

# Relationship of $k$ -Bend and Monotonic $\ell$ -Bend Edge Intersection Graphs of Paths on a Grid

Eranda Çela<sup>1</sup> and Elisabeth Gaar\*<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>TU Graz, Steyrergasse 30, Graz A-8010, Austria  
cela@math.tugraz.at

<sup>2</sup>Alpen-Adria-Universität Klagenfurt, Universitaetsstrasse  
65-57, Klagenfurt A-9020, Austria  
elisabeth.gaar@aau.at

February 17, 2020

## Abstract

If a graph  $G$  can be represented by means of paths on a grid, such that each vertex of  $G$  corresponds to one path on the grid and two vertices of  $G$  are adjacent if and only if the corresponding paths share a grid edge, then this graph is called EPG and the representation is called EPG representation. A  $k$ -bend EPG representation is an EPG representation in which each path has at most  $k$  bends. The class of all graphs that have a  $k$ -bend EPG representation is denoted by  $B_k$ .  $B_\ell^m$  is the class of all graphs that have a monotonic (each path is ascending in both columns and rows)  $\ell$ -bend EPG representation.

It is known that  $B_k^m \subsetneq B_k$  holds for  $k = 1$ . We prove that  $B_k^m \subsetneq B_k$  holds also for  $k \in \{2, 3, 5\}$  and for  $k \geq 7$  by investigating the  $B_k$ -membership and  $B_k^m$ -membership of complete bipartite graphs. In particular we derive necessary conditions for this membership that have to be fulfilled by  $m$ ,  $n$  and  $k$ , where  $m$  and  $n$  are the number of vertices on the two partition classes of the bipartite graph. We conjecture that  $B_k^m \subsetneq B_k$  holds also for  $k \in \{4, 6\}$ .

Furthermore we show that  $B_k \not\subseteq B_{2k-9}^m$  holds for all  $k \geq 5$ . This implies that restricting the shape of the paths can lead to a significant

---

\*The second author acknowledges support by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF): I 3199-N31.

increase of the number of bends needed in an EPG representation. So far no bounds on the amount of that increase were known. We prove that  $B_1 \subseteq B_3^m$  holds, providing the first result of this kind.

**Keywords:** paths on a grid, EPG graph, (monotonic) bend number, complete bipartite graph

## 1 Introduction and Definitions

In 2009 Golumbic, Lipshteyn and Stern [14] introduced edge intersection graphs of paths on a grid. If a graph  $G$  can be represented by means of paths on a grid, such that each vertex of  $G$  corresponds to one path on the grid and two vertices of  $G$  are adjacent if and only if the corresponding paths share a grid edge, then this graph is called *edge intersection graph of paths on a grid (EPG)* and the representation is called *EPG representation*. Here the term *edge intersection of paths* refers to the fact that the paths share a grid edge.

A  $k$ -bend EPG representation or  $B_k$ -EPG representation is an EPG representation in which each path has at most  $k$  bends. A graph that has a  $B_k$ -EPG representation is called  $B_k$ -EPG and the class of all  $B_k$ -EPG graphs is denoted by  $B_k$ . A path on a grid is called *monotonic*, if it is ascending in both columns and rows, i.e. it has the shape of a staircase that is going upwards from left to right. The graphs that have a  $B_\ell$ -EPG representation in which each path is monotonic are called  $B_\ell^m$ -EPG and the class of all these graphs is denoted by  $B_\ell^m$ . The bend number  $b(G)$  of a graph  $G$  is the minimum  $k$  such that  $G$  is  $B_k$ -EPG. The monotonic bend number  $b^m(G)$  of graph  $G$  is defined as the minimum  $\ell$  such that  $G$  is  $B_\ell^m$ -EPG. Note that already Golumbic, Lipshteyn and Stern [14] showed that each graph is  $B_k$ -EPG and  $B_\ell^m$ -EPG for some  $k$  and  $\ell$ .

EPGs initially were introduced because of two applications. The first one comes from circuit layout setting. In this setting the wires correspond to the paths on the grid. In the knock-knee layout model one wants to place the wires on the grid in multiple layers, such that the wires of each layer do not share a grid edge, but crossing and bending of wires is allowed. In our notation that corresponds to finding a coloring of the vertices of the graph, such that two adjacent vertices are not colored with the same color. For more information see [8, 17]. Another application comes from chip manufacturing. There a transition whole is required, whenever a wire bends. Many transition wholes may enlarge the area and furthermore increase the cost of the chip, hence it is desirable to minimize the number of bends or equivalently find the minimum  $k$  such that the corresponding graph is in  $B_k$ . Further information can be found in [14].

Furthermore EPGs are a generalization of *edge intersection graphs of paths on a tree* (EPT). Also *vertex intersection graph of paths on a tree* (VPT) are a generalization of EPTs, which were further generalized to *vertex intersection graphs of paths on a grid* (VPG). In this paper we will only deal with EPGs, so we refer to [1] for more information.

There has been a lot of research on EPGs since their introduction. One of the topics of interest is the recognition problem of  $B_k$ -EPG graphs, i.e. to determine for a given  $k$  and a given graph whether this graph is  $B_k$  ( $B_k^m$ ). Currently it is known that the recognition problem is NP-hard for  $B_1$  (Heldt, Knauer and Ueckerdt [16]),  $B_1^m$  (Cameron, Chaplick and Hoàng [9]),  $B_2$  and  $B_2^m$  (Pergel and Rzażewski [18]).

Recently a number of results on combinatorial optimization problems on specific  $B_k$ -EPG graphs have been published. Subject of investigation are certain NP-hard combinatorial optimization problems which turn out to be tractable, i.e. polynomially solvable or approximable within a guaranteed approximation ratio, for  $B_k$ -EPG graphs, see [5–7, 12]. Thus the computation of the bend number and the monotonic bend number of graphs or related upper bounds is a relevant research question in this context. However this appears to be a challenging task, considering that even the recognition of  $B_k$  ( $B_k^m$ ) graphs is NP-hard for  $k = 1$  and  $k = 2$ , as mentioned above.

A related and more viable line of research is the determination of (upper bounds on) the (monotonic) bend number of special graph classes. Among the first graph class for which an upper bound on the bend number was given were planar graphs. The first upper bound of 5 was obtained in 2009 by Biedl and Stern [4] and was improved to 4 by Heldt, Knauer and Ueckerdt [15] in 2012. Heldt et al. [15] also showed that 2 is an upper bound on the bend number of outerplanar graphs. Ćela and Gaar [10] showed recently that 2 is also an upper bound on the monotonic bend number of outerplanar graphs. Moreover they give a full characterization of maximal outerplanar graphs and cacti with (monotonic) bend number equal to 0, 1 and 2 in terms of forbidden induced subgraphs.

Also other graph classes were considered. Recently Francis and Lahiri [13] proved that Halin graphs are  $B_2^m$  and Deniz, Nivelle, Ries and Schindl [11] provided a characterization of split graphs for which there exists a  $B_1$ -EPG representation which uses only L-shaped paths on the grid, i.e. paths consisting of a vertical top-bottom segment followed by a horizontal left-right segment.

Another line of research on EPGs concerns the mutual relationship between the classes  $B_k$  and the classes  $B_\ell^m$ . Our paper is a contribution in this direction. The chains of inclusions  $B_0 \subseteq B_1 \subseteq B_2 \subseteq \dots$  and  $B_0^m \subseteq B_1^m \subseteq B_2^m \subseteq \dots$  trivially hold. Furthermore  $B_0 = B_0^m$ ,  $B_0 \subseteq B_1^m$

and  $B_k^m \subseteq B_k$ , for every  $k$ , are obvious. In [16] Heldt, Knauer and Ueckerdt dealt with the question whether the complete bipartite graph  $K_{m,n}$  on  $m$  and  $n$  vertices in the two partition classes is in  $B_k$ . They identified several sufficient conditions which have to be fulfilled by  $m$ ,  $n$  and  $k$  to guarantee that  $K_{m,n}$  is in  $B_k$  or  $K_{m,n}$  is not in  $B_k$ . They used this kind of results to prove that  $B_k \subsetneq B_{k+1}$  holds for every  $k \geq 0$ . In this paper we will derive new results of this type, especially for the monotonic case. It is still not known whether  $B_k^m \subsetneq B_{k+1}^m$  also holds.

The relationship between  $B_k$  and  $B_k^m$  has already been considered in the literature. Golubic, Lipshteyn and Stern [14] conjectured that  $B_1^m \subsetneq B_1$ , which was confirmed in [9]. In this paper we show that  $B_k \subsetneq B_k^m$  also  $k \in \{2, 3, 5\}$  and  $k \geq 7$ , while the cases  $k = 4$  and  $k = 6$  remain open.

