

# On Light Spanners, Low-treewidth Embeddings and Efficient Traversing in Minor-free Graphs

Vincent Cohen-Addad<sup>1</sup>, Arnold Filtser<sup>2</sup>, Philip N. Klein<sup>3</sup>, and Hung Le<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Google Research

<sup>2</sup>Columbia University

<sup>3</sup>Brown University

<sup>4</sup>University of Massachusetts at Amherst

## Abstract

Understanding the structure of minor-free metrics, namely shortest path metrics obtained over a weighted graph excluding a fixed minor, has been an important research direction since the fundamental work of Robertson and Seymour. A fundamental idea that helps both to understand the structural properties of these metrics and lead to strong algorithmic results is to construct a “small-complexity” graph that approximately preserves distances between pairs of points of the metric. We show the two following structural results for minor-free metrics:

1. Construction of a *light* subset spanner. Given a subset of vertices called terminals, and  $\epsilon$ , in polynomial time we construct a subgraph that preserves all pairwise distances between terminals up to a multiplicative  $1 + \epsilon$  factor, of total weight at most  $O_\epsilon(1)$  times the weight of the minimal Steiner tree spanning the terminals.
2. Construction of a stochastic metric embedding into low treewidth graphs with expected additive distortion  $\epsilon D$ . Namely, given a minor free graph  $G = (V, E, w)$  of diameter  $D$ , and parameter  $\epsilon$ , we construct a distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  over dominating metric embeddings into treewidth- $O_\epsilon(\log n)$  graphs such that  $\forall u, v \in V, \mathbb{E}_{f \sim \mathcal{D}}[d_H(f(u), f(v))] \leq d_G(u, v) + \epsilon D$ .

One of our important technical contributions is a novel framework that allows us to reduce *both problems* to problems on simpler graphs of *bounded diameter* that we solve using a new decomposition. Our results have the following algorithmic consequences: (1) the first efficient approximation scheme for subset TSP in minor-free metrics; (2) the first approximation scheme for vehicle routing with bounded capacity in minor-free metrics; (3) the first efficient approximation scheme for vehicle routing with bounded capacity on bounded genus metrics. En route to the latter result, we design the first FPT approximation scheme for vehicle routing with bounded capacity on bounded treewidth graphs (parameterized by the treewidth).

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Main contribution . . . . .	3
1.2	Techniques . . . . .	5
<b>2</b>	<b>Proof Overviews</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1	Light subset spanners for minor-free metrics . . . . .	7
2.2	Embedding into low-treewidth graphs . . . . .	10
<b>3</b>	<b>Related work</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Preliminaries</b>	<b>14</b>
4.1	Robertson-Seymour decomposition of minor-free graphs . . . . .	15
4.2	Vortex paths . . . . .	16
<b>5</b>	<b>Light Subset Spanners for Minor-Free Metrics</b>	<b>18</b>
5.1	Step (1): Planar graphs with a single vortex and bounded diameter, proof of <a href="#">Lemma 1</a> . . . .	19
5.2	Step (2.0): Unbounded diameter, proof of <a href="#">Lemma 2</a> . . . . .	25
5.3	Step (2.1): Reducing vortices, proof of <a href="#">Lemma 3</a> . . . . .	26
5.4	Step (2.2): Cutting out genus, proof of <a href="#">Lemma 4</a> . . . . .	28
5.5	Step (2.3): Removing apices, proof of <a href="#">Lemma 5</a> . . . . .	30
5.6	Step (2.4): Eliminating clique-sums, proof of <a href="#">Proposition 1</a> . . . . .	30
<b>6</b>	<b>Embedding Minor-Free Graphs into Small Treewidth Graphs</b>	<b>34</b>
6.1	Step (1): Planar graphs with a single vortex, proof of <a href="#">Lemma 6</a> . . . . .	34
6.2	A Cutting Lemma . . . . .	35
6.3	Step (2.1): Planar graphs with more than one vortex, proof of <a href="#">Lemma 7</a> . . . . .	36
6.4	Step (2.2): Cutting out genus, proof of <a href="#">Lemma 8</a> . . . . .	38
6.5	Step (2.3): Removing apices, proof of <a href="#">Lemma 9</a> . . . . .	42
6.6	Step (2.4): General minor-free graphs, proof of <a href="#">Theorem 2</a> . . . . .	44
6.7	Corollaries . . . . .	46
<b>7</b>	<b>Algorithmic Applications</b>	<b>47</b>
7.1	EPTAS for subset TSP . . . . .	47
7.2	Approximation schemes for vehicle routing . . . . .	47
<b>8</b>	<b>Lower bound for deterministic embedding into bounded treewidth graphs</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Additional Notation</b>	<b>63</b>
A.1	Key notation for <a href="#">Section 5.1</a> . . . . .	63
<b>B</b>	<b>Missing Proofs</b>	<b>64</b>
B.1	Proof of <a href="#">Observation 4</a> . . . . .	64

# 1 Introduction

Fundamental routing problems such as the Traveling Salesman Problem (TSP) and the Vehicle Routing Problem have been widely studied since the 50s. Given a metric space, the goal is to find a minimum-weight collection of tours (only one for TSP) so as to meet a prescribed demand at some points of the metric space. The research on these problems, from both practical and theoretical perspectives, has been part of the agenda of the operations research and algorithm-design communities for many decades (see e.g.: [HK85, AKTT97, CFN85, SG03, BMT13, ZTXL15, LN15, ZTXL16]). Both problems have been the source of inspiration for many algorithmic breakthroughs and, quite frustratingly, remain good examples of the limits of the power of our algorithmic methods.

Since both problems are APX-hard in general graphs [PY93, AKTT97] and since the best known approximation for TSP remains the 40-year old  $\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation of Christofides [Chr76], it has been a natural and successful research direction to focus on *structured* metric spaces. Initially, researchers focused on achieving polynomial-time approximation schemes (PTASs) for TSP in planar-graphs [GKP95, AGK<sup>+</sup>98] and Euclidean metrics [Aro97, Mit99]. Two themes emerged in the ensuing research: speed-ups and generalization.

In the area of speed-ups, a long line of research on Euclidean TSP improved the running time  $n^{O(1/\epsilon)}$  of the initial algorithm by Arora to linear time [BG13]. In a parallel research thread, Klein [Kle05, Kle08] gave the first *efficient PTAS*<sup>1</sup> for TSP in weighted planar graphs, a linear-time algorithm.

In the area of generalization, a key question was whether these results applied to more general (and more abstract) families of metrics. One such generalization of Euclidean metrics is metrics of bounded doubling dimension. Talwar [Tal04] gave a *quasi*-polynomial-time approximation scheme (QPTAS) for this problem which was then improved to an EPTAS [Got15]. In minor-free metrics, an important generalization of planar metrics, Grigni [Gri00] gave a QPTAS for TSP which was recently improved to EPTAS by Borradaile et al. [BLW17].

When the metric is that of a planar/minor-free graph, the problem of visiting every vertex is not as natural as that of visiting a given subset of vertices (the *Steiner TSP* or *subset TSP*) since the latter cannot be reduced to the former without destroying the graph structure. The latter problem turns out to be much harder than TSP in minor-free graphs, and in fact no approximation scheme was known until the recent PTAS for subset TSP by Le [Le20]. This immediately raises the question:

**Question 1.** *Is there an EPTAS for subset TSP in minor-free graphs?*

The purpose of this line of work is to understand what are the most general metrics for which we can obtain approximation schemes for routing problems, and when it is the case how fast can the approximation schemes be made. Toward this goal, minor-free metrics have been a testbed of choice for generalizing the algorithmic techniques designed for planar or bounded-genus graphs. Indeed, while minor-free metrics offer very structured decompositions, as shown by the celebrated work of Robertson and Seymour [RS03], Klein et al. [KPR93], and Abraham et al. [AGG<sup>+</sup>19] (see also [FT03, Fil19a]), they do not exhibit a strong topological structure. Hence, various strong results for planar metrics, such as the efficient approximation schemes for Steiner Tree [BKM09] or Subset TSP [Kle06], are not known to exist in minor-free metrics.

---

<sup>1</sup>A PTAS is an *efficient* PTAS (an EPTAS) if its running time is bounded by a polynomial  $n^c$  whose degree  $c$  does not depend on  $\epsilon$

A common ingredient to designing efficient PTAS for TSP is the notion of *light spanner*: a weighted subgraph  $H$  over the points of the original graph/metric space  $G$  that preserves all

Space	Lightness	TSP runtime	Reference
$(\mathbb{R}^{O(1)}, \ \cdot\ _2)$	$\epsilon^{-O(1)}$	$2^{\epsilon^{-O(1)}} \cdot \tilde{O}(n)$	[RS98, LS19]
Doubling $O(1)$	$\epsilon^{-O(1)}$	$2^{\epsilon^{-O(1)}} \cdot \tilde{O}(n)$	[Got15, BLW19]
Planar	$O(1/\epsilon)$	$2^{O(1/\epsilon^2)} \cdot O(n)$	[ADD <sup>+</sup> 93, Kle05]
$K_{O(1)}$ free	$\tilde{O}(1/\epsilon^3)$	$2^{\tilde{O}(1/\epsilon^4)} \cdot n^{O(1)}$	[DHK11, BLW17]

pairwise distances up to some  $1 + \epsilon$  multiplicative factor (i.e.  $\forall u, v \in V(G)$ ,  $d_H(u, v) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot d_G(u, v)$ ). The *lightness* of the spanner  $H$  is the ratio between the total weight of  $H$ , to that of the Minimum Spanning Tree (MST) of  $G$ . While significant progress has been made on understanding the structure of spanners (see the table), it is not the case for *subset spanners*. A subset spanner  $H$  w.r.t. a prescribed subset  $K$  of vertices, called terminals, is a subgraph that preserves distances between terminals up to a  $1 + \epsilon$  multiplicative factor (i.e.  $\forall u, v \in K$ ,  $d_H(u, v) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot d_G(u, v)$ ). The *lightness* of  $H$  is the ratio between the weight of  $H$  to the weight of a minimum Steiner tree <sup>2</sup> w.r.t.  $K$ . While for light spanners the simple greedy algorithm is “existentially optimal” [FS16], in almost all settings, no such “universal” algorithm is known for constructing light subset spanners. In planar graphs, Klein [Kle06] constructed the first light subset spanner. Borradaile et al. [BDT14] generalized Klein’s construction to bounded-genus graphs. Unfortunately, generalizing these two results to minor-free metrics remained a major challenge since both approaches were heavily relying on topological arguments. Recently, Le [Le20] gave the first polynomial-time algorithm for computing a subset spanner with lightness  $\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}) \cdot \log |K|$  in  $K_r$ -minor-free graphs. However, the following question remains a fundamental open problem, often mentioned in the literature [DHK11, BDT14, BLW17, Le20].

