NORTH 41-50	32	1.79	18.2	6	18.8%	83.3%	16.7%

Table 2. Runtime and Backtracking stats.

	RUNTIME (MINUTES)			SOLVED BY		TYPES OF SOLUTIONS		TYPES OF CUTS		
	AVG	SD	MAX	BACKTRACKING	SATUR	COMPL	DEC	KEC	NONPLANAR	
ROME 10-20	0.07	0.60	5.50	14.5%	16.7%	83.3%	44.5%	30.5%	25.1%	
ROME 21-30	0.38	3.61	38.40	24.6%	25.0%	75.0%	51.7%	14.7%	33.6%	
ROME 31-40	1.34	12.06	115.38	21.2%	13.9%	86.1%	51.5%	14.5%	34.0%	
ROME 41-50	0.01	0.01	0.02	20.0%	22.2%	77.8%	45.9%	21.0%	33.1%	
NORTH 10-20	1.86	10.10	92.69	39.3%	11.4%	88.6%	43.1%	40.5%	16.4%	
NORTH 21-30	3.85	10.14	39.58	25.9%	0.0%	100.0%	49.9%	21.0%	29.2%	
NORTH 31-40	3.78	11.65	39.80	9.5%	0.0%	100.0%	42.0%	45.9%	12.1%	
NORTH 41-50	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	

The standard deviation is about one order of magnitude greater than the mean value, but still around a few minutes, which indicates that the running time of `1PlanarTester` on the solved instances is relatively stable. It is worth noting that the running time on the largest graphs with up to 50 vertices is negligible with respect to the other values reported in the table and also very stable. By inspecting the raw data, we could observe that this behavior is due to the fact that such instances have many blocks (see also Table 1), most of which are solved through preliminary tests (i.e., without entering the backtracking routine) or are solved by backtracking but are very small.

Table 2 also reports some statistics about the computations, which may help to better understand the conditions that mostly influence the behavior of the backtracking algorithm. The fifth column shows the percentage of instances for which the algorithm needed to run the backtracking procedure, i.e., those for which the preliminary tests did not suffice. Many of these instances are in the subsets ROME 21-30, ROME 31-40, and NORTH 10-20. The columns TYPES OF SOLUTIONS report the distribution of the conditions that led to a positive instance during an execution of the backtracking algorithm: SATUR means that a solution was found by edge saturation, i.e., the subgraph G_ν induced by the current partial solution y_ν coincides with G and the graph G_ν^* was planar; COMPL means that a solution was found by running the completion subroutine on y_ν and again G_ν^* was planar (refer to Algorithm 1). The data show that this second condition is much more frequent than the first one. We remark that in the set NORTH 41-50 we only solved those instances that did not require the backtracking algorithm, thus in this case we have 0% both on SATUR and on COMPL. The columns TYPES OF CUTS report the distribution of the cut conditions through-

Table 3. Crossings.

	CROSSINGS PER GRAPH						CROSSING RATIO 1PLANARTESTER / OGDF
	1PlanarTester			OGDF			
	AVG	SD	MAX	AVG	SD	MAX	
ROME 10-20	1.33	1.36	10	1.13	0.57	5	1.07
ROME 21-30	1.39	1.58	10	1.16	0.43	3	1.12
ROME 31-40	1.76	2.76	16	1.13	0.35	3	1.30
ROME 41-50	1.42	2.16	12	1.24	0.56	3	1.09
NORTH 10-20	2.49	1.99	7	1.78	1.29	7	1.78
NORTH 21-30	2.90	2.86	9	1.52	0.85	4	1.64
NORTH 31-40	1.50	1.12	4	1.50	1.12	4	1.00
NORTH 41-50	1.00	0.00	1	1.00	0.00	1	1.00

out a backtracking computation; they represent conditions that violate a valid solution: DEC represents a double edge crossing; KET represents a kite edge crossing; NONPLANAR means that G_ν^* was nonplanar. We observe that the most frequent type of cuts is an edge crossed twice. Concerning the other two types, on the ROME set the NONPLANAR condition is on average more frequent than the KEC condition, while we observe an inverse behavior on the NORTH set. This seems to be partially related to the higher density of the NORTH graphs, which intuitively yield a higher number of kite edges.

About the number of crossings, Table 3 reports the average, maximum, and standard deviation over all solved instances in each sample. Both 1PlanarTester and OGDF produced drawings with very few crossings on average. We observe that the NORTH graphs yield more crossings than the ROME graphs, which still reflects the more challenging nature of the NORTH set. Furthermore, the average over all ratios between the crossings made by 1PlanarTester and those made by the OGDF planarizer is below 1.78 (last column in the table). This indicates that, on the solved instances, restricting the number of crossings per edge does not affect too much the total number of crossings.