Furthermore we are interested in the gap between the bend number  $b(G)$  and the monotonic bend number  $b^m(G)$  of a graph. More precisely we pose the question whether there exists a function  $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  such that  $b^m(G) \leq f(b(G))$  holds for every graph  $G$ . As a first step towards answering this question we show that  $B_k \not\subseteq B_{2k-9}^m$  holds for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $k \geq 5$ , which implies the existence of graphs for which  $b^m(G) \geq 2k - 8$  and  $b(G) \leq k$ , for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $k \geq 5$ . Moreover we show that  $b(G) \leq 1$  implies  $b^m(G) \leq 3$ .

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 deals with the (monotonic) bend number of  $K_{m,n}$ . First we review some results from the literature on the bend number of  $K_{m,n}$ , where  $m \leq n$ . In particular we discuss a theorem from [16] and point out that the proof of the theorem does not work out for  $m = 4$  and  $m = 5$ . Further we show that the statement of the theorem holds for  $m = 4$ , while we don't know whether it holds for  $m = 5$ . However we only exploit the statement of the theorem for  $m \geq 7$  in our later work. In Section 2.2 we derive two inequalities on  $m$ ,  $n$  and  $k$  which have to be fulfilled if  $K_{m,n}$  is in  $B_k^m$ . In Section 2.3 we show that  $b^m(K_{m,n}) \leq 2m - 2$  for every  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $m \leq n$ . Moreover we show that this upper bound on  $b^m(K_{m,n})$  is best possible, i.e. for each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists an  $n_m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $n_m \geq m$ , such that  $b^m(K_{m,n_m}) = 2m - 2$ . An analogous behavior of  $b(K_{m,n})$  has been already shown in literature [16]. However, we will see that this maximum bend number is attained already for smaller values of  $n_m$  in the monotonic case.

In Section 3.1 we present a graph which is in  $B_2$  and not in  $B_2^m$  in order to prove  $B_k^m \subsetneq B_k$  for  $k = 2$ . In Section 3.2 we use the results of Section 2.2 to prove that  $B_k^m \subsetneq B_k$  also for  $k \in \{3, 5\}$  and  $k \geq 7$ , thus answering an open question of [14] for almost all values of  $k$ .

Finally in Section 4 we investigate the relationship between  $B_k$  and  $B_\ell^m$  for  $\ell > k$ . In Section 4.1 we show that for odd  $k \geq 5$  there is a graph in  $B_k$

which is not in  $B_{2k-8}^m$  and for even  $k \geq 5$  there is a graph in  $B_k$  which is not in  $B_{2k-9}^m$ . Then in Section 4.2 we prove that  $B_1 \subseteq B_3^m$ , giving the first result of this kind. We summarize our results and discuss some open questions in Section 5.

**Terminology and notation.** Eventually we summarize our terminology and notation used throughout the paper. The crossings of two *grid lines* are called *grid points*. The part of a grid line between two consecutive grid points is called a *grid edge*. A grid edge can be *horizontal* or *vertical*.

A *path* on a grid consists of a *start point* and an *end point*, which are both grid points, and consecutive grid edges. A turn of a path on the grid is called *bend* and a grid point, in which the path turns, is called a *bend point*.

The part of a path between two consecutive bend points is called a *segment*. Also the part of the path from the start point to the first bend point and the part of the path from the last bend point to the end point are called *segments*. The grid points contained in a segment of a path which are neither bend points nor starting points or end points of that path build the *interior* of that segment. Clearly any segment consists either entirely of horizontal grid edges or entirely of vertical grid edges. We call such segments *horizontal* and *vertical segments*, respectively. Paths without bends correspond to (horizontal or vertical) segments.

We say that two paths on a grid *intersect*, if they have at least one common grid edge. If two segments  $S_1, S_2$  lie on the same grid line but do not intersect (if considered as paths), then we call them *aligned*; such a pair  $(S_1, S_2)$  is called an *alignment*. Figure 1(a) depicts two aligned segments  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ .

A pair  $(S_1, S_2)$  of segments is called a *crossing* if one of the two segments lies on a horizontal grid line, the other segment lies on a vertical grid line, and there is a grid point which belongs to the interior of each of the segments. Figure 1(b) depicts a crossing  $(S_1, S_2)$  with grid point  $x$  belonging to the interior of both segments.

A pair  $(S_1, S_2)$  of segments is called a *pseudocrossing* if one of the two segments lies on a horizontal grid line, the other segment lies on a vertical grid line, and there is no grid point which belongs to the interior of each of the segments. Figure 1(c)-(e) depict different pseudocrossings.

Given a set  $\mathcal{P}$  of pairwise non-intersecting paths on a grid we define the alignments (crossings, pseudocrossings) of  $\mathcal{P}$  as the set of all alignments (crossings, pseudocrossings)  $(S_1, S_2)$  for which there exist two distinct paths  $P_1, P_2 \in \mathcal{P}$  such that  $S_i$  is a segment of  $P_i$ , for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . Figure 1(f) depicts two paths  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  containing two alignments (a horizontal one and a vertical one) and two pseudocrossings.




Figure 1: (a) An alignment  $(S_1, S_2)$ . (b) A crossing  $(S_1, S_2)$ . (c)-(e) Different pseudocrossings  $(S_1, S_2)$ . (f) Two paths  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  containing two alignments and two pseudocrossings.

In an EPG representation of the graph  $G$  with vertex set  $V$  we denote the path corresponding to a vertex  $v \in V$  by  $P_v$ .

## 2 Complete Bipartite Graphs

The aim of this section is to summarize existing results on the  $B_k$ -EPG representation of complete bipartite graphs and derive new upper and lower bounds on their (monotonic) bend number. We start by investigating some results from the literature in Section 2.1. Then we derive two Lower-Bound-Lemmas in Section 2.2. Eventually we give an upper bound on the monotonic bend number of a  $K_{m,n}$  in Section 2.3. The results obtained in this section will be used in Section 3.2 where the relationship between  $B_k^m$  and  $B_k$  for  $k \geq 3$  is investigated.

Throughout this section we consider the complete bipartite graph  $K_{m,n}$  with  $m \leq n$ . We denote the two partition classes of  $K_{m,n}$  by  $A$  and  $B$ , where  $|A| = m$  and  $|B| = n$ . In an EPG representation we denote the set of all paths that correspond to vertices of  $A$  and  $B$  by  $\mathcal{P}_A$  and  $\mathcal{P}_B$ , respectively; so  $\mathcal{P}_A = \{P_v : v \in A\}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_B = \{P_w : w \in B\}$ .

### 2.1 Upper Bounds on the Bend Number

First of all notice that the bend number of  $K_{m,n}$  for  $m \in \{0, 1, 2\}$  is known. The trivial case  $m = 0$  corresponds to a graph without any edges and hence  $b(K_{0,n}) = b^m(K_{0,n}) = 0$ , for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

The other trivial case  $m = 1$  corresponds to a star graph with  $n + 1$  vertices. A  $B_0$ -EPG representation of this graph consists of a horizontal path  $P$  with  $n$  grid edges to represent the central vertex, and the pairwise different grid edges of  $P$  represent the other vertices. Thus  $b(K_{1,n}) = b^m(K_{1,n}) = 0$ , for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

The bend number of  $K_{2,n}$  has been determined by Asinowski and Suk [2] for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ :  $b(K_{2,n}) = 2$  if and only if  $n \geq 5$ ,  $b(K_{2,n}) = 1$  if and only if  $2 \leq n \leq 4$ , and  $b(K_{2,n}) = 0$  if and only if  $n \leq 1$ . The EPG representations for  $K_{2,n}$  in [2] are monotonic, therefore  $b^m(K_{2,n}) = b(K_{2,n})$  holds for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

The more general case  $m \geq 3$  has been considered by Heldt, Knauer and Ueckerdt in [16]. We first discuss the following result of these authors.

**Theorem 2.1** (Heldt, Knauer, Ueckerdt [16]). *If  $m \geq 4$  is even and  $n = \frac{1}{4}m^3 - \frac{1}{2}m^2 - m + 4$ , then  $K_{m,n}$  is in  $B_{m-1}$  but not in  $B_{m-2}$ . If  $m \geq 7$  is odd and  $n = \frac{1}{4}m^3 - m^2 + \frac{3}{4}m$ , then  $K_{m,n}$  is in  $B_{m-1}$  but not in  $B_{m-2}$ .*

The above theorem makes no statement for the cases  $m = 3$  and  $m = 5$ . However in [16] the authors claim that the statement of Theorem 2.1 for odd  $m$  holds also for  $m = 5$  (see [16, Theorem 4.4.]). But the proof provided in [16] is not correct for  $m = 5$  and we do not know whether the statement is true in this case. Also for the case  $m = 4$  the proof provided in [16] is not correct, however in this case the statement is true as argued below.