**Question 2.** *Does a subset spanner of lightness  $\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$  exist in minor-free graphs?*

A very related routing problem which is poorly understood even in structured metrics is the vehicle routing problem. Given a special vertex called the *depot* and a *capacity*  $Q$ , the goal is to find a collection of subsets of the vertices of the graph each of size at most  $Q + 1$  such that (1) each vertex appears in at least one subset, (2) each subset contains the depot, and (3) the sum of the lengths of the shortest tours visiting all the vertices of each subset is minimized. This is a very classic routing problem, introduced in the late 50s by Dantzig and Ramser [DR59]. While major progress has been made on TSP during the 90s and 00s for planar and Euclidean metrics, the current understanding of vehicle routing is much less satisfactory. In Euclidean space, the best known result is a QPTAS by Das and Mathieu [DM15], while the problem has been shown to be APX-hard for planar graphs (in fact APX-hard for trees [Bec18])<sup>3</sup> unless the capacity  $Q$  is a fixed constant – note that the problem remains NP-hard in that case too (see [AKTT97]). Given the current success of delivery platforms, the problem with constant capacity is still of high importance from an operations research perspective. Hence, Becker et al. [BKS17] have recently given a quasi-polynomial approximation scheme for planar graphs, which was subsequently improved to a running time of  $n^{(Q\epsilon)^{-\tilde{O}(Q/\epsilon)}}$  [BKS19]. The next question is:

**Question 3.** *Does the vehicle routing with bounded capacity problem admit an EPTAS in planar and bounded genus graphs?*

Since the techniques in previous work [BKS17, BKS19] for the vehicle routing problem rely

<sup>2</sup>A Steiner tree is a connected subgraph containing all the terminals  $K$ . A minimum Steiner tree is a minimum-weight such subgraph; because cycles do no help in achieving connectivity, we can require that the subgraph be a tree.

<sup>3</sup>More precisely, the problem where the demand at each vertex is arbitrary is known to be APX-hard on trees.

on topological arguments, they are not extensible to minor-free graphs. In fact, no nontrivial approximation scheme was known for this problem in minor-free graphs. We ask:

**Question 4.** *Is it possible to design a QPTAS for the vehicle routing with bounded capacity problem minor-free graphs?*

The approach of Becker et al. (drawing on [EKM14]) is through *metric embeddings*, similar to the celebrated work of Bartal [Bar96] and Fakcharoenphol et al. [FRT04] who showed how to embed any metric space into a simple tree-like structure. Specifically, Becker et al. aim at embedding the input metric space into a “simpler” target space, namely a graph of bounded treewidth, while (approximately) preserving all pairwise distances. A major constraint arising in this setting is that for obtaining approximation schemes, the distortion of the distance should be carefully controlled. An ideal scenario would be to embed  $n$ -vertex minor free graphs into graphs of treewidth at most  $O_\epsilon(\log n)$ , while preserving the pairwise distance up to a  $1 + \epsilon$  factor. Unfortunately, as implied by the work of Chakrabarti et al. [CJLV08], there are  $n$  vertex planar graphs such that every (stochastic) embedding into  $o(\sqrt{n})$ -treewidth graphs must incur expected multiplicative distortion  $\Omega(\log n)$  (see also [Rao99, KLMN05, AFGN18] for embeddings into Euclidean metrics).

Bypassing the above roadblock, Eisenstat et al. [EKM14] and Fox-Epstein et al. [FKS19] showed how to embed planar metrics into bounded-treewidth graphs while preserving distances up to a controlled *additive* distortion. Specifically, given a planar graph  $G$  and a parameter  $\epsilon$ , they showed how to construct a metric embedding into a graph  $H$  of bounded treewidth such that all pairwise distances between pairs of vertices are preserved up to an additive  $\epsilon D$  factor, where  $D$  is the diameter of  $G$ . While  $\epsilon D$  may look like a crude additive bound, it is good enough for obtaining approximation schemes for some classic problems such as  $k$ -center, and vehicle routing. While Eisenstat et al. constructed an embedding into a graph of treewidth  $\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}) \cdot \log n$ , Fox-Epstein et al. constructed an embedding into a graph of treewidth  $\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$ , leading to the first PTAS for vehicle routing (with running time  $n^{(Q/\epsilon)^{O(Q/\epsilon)}}$ ). Yet for minor-free graphs, or even bounded-genus graphs, obtaining such a result with any non-trivial bound on the treewidth is a major challenge; the embedding of Fox-Epstein et al. [FKS19] heavily relies on planarity (for example by using the face-vertex incident graph). Therefore, prior to our work, the following question is widely open.

**Question 5.** *Is it possible to (perhaps stochastically) embed a minor-free graph with diameter  $D$  to a graph with treewidth  $\text{polylog}(n)$  and additive distortion at most  $\epsilon D$ ?*

## 1.1 Main contribution

We answer all the above questions by the affirmative. Our first main contribution is a “truly” *light subset spanner* for minor-free metrics that bridges the gap for spanners between planar and minor-free metrics; this completely settles [Question 2](#). In the following, the  $O_r$  notation hides factors in  $r$ , e.g.  $x = O_r(m) \iff x \leq m \cdot f(r)$  for some sufficiently large  $m$  and computable function  $f$ ; and  $\text{poly}(x)$  is (some) polynomial function of  $x$ .

**Theorem 1.** *Given a  $K_r$ -minor-free graph  $G$ , a set of terminals  $K \subseteq V(G)$ , and a parameter  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ , there is a polynomial time algorithm that computes a subset spanner with distortion  $1 + \epsilon$  and lightness  $O_r(\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$ .*

Our second main contribution is a *stochastic embedding* (see [Definition 3](#)) of minor-free graphs into bounded-treewidth graphs with small expected additive distortion, obtaining the first result of this kind for minor-free graphs and resolving [Question 5](#) positively.

**Theorem 2.** *Given an  $n$ -vertex  $K_r$ -minor-free graph  $G$  of diameter  $D$ , and a parameter  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ , in polynomial time one can construct a stochastic embedding from  $G$  into graphs with treewidth  $O_r(\frac{\log n}{\epsilon^2})$ , and expected additive distortion  $\epsilon D$ .*

While the embedding of planar graphs to low treewidth graphs by Fox-Epstein et al. [FKS19] is deterministic, our embedding in Theorem 2 is stochastic. Thus, it is natural to ask whether randomness is necessary. We show in Theorem 3 below that the embedding must be stochastic to guarantee (expected) additive distortion  $\epsilon D$ , for small enough  $\epsilon$  (see Section 8 for details).

**Theorem 3.** *There is an infinite graph family  $\mathcal{H}$  of  $K_6$ -free graphs, such that for every  $H \in \mathcal{H}$  with  $n$  vertices and diameter  $D$ , every dominating embedding of  $H$  into a treewidth- $o(\sqrt{n})$  graph has additive distortion at least  $\frac{1}{20} \cdot D$ .*

For the more restricted case of a graph with genus  $g$ , we can construct a deterministic embedding without any dependence on the number of vertices.

**Theorem 4.** *Given a genus- $g$  graph  $G$  of diameter  $D$ , and a parameter  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ , there exists an embedding  $f$  from  $G$  to a graph  $H$  of treewidth  $O_g(\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$  with additive distortion  $\epsilon D$ .*

Next we describe the algorithmic consequences of our results. First, we obtain an efficient PTAS for a Subset TSP problem in  $K_r$ -minor-free graphs for any fixed  $r$ , thereby completely answering Question 1. (See Section 7.1 for details.)

**Theorem 5.** *Given a set of terminals  $K$  in an  $n$ -vertex  $K_r$ -minor-free graph  $G$  of, there exists an algorithm with running time  $2^{O_r(\text{poly}(1/\epsilon))} n^{O(1)}$  that can find a tour visiting every vertex in  $K$  of length at most  $1 + \epsilon$  times the length of the shortest tour.*

Second, we obtain the first polynomial-time approximation scheme for bounded-capacity vehicle routing in  $K_r$ -minor-free graphs.