Concerning **G2**, Table 1 reports the percentage of solved instances divided by 1-planar and not 1-planar. We recall that we removed all planar graphs from our benchmarks. All solved instances in the ROME set are 1-planar, while the NORTH graphs contain a percentage of non-1-planar instances varying between 11% and 43% over the different samples. The fact that in both sets the percentage of 1-planar graphs is greater than the percentage of not 1-planar graphs may also suggest that the unsolved instances are more likely to be not 1-planar. To substantiate this hypothesis, we ran our algorithm on some graphs that are not 1-planar but become 1-planar after removing a few edges; these graphs have been generated by using minimal non-1-planar graphs described in [42]. The algorithm could not solve any of these instances within three hours, which confirms that our backtracking routine is not very effective on graphs having this kind of structure.

5 Conclusions and Future Research Directions

We investigated the feasibility of a practical algorithm for 1-planarity testing and embedding. Our contribution provides initial indications that may stimulate further research on the design of more sophisticated approaches for the 1-planarity testing problem. Among the many directions that can be explored to improve the efficiency we suggest the following:

(i) A bottleneck of our algorithm is its $O(n^2)$ encoding scheme. One can try to reduce this size to $O(n)$, by using a balanced separating curves approach like that described in [7]. This would allow us to treat larger instances, although it is unclear how to exploit this tool to design an encoding scheme that can be effectively integrated into a backtracking strategy.

(ii) More sophisticated rules can be studied to prune a subtree or to complete a partial solution during a backtracking execution. For example, can one use SPQR-trees to test different triconnected components independently and then merge them together?

(iii) One can study an ILP formulation for the problem. To this aim, the crossing minimization strategy in [20] may provide useful insights to compute crossing minimal 1-planar (or more in general k -planar) embeddings.

A further research direction opened by our work is to extend our experiments to label a larger set of instances. For example, one could experimentally estimate the probability that a graph generated with a random or with a scale-free model is 1-planar. Finally, the recognition problem is NP-complete for other families of beyond-planar graphs, such as fan-planar graphs (see [9,13]), and hence it would be interesting to design practical recognition algorithms also for these families.

Acknowledgments. We thank Giuseppe Liotta for useful discussions.

References

1. <http://www.graphdrawing.org/data.html>, [Online; accessed June-2019]
2. <http://mozart.diei.unipg.it/montecchiani/1planarity/labels.xlsx>, [Online; accessed June-2019]
3. Alam, M.J., Brandenburg, F.J., Kobourov, S.G.: Straight-line grid drawings of 3-connected 1-planar graphs. In: Graph Drawing. LNCS, vol. 8242, pp. 83–94. Springer (2013)
4. Alam, M.J., Brandenburg, F.J., Kobourov, S.G.: On the book thickness of 1-planar graphs. CoRR **abs/1510.05891** (2015)
5. Auer, C., Bachmaier, C., Brandenburg, F.J., Gleißner, A., Hanauer, K., Neuwirth, D., Reislhuber, J.: Outer 1-planar graphs. *Algorithmica* **74**(4), 1293–1320 (2016)
6. Auer, C., Brandenburg, F.J., Gleißner, A., Reislhuber, J.: 1-planarity of graphs with a rotation system. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.* **19**(1), 67–86 (2015)
7. Bannister, M.J., Cabello, S., Eppstein, D.: Parameterized complexity of 1-planarity. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.* **22**(1), 23–49 (2018)
8. Bekos, M.A., Bruckdorfer, T., Kaufmann, M., Raftopoulou, C.N.: The book thickness of 1-planar graphs is constant. *Algorithmica* **79**(2), 444–465 (2017)