To be more precise, in [16] on the one hand the authors provide a  $B_{m-1}$ -EPG representation for  $K_{m,n}$  for  $m \geq 3$  and  $n$  defined as in Theorem 2.1, i.e. a constructive proof for one part of [16, Theorem 4.4.]. On the other hand the Lower-Bound-Lemma I [16, Lemma 4.1] is used in order to show that  $K_{m,n}$  is not in  $B_{m-2}$  for  $n$  defined as in Theorem 2.1. This Lower-Bound-Lemma I states that

$$(k+1)(m+n) \geq mn + \sqrt{2k(m+n)}$$

holds for every  $B_k$ -EPG representation of  $K_{m,n}$  with  $n \geq m \geq 3$ . Further they observe that for  $n$  defined as in Theorem 2.1 the inequality  $n \geq (m-1)^2$  holds, while the inequality of the Lower-Bound-Lemma I is not fulfilled for  $n \geq (m-1)^2$  and  $k = m-2$ , thus negating the membership of the corresponding graphs in  $B_{m-2}$ . However, for  $n$  defined as in Theorem 2.1, the inequality  $n \geq (m-1)^2$  holds only if  $m \geq 6$ . Thus the proof provided for [16, Theorem 4.4] only works for  $m \geq 6$ .

For  $m = 4$  we have  $n = 8$ , and the construction in [16] proves that  $K_{4,8}$  is in  $B_3$ . Furthermore by applying the Lower-Bound-Lemma I for  $m = 4$ ,  $n = 6$  and  $k = 2$  we get that  $K_{4,6}$  is not in  $B_2$ . This implies that also  $K_{4,8}$  is not in  $B_2$ . Therefore the statement of Theorem 2.1 is also true for  $m = 4$ .

If  $m = 5$  the construction in [16] yields that  $K_{5,10}$  is in  $B_4$ . If we use the Lower-Bound-Lemma I, then we get that  $K_{5,11}$  is not in  $B_3$  and that the bend number of  $K_{5,10}$  is at least 3. Therefore the bend number of  $K_{5,10}$  could be either 3 or 4.

## 2.2 Lower-Bound-Lemmas

In order to investigate the relationship between  $B_k^m$  and  $B_k$  for large values of  $k$ , we first derive a Lower-Bound-Lemma for  $B_k^m$ -EPG representations similarly to the Lower-Bound-Lemma I for  $B_k$ -EPG representations from [16]. To this end we use an auxiliary result from [16, Lemma 4.6].

**Lemma 2.2** (Heldt, Knauer, Ueckerdt [16]). *Let  $3 \leq m \leq n$ . For a  $B_k$ -EPG representation of  $K_{m,n}$  denote by  $c$  the number of crossings of  $\mathcal{P}_A$ . Then*

$$n(2m - k - 2) \leq 2c + 2(k + 1)m$$

*holds.*

In the following we derive inequalities on  $m$ ,  $n$  and  $k$  which hold whenever a  $K_{m,n}$  is in  $B_k^m$ . The next lemma is a first step towards such a result.

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $3 \leq m \leq n$ . For a  $B_k$ -EPG representation of  $K_{m,n}$  denote by  $a$ ,  $c$  and  $p$  be the total number of alignments, crossing and pseudocrossings of  $\mathcal{P}_A$ , respectively. Then*

$$n \left( m - \left\lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rceil \right) \leq a + 2c + p$$

*holds.*

*Proof.* Let  $w$  be a vertex of  $B$ . For each vertex  $v \in A$  we denote by  $e_v^w$  a fixed but arbitrarily chosen common grid edge of  $P_v$  and  $P_w$ . Such an edge exists, because  $P_w$  intersects  $P_v$  since  $w$  is adjacent to all vertices of  $A$ . The grid edges  $e_v^w$  for all  $v \in A$  are pairwise disjoint, because the vertices of  $A$  are not adjacent to each other.

We order the vertices  $A = \{v_1, \dots, v_m\}$  in such a way that  $e_{v_i}^w$  precedes  $e_{v_{i+1}}^w$  in the path  $P_w$ , for all  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m-1\}$ . For  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ , let  $S_i^w$  be the segment of  $P_{v_i}$  that contains  $e_{v_i}^w$ . We consider the pairs  $(S_i^w, S_{i+1}^w)$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m-1\}$  and denote by  $a_w$ ,  $c_w$  and  $p_w$  the number of those pairs of segments which are alignments, crossings and pseudocrossings, respectively. For example  $a_w$  is defined as

$$a_w = \left| \left\{ i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m-1\} : (S_i^w, S_{i+1}^w) \text{ is an alignment} \right\} \right|,$$

and  $c_w$  and  $p_w$  are defined analogously. Next we derive lower and upper bounds on  $a_w$ ,  $c_w$  and  $p_w$ .

Let  $x_w$ ,  $y_w$  and  $z_w$  be the number of indices  $i \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$  such that  $e_{v_i}^w$  and  $e_{v_{i+1}}^w$  lie on the same segment of  $P_w$ , on consecutive segments of  $P_w$ ,

and neither on the same nor on consecutive segments of  $P_w$ , respectively. Then clearly  $x_w + y_w + z_w = m - 1$  holds.

It is easy to see that if  $e_{v_i}^w$  and  $e_{v_{i+1}}^w$  lie on the same segment of  $P_w$ , then the corresponding segments  $S_i^w$  and  $S_{i+1}^w$  of  $P_{v_i}$  and  $P_{v_{i+1}}$  lie on the same grid line. Thus in this case  $(S_i^w, S_{i+1}^w)$  is an alignment and hence  $x_w \leq a_w$  holds.

If  $e_{v_i}^w$  and  $e_{v_{i+1}}^w$  lie on consecutive segments of  $P_w$ , then one of the corresponding segments  $S_i^w$  and  $S_{i+1}^w$  is horizontal and the other one is vertical. Hence  $(S_i^w, S_{i+1}^w)$  is either a crossing or a pseudocrossing. Therefore  $y_w \leq p_w + c_w$  holds.

If  $e_{v_i}^w$  and  $e_{v_{i+1}}^w$  lie neither on the same nor on consecutive segments of  $P_w$ , then the subpath of  $P_w$  between (and not including) the two segments of  $P_w$  containing  $e_{v_i}^w$  and  $e_{v_{i+1}}^w$  contains at least one segment and does not contain any  $e_{v_{i'}}^w$  for  $i' \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$ . Let us call such a subpath a *free subpath* of  $P_w$ . Since  $P_w$  has at most  $k+1$  segments and each free subpath is preceded and also succeeded by a segment containing  $e_{v_{i'}}^w$  for some  $i' \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$ , the number of free subpaths is at most  $\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor$  and hence  $z_w \leq \lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor$  holds.

To summarize up to now we have shown that

$$m - \left\lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rceil = m - 1 - \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor \leq m - 1 - z_w = x_w + y_w \leq a_w + c_w + p_w$$

holds. Summing this up over all vertices  $w \in B$  yields

$$n \left( m - \left\lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rceil \right) \leq \sum_{w \in B} (a_w + c_w + p_w).$$

It remains to determine an upper bound on  $\sum_{w \in B} (a_w + c_w + p_w)$ . Towards this end let  $a_B = \sum_{w \in B} a_w$ ,  $c_B = \sum_{w \in B} c_w$  and  $p_B = \sum_{w \in B} p_w$ .

Clearly an alignment (crossing, pseudocrossing)  $(S_i^w, S_{i+1}^w)$ , for  $w \in B$  and for  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m-1\}$ , is an alignment (crossing, pseudocrossing) of  $\mathcal{P}_A$ , since  $S_i^w$  is a segment of  $P_{v_i}$ , for  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ .

This implies that  $a_B \leq a$  and  $p_B \leq p$  because the alignments and pseudocrossings counted in  $a_B$  and  $p_B$  are pairwise distinct due to the fact that the paths in  $\mathcal{P}_A$  are pairwise non-intersecting and also the paths in  $\mathcal{P}_B$  are pairwise non-intersecting.

The crossings counted in  $c_B$  are not necessarily pairwise distinct because a crossing  $(S_i^w, S_{i+1}^w)$  can also appear as a crossing  $(S_j^{w'}, S_{j+1}^{w'})$ , for some  $w, w' \in B$ ,  $w \neq w'$  and some  $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m-1\}$ , see Figure 2. However, the same crossing can not be counted more than twice in  $c_B$  because the paths in  $\mathcal{P}_B$  are pairwise non-intersecting, so  $c_B \leq 2c$  holds.

$$S_i^w = S_j^{w'} \quad \begin{array}{c} P_w \\ \vdots \\ S_{i+1}^w = S_{j+1}^{w'} \\ \vdots \\ P_{w'} \end{array}$$

Figure 2: The crossings  $(S_i^w, S_{i+1}^w)$  and  $(S_j^{w'}, S_{j+1}^{w'})$  coincide.

Eventually we can deduce

$$n \left( m - \left\lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rfloor \right) \leq \sum_{w \in B} (a_w + c_w + p_w) = a_B + c_B + p_B \leq a + 2c + p.$$

□

The next lemma gives bounds on the number of alignments, crossings and pseudocrossings.