**Theorem 6.** *there is a randomized algorithm that, given an  $n$ -vertex  $K_r$ -minor-free graph  $G$  and an instance of bounded-capacity vehicle routing on  $G$ , in time  $n^{O_{\epsilon, Q, r}(\log \log n)}$  returns a solution with expected cost at most  $1 + \epsilon$  times the cost of the optimal solution.*

Theorem 6 provides a definite answer to Question 4. En route to this result, we design a new dynamic program for bounded-capacity vehicle routing on bounded-treewidth graphs that constitutes the first approximation scheme that is fixed-parameter tractability in the treewidth (and also in  $\epsilon$ ) for this class of graphs. For planar graphs and bounded-genus graphs, this yields a  $2^{\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon})} n^{O(1)}$  approximation scheme and completely answers Question 3.

**Theorem 7.** *There is a randomized algorithm that, given a graph  $G$  with genus at most  $g$  and an instance of bounded-capacity vehicle routing on  $G$ , in time  $2^{O_{g, Q}(\text{poly}(1/\epsilon))} n^{O(1)}$  returns a solution whose expected cost at most  $1 + \epsilon$  times the cost of the optimal solution.*

A major tool in our algorithm in Theorem 7 is a new efficient dynamic programming for approximating bounded-capacity vehicle routing in bounded treewidth graphs. The best exact algorithm known for bounded-treewidth graphs has running time  $n^{O(Q_{\text{tw}})}$  [BKS18].

**Theorem 8.** *Let  $\text{tw}, \epsilon > 0$ . There is an algorithm that, for any instance of the vehicle routing problem  $(G, Q, s)$  such that  $G$  has treewidth  $\text{tw}$  and  $n$  vertices, outputs a  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate solution in time  $(Q\epsilon^{-1} \log n)^{O(Q_{\text{tw}}/\epsilon)} n^{O(1)}$ .*

We refer readers to Section 7.2 for details on Theorem 6, Theorem 7, and Theorem 8.

## 1.2 Techniques

In their seminal series of papers regarding minor free graph, Robertson and Seymour showed how to decompose a minor-free graph into four "basic components": *surface-embedded graphs*, *apices*, *vortices* and *clique-sums* [RS03] (see Section 4.1 for details and definitions). Their decomposition suggested an algorithmic methodology, called the *RS framework*, for solving a combinatorial optimization problem on minor-free graphs: solve the problem on planar graphs, and then generalize to bounded-genus graphs, to graphs embedded on a surface with few vortices, then deal with the apices, and finally extend to minor-free graphs. The RS framework has been successfully applied to many problems such as vertex cover, independent set and dominating set [Gro03, DHK05]. A common feature for these problems was that the graphs were unweighted, and the problems rather "local". This success can be traced back to the pioneering work of Grohe [Gro03] who showed how to handle graphs embedded on a surface with few vortices by showing that these graphs have linear local-treewidth.

However, there is no analogous tool that can be applied to fundamental connectivity problems such as Subset TSP, Steiner tree, and survivable network design. Therefore, even though efficient PTASes for these problems were known for planar graphs [Kle06, BKM07, BK08] for a long time, achieving similar results for any of them in minor-free graphs remains a major open problem. Inspired by the RS framework, we propose a multi-step framework for light subset spanner and embedding problems in minor-free graphs.

**A multi-step framework** The fundamental building block in our framework is planar graphs each with a *single vortex* with bounded diameter  $D$ , on which we solve the problems (Step 1 in our framework). We consider this as a major conceptual contribution as we overcome the barrier posed by vortices. We do so by introducing a hierarchical decomposition where each cluster in every level of the decomposition is separated from the rest of the graph by a constant number of shortest paths *of the input graph*.<sup>4</sup> Similar decomposition for planar graphs [AGK<sup>+</sup>98, Tho04b] and bounded-genus graphs [KKS11] has found many algorithmic applications [AGK<sup>+</sup>98, Tho04a, EKM14, KKS11]. Surprisingly, already for the rather restricted case of apex graphs,<sup>5</sup> it is impossible to have such a decomposition. We believe that our decomposition is of independent interest.

While it is clear that the diameter parameter  $D$  is relevant for the embedding problem, a priori it is unclear why it is useful for the light-subset-spanner problem. As we will see later, the diameter comes from a reduction to subset local spanners (Le [Le20]), while the assumption is enabled by using sparse covers [AGMW10].

In Step 2, we generalize the results to  $K_r$ -minor-free graphs. Step 2 is broken into several mini-steps. In Mini-Step 2.1,<sup>6</sup> we handle the case of planar graphs with more than one vortex; we introduce a *vortex-merging operation* to reduce to the special case in Step 1. In Mini-Step 2.2, we handle graphs embedded on a surface with multiple vortices. The idea is to cut along vortex paths to reduce the genus one at a time until the surface embedded part is planar (genus 0), and in this case, Step 2.1 is applicable. In Mini-Step 2.3, we handle graphs embedded on a surface with

<sup>4</sup>One might hope that a similar decomposition can be constructed using the shortest-path separator of Abraham and Gavioille [AG06] directly. Unfortunately, this is impossible as the length of the shortest paths in [AG06] is unbounded w.r.t.  $D$ . Rather, they are shortest paths in different subgraphs of the original graph.

<sup>5</sup>A graph  $G$  is an apex graph if there is a vertex  $v$  such that  $G \setminus v$  is a planar graph.

<sup>6</sup>In the subset spanner problem, there is an additional step where we remove the constraint on the diameter of the graph, and this becomes Step 2.0.



multiple vortices and *a constant number of apices*, a.k.a *nearly embeddable graphs*. In Mini-Step 2.4, we show how to handle general  $K_r$ -minor-free graphs by dealing with clique-sums.

In this multi-step framework, there are some steps that are simple to implement for one problem but challenging for the other. For example, implementing Mini-Step 2.3 is simple in the light subset spanner problem, while it is highly non-trivial for the embedding problem; removing apices can result in a graph with unbounded diameter. Novel ideas are typically needed to resolve these challenges; we refer the reader to [Section 2](#) for more technical details.

We believe that our multi-step framework will find applications in designing PTASes for other problems in  $K_r$ -minor-free graphs, such as minimum Steiner tree or survivable network design.

**An FPT approximation scheme for vehicle routing on low treewidth graphs** Our  $(1+\epsilon)$ -approximation for vehicle routing with bounded capacity in bounded treewidth graphs relies on a dynamic program that proceeds along the clusters of a branch decomposition<sup>7</sup>, namely the subgraphs induced by the leaves of the subtrees of the branch decomposition. One key idea is to show that there exists a near-optimal solution such that the number of tours entering (and leaving) a given cluster with some fixed capacity  $q \in [Q]$  can be rounded to a power of  $1 + \tilde{\epsilon}$ , for some  $\tilde{\epsilon}$  to be chosen later. To achieve this, we start from the optimum solution and introduce *artificial paths*, namely paths that start at a vertex and go to the depot (or from the depot to a vertex), without making any delivery and whose only purpose is to help *rounding* the number of paths entering or leaving a given cluster of the decomposition (i.e.: making it a power of  $1 + \tilde{\epsilon}$ ). This immediately reduces the number of entries in the dynamic programming table we are using, reducing the running time of the dynamic program to the desired complexity.

The main challenge becomes to bound the number of artificial paths hence created so as to show that the obtained solution has cost at most  $1 + \epsilon$  times the cost of the optimum solution. To do so, we design a charging scheme and prove that every time a new path is created, its cost can be charged to the cost of some  $\tilde{\epsilon}^{-1}$  paths of the original optimum solution. Then, we ensure that each path of the original optimum solution does not get charged more than  $\epsilon$  times. This is done by showing by defining that a path *enters* (resp. *leaves*) a cluster only if it is making its next delivery (resp. it has made its last delivery) to a vertex inside. This definition helps limit the number of times a path gets charged to  $\tilde{\epsilon} = \epsilon/(Q \log n)$  but it also separates the underlying shortest path metric from the structure of the graph: A path from vertices  $s_1, \dots, s_k$  should not be considered entering any cluster of the branch decomposition containing  $s_i$  if it does not pick up its next delivery (or has picked up its last delivery) within the cluster of  $s_i$ . This twist demands a very careful design of the dynamic program by working with distances rather than explicit paths.

Then, our dynamic program works as follows: The algorithm computes the best solution at a given cluster  $C$  of the decomposition, for any prescribed number of tours (rounded to a power of  $1 + \tilde{\epsilon}$ ) entering and leaving  $C$ . This is done by iterating over all pairs of (pre-computed) solutions for the child clusters of  $C$  that are consistent with (namely, that potentially *can* lead to) the prescribed number of tours entering and leaving at  $C$ . Given consistent solutions for the child cluster, the optimal cost of combining them (given the constraints on the number of tours entering at  $C$ ) is then computed through a min-cost max-flow assignment.

---

<sup>7</sup>For simplicity, we work with branch decompositions



## 2 Proof Overviews

### 2.1 Light subset spanners for minor-free metrics

In this section, we give a proof overview and review the main technical ideas for the proof of [Theorem 1](#). A subgraph  $H$  of a graph  $G$  is called a *subset  $L$ -local  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -spanner* of  $G$  with respect to a set  $K$  of terminals if:

$$\forall t_1, t_2 \in K \text{ s.t. } d_G(t_1, t_2) \leq L \quad \text{it holds that} \quad d_H(t_1, t_2) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot d_G(t_1, t_2)$$

Our starting point is the following reduction of Le [\[Le20\]](#).