9. Bekos, M.A., Cornelsen, S., Grilli, L., Hong, S., Kaufmann, M.: On the recognition of fan-planar and maximal outer-fan-planar graphs. *Algorithmica* **79**(2), 401–427 (2017)
10. Bekos, M.A., Didimo, W., Liotta, G., Mehrabi, S., Montecchiani, F.: On RAC drawings of 1-planar graphs. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **689**, 48–57 (2017)
11. Bekos, M.A., Kaufmann, M., Montecchiani, F.: Guest editors’ foreword and overview - special issue on graph drawing beyond planarity. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.* **22**(1), 1–10 (2018)
12. Biedl, T.C., Liotta, G., Montecchiani, F.: Embedding-preserving rectangle visibility representations of nonplanar graphs. *Discrete & Computational Geometry* **60**(2), 345–380 (2018)
13. Binucci, C., Di Giacomo, E., Didimo, W., Montecchiani, F., Patrignani, M., Symvonis, A., Tollis, I.G.: Fan-planarity: Properties and complexity. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **589**, 76–86 (2015)
14. Brandenburg, F.J.: 1-visibility representations of 1-planar graphs. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.* **18**(3), 421–438 (2014)
15. Brandenburg, F.J.: Recognizing optimal 1-planar graphs in linear time. *Algorithmica* **80**(1), 1–28 (2018)
16. Brandenburg, F.J.: Characterizing and recognizing 4-map graphs. *Algorithmica* **81**(5), 1818–1843 (2019)
17. Cabello, S., Mohar, B.: Adding one edge to planar graphs makes crossing number and 1-planarity hard. *SIAM J. Comput.* **42**(5), 1803–1829 (2013)
18. Chimani, M., Gutwenger, C., Jünger, M., Klau, G.W., Klein, K., Mutzel, P.: The open graph drawing framework (OGDF). In: *Handbook of Graph Drawing and Visualization*, pp. 543–569. Chapman and Hall/CRC (2013)
19. Chimani, M., Hliněný, P.: Inserting multiple edges into a planar graph. In: *SoCG 2016. LIPIcs*, vol. 51, pp. 30:1–30:15. Schloss Dagstuhl (2016)
20. Chimani, M., Mutzel, P., Bomze, I.M.: A new approach to exact crossing minimization. In: *ESA. LNCS*, vol. 5193, pp. 284–296. Springer (2008)
21. Di Battista, G., Garg, A., Liotta, G., Tamassia, R., Tassinari, E., Vargiu, F.: An experimental comparison of four graph drawing algorithms. *Comput. Geom.* **7**, 303–325 (1997)
22. Di Giacomo, E., Didimo, W., Evans, W.S., Liotta, G., Meijer, H., Montecchiani, F., Wismath, S.K.: Ortho-polygon visibility representations of embedded graphs. *Algorithmica* **80**(8), 2345–2383 (2018)
23. Didimo, W., Eades, P., Liotta, G.: Drawing graphs with right angle crossings. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **412**(39), 5156–5166 (2011)
24. Didimo, W., Liotta, G., Montecchiani, F.: A survey on graph drawing beyond planarity. *ACM Comput. Surv.* **52**(1), 4:1–4:37 (2019)
25. Dujmovic, V., Eppstein, D., Wood, D.R.: Structure of graphs with locally restricted crossings. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* **31**(2), 805–824 (2017)
26. Dujmovic, V., Joret, G., Micek, P., Morin, P., Ueckerdt, T., Wood, D.R.: Planar graphs have bounded queue-number. *CoRR* **abs/1904.04791** (2019)
27. Eppstein, D.: Diameter and treewidth in minor-closed graph families. *Algorithmica* **27**(3), 275–291 (2000)
28. Eppstein, D., Gupta, S.: Crossing patterns in nonplanar road networks. In: *SIGSPATIAL/GIS*. pp. 40:1–40:9. ACM (2017)
29. Eppstein, D., Löffler, M., Strash, D.: Listing all maximal cliques in large sparse real-world graphs. *ACM J. Exp. Algorithmics* **18** (2013)
30. Grigoriev, A., Bodlaender, H.L.: Algorithms for graphs embeddable with few crossings per edge. *Algorithmica* **49**(1), 1–11 (2007)

31. Grohe, M.: Local tree-width, excluded minors, and approximation algorithms. *Combinatorica* **23**(4), 613–632 (2003)
32. Gutwenger, C., Mutzel, P.: An experimental study of crossing minimization heuristics. In: Liotta, G. (ed.) *GD 2003*. LNCS, vol. 2912, pp. 13–24. Springer (2003)
33. Gutwenger, C., Mutzel, P., Weiskircher, R.: Inserting an edge into a planar graph. *Algorithmica* **41**(4), 289–308 (2005)
34. Hong, S., Eades, P., Katoh, N., Liotta, G., Schweitzer, P., Suzuki, Y.: A linear-time algorithm for testing outer-1-planarity. *Algorithmica* **72**(4), 1033–1054 (2015)
35. Hong, S., Eades, P., Liotta, G., Poon, S.: Fáry’s theorem for 1-planar graphs. In: *COCOON*. LNCS, vol. 7434, pp. 335–346. Springer (2012)
36. Hong, S., Kaufmann, M., Kobourov, S.G., Pach, J.: Beyond-planar graphs: Algorithmics and combinatorics (dagstuhl seminar 16452). *Dagstuhl Reports* **6**(11), 35–62 (2016)
37. Hong, S., Nagamochi, H.: Re-embedding a 1-plane graph into a straight-line drawing in linear time. In: *Graph Drawing*. LNCS, vol. 9801, pp. 321–334. Springer (2016)
38. Hong, S., Tokuyama, T.: Algorithms for beyond planar graphs. NII Shonan Meet. Rep. (2016)
39. Huang, W., Eades, P., Hong, S.: Larger crossing angles make graphs easier to read. *J. Vis. Lang. Comput.* **25**(4), 452–465 (2014)
40. Jayakumar, R., Thulasiraman, K., Swamy, M.N.S.: $O(n^2)$ algorithms for graph planarization. *IEEE Trans. CAD Integr. Circuits Syst.* **8**(3), 257–267 (1989)
41. Kobourov, S.G., Liotta, G., Montecchiani, F.: An annotated bibliography on 1-planarity. *Computer Science Review* **25**, 49–67 (2017)
42. Korzhik, V.P., Mohar, B.: Minimal obstructions for 1-immersions and hardness of 1-planarity testing. *J. Graph Theory* **72**(1), 30–71 (2013)
43. Pach, J., Tóth, G.: Graphs drawn with few crossings per edge. *Combinatorica* **17**(3), 427–439 (1997)