**Lemma 2.4.** *Consider two paths  $P_1, P_2$  in a  $B_k$ -EPG representation that do not intersect. Let  $a, c$  and  $p$  be the number of alignments, crossings and pseudocrossings of  $\{P_1, P_2\}$ , respectively. If one path starts horizontally and the other one starts vertically, then*

$$(a) \quad c + p \leq 2 \left\lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rfloor \left\lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rceil + \left( \left\lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rceil - \left\lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rfloor \right)^2 \quad \text{and}$$

(b) *if the paths are monotonic  $a + c \leq k + 1$  hold.*

*If both paths start horizontally or both paths start vertically, then*

$$(c) \quad c + p \leq 2 \left\lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rfloor \left\lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rceil \quad \text{and}$$

(d) *if the paths are monotonic  $a + c \leq k$  hold.*

*Proof.* First we consider (a) and (c). In a crossing or a pseudocrossing  $(S_1, S_2)$  of  $\{P_1, P_2\}$  one of the segments is horizontal and the other one is vertical. Notice that a path that starts with a horizontal segment has  $\left\lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rceil$  horizontal and  $\left\lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rfloor$  vertical segments, whereas a path that starts with a vertical segment has  $\left\lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rfloor$  horizontal and  $\left\lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rceil$  vertical segments. If one of the paths start horizontally and one path starts vertically this implies that

$$\begin{aligned} c + p &\leq \left\lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rfloor^2 + \left\lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rceil^2 \\ &= 2 \left\lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rfloor \left\lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rceil + \left( \left\lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rceil - \left\lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rfloor \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

and hence (a) holds. With the same arguments we obtain

$$c + p \leq 2 \left\lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rfloor \left\lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rceil$$

for paths that start into the same direction. Thus (c) is satisfied.

Next we consider (b), so assume the paths are monotonic. It is easy to see that each segment of  $P_1$  can not cross 2 or more segments of  $P_2$  and can not be aligned with 2 or more segments of  $P_2$ . Furthermore, whenever a segment of  $P_1$  crosses a segment of  $P_2$ , it can not be aligned with another segment of  $P_2$ . Moreover, whenever a segment of  $P_1$  is aligned with a segment of  $P_2$ , it can not cross another segment of  $P_2$ . Hence each segment of  $P_1$  can be part of at most one crossing or alignment. This implies (b) as  $P_1$  has at most  $k+1$  segments.

In order to prove (d) assume without loss of generality that both paths start horizontally. The arguments of (b) imply that each segment of each of the paths can appear in at most one crossing or one alignment. We distinguish two cases. If one of the paths starts in a lower grid line than the other, then the first segment of this path can neither be aligned to nor cross the other path. Therefore alignments and crossings can only occur on the remaining  $k$  segments of the path and hence  $a + c \leq k$  holds. If both paths start on the same grid line, then let without loss of generality the first segment of  $P_1$  lie to the left of the first segment of  $P_2$ . It is easy to see that the second segment of  $P_1$  can neither be aligned to nor cross  $P_2$ . Therefore also in this case we have  $a + c \leq k$ . This proves (d).  $\square$

Next we combine the bounds on the number of crossings derived in Lemma 2.4 with Lemma 2.2 in the following result.

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $3 \leq m \leq n$ . In every  $B_k^m$ -EPG representation of  $K_{m,n}$*

$$n(2m - k - 2) \leq k(m - 1)m + \frac{1}{2}m^2 + 2(k + 1)m$$

*holds.*

*Proof.* Let  $c$  denote the number of crossings of the paths in  $\mathcal{P}_A$ . Every  $B_k^m$ -EPG representation is a  $B_k$ -EPG representation too, therefore it follows from Lemma 2.2 that

$$n(2m - k - 2) \leq 2c + 2(k + 1)m \tag{1}$$

holds for every  $B_k^m$ -EPG representation of  $K_{m,n}$ . Now we give an upper bound on  $c$ . Let  $\ell$  be the number of paths in  $\mathcal{P}_A$  which start with a horizontal

segment. Then  $m - \ell$  paths of  $\mathcal{P}_A$  start with a vertical segment. Since the paths in  $\mathcal{P}_A$  are pairwise non-intersecting, the number  $c$  of crossings of  $\mathcal{P}_A$  can be calculated as  $c = \sum_{\{v,v'\} \subseteq A} c_{v,v'}$ , where  $c_{v,v'}$  is the number of crossings of  $\{P_v, P_{v'}\}$ .

If both  $P_v$  and  $P_{v'}$  start with a horizontal (vertical) segment, then  $c_{v,v'} \leq k$  by Lemma 2.4(d). If one of the paths  $P_v$  and  $P_{v'}$  starts with a horizontal segment and the other one starts with a vertical segment, then  $c_{v,v'} \leq k + 1$  by Lemma 2.4(b). Notice that there are exactly  $\ell(m - \ell)$  pairs of paths  $P_v$  and  $P_{v'}$  with the latter property and  $\binom{m}{2} - \ell(m - \ell)$  pairs of paths  $P_v$  and  $P_{v'}$  both starting with a horizontal (vertical) segment. In total we get

$$c = \sum_{\{v,v'\} \subseteq A} c_{v,v'} \leq k \binom{m}{2} + \ell(m - \ell).$$

Since  $\ell(m - \ell) \leq \left(\frac{m}{2}\right)^2$  for all  $0 \leq \ell \leq m$  we get

$$c \leq k \binom{m}{2} + \frac{m^2}{4} = \frac{1}{2} \left( k(m-1)m + \frac{1}{2}m^2 \right),$$

which in combination with (1) completes the proof.  $\square$

Next we combine the bounds on the number of crossings derived in Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 2.3 as follows.

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let  $3 \leq m \leq n$ . In every  $B_k^m$ -EPG representation of  $K_{m,n}$*

$$n \left( m - \left\lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rceil \right) \leq \binom{m}{2} \left( 2 \left\lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rfloor \left\lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rceil + k \right) + \frac{1}{4}m^2 \left( 1 + \left( \left\lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rceil - \left\lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rfloor \right)^2 \right)$$

*holds.*

*Proof.* We combine Lemma 2.3 and Lemma 2.4 by proceeding analogously as in the proof of Lemma 2.5.

In particular let  $a$ ,  $c$  and  $p$  be the number of alignments, crossings and pseudocrossings of  $\mathcal{P}_A$ , respectively. As done in the proof of Lemma 2.5 we can compute  $c$  as the sum of the number of crossings  $c_{v,v'}$  of  $\{P_v, P_{v'}\}$  over all pairs  $\{v, v'\} \subseteq A$ . Similarly we write  $p$  and  $a$  as the sum of the number of pseudocrossings  $p_{v,v'}$  (alignments  $a_{v,v'}$ ) of  $\{P_v, P_{v'}\}$  over all pairs  $\{v, v'\} \subseteq A$ . Thus we obtain  $a + 2c + p = \sum_{\{v,v'\} \subseteq A} (a_{v,v'} + c_{v,v'}) + \sum_{\{v,v'\} \subseteq A} (c_{v,v'} + p_{v,v'})$ .

Then we use Lemma 2.4 (b) and (d) to bound each summand of the first sum from above and Lemma 2.4 (a) and (c) to bound each summand of the second sum from above. Then we transform the sum of these upper bounds analogously as in the proof of Lemma 2.5 and finally use Lemma 2.3 to bound  $a + 2c + p$  from below. This completes the proof.  $\square$

To summarize Lemma 2.5 and Lemma 2.6 provide inequalities on  $m$ ,  $n$  and  $k$  which hold whenever a  $K_{m,n}$  with  $3 \leq m \leq n$  is in  $B_k^m$ . These inequalities are used in the next section and in Section 3.2.

## 2.3 Upper Bounds on the Monotonic Bend Number

In [16] a lot of work has been done to determine the monotonic bend number of  $K_{m,n}$  in dependence of  $m$  and  $n$ . In particular it was proven that  $b(K_{m,n}) = 2m - 2$  for  $m \geq 3$  and  $n \geq m^4 - 2m^3 + 5m^2 - 4m + 1$ . We deduce a similar result for the monotonic case.

We first generalize a result of [4]. There it was shown by slightly modifying a construction of [14] that  $K_{m,n} \in B_{2m-2}^m$  for all  $n$ . We modify the construction of [4] and give an analogous result for the monotonic case.

**Theorem 2.7.** *It holds that  $K_{m,n} \in B_{2m-2}^m$ .*

*Proof.* In order to prove this, it is enough to give a  $B_{2m-2}^m$ -EPG representation of  $K_{m,n}$ , which can be found in Figure 3. Each vertex of  $K_{m,n}$  belonging to the partition class  $A$  of size  $m$  is represented in the grid by a path consisting of just one horizontal segment. Each of the  $n$  vertices of the other partition class  $B$  is represented in the grid by a staircase with  $2m - 2$  bends. The staircases have pairwise empty intersections.  $\square$

This means that for fixed  $m$  and varying  $n$  both  $b(K_{m,n}) \leq 2m - 2$  and  $b^m(K_{m,n}) \leq 2m - 2$  hold. Hence the upper bound on the number of bends needed for an EPG representation of  $K_{m,n}$  with  $3 \leq m \leq n$  is the same, namely  $2m - 2$ , no matter whether all kind of bends or only monotonic bends are allowed. This fact is even more surprising if we take into account Theorem 4.1, which states the existence of graphs for which the gap between the bend number and the monotonic bend number can be arbitrarily large.