**Theorem 9** (Theorem 1.4 [\[Le20\]](#)). *Fix an  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ . Suppose that for any  $K_r$ -minor-free weighted graph  $G = (V, E, w)$ , subset  $K \subseteq V$  of terminals, and parameter  $L > 0$ , there is a subset  $L$ -local  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -spanner w.r.t.  $K$  of weight at most  $O_r(|K| \cdot L \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$ . For any terminal set,  $G$  admits a subset  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -spanner with lightness  $O_r(\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$ .*

Our main focus is to construct a light subset  $L$ -local spanner.

**Proposition 1.** *For any edge-weighted  $K_r$ -minor-free graph  $G = (V, E, w)$ , any subset  $K \subseteq V$  of terminals, and any parameter  $L > 0$ , there is a subset  $L$ -local  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -spanner for  $G$  with respect to  $K$  of weight  $O_r(|K| \cdot L \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$ .*

[Theorem 1](#) follows directly by combining [Theorem 9](#) with [Proposition 1](#). Our focus now is on proving [Proposition 1](#). The proof is divided into two steps: in step 1 we solve the problem on the restricted case of planar graphs with bounded diameter and a single vortex. Then, in step 2, we reduce the problem from  $K_r$ -minor-free graphs to the special case solved in step 1.

**Step 1: Single vortex with bounded diameter** The main lemma in step 1 is stated below; the proof appears in [Section 5.1](#). We define a *single-vortex* graph  $G = G_\Sigma \cup W$  as a graph whose edge set can be partitioned into two parts  $G_\Sigma, W$  such that  $G_\Sigma$  induces a plane graph and  $W$  is a vortex of width<sup>8</sup> at most  $h$  glued to some face of  $G_\Sigma$ .

**Lemma 1** (Single Vortex with Bounded Diameter). *Consider a single-vortex graph  $G = G_\Sigma \cup W$  with diameter  $D = O_h(L)$ , where  $G_\Sigma$  is planar, and  $W$  is a vortex of width at most  $h$  glued to a face of  $G_\Sigma$ . For any terminal set  $K$ , there exists a subset  $L$ -local  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -spanner for  $G$  with respect to  $K$  of weight  $O_h(|K|L \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$ .*

The basic idea in constructing the spanner for [Lemma 1](#) is to use shortest-path separators to recursively break down the graph into clusters while maintaining the distance from every terminal to the boundaries of its cluster. Let  $k$  be the number of terminals. The idea is to construct a hierarchical tree of clusters of depth  $O(\log k)$  where each terminal-to-boundary-vertex path is well approximated. An elementary but inefficient approach to obtain such a result is add a single-source spanner ([Lemma 11](#)) from each terminal  $t$  to every shortest path (at distance at most  $L$ ) in each one of the separators in all the recursive levels. As a result, the spanner will consist of  $O_h(k \log k)$  single-source spanners of total weight  $O_h(L \cdot k \log k \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$ , as obtained in [\[Le20\]](#). Thus, a very natural and basic question is whether minor-free graphs have enough structure so that we can do

---

<sup>8</sup>The *width* of the vortex is the width of its path decomposition.

avoid the  $\log k$  factors coming from the depth of the hierarchy. We show that this is indeed the case.

The problem with the previous approach is that for each hierarchical cluster  $\mathcal{T}$  in the decomposition, the total weight of the edges added to the spanner is proportional to the number of terminals in  $\mathcal{T}$  (and is thus  $k \log k \cdot L$  in total, considering the entire process). Our approach is the following: instead of adding single-source spanners from a terminal to paths in  $O(\log k)$  separators, we add bipartite spanners (Lemma 12) from the paths in a newly added separator to all the separator paths in the boundary of the current cluster. A *bipartite spanner* is a set of edges that preserve all pairwise distances between two paths such that its weight is proportional to the distance between the paths and their lengths. The hope is to pay only  $L$  for each hierarchical cluster  $\mathcal{T}$ , regardless of the number of terminals it contains. This approach has two main obstacles: (1) the number of paths in the boundary of a cluster at depth  $t$  of the recursion can be as large as  $\Omega_h(t)$ , implying that the total number of bipartite spanners added is  $\Omega_h(k \log k)$  – and we would not have gained anything compared to the elementary approach, and (2) the weight of the shortest paths is unbounded. While initially the diameter and thus the length of shortest paths is bounded by  $O_h(L)$ , in the clusters created recursively, after deleting some paths there is no such bound. Note that in the approach that used the single-source spanners this was a non-issue, as for single-source spanner (Lemma 11), the length of the shortest path  $P$  does not matter. However, the weight of a bipartite spanner (Lemma 12) depends on the weight of the paths it is constructed for.

We resolve both these issues by recursively constructing separators with a special structure. According to Abraham and Gaville [AG06], a separator can be constructed using a fundamental vortex cycle constructed between two vortex paths induced by an arbitrary tree (see Definition 4). We construct a spanning tree  $T$  as a shortest-path tree rooted in the perimeter vertices. Every separator then consists of two shortest paths from perimeter vertices to vertices in the embedded part of the graph, and at most two bags. The important property is that for every cluster  $G_\Upsilon$  we encounter during the recursion,  $T \cap G_\Upsilon$  is a spanning tree of  $G_\Upsilon$ . As a result, all the shortest paths we use for the separators throughout the process are actual shortest paths in  $G$ . In particular, their length is bounded, and thus issue (2) is resolved. In order to resolve issue (1), we control the number of shortest paths in the boundary of a cluster in our decomposition using a more traditional approach. Specifically, in some recursive steps, we aim for a reduction in the number of paths in the boundary instead of a reduction in the number of terminals.

**Step 2: From minor-free to single vortex with bounded diameter.** We generalize the spanner construction of Step 1 to minor-free graphs using the Robertson-Seymour decomposition. We have five sub-steps, each generalizing further (at the expense of increasing the weight of the spanner by an additive term  $O_h(kL \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$ ).

Thus, consider the construction proposed in Step 1. In the first sub-step, we remove the assumption on the bounded diameter and make our spanner construction work for arbitrary planar graphs with a single vortex. The approach is as follows: Break a graph with unbounded diameter to overlapping clusters of diameter  $O_h(L)$  such that every pair of vertices at distance at most  $L$  belongs to some cluster, and each vertex belong to at most  $O_h(1)$  clusters. This is done using Abraham et al. sparse covers [AGMW10]. Then construct a spanner for each cluster separately by applying the approach of Step 1, namely Lemma 1, and return the union of these spanners. More concretely, we prove the following lemma, whose proof appears in Section 5.2.

**Lemma 2** (Single Vortex). *Consider a graph  $G = G_\Sigma \cup W$  where  $G_\Sigma$  is planar, and  $W$  is a vortex of width at most  $h$  glued to a face of  $G_\Sigma$ . For any terminal set  $K$ , there exists a subset  $L$ -local  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -spanner for  $G$  with respect to  $K$  of weight  $O_h(|K|L \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$ .*

In the second sub-step, we generalize to planar graphs with at most  $h$  vortices of width  $h$ . The basic idea is to “merge” all vortices into a single vortex of width  $O(h^2)$ . This is done by repeatedly deleting a shortest path between pairs of vortices, and “opening up” the cut to form a new face. The two vortices are then “merged” into a single vortex – in other words, they can be treated as a single vortex by the algorithm obtained at the first sub-step. This is repeated until all the vortices have been “merged” into a single vortex, at which point [Lemma 2](#) applies. Here we face a quite important technical difficulty: when opening up a shortest path between two vortices, we may alter shortest paths between pairs of terminals (e.g.: the shortest path between two terminals intersects the shortest path between our two vortices, in which case deleting the shortest path between the vortices destroys the shortest path between the terminals). To resolve this issue, we compute a single-source spanner from each terminal to every nearby deleted path, thus controlling the distance between such terminal pairs in the resulting spanner.

The above idea is captured in the following lemma, whose proof appears in [Section 5.3](#).

**Lemma 3** (Multiple Vortices). *Consider a graph  $G = G_\Sigma \cup W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_{h'}$ , where  $G_\Sigma$  is planar,  $h' \leq h$ , and each  $W_i$  is a vortex of width at most  $h$  glued to a face of  $G_\Sigma$ . For any terminal set  $K$ , there exists a subset  $L$ -local  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -spanner for  $G$  with respect to  $K$  of weight  $O_h(|K|L \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$ .*

In our third sub-step, we generalize to graphs of bounded genus with multiple vortices. The main tool here is “vortex paths” from [\[AG06\]](#). Specifically, we can remove two vortex paths and reduce the genus by one (while increasing the number of vortices). Here each vortex path consists of essentially  $O_h(1)$  shortest paths. We apply this genus reduction repeatedly until the graph has genus zero. The graph then has  $O(g)$  new vortices. Next, we apply [Lemma 3](#) to create a spanner. The technical difficulty of the previous step arises here as well: There may be shortest paths between pairs of terminals that intersect the vortex paths. We handle this issue in a similar manner. The proof appears in [Section 5.4](#).

**Lemma 4** (Multiple Vortices and Genus). *Consider a graph  $G = G_\Sigma \cup W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_{h'}$  where  $G_\Sigma$  is (cellularly) embedded on a surface  $\Sigma$  of genus at most  $g = O(h)$ ,  $h' \leq h$ , and each  $W_i$  is a vortex of width at most  $h$  glued to a face of  $G_\Sigma$ . For any terminal set  $K$ , there exists a subset  $L$ -local  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -spanner for  $G$  with respect to  $K$  of weight  $O_h(|K|L \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$ .*

In our fourth sub-step, we generalize to nearly  $h$ -embeddable graphs. That is, in addition to genus and vortices, we also allow  $G$  to have at most  $h$  apices. The spanner is constructed by first deleting all the apices and applying [Lemma 4](#). Then, in order to compensate for the deleted apices, we add a shortest path from each apex to every terminal at distance at most  $L$ . The proof appears in [Section 5.5](#).