However, it turns out that the upper bound on  $b^m(K_{m,n})$  is already reached for a smaller  $n$  than the upper bound on  $b(K_{m,n})$ . In particular the above stated result from [16] implies that  $b(K_{m,n}) = 2m - 2$  for  $n \geq N_1$  for some  $N_1 \in \Theta(m^4)$ . As a consequence of the next result it follows that  $b^m(K_{m,n}) = 2m - 2$  for  $n \geq N_2$  already for some  $N_2 \in \Theta(m^3)$ .

**Theorem 2.8.** *Let  $3 \leq m$ . If  $n \geq 2m^3 - \frac{1}{2}m^2 - m + 1$  then  $K_{m,n} \notin B_{2m-3}^m$ .*




Figure 3: A  $B_{2m-2}^m$ -EPG representation of  $K_{m,n}$ .

*Proof.* Assume that  $K_{m,n} \in B_{2m-3}^m$ . By applying Lemma 2.5 for  $k = 2m - 3$  we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
 n(2m - (2m - 3) - 2) &\leq (2m - 3)(m - 1)m + \frac{1}{2}m^2 + 2(2m - 2)m \\
 \Leftrightarrow n &\leq 2m^3 - \frac{1}{2}m^2 - m
 \end{aligned}$$

has to hold. This is a contradiction for  $n \geq 2m^3 - \frac{1}{2}m^2 - m + 1$ .  $\square$

### 3 Relationship between $B_k^m$ and $B_k$

It is an open question of [14] to determine the relationship between  $B_k^m$  and  $B_k$  for  $k \geq 1$ . Obviously  $B_k^m \subseteq B_k$  holds for every  $k$ . In [14] Golumbic, Lipshteyn and Stern conjectured that  $B_1^m \subsetneq B_1$ . This conjecture was confirmed by Cameron, Chaplick and Hoàng in [9] by showing that the graph  $S_3$ , which was known to be in  $B_1$  from [14], is not in  $B_1^m$ .

In this section we consider the question whether  $B_k^m \subsetneq B_k$  holds also for  $k \geq 2$ . We first consider the case  $k = 2$  in Section 3.1 and then the remaining cases  $k \geq 3$  in Section 3.2. The case distinction is due to the different methods used in the investigations.

#### 3.1 Relationship between $B_2^m$ and $B_2$

The aim of this section is to prove that  $B_2^m \subsetneq B_2$  holds. For this purpose we show that the graph  $H_1$  represented in Figure 4 is in  $B_2$  but not in  $B_2^m$ .  $H_1$  is defined as follows.




Figure 4: (a) The graph  $H_1$ . (b) The graph  $H_2$  contained in every gray area of  $H_1$ .

**Definition 3.1.** The graph  $H_1$  depicted in Figure 4 is constructed in the following way. The vertices  $\{u, v\}$  and  $\{a_1, \dots, a_{50}\}$  form a  $K_{2,50}$ . Furthermore, for every  $1 \leq j < 50$  the vertices  $\{a_j, a_{j+1}\}$  and  $\{b_{1,j}, \dots, b_{50,j}\}$  form a  $K_{2,50}$ . Additional to that for every  $1 \leq j < 50$  and for every  $1 \leq i < 50$  there is the graph  $H_2$  of Figure 4 (b) placed between the vertices  $b_{i,j}$  and  $b_{i+1,j}$ .

The next result follows from a proof of Heldt, Knauer and Ueckerdt in [15]. In Proposition 1 they use a similar construction in order to prove that there is a planar graph with treewidth at most 3 which is not in  $B_2$ . Their construction builds also on the graph  $H_1$  (called  $G$  in their paper) but the graph suspended between any two vertices  $b_{i,j}, b_{i+1,j}$ , for  $1 \leq i, j < 50$ , (called  $H$  in their paper) is a 29-vertex graph different from  $H_2$ . In the first part of the proof of Proposition 1 Heldt et al. prove some properties of  $B_2$ -EPG representations of the subgraph of  $H_1$  as summarized in the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.2** (Heldt, Knauer, Ueckerdt [15]). *In any  $B_2$ -EPG representation of the graph  $H_1$  depicted in Figure 4 there exist two indices  $i$  and  $j$ ,  $1 \leq i, j \leq 49$ , with the following properties:*

- (a) *the paths  $P_{b_{i,j}}$  and  $P_{b_{i+1,j}}$  consist of three segments each,*

- (b) there is a segment  $S_j$  of the path  $P_{a_j}$  which completely contains one end segment of  $P_{b_{i,j}}$  and one end segment of  $P_{b_{i+1,j}}$ ,
- (c) there is a segment  $S_{j+1}$  of the path  $P_{a_{j+1}}$  which completely contains the other end segments of  $P_{b_{i,j}}$  and  $P_{b_{i+1,j}}$ ,
- (d)  $S_j$  and  $S_{j+1}$  are either both vertical segments or both horizontal segments.

With this auxiliary result we are able to prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.3.** *The graph  $H_1$  is not in  $B_2^m$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that  $H_1$  is in  $B_2^m$ . Every  $B_2^m$ -EPG representation is a  $B_2$ -EPG representation as well, therefore Lemma 3.2 holds also for any  $B_2^m$ -EPG representation of  $H_1$ . Assume without loss of generality that the center segment (i.e. the second segment) of  $P_{b_{i,j}}$  is a horizontal segment, that it is above the center segment of  $P_{b_{i+1,j}}$  and that the segment  $S_j$  of  $P_{a_j}$  is on the left side of the segment  $S_{j+1}$  of  $P_{a_{j+1}}$ . Then the positioning of the segments of the paths has to look like in Figure 5.




Figure 5: A part of the hypothetical  $B_2^m$ -EPG representation of  $H_1$ .

All of the vertices  $c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, c_5$  and  $c_6$  of the graph  $H_2$  between  $b_{i,j}$  and  $b_{i+1,j}$  are adjacent to both  $b_{i,j}$  and  $b_{i+1,j}$ , but neither to  $a_j$  nor to  $a_{j+1}$ . Therefore each of the six paths  $P_{c_1}, \dots, P_{c_6}$  has to share a grid edge with the center segments of both  $P_{b_{i,j}}$  and  $P_{b_{i+1,j}}$ . As a result,  $P_{c_i}$  starts with a first horizontal segment intersecting the center segment of  $P_{b_{i+1,j}}$ , continues with a second vertical segment and ends with a third horizontal segment intersecting the center segment of  $P_{b_{i,j}}$ , for every for  $1 \leq i \leq 6$ .

Now consider the vertices  $c_1, c_3$  and  $c_5$ . They form an independent set, so  $P_{c_1}, P_{c_3}, P_{c_5}$  are non-intersecting. Therefore the three vertical segments of these paths are disjoint and can be ordered from left to right. Let  $P_L, P_M$  and  $P_R$  be the path in  $\{P_{c_1}, P_{c_3}, P_{c_5}\}$  with the left-most, the middle and the right-most center segment, respectively. Moreover we denote with  $S_L, S_M$  and  $S_R$  the center segment of  $P_L, P_M$  and  $P_R$ , respectively. In the following

we say that a path  $P_{c_i}$  lies left to, right to and on another path  $P_{c_j}$  if the center segment of  $P_{c_i}$  lies left to, right to and on the center segment of  $P_{c_j}$  for some  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 6$ , respectively.

Next take a closer look at the paths  $P_{c_4}$  and  $P_{c_6}$ . Each of them intersects each of the three paths  $P_L$ ,  $P_M$  and  $P_R$ , since both vertices  $c_4$ ,  $c_6$  are adjacent to each of  $c_1$ ,  $c_3$  and  $c_5$ . Since  $c_4$  and  $c_6$  are not adjacent to each other,  $P_{c_4}$  and  $P_{c_6}$  do not intersect and hence the vertical segments of  $P_{c_4}$  and  $P_{c_6}$  are disjoint. Assume without loss of generality that  $P_{c_4}$  is left to  $P_{c_6}$ .

If  $P_{c_4}$  is right to or on  $P_L$ , then  $P_{c_6}$  can not intersect  $P_L$  on the first or second segment of  $P_L$ , because  $P_{c_6}$  is right to  $P_{c_4}$  and does not intersect  $P_{c_4}$ . Therefore  $P_{c_6}$  intersects  $P_L$  on its third segment. This implies that  $P_{c_6}$  lies left to or on  $P_M$ . But  $P_{c_4}$  is left to  $P_{c_6}$ , hence  $P_{c_4}$  is left to  $P_M$  and therefore can not intersect  $P_R$ , a contradiction. Analogously it follows that  $P_{c_6}$  can not be left to or on  $P_R$ .