**Lemma 5** (Nearly  $h$ -Embeddable). *Consider a nearly  $h$ -embeddable graph  $G$  with a set  $K$  of  $k$  terminals. There exists an  $L$ -local  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -spanner for  $K$  of weight  $O_h(kL \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$ .*

Finally, in our last sub-step, we generalize to minor-free graphs, thus proving [Proposition 1](#). Recall that according to [\[RS03\]](#) a minor graph can be decomposed into a clique-sum decomposition, where each node in the decomposition is nearly  $h$ -embeddable. Our major step here is transforming

the graph  $G$  into a graph  $G'$  that preserves all terminal distances in  $G$ , while having at most  $O(k)$  bags in its clique-sum decomposition. This is done by first removing leaf nodes which are not “essential” for any terminal distance, and then shrinking long paths in the decomposition where all internal nodes have degree two and (roughly) do not contain terminals. Next, given  $G'$ , we make each vertex that belongs to one of the cliques in the clique-sum decomposition into a terminal. The new number of terminals is bounded by  $O_h(k)$ . The last step is simply to construct an internal spanner for each bag separately using [Lemma 5](#), and return the union of the constructed spanners. The proof (of [Proposition 1](#)) appears in [Section 5.6](#).

## 2.2 Embedding into low-treewidth graphs

At a high level, we follow the same approach as for the subset spanner. Due to the different nature of the constructed structures, and the different distortion guarantees, there are some differences that raise significant challenges.

Our first step is to generalize the result of Fox-Epstein et al. [\[FKS19\]](#) to graph of bounded genus. Basically, our approach is the same as for the subset spanner: we decompose the graph into simpler and simpler pieces by removing shortest paths. Here, instead of deleting a path, we will use a *cutting lemma*. However, in this setting it is not clear how to use single-source or bipartite spanners to compensate for the changes to the shortest-path metric due to path deletions, since these spanners may have large treewidth. Instead, we will *portalize* the cut path. That is, we add an  $\epsilon D$ -net<sup>9</sup> of the path to every bag of the tree decomposition of the host graph. Clearly, this strategy has to be used cautiously since it immediately increases the treewidth significantly.

Apices pose an interesting challenge. Standard techniques to deal with apices consist in removing them from the graph, solve the problem on the remaining graph which is planar, and add back the apices later [\[Gro03, DHK05\]](#). However, in our setting, removing apices can make the diameter of the resulting graph, say  $G'$ , become arbitrarily larger than  $D$  and thus, it seems hopeless to embed  $G'$  into a low treewidth graph with an additive distortion bounded by  $D$ . This is where randomness comes into play: we use padded decomposition [\[Fil19a\]](#) to randomly partition  $G'$  into pieces of (strong) diameter  $D' = O(\frac{D}{\epsilon})$ . We then embed each part of the partition (which is planar) separately into graphs of bounded treewidth with additive distortion  $\epsilon^2 D' = O(\epsilon D)$ , add back the apices by connecting them to all the vertices of all the bounded treewidth graphs (and so adding all of them to each bag of each decomposition) and obtain a graph with bounded treewidth and an *expected* additive distortion  $\epsilon D$ .

Our next stop on the road to minor-free metrics is to find bounded treewidth embeddings of clique-sums of bounded genus graphs with apices.

Suppose that  $G$  is decomposed into clique-sums of graphs  $G_1, G_2, \dots, G_k$ . We call each  $G_i$  a *piece*. A natural idea is to embed each  $G_i$  into a low treewidth graph  $H_i$ , called the *host graph* with a tree decomposition  $\mathcal{T}_i$ , and then combine all the tree decompositions together. Suppose that  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  participate in the clique-sum decomposition of  $G$  using the clique  $Q$ . To merge  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ , we wish to have an embedding from  $G_i$  to  $H_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , that *preserves* the clique  $Q$  in the clique-sum of  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ . That is, the set of vertices  $\{f_i(v) | v \in Q\}$  induces a clique in  $H_i$  (so that there will be bag in the tree decomposition of  $H_i$  containing  $f(Q)$ ). However, it is impossible to have such an embedding even if all  $G_i$ ’s are planar<sup>10</sup>. To overcome this obstacle, we will allow each vertex in

<sup>9</sup>An  $r$ -net of a set  $A$ , is a set  $N \subset A$  of vertices all at distance at least  $r$  from each other, and such that every  $v \in A$  has a net point  $t \in N$  at distance at most  $r$ . If  $A$  is a path of length  $L$ , then for every  $r$ -net  $N$ ,  $|N| = O(\frac{L}{r})$ .

<sup>10</sup>To see this, suppose that  $G$  is clique-sums of a graph  $G_0$  with many other graphs  $G_1, G_2, \dots, G_s$  in a star-like

$G_i$  to have multiple images in  $H_i$ . Specifically, we introduce *one-to-many* embeddings. Note that given a one-to-many embedding, one can construct a classic embedding by identifying each vertex with an arbitrary copy.

**Definition 1** (One-to-many embedding). *An embedding  $f : G \rightarrow 2^H$  of a graph  $G$  into a graph  $H$  is a one-to-many embedding if for every  $v \in G$ ,  $f(v)$  is a non empty set of vertices in  $H$ , where the sets  $\{f(v)\}_{v \in G}$  are disjoint.*

*We say that  $f$  is dominating if for every pair of vertices  $u, v \in G$ , it holds that  $d_G(u, v) \leq \min_{u' \in f(u), v' \in f(v)} d_H(u', v')$ . We say that  $f$  has additive distortion  $\epsilon D$  if it is dominating and  $\forall u, v \in G$  it holds that  $\max_{u' \in f(u), v' \in f(v)} d_H(u', v') \leq d_G(u, v) + \epsilon D$ . Note that, as for every vertex  $v \in G$ ,  $d_G(v, v) = 0$ , having additive distortion  $\epsilon D$  implies that all the copies in  $f(v)$  are at distance at most  $\epsilon D$  from each other.*

*A stochastic one-to-many embedding is a distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  over dominating one-to-many embeddings. We say that a stochastic one-to-many embedding has expected additive distortion  $\epsilon D$  if  $\forall u, v \in G$  it holds that  $\mathbb{E}[\max_{u' \in f(u), v' \in f(v)} d_H(u', v')] \leq d_G(u, v) + \epsilon D$ .*

We can show that in order to combine the different one-to-many embeddings of the pieces  $G_1, \dots, G_s$ , it is enough that for every clique  $Q$  we will have a bag  $B$  containing at least one copy of each vertex in  $Q$ . Formally,

**Definition 2** (Clique-preserving embedding). *A one-to-many embedding  $f : G \rightarrow 2^H$  is called clique-preserving embedding if for every clique  $Q \in G$ , there is a clique  $Q'$  in  $H$  such that for every vertex  $v \in Q$ ,  $f(v) \cap Q' \neq \emptyset$ .*

While it is impossible to preserve all cliques in a one-to-one embedding, it is possible to preserve all cliques in a one-to-many embedding; this is one of our major conceptual contributions. One might worry about the number of maximal cliques in  $G$ . However, since  $G$  has constant degeneracy, the number of maximal cliques is linear [ELS10]. Suppose that  $f$  is clique-preserving, and let  $\mathcal{T}$  be some tree-decomposition of  $H$ . Then for every clique  $Q$  in  $G$ , there is a bag of  $\mathcal{T}$  containing a copy of (the image of)  $Q$  in  $H$ .

We now have the required definitions, and begin the description of the different steps in creating the embedding. The most basic case we are dealing with directly is that of a planar graph with a single vortex and diameter  $D$  into a graph of treewidth  $O(\frac{\log n}{\epsilon})$  and additive distortion  $\epsilon D$ . The high level idea is to use vortex-path separator to create a hierarchical partition tree  $\tau$  as in Section 5.1. The depth of the tree will be  $O(\log n)$ . To accommodate for the damage caused by the separation, we *portalize* each vortex-path in the separator. That is for each such path  $Q$ , we pick an  $\epsilon D$ -net<sup>9</sup>  $N_Q$  of size  $O(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$ . The vertices of  $N_Q$  called *portals*. Since each node of  $\tau$  is associated with a constant number of vortex-paths, there are at most  $O(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$  portals corresponding to each node of  $\tau$ . Thus, if we collect all portals along the path from a leaf to the root of  $\tau$ , there are  $O(\frac{\log n}{\epsilon})$  portals. We create a bag for each leaf  $\Upsilon$  of the tree  $\tau$ . In addition for each bag we add the portals corresponding to nodes along the path from the root to  $\Upsilon$ . The tree decomposition is then created w.r.t.  $\tau$ . Finally, we need to make the embedding clique-preserving. Consider a clique  $Q$ , there will be a leaf  $\Upsilon_Q$  of  $\tau$  containing a sub-clique  $Q' \subseteq Q$ , while all the vertices in  $Q \setminus Q'$  belong to paths in the boundary of  $\Upsilon_Q$ . We will create a new bag containing (copies) of all the vertices in  $Q$  and all the corresponding portals. The vertices of  $Q'$  will have a single copy in the embedding, while the distortion of the vertices  $Q' \subseteq Q$  will be guaranteed using a nearby portal.