As a result  $P_{c_4}$  lies left to  $P_L$  and  $P_{c_6}$  lies right to  $P_R$ .  $P_{c_4}$  has to intersect  $P_R$ , so the third segment of  $P_L$  and  $P_M$  are completely contained in the third segment of  $P_{c_4}$ . Similarly  $P_{c_6}$  has to intersect  $P_L$ , so the first segment of  $P_M$  and  $P_R$  are completely contained in the first segment of  $P_{c_6}$ . For an illustration of this configuration see Figure 6.




Figure 6: The only possible placement of paths  $P_{c_4}$ ,  $P_{c_6}$  and  $\{P_L, P_M, P_R\} = \{P_{c_1}, P_{c_3}, P_{c_5}\}$  in the hypothetical  $B_2^m$ -EPG representation of  $H_1$ .

Now consider the path  $P_{c_2}$  and observe that it has to intersect all of  $P_L$ ,  $P_M$  and  $P_R$  but does not intersect  $P_{c_4}$  and  $P_{c_6}$ . This implies that  $P_{c_2}$  has to intersect  $P_L$  on the first or second segment, it has to intersect  $P_M$  on the second segment and it has to intersect  $P_R$  on the second or the third segment, a contradiction. Hence  $H_1$  can not have a  $B_2^m$ -EPG representation.  $\square$

After proving that  $H_1$  is not in  $B_2^m$  we observe that  $H_1$  is in  $B_2$  and obtain the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.4.** *It holds that  $B_2^m \subsetneq B_2$ .*




Figure 7: (a) A  $B_2$ -EPG representation of the graph  $H_1$  of Figure 4. Every gray area represents the  $B_2$ -EPG representation of  $H_2$  depicted in (b).

*Proof.* The fact that  $B_2^m \subseteq B_2$  follows by definition. In order to see that strict inclusion holds, we consider the graph  $H_1$  depicted in Figure 4.

We have already seen in Lemma 3.3 that the graph  $H_1$  is not in  $B_2^m$ . So it is enough to show that  $H_1$  is in  $B_2$ . To this end consider a  $B_2$ -EPG representation of  $H_1$  given in Figure 7.  $\square$

Summarizing  $B_k^m \subsetneq B_k$  holds for  $k = 1$  as shown in [9] and also for  $k = 2$  as shown in this paper.

### 3.2 Relationship between $B_k^m$ and $B_k$ for $k \in \{3, 5\}$ and $k \geq 7$

In this section we use the results from Section 2 in order to investigate the relationship between  $B_k^m$  and  $B_k$  for  $k \in \{3, 5\}$  and  $k \geq 7$ .

We start our investigation with  $k = 3$  and prove that  $B_3^m \subsetneq B_3$  holds. To this end we use a result of [16] to show that a particular graph is in  $B_3$ , and then use results of Section 2 to prove that this graph is not in  $B_3^m$ .

**Lemma 3.5.** *It holds that  $B_3^m \subsetneq B_3$ .*

*Proof.* Heldt, Knauer, Ueckerdt [16] have computed  $b(K_{3,n})$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  except for  $n \in [40, 60]$  (as reported at the end of Section 4 in [16]). In particular they showed that  $b(K_{3,36}) = 3$ , hence  $K_{3,36}$  belongs to  $B_3$ . Now assume that  $K_{3,36}$  is in  $B_3^m$ . Then by Lemma 2.6 we have

$$\begin{aligned} 36 \left( 3 - \left\lceil \frac{4}{2} \right\rceil \right) &\leq 3 \left( 2 \left\lfloor \frac{4}{2} \right\rfloor \left\lceil \frac{4}{2} \right\rceil + 3 \right) + \frac{1}{4} 3^2 \\ \Leftrightarrow \quad 36 &\leq 35.25, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Hence  $K_{3,36}$  is not in  $B_3^m$  and with the trivial inclusion  $B_3^m \subseteq B_3$  we get  $B_3^m \subsetneq B_3$ .  $\square$

Now we know that  $B_k^m \subsetneq B_k$  holds for  $k \leq 3$ . Next we show  $B_5^m \subsetneq B_5$ . Similarly as in the case of  $k = 3$  we use a result of [16] to show that a particular graph is in  $B_5$  and then use results of Section 2 to prove that this graph is not in  $B_5^m$ .

**Lemma 3.6.** *It holds that  $B_5^m \subsetneq B_5$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $B_5^m \subseteq B_5$  obviously holds, it is enough to show  $B_5^m \neq B_5$ .

Heldt, Knauer, Ueckerdt [16] showed that  $K_{m,n} \in B_{2m-3}$  if  $n \leq m^4 - 2m^3 + \frac{5}{2}m^2 - 2m - 4$  (see Theorem 4.5 in [16]). For  $m = 4$  this implies that  $K_{4,156} \in B_5$ . Assume that  $K_{4,156} \in B_5^m$ . Then by Lemma 2.5 we get

$$\begin{aligned} 156(2 \cdot 4 - 5 - 2) &\leq 5 \cdot 3 \cdot 4 + \frac{1}{2} 4^2 + 2 \cdot 6 \cdot 4 \\ \Leftrightarrow \quad 156 &\leq 116, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. So  $K_{4,156} \notin B_5^m$  but  $K_{4,156} \in B_5$ , hence  $B_5^m \neq B_5$ .  $\square$

Finally we show  $B_k^m \subsetneq B_k$  for  $k \geq 7$ . To this end we again use Lemma 2.5 and a result of [16] quoted as Theorem 2.1 in the paper at hand.

**Lemma 3.7.** *It holds that  $B_k^m \subsetneq B_k$  for  $k \geq 7$ .*

*Proof.* We first prove the statement for odd  $k$ . Theorem 2.1 implies that  $K_{k+1, \frac{1}{4}(k+1)^3 - \frac{1}{2}(k+1)^2 - (k+1) + 4} = K_{k+1, \frac{1}{4}k^3 + \frac{1}{4}k^2 - \frac{5}{4}k + \frac{11}{4}} \in B_k$  for  $k \geq 3$ . Assume that this graph is in  $B_k^m$ . Then by Lemma 2.5 with  $m = k + 1$  and  $n =$





which is a contradiction for  $k \geq 0$ . So  $H_k$  is not in  $B_{2m-8}^m$ . Hence for odd  $k \geq 5$ , there is a graph in  $B_k$  which is not in  $B_{2k-8}^m$ .

Consider now the case where  $k$  is even. Theorem 2.1 implies  $H'_k = K_{k+1, \frac{1}{4}(k+1)^3 - (k+1)^2 + \frac{3}{4}(k+1)} = K_{k+1, \frac{1}{4}k^3 - \frac{1}{4}k^2 - \frac{1}{2}k} \in B_k$  for  $k \geq 6$ . If we assume that  $H'_k$  is in  $B_{2m-9}^m$  for  $k \geq 6$ , we obtain the following inequality by applying Lemma 2.5

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \frac{1}{4}k^3 - \frac{1}{4}k^2 - \frac{1}{2}k \right) 9 \leq (2k-9)(k+1)k + \frac{1}{2}(k+1)^2 + \\ & \qquad \qquad \qquad 2(2k-8)(k+1) \\ \Leftrightarrow & \quad 9 \left( \frac{1}{4}k^3 - \frac{1}{4}k^2 - \frac{1}{2}k \right) \leq 2k^3 - \frac{5}{2}k^2 - 20k - \frac{31}{2} \\ \Leftrightarrow & \quad 0 \leq -\frac{1}{4}k^3 - \frac{1}{4}k^2 - \frac{31}{2}k - \frac{31}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

The latter inequality is an obvious contradiction for  $k \geq 0$ . Hence  $H'_k$  is in  $B_k$  but not in  $B_{2k-9}^m$  for even  $k \geq 6$ .  $\square$

Theorem 4.1 reveals that  $B_k \not\subseteq B_{2k-8}^m$  for odd  $k \geq 5$  and that  $B_k \not\subseteq B_{2k-9}^m$  for even  $k \geq 5$ . Thus restricting the paths of the EPG representation to be monotonic is a significant limitation. Theorem 4.1 clearly implies that  $B_k \subseteq B_{k+1}^m$  does not hold in general. Notice however that the question whether  $B_{k+1}^m \subseteq B_k$  holds is still open.

## 4.2 Relationship between $B_1$ and $B_3^m$

As mentioned at the beginning of Section 4 in general the minimum number of bends needed for an EPG representation of a graph increases when the paths on the grid are required to be monotonic. In order to quantify the amount of this increase we would like to find the minimum  $\ell$  such that  $B_k \subseteq B_\ell^m$ . Theorem 4.1 shows that  $2k-9$  is a lower bound for  $\ell$ , i.e.  $\ell \geq 2k-9$  for  $k \geq 5$ .