---

way, where  $G_0$  has treewidth polynomial in  $n$ , and every edge of  $G_0$  is used for some clique sum. If  $H_0$  preserves all cliques, it contains  $G_0$  and thus has treewidth polynomial in  $n$ .



**Lemma 6** (Single Vortex with Bounded Diameter). *Given a single-vortex graph  $G = G_\Sigma \cup W$  where the vortex  $W$  has width  $h$ . There is a one-to-many, clique-preserving embedding  $f$  from  $G$  to a graph  $H$  with treewidth  $O(\frac{h \log n}{\epsilon})$  and additive distortion  $\epsilon D$  where  $D$  is diameter of  $G$ .*

We then can extend the embedding to planar graphs with multiple vortices using the *vortex merging* technique (Section 5.3), and then to graphs embedded on a genus- $g$  surface with multiple vortices by cutting along vortex-paths. The main tool here is a *cutting lemma* described in Section 6.2 which bound the diameter blowup after each cutting step. At this point, the embedding is still deterministic. The proofs appear in Section 6.3 and Section 6.4 respectively.

**Lemma 7** (Multiple Vortices). *Consider a graph  $G = G_\Sigma \cup W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_{v(G)}$  of diameter  $D$ , where  $G_\Sigma$  can be drawn on the plane, and each  $W_i$  is a vortex of width at most  $h$  glued to a face of  $G_\Sigma$ , and  $v(G)$  is the number of vortices in  $G$ . There is a one-to-many, clique-preserving embedding  $f$  from  $G$  to a graph  $H$  of treewidth at most  $\frac{h 2^{O(v(G))} \log n}{\epsilon}$  with additive distortion  $\epsilon D$ .*

**Lemma 8** (Multiple Vortices and Genus). *Consider a graph  $G = G_\Sigma \cup W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_{v(G)}$  of diameter  $D$ , where  $G_\Sigma$  is (cellularly) embedded on a surface  $\Sigma$  of genus  $g(G)$ , and each  $W_i$  is a vortex of width at most  $h$  glued to a face of  $G_\Sigma$ . There is a one-to-many clique-preserving embedding  $f$  from  $G$  to a graph  $H$  of treewidth at most  $\frac{h 2^{O(v(G)g(G))} \log n}{\epsilon}$  with additive distortion  $\epsilon D$ .*

We then extend the embedding to graphs embedded on a genus- $g$  surface with multiple vortices and apices (a.k.a. nearly embeddable graphs). The problem with apices, as pointed out at the beginning of this section, is that the diameter of the graph after removing apices could be unbounded in terms of the diameter of the original graph. Indeed, while the embedding in Lemma 8 is deterministic, it is not clear how to *deterministically* embed a nearly embeddable graph into a bounded treewidth graph with additive distortion  $\epsilon D$ . We use padded decompositions [Fil19a] to decompose the graph into clusters of strong diameter  $O(D/\epsilon)$ , embed each part separately, and then combine all the embeddings into a single graph. Note that separated nodes will have additive distortion as large as  $2D$ , however, this will happen with probability at most  $O(\epsilon)$ . To make this embedding clique-preserving, we add to each cluster its neighborhood. Thus some small fraction of the vertices will belong to multiple clusters. As a result, we obtain a one-to-many stochastic embedding with expected additive distortion  $\epsilon D$ . The proof appears in Section 6.5.

**Lemma 9** (Nearly  $h$ -Embeddable). *Given a nearly  $h$ -embeddable graph  $G$  of diameter  $D$ , there is a one-to-many stochastic clique-preserving embedding into graphs with treewidth  $O_h(\frac{\log n}{\epsilon^2})$  and expected additive distortion  $\epsilon D$ . Furthermore, every bag of the tree decomposition of every graph in the support contains (the image of) the apex set of  $G$ .*

Finally we are in the case of general minor free graph  $G = G_1 \oplus_h G_2 \oplus_h \dots \oplus_h G_s$ . We sample an embedding for each  $G_i$  using Lemma 9 to some bounded treewidth graph  $H_i$ . As all these embeddings are clique-preserving, there is a natural way to combine the tree decompositions of all the graphs  $H_i$  together. Here we run into another challenge: we need to guarantee that the additive distortion caused by merging tree decompositions is not too large. To explore this challenge, let us consider the clique-sum decomposition tree  $\mathcal{T}$  of  $G$ : each node of  $\mathcal{T}$  corresponds uniquely to  $G_i$  for some  $i$ , and that  $G$  is obtained by clique-summing all adjacent graphs  $G_i$  and  $G_j$  in  $\mathcal{T}$ . Suppose that  $\mathcal{T}$  has a (polynomially) long path  $\mathcal{P}$  with hop-length  $p$ . Then, for a vertex  $u$  in the graph corresponding to one end of  $\mathcal{P}$  and a vertex  $v$  in the graph corresponding to another end of  $\mathcal{P}$ ,



the additive distortion between  $u$  and  $v$  could potentially be  $\epsilon D$  since every time the shortest path between  $u$  and  $v$  goes through a graph  $G_i$ , we must pay additive distortion  $\epsilon D$  in the embedding of  $G_i$ . When  $p$  is polynomially large, the additive distortion is polynomial in  $n$ . We resolve this issue by the following idea: (1) pick a *separator piece*  $G_i$  of  $\mathcal{T}$  ( $G_i$  is a separator of  $\mathcal{T}$  if each component  $\mathcal{T} \setminus G_i$  has at most  $2/3$  the number of pieces of  $\mathcal{T}$ ), (2) recursively embed pieces in subtrees of  $\mathcal{T} \setminus G_i$  and (3) add the join set between  $G_i$  and each subtree, say  $\mathcal{T}'$  of  $\mathcal{T} \setminus G_i$  to all bags of the tree decomposition corresponding to  $\mathcal{T}'$ . We then can show that this construction incurs another additive  $\log n$  factor in the treewidth while insuring a total additive distortion of  $\epsilon D$ . Hence the final tree decomposition has width  $O(\frac{\log n}{\epsilon^2})$ . The proof of [Theorem 2](#) appears in [Section 6.6](#).

An interesting consequence of our one-to-many embedding approach is that the host graphs  $H$  will contain Steiner points. That is, its vertex set will be greater than  $V$ . We do not know whether it is possible to obtain the properties of [Theorem 2](#) while embedding into  $n$ -vertex graphs. In this context, the Steiner point removal problem studies whether it is possible to remove all Steiner points while preserving both pairwise distance and topological structure [[Fil19b](#), [Fil20](#)]. Unfortunately, in general, even if  $G$  is a tree, a multiplicative distortion of 8 is necessary [[CXKR06](#)]. Nevertheless, as Krauthgamer et al. [[KNZ14](#)] proved, given a set  $K$  of  $k$  terminals in a graph  $H$  of treewidth  $\text{tw}$ , we can embed the terminal set  $K$  isometrically (that is with multiplicative distortion 1) into a graph with  $O(k \cdot \text{tw}^3)$  vertices and treewidth  $\text{tw}$ . It follows that we can ensure that all embeddings in the support of the stochastic embedding in [Theorem 2](#) are into graphs with  $O_r(n \cdot \frac{\log^3 n}{\epsilon^6})$  vertices.

### 3 Related work

**TSP in Euclidean and doubling metrics** Arora [[Aro97](#)] and Mitchell [[Mit99](#)] gave polynomial-time approximation schemes (PTASs) for TSP (Arora’s algorithm is a PTAS for any fixed dimension). Rao and Smith [[RS98](#)] gave an  $O(n \log n)$  approximation scheme for bounded-dimension Euclidean TSP, later improved to linear-time by Bartal and Gottlieb [[BG13](#)]. For TSP in doubling metrics, Talwar [[Tal04](#)] gave a QPTAS; Bartal et al. [[BGK16](#)] gave a PTAS; and Gottlieb [[Got15](#)] gave efficient PTAS.

**TSP and subset TSP in minor-closed families** For TSP problem in planar graphs, Grigni et al. [[GKP95](#)] gave the first (inefficient) PTAS for *unweighted* graphs; Arora et al. [[AGK<sup>+</sup>98](#)] extended Grigni et al. [[AGK<sup>+</sup>98](#)] to weighted graphs; Klein [[Kle05](#)] designed the first EPTAS by introducing the contraction decomposition framework. Borradaile et al. [[BDT14](#)] generalized Klein’s EPTAS to bounded-genus graphs. The first PTAS for  $K_r$ -minor-free graph was designed by Demaine et al. [[DHK11](#)] that improved upon the QPTAS by Grigni [[Gri00](#)]. Recently, Borradaile et al. [[BLW17](#)] obtained an EPTAS for TSP in  $K_r$ -minor-free graphs by constructing light spanners; this work completed a long line of research on approximating classical TSP in  $K_r$ -minor-free graphs.

For subset TSP, Arora et al. [[AGK<sup>+</sup>98](#)] designed the first QPTAS for weighted planar graphs. Klein [[Kle06](#)] obtained the first EPTAS for subset TSP in planar graphs by constructing a light planar subset spanner. Borradaile et al. [[BDT14](#)] generalized Klein’s subset spanner construction to bounded-genus graphs, thereby obtained an EPTAS. Le [[Le20](#)] designed the first (inefficient) PTAS for subset TSP in minor-free graphs. Our [Theorem 5](#) completed this line of research.

**Light (subset) spanners** Light and sparse spanners were introduced for distributed computing [[Awe85](#), [PS89](#), [ABP92](#)]. Since then, spanners attract ever-growing interest; see [[ABS<sup>+</sup>19](#)] for a

survey. Over the years, light spanners with constant lightness have been shown to exist in Euclidean metrics [RS98, LS19], doubling metrics [Got15, BLW19], planar graphs [ADD<sup>+</sup>93], bounded genus graphs [Gri00] and minor-free graphs [BLW17]. For subset spanners, relevant results include subset spanners with constant lightness for planar graphs by Klein [Kle06], for bounded genus graphs by Borradaile et al. [BDT14]. Le [Le20] constructed subset spanners with lightness  $O(\log |K|)$  for minor-free graphs.

**Capacitated vehicle routing** There is a rich literature on the capacitated vehicle routing problem. When  $Q$  is arbitrary, the problem becomes extremely difficult as there is no known PTAS for any non-trivial metric. For  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , there is a QPTAS by Mathieu and Das for  $\mathbb{R}^2$  [DM15] and for tree metrics, there is a (tight)  $\frac{4}{3}$ -approximation algorithm by Becker [Bec18]. In general graphs, Haimovich and Rinnooy Kan [HK85] designed a 2.5-approximation algorithm.

In Euclidean spaces, better results were known for restricted values of  $Q$ : PTASes in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  for  $Q = O(2^{\log^{O_\epsilon(1)} n})$  by a sequence of work [HK85, AKTT97, ACL09] and for  $Q = \Omega(n)$  by Asano et al. [AKTT97]; a PTAS in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  for  $Q = O(\log n^{1/d})$  by Khachay and Dubinin [KD16].

For constant  $Q$ , progress has been made on designing approximation schemes for various minor-closed families of graphs. In recent work, Becker et al. [BKS19] designed a PTAS for planar graphs. Becker et al. [BKS17] gave a QPTAS for planar and bounded-genus graphs.

Other relevant works include a PTAS for graphs of bounded highway dimension and constant  $Q$  [BKS18], a bicriteria PTAS for tree metrics and arbitrary  $Q$  [BP19], and an exact algorithm for treewidth- $tw$  graphs with running time  $O(n^{twQ})$  [BKS18].

## 4 Preliminaries

$O_r$  notation hides factors in  $r$ , e.g.  $O_r(m) = O(m) \cdot f(r)$  for some function  $f$  of  $r$ .

We consider connected undirected graphs  $G = (V, E)$  with edge weights  $w_G : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ . Additionally, we denote  $G$ 's vertex set and edge set by  $V(G)$  and  $E(G)$ , respectively. Let  $d_G$  denote the shortest path metric in  $G$ , i.e.,  $d_G(u, v)$  equals to the minimal weight of a path from  $u$  to  $v$ . Given a vertex  $v$  and a subset of vertices  $S$ ,  $d_G(v, S) = \min_{u \in S} d_G(v, u)$  is the distance between  $v$  and  $S$ . If  $v \in S$ , then  $d_G(v, S) = 0$ . When the graph is clear from the context, we simply use  $w$  to refer to  $w_G$ , and  $d$  to refer to  $d_G$ .  $G[S]$  denotes the induced subgraph by  $S$ . We define the *strong*<sup>11</sup> diameter of  $S$ , denoted by  $\text{DIAM}(S)$ , to be  $\max_{u, v \in S} d_{G[S]}(u, v)$ . For a subgraph  $H$  of  $G$ ,  $w_G(H) = \sum_{e \in E(H)} w_G(e)$  denotes the total weight of all the edges in  $H$ .

For two paths  $P_1, P_2$  where the last vertex of  $P_1$  is the first vertex of  $P_2$ . We denote by  $P_1 \circ P_2$  the concatenation of  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ . We denote by  $P[u, v]$  a subpath between  $u$  and  $v$  of  $P$ .

We say a subset of vertices  $N$  is a  $r$ -*net* of  $G$  if the distance between any two vertices of  $N$  is at least  $r$  and for every  $x \in V(G)$ , there exists  $y \in N$  such that  $d_G(x, y) \leq r$ .

Given a subset  $U \subseteq V$  of vertices, a *Steiner tree* of  $U$  is an acyclic subgraph of  $G$  such that all the vertices in  $U$  belong to the same connected component. A *Minimum Steiner tree* is a subgraph of minimum weight among all such subgraphs (it is not necessarily unique). Given a subset  $U$  of terminals, a *subset  $t$ -spanner w.r.t.  $U$*  is a subgraph  $H$  that preserves the distances between any pair of terminals, up to a multiplicative factor of  $t$ , i.e.,  $\forall u, v \in U$ ,  $d_H(u, v) \leq t \cdot d_G(u, v)$ . Note that

<sup>11</sup>The *weak* diameter of  $S$  is  $\max_{u, v \in S} d_G(u, v)$ .

as  $H$  is a subgraph, it necessarily holds that  $d_G(u, v) \leq d_H(u, v)$ . The lightness of  $H$  is the ratio of its weight  $w(H)$  to the weight of a minimum Steiner tree of  $U$ .

A metric embedding is a function  $f : G \rightarrow H$  between two graphs  $G$  and  $H$ . We say that metric embedding  $f$  is *dominating* if for every pair of vertices  $u, v \in G$ , it holds that  $d_G(u, v) \leq d_H(f(u), f(v))$ .

**Definition 3** (Stochastic embedding). *A stochastic embedding, is a distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  over dominating embeddings  $f$ . We say that a stochastic embedding has expected additive distortion  $\epsilon D$ , if  $\forall u, v \in G$  it holds that  $\mathbb{E}_{f \sim \mathcal{D}}[d_H(f(u), f(v))] \leq d_G(u, v) + \epsilon D$ .*

#### 4.1 Robertson-Seymour decomposition of minor-free graphs

In this section, we review notation used in graph minor theory by Robertson and Seymour. Readers who are familiar with Robertson-Seymour decomposition can skip this section. Basic definitions such as tree/path decomposition and treewidth/pathwidth are provided in [Appendix A](#).

Informally speaking, the celebrated theorem of Robertson and Seymour ([Theorem 10](#), [\[RS03\]](#)) said that any minor-free graph can be decomposed into a collection of graphs *nearly embeddable* in the surface of constant genus, glued together into a tree structure by taking *clique-sum*. To formally state the Robertson-Seymour decomposition, we need additional notations.

A *vortex* is a graph  $G$  equipped with a path decomposition  $\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\}$  and a sequence of  $t$  designated vertices  $x_1, \dots, x_t$ , called the *perimeter* of  $G$ , such that each  $x_i \in X_i$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq t$ . The *width* of the vortex is the width of its path decomposition. We say that a vortex  $W$  is *glued* to a face  $F$  of a surface embedded graph  $G$  if  $W \cap F$  is the perimeter of  $W$  whose vertices appear consecutively along the boundary of  $F$ .

**Nearly  $h$ -embeddability** A graph  $G$  is nearly  $h$ -embeddable if there is a set of at most  $h$  vertices  $A$ , called *apices*, such that  $G \setminus A$  can be decomposed as  $G_\Sigma \cup \{W_1, W_2, \dots, W_h\}$  where  $G_\Sigma$  is (cellularly) embedded on a surface  $\Sigma$  of genus at most  $h$  and each  $W_i$  is a vortex of width at most  $h$  glued to a face of  $G_\Sigma$ .

**$h$ -Clique-sum** A graph  $G$  is a  $h$ -clique-sum of two graphs  $G_1, G_2$ , denoted by  $G = G_1 \oplus_h G_2$ , if there are two cliques of size exactly  $h$  each such that  $G$  can be obtained by identifying vertices of the two cliques and remove some clique edges of the resulting identification.

Note that clique-sum is not a well-defined operation since the clique-sum of two graphs is not unique due to the clique edge deletion step. We now can state the decomposition theorem.

**Theorem 10** (Theorem 1.3 [\[RS03\]](#)). *There is a constant  $h = O_r(1)$  such that any  $K_r$ -minor-free graph  $G$  can be decomposed into a tree  $\mathcal{T}$  where each node of  $\mathcal{T}$  corresponds to a nearly  $h$ -embeddable graph such that  $G = \cup_{X_i, X_j \in E(\mathcal{T})} X_i \oplus_h X_j$ .*

By slightly abusing notation, we use the term *nodes* of  $\mathcal{T}$  to refer to both the nodes and the graphs corresponding to the nodes of  $\mathcal{T}$ . Note that nodes of  $\mathcal{T}$  may not be subgraphs of  $G$ , as in the clique-sum, some edges of a node, namely some edges of a nearly  $h$ -embeddable subgraph associated to a node, may not be present in  $G$ . However, for any edge  $(u, v)$  between two vertices of a node, say  $X$ , of  $\mathcal{T}$ , that are not present in  $G$ , we add edge  $(u, v)$  to  $G$  and set its weight to be  $d_G(u, v)$ . It is immediate that this does not change the Robertson-Seymour decomposition of the graph, nor its shortest path metric. Thus, in the decomposition of the resulting graph, the

clique-sum operation does not remove any edge. This is an important point to keep in mind as in what follows, we will remove some nodes out of  $\mathcal{T}$  while guaranteeing that the shortest path metric between terminals is not affected.

## 4.2 Vortex paths

Throughout the paper, we will use the notion of *vortex-path*, which was first introduced by Abraham and Gavaille [AG06].