It remains to investigate the relationship for small values of  $k$ . Notice that for  $k=0$  we have  $\ell=0$  because  $B_0 = B_0^m$ . Thus 1 is the smallest value of  $k$  for which  $\ell$  and/or bounds on it are not known. In the following we consider this case and show that  $B_1 \subseteq B_3^m$ , i.e. 3 is an upper bound on the minimum value of  $\ell$  for which  $B_1 \subseteq B_\ell^m$ .

**Theorem 4.2.** *The inclusion  $B_1 \subseteq B_3^m$  holds.*

*Proof.* Let  $G$  be a graph in  $B_1$ . We show that  $G$  is in  $B_3^m$  by presenting a monotonic  $B_3$ -EPG representation of  $G$ . The latter is constructed by transforming a  $B_1$ -EPG representation of  $G$  into a  $B_3^m$ -EPG representation of  $G$  as

described below. The transformation is illustrated by means of an example; Figure 8 (a) and Figure 8 (b) show a graph  $G$  and a  $B_1$ -EPG representation of it, respectively, whereas Figure 11 shows the corresponding  $B_3^m$ -EPG representation obtained as a result of the transformation mentioned above. The transformation itself is illustrated in Figure 9 and Figure 10.

Let  $R$  be an arbitrary  $B_1$ -EPG representation of  $G$ . We place another copy of the same  $B_1$ -EPG representation to the top right of  $R$ , see Figure 9, and then step by step modify both the original  $B_1$ -EPG representation and its copy as described below. At any point in time during this modification process we denote by  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  the current modified  $B_1$ -EPG representation and the current modified copy of the original  $B_1$ -EPG representation, respectively. For a vertex  $v$  of  $G$  we denote by  $P_v$ ,  $P_v^1$  and  $P_v^2$  the path corresponding to  $v$  in  $R$ ,  $R_1$  and  $R_2$ , respectively. At the beginning of the modification process  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  coincide with the original  $B_1$ -EPG representation and its copy, respectively, as in Figure 9.




Figure 8: (a) A graph  $G$ . (b) The  $B_1$ -EPG representation  $R$  of  $G$ .

Now consider the vertices of  $G$  one by one in an arbitrary order and for every vertex perform the steps described below. Let  $v$  be the currently considered vertex. If  $P_v$  has a horizontal segment, we introduce a new vertical grid line  $L_v^+$  directly to the left of the vertical grid line containing the right end point of the horizontal segment of  $P_v^1$  in  $R_1$  and shorten the horizontal segment of  $P_v^1$  to end in  $L_v^+$  instead of ending at the original right end point. Then, if the path  $P_v$  contains a vertical segment which starts at the original right end point of the horizontal segment mentioned above, we modify  $P_v^1$  in  $R_1$  by shifting its vertical segment to lie on  $L_v^+$ . If  $P_v$  has a vertical segment, we introduce a new horizontal grid line  $L_v^-$  directly beneath the horizontal grid line containing the lower end point of the vertical segment of  $P_v^2$  in  $R_2$  and extend the vertical segment of  $P_v^2$  until  $L_v^-$ . Then, if the path  $P_v$  contains a horizontal segment which starts at the original lower end point




Figure 9: The grid with the two copies  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  of  $R$  shown in Figure 8(b).

of the vertical segment mentioned above, we modify  $P_v^2$  in  $R_2$  by shifting its horizontal segment to lie on  $L_v^-$ . An example of the modified grid and paths and the final  $R_1, R_2$  for the graph in Figure 8 (a) can be seen in Figure 10.

Now we construct a  $B_3^m$ -EPG representation of  $G$  with a path  $Q_v$  for every vertex  $v$  in the following way. If the path  $P_v$  consists of a single horizontal segment, we define  $Q_v$  as the horizontal segment of  $P_v^1$  in  $R_1$  and call this segment the *lower* segment of  $Q_v$ . If the path  $P_v$  consists of a single vertical segment, we define  $Q_v$  as the vertical segment of  $P_v^2$  in  $R_2$  and call this segment the *upper* segment of  $Q_v$ . If the path  $P_v$  contains a horizontal and a vertical segment, then the path  $Q_v$  starts with the horizontal segment of  $P_v^1$  in  $R_1$ ; this segment is called the *lower* segment of  $Q_v$ . Further the path  $Q_v$  continues with a vertical segment lying on the vertical grid line  $L_v^|$  and ending at the intersection of  $L_v^|$  and  $L_v^-$ . This intersection is the upper end point of this segment. Starting at this grid point  $Q_v$  proceeds with a horizontal segment lying on  $L_v^-$  until it reaches the vertical grid line containing the vertical segment of  $P_v^2$  in  $R_2$ . Finally  $Q_v$  ends with the vertical segment of  $P_v^2$  in  $R_2$ ; this segment is called the *upper* segment of  $Q_v$ . The result of this construction for the graph in Figure 8(a) and its  $B_1$ -EPG representation  $R$  is depicted in Figure 11.

Observe that this construction has the following properties. If  $P_v$  contains two segments, then  $Q_v$  contains 4 segments, the lower one being the horizontal segment of  $P_v^1$  in  $R_1$  and the upper one being the vertical segment of  $P_v^2$  in  $R_2$ . The two remaining segments, a vertical and a horizontal one, are contained in the two additionally introduced grid lines that are used by no other path, because every path  $Q_v$  uses only the additional grid lines  $L_v^|$  and  $L_v^-$  introduced exclusively for the vertex  $v$ . If  $P_v$  consists of one horizontal




Figure 10: The final status of the modifications  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  of the  $B_1$ -EPG representation  $R$  shown in Figure 8(b) and its copy.

(vertical) segment, then  $Q_v$  consists also of one horizontal (vertical) segment which coincides with the corresponding segment of  $P_v^1$  ( $P_v^2$ ) in  $R_1$  ( $R_2$ ) and is a lower (upper) segment. Moreover it is easy to see that every path  $Q_v$  in this construction is monotonic and bends at most 3 times.

What is left to show is that the above construction indeed leads to an EPG representation of  $G$ , i.e. that any two paths  $Q_v$  and  $Q_{v'}$  intersect if and only if the vertices  $v$  and  $v'$  are adjacent in  $G$ . To this end it is enough to show that two paths  $Q_v$  and  $Q_{v'}$  intersect, if and only if the paths  $P_v$  and  $P_{v'}$  intersect in the original  $B_1$ -EPG representation  $R$ .

Assume  $Q_v$  and  $Q_{v'}$  intersect. First consider the case that at least one of  $Q_v$  and  $Q_{v'}$  consists of only one segment. Assume without loss of generality that  $Q_v$  consists of one horizontal segment. Due to the properties of the construction this segment of  $Q_v$  is a lower segment and hence the unique segment of  $P_v^1$  in  $R_1$ . Consequently, again due to the properties of the construction, the segment of  $Q_{v'}$  intersecting  $Q_v$  is the horizontal segment of  $P_{v'}^1$  in  $R_1$ . Hence  $P_v^1$  and  $P_{v'}^1$  intersect in the final  $R_1$  on their horizontal segments. By construction this is only the case if  $P_v$  and  $P_{v'}$  intersect on their horizon-




Figure 11: The obtained  $B_3^m$ -EPG representation of the graph of Figure 8 (a).

tal segments in  $R$ , because during the update of  $R_1$  only vertical segments of paths are moved into new grid lines in such a way that intersections are maintained.

Now assume that both paths  $Q_v$  and  $Q_{v'}$  consist of more than one segment. There are no intersections of the paths in any additionally introduced grid lines because every additionally introduced grid line is related to one vertex and the additionally introduced grid line related to different vertices are different. Moreover by construction every additionally introduced vertical grid line contains at most one segment of the path  $P_v^1$  in  $R_1$  representing the vertex  $v$  to which the line is related. Analogously every additionally introduced horizontal grid line contains at most one segment of the path  $P_v^2$  in  $R_2$  representing the vertex  $v$  to which the line is related. These considerations together with the fact that  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  do not share any grid lines imply that the intersection of  $Q_v$  and  $Q_{v'}$  involves either the lower segments of each path, or it involves the upper segments of each path. Consequently, according to the properties of the construction, the paths  $Q_v$  and  $Q_{v'}$  intersect in their lower segments (in  $R_1$ ) or in their upper segments (in  $R_2$ ). In both situations we can proceed as in the previous case.

Next we show the other direction of the equivalence, i.e. we assume that  $P_v$  and  $P_{v'}$  intersect in the original  $B_1$ -EPG representation  $R$  of  $G$  and show that also  $Q_v$  and  $Q_{v'}$  intersect. By construction, if  $P_v$  and  $P_{v'}$  intersect in a horizontal grid line, then the modified paths  $P_v^1$  and  $P_{v'}^1$  intersect in a horizontal grid line in  $R_1$  at all times. Thus the properties of the construction imply the intersection of the lower segments of  $Q_v$  and  $Q_{v'}$ . Analogously, if  $P_v$  and  $P_{v'}$  intersect in a vertical grid line, then the modified paths  $P_v^2$  and  $P_{v'}^2$  intersect in a vertical grid line in  $R_2$  at all times, and the properties of the construction imply the intersection of the upper segments of  $Q_v$  and  $Q_{v'}$ .  $\square$

Notice that it is an open question whether the result of Theorem 4.2 is best possible, so whether  $\ell = 3$  is really the minimum  $\ell$  such that  $B_1 \subseteq B_\ell^m$  or whether even  $B_1 \subseteq B_2^m$  holds.