**Definition 4** (Vortex-path [AG06]). *Given a vortex embedded graph  $G = G_\Sigma \cup W_1 \cup W_2 \dots \cup W_{v(G)}$ , a vortex-path between two vertices  $u, v$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{V}[u, v]$ , is a subgraph of  $G$  that can be written as  $\mathcal{V}[u, v] = P_0 \cup X_1 \cup Y_1 \cup P_1 \cup \dots \cup X_\ell \cup Y_\ell \cup P_\ell$  such that:*

- (a)  $P_i$  is a path of  $G_\Sigma$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq \ell$ .
- (b) For all  $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ ,  $X_i$  and  $Y_i$  are two bags of the same vortex, denoted  $\mathcal{W}(X_i)$ .
- (c) For any  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq \ell$ ,  $\mathcal{W}(X_i) \neq \mathcal{W}(X_j)$ .
- (d)  $P_0$  ( $P_\ell$ ) is a path from  $u$  ( $v$ ) to a perimeter vertex in  $X_1$  ( $Y_\ell$ ).  $P_i$  is a path from a perimeter vertex in  $Y_i$  to a perimeter vertex in  $X_{i+1}$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$ . No path  $P_i$  contains a perimeter vertex as an internal vertex for any  $i \in [0, \ell]$ .

Each path  $P_i$  is called a segment of  $\mathcal{V}$ .

When the endpoints of a vortex-path  $\mathcal{V}[u, v]$  are not relevant in our discussion, we would omit the endpoints and simply denote it by  $\mathcal{V}$ . The *projection* of the vortex-path  $\mathcal{V}[u, v] = P_0 \cup X_1 \cup Y_1 \cup P_1 \cup \dots \cup X_\ell \cup Y_\ell \cup P_\ell$  denoted by  $\bar{\mathcal{V}}$  is a path formed by  $P_0 \circ e_1 \circ P_1 \circ e_2 \circ \dots \circ e_\ell \circ P_\ell$  where  $e_i$  is an (imaginary) extra edge added to  $G_\Sigma$  between the perimeter vertex of  $X_i$  and the perimeter vertex of  $Y_i$ , and embedded inside the cellular face upon which the vortex  $W_i$  is glued. We observe that even though  $\mathcal{V}$  may not be a path of  $G$ , its projection  $\bar{\mathcal{V}}$  is a curve of  $\Sigma$ . See Figure 1 for a simple example and see Figure 6 in Appendix A for a more complex one.

Consider a path  $Q = (u = v_0, v_1, \dots, v_r = v)$  in  $G$  with two endpoints in the embedded part  $G_\Sigma$ .  $Q$  induces a vortex path  $\mathcal{V}[u, v]$  defined as follows: Start a walk on  $Q$  until you first encounter a vertex  $v_{i_1}$  that belongs to a vortex  $W_{i_1}$ . Let  $u_{i_1}$  be the last vertex in  $Q$  belonging to  $W_{i_1}$ . Note that necessarily  $v_{i_1}, u_{i_1}$  are perimeter vertices in  $W_{i_1}$ , denote them  $x_{j_1}^{i_1}, x_{l_1}^{i_1}$  respectively. We continue and define  $v_{i_2}$  to be the first vertex (after  $u_{i_1}$ ) belonging to some vortex  $W_{i_2}$ , and  $u_{i_2}$  being the last vertex in  $Q \cap W_{i_2}$ .  $x_{j_2}^{i_2}, x_{l_2}^{i_2}$  are defined in the natural manner. We iteratively define  $(v_{i_3} = x_{j_3}^{i_3}, W_{i_3}, u_{i_3} = x_{l_3}^{i_3}), (v_{i_4} = x_{j_4}^{i_4}, W_{i_4}, u_{i_4} = x_{l_4}^{i_4}), \dots$  until the first index  $i_s$  such that there is no vertex  $v_{i_{s+1}}$  after  $u_{i_s}$  belonging to a vortex. The respective induced vortex path is defined as  $P_0 \cup X_1 \cup Y_1 \cup P_1 \cup \dots \cup X_\ell \cup Y_s \cup P_s$  where  $P_0 = (v_0, \dots, v_{i_1})$ ,  $P_q = (u_{i_q}, \dots, v_{i_{q+1}})$ ,  $X_q$  (resp.  $Y_q$ ) is a bag in  $W_{i_q}$  associated with the perimeter vertex  $x_{j_q}^{i_q}$  (resp.  $x_{l_q}^{i_q}$ ), and  $P_s = Q[u_{i_s}, v]$ . See Figure 1.

Suppose next that  $G$  has genus 0. Specifically, that  $G = G_\Sigma \cup W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_{h'}$ , where  $G_\Sigma$  can be drawn on the plane,  $h' \leq h$ , and each  $W_i$  is a vortex of width at most  $h$  glued to a face of  $G_\Sigma$ . Fix some drawing of  $G_\Sigma$  on the plane, let  $T_r$  be an arbitrary spanning tree of  $G$  rooted at  $r$ .

A *fundamental vortex cycle*  $C$  of  $T$  is a union of vortex paths  $\mathcal{V}[r, v] \cup \mathcal{V}[r, u]$ , induced by two paths  $Q_1, Q_2$ , both starting at the root  $r$ , end at  $u, v \in G_\Sigma$ , such that either  $u, v$  are neighbors in  $G_\Sigma$ , or a curve could be added between  $u$  to  $v$  without intersecting any other curve in the drawing  $G_\Sigma$ . Denote this edge/imaginary curve by  $e_C$ . We call the union of the projections,  $\bar{\mathcal{V}}[r, v] \cup \bar{\mathcal{V}}[r, u]$  the *embedded part* of  $C$ . Adding  $e_C$  to the embedded part,  $\bar{\mathcal{V}}[r, v] \cup \bar{\mathcal{V}}[r, u] \cup e_C$  induces a close curve  $\bar{C}$  which is associated with  $C$ . Removing the fundamental vortex cycle  $C$  from  $G$  partitions  $G \setminus C$




Figure 1: In part (1) displayed a planar graph with a single vortex. The vortex embedded on a face colored in blue. The perimeter vertices are colored in red. The vertices belonging to the vortex but not to the planar graph displayed by smaller dots (while their edges in gray).

In part (2) a path  $P$  from  $v$  to  $u$  is displayed, in red.

In part (3) displayed a vortex path  $\mathcal{V}[v, u] = P_0 \cup X \cup Y \cup P_1$  which induced by  $P$ . Here  $P_0, P_1$  displayed in green, where  $P_0$  is the prefix of  $P$  from  $v$  to  $x_2$ , and  $P_2$  is the suffix of  $P$  from  $x_9$  to  $u$ .  $X$  (resp.  $Y$ ) which is encircled by a dashed blue line, is the bag  $X_2$  ( $X_9$ ) associated with the perimeter vertex  $x_2$  ( $x_9$ ).

In part (4) displayed in red the projection  $\bar{\mathcal{V}}$  of the vortex path  $\mathcal{V}$ .  $\bar{\mathcal{V}}$  consist of  $P_0, P_1$ , and an imaginary edge  $e$  (dashed) between  $x_2$  to  $x_9$ .

In part (5) displayed a fundamental vortex cycle  $C$ , where it's embedded is in green. All the vertices in  $\mathcal{W}(C)$  are encircled by a blue line.

In part (6) we display the close curve  $\bar{C}$  induced by  $C$ .  $e_C$ , as well as the other imaginary edges are displayed by a red dashed lines. The interior of  $\bar{C}$  is encircled by an orange dashed line, while the exterior is encircled by an purple dashed line.

into two parts, interior  $\mathcal{I}$  and exterior  $\mathcal{E}$ . The embedded part  $G_\Sigma$  is partitioned to interior  $\mathcal{I} \cap G_\Sigma$  and exterior  $\mathcal{E} \cap G_\Sigma$ , w.r.t. the closed curve  $\bar{C}$  associated with  $C$ . For every vertex  $z$  belonging to the vortex only ( $z \in W \setminus G_\Sigma$ ), which was not deleted, let  $X_i$  be an arbitrary bag containing  $z$ . Note that  $X_i$  is not one of the bags belonging to the fundamental vortex cycle. In particular, even though it might be deleted, the perimeter vertex  $x_i$  belongs either to the interior or the exterior of  $\bar{C}$ . If  $x_i$  is in the interior, respectively exterior, part of  $G \setminus C$ , then vertex  $z$  joins the interior  $\mathcal{I}$ , respectively exterior  $\mathcal{E}$ , part of  $G \setminus C$ . Note that cycle vertices  $C$  belong to neither to the interior or the exterior.

**Claim 1.**  $\mathcal{I}, C, \mathcal{E}$  form a partition of  $G$ . Further, there are no edges between  $\mathcal{I}$  and  $\mathcal{E}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $u \in \mathcal{E}$ , and  $v \in \mathcal{I}$ . Assume for contradiction that they are neighbors in  $G$ , denote  $e = (u, v)$ . We continue by case analysis,

- Suppose  $e \in G_\Sigma$ . In this case  $e$  must cross the closed curve  $\bar{C}$ , a contradiction.
- Suppose  $e \notin G_\Sigma$ . Then  $u, v$  must belong to the same vortex  $W$  (they might be perimeter vertices, however  $e$  must belong to  $W$ ). Denote by  $I_u = \{i \mid u \in X_i\}$  and  $I_v = \{i \mid v \in X_i\}$  the set of indices belonging to bags containing  $u$  and  $v$ , respectively. By the definition of path decomposition, there are integers  $a_u, b_u, a_v, b_v$  such that  $I_u = [a_u, b_u]$  and  $I_v = [a_v, b_v]$ . As  $u \in \mathcal{E}$  and  $v \in \mathcal{I}$ , there are indices  $i_u \in [a_u, b_u]$ ,  $i_v \in [a_v, b_