We conclude this section with a few comments related to the size of EPG representations, i.e. the number of horizontal and vertical grid lines used by the paths in the EPG representation. Recently this question was investigated by Biedl, Derka, Dujmović and Morin [3]. The size of the  $B_3^m$ -EPG representation obtained by the construction in the proof of Theorem 4.2 depends on the size of the  $B_1$ -EPG representation of the graph; in the worst case the constructed  $B_3^m$ -EPG representation uses twice as many horizontal grid lines and twice as many vertical grid line as compared to the original  $B_1$ -EPG representation and an additional horizontal and vertical grid line for every vertex. This gives rise to the natural question whether the construction given in the proof of Theorem 4.2 is best possible with respect to the size. Currently we cannot answer this question.

On the other hand it would be of benefit to start with a *small*  $B_1$ -EPG representation. So another natural question is to find the smallest possible  $B_1$ -EPG representation of a  $B_1$ -EPG graph. In the small EPG representations dealt with in [3] no fixed number of bends is considered and the last question is also open.

## 5 Conclusions and Open Problems

In this paper we investigated the relationship of the classes  $B_k$  and  $B_\ell^m$  for different values of  $k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ .

In particular we considered the bend number and the monotonic bend number of complete bipartite graphs. We extended the already known result  $b(K_{m,n}) \leq 2m - 2$  (see [16]) to the monotonic bend number, i.e. we proved  $b^m(K_{m,n}) \leq 2m - 2$  for any  $3 \leq m \leq n$ , and showed that the upper bound  $2m - 2$  is attained for smaller values of  $n$  in the monotonic case.

As auxiliary results we derived two different inequalities which hold whenever a  $K_{m,n}$  is in  $B_k^m$ . We used these inequalities to prove the strict inclusion  $B_k^m \subsetneq B_k$  for  $k \in \{3, 5\}$  and  $k \geq 7$ . Furthermore, we show that  $B_2^m \subsetneq B_2$  by specifying a particular graph which is in  $B_2$  but not in  $B_2^m$ . Thus we positively answer the open question on the correctness of  $B_k^m \subsetneq B_k$  posed in [14] for almost all  $k$ . Of course it is a pressing question to prove  $B_k^m \subsetneq B_k$  also for the remaining cases  $k = 4$  and  $k = 6$ . In order to prove  $B_4^m \subsetneq B_4$  by using Lemma 2.5 it would be enough to show that  $K_{4,49} \in B_4$  or  $K_{5,36} \in B_4$ . For  $k = 6$  it would be enough to show that one of  $K_{5,102}$ ,  $K_{6,71}$  and  $K_{7,63}$  is in  $B_6$ .

Additionally we considered the relationship of  $B_k$  and  $B_\ell^m$  for  $\ell > k$ . In this context the existence and the identification of non-trivial functions  $f, g: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  such that  $b^m(G) \leq f(b(G))$  and  $b(G) \leq g(b^m(G))$  holds for any graph  $G$  (or for any graph belonging to some particular class of graphs) is a general question the answer of which seems to be out of reach at the moment. However we could deal with some specific problems related to that question.

In particular we showed that for every  $k \geq 5$  there is a graph in  $B_k$  which is not in  $B_{2k-9}^m$ , proving that  $B_k \not\subseteq B_{2k-9}^m$  holds. In terms of the function  $f$  above this implies  $f(x) \geq 2x - 8$  for all  $x \geq 5$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{N}$ . We do not know whether the converse relationship  $B_{2k-9}^m \not\subseteq B_k$  holds and we do not know any analogous bound for the function  $g$ .

Further we showed that  $B_1 \subseteq B_3^m$ , but we do not know whether this results is best possible, i.e. whether there is a graph in  $B_1$  which is not in  $B_2^m$  or whether  $B_1 \subseteq B_2^m$  holds.

Another natural question which seems to be simple but has not been answered yet concerns the inclusion  $B_k^m \subseteq B_{k+1}^m$ . We conjecture this inclusion to be strict, i.e. we conjecture that  $B_k^m \subsetneq B_{k+1}^m$  holds. A possible approach to prove this conjecture for a given  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  would be to specify a particular pair of natural numbers  $(m, n)$  with  $3 \leq m \leq n$  for which (a) some Lower-Bound-Lemma implies  $K_{m,n} \notin B_k^m$  and (b) a  $B_{k+1}^m$ -EPG representation can be constructed. The identification of such a pair  $(m, n)$ ,  $3 \leq m \leq n$ , would clearly prove the existence of a complete bipartite graph  $K_{m,n}$  with monotonic bend number equal to  $k$  for any  $k \geq 2$ .

Finally the size of (monotonic) EPG representations is another subject of interest. In particular it would be interesting to determine the minimum number of grid lines needed for a  $B_k$ -EPG representation and  $B_\ell^m$ -EPG representation of a graph  $G$  with  $b(G) \leq k$  and  $b^m(G) \leq \ell$ , respectively.

## References

- [1] Andrei Asinowski, Elad Cohen, Martin Charles Golumbic, Vincent Limouzy, Marina Lipshteyn, and Michal Stern. Vertex intersection graphs of paths on a grid. *Journal of Graph Algorithms and Applications*, 16(2):129–150, 2012.
- [2] Andrei Asinowski and Andrew Suk. Edge intersection graphs of systems of paths on a grid with a bounded number of bends. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 157(14):3174–3180, 2009.
- [3] Therese Biedl, Martin Derka, Vida Dujmović, and Pat Morin. EPG-representations with small grid-size. In *Graph drawing and network visualization*, volume 10692 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 184–196. Springer, 2018.
- [4] Therese Biedl and Michal Stern. Edge-intersection graphs of  $k$ -bend paths in grids. In *Computing and Combinatorics*, pages 86–95. Springer, 2009.
- [5] Flavia Bonomo, María Pía Mazzoleni, and Maya Stein. Clique coloring  $B_1$ -EPG graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 340(5):1008–1011, 2017.
- [6] M. Bougeret, S. Bessy, D. Gonçalves, and C. Paul. On independent set on  $B_1$ -EPG graphs. In *Approximation and online algorithms*, volume 9499 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 158–169. Springer, 2015.
- [7] Nicolas Bousquet and Marc Heinrich. Computing maximum cliques in  $B_2$ -EPG graphs. In *Graph-theoretic concepts in computer science*, volume 10520 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 140–152. Springer, 2017.
- [8] M.L. Brady and M. Sarrafzadeh. Stretching a knock-knee layout for multilayer wiring. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, 39(1):148–151, 1990.
- [9] Kathie Cameron, Steven Chaplick, and Chính T Hoàng. Edge intersection graphs of L-shaped paths in grids. *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics*, 44:363–369, 2013.
- [10] Eranda Çela and Elisabeth Gaar. Monotonic Representations of Outerplanar Graphs as Edge Intersection Graphs of Paths on a Grid. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1908.01981, 2019.

- [11] Zakir Deniz, Simon Nivellet, Bernard Ries, and David Schindl. On split  $B_1$ -EPG graphs. In *LATIN 2018: Theoretical informatics*, volume 10807 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 361–375. Springer, 2018.
- [12] Dror Epstein, Martin Charles Golumbic, and Gila Morgenstern. Approximation algorithms for  $B_1$ -EPG graphs. In *Algorithms and Data Structures*, pages 328–340. Springer, 2013.
- [13] Mathew C. Francis and Abhiruk Lahiri. VPG and EPG bend-numbers of Halin graphs. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 215:95–105, 2016.
- [14] Martin Charles Golumbic, Marina Lipshteyn, and Michal Stern. Edge intersection graphs of single bend paths on a grid. *Networks*, 54(3):130–138, 2009.
- [15] Daniel Heldt, Kolja Knauer, and Torsten Ueckerdt. On the bend-number of planar and outerplanar graphs. In *LATIN 2012: Theoretical Informatics*, pages 458–469. Springer, 2012.
- [16] Daniel Heldt, Kolja Knauer, and Torsten Ueckerdt. Edge-intersection graphs of grid paths: The bend-number. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 167(0):144 – 162, 2014.
- [17] Paul Molitor. A survey on wiring. *J. Inf. Process. Cybern.*, 27(1):3–19, 1991.
- [18] Martin Pergel and Paweł Rzażewski. On edge intersection graphs of paths with 2 bends. In *Graph-theoretic concepts in computer science*, volume 9941 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 207–219. Springer, Berlin, 2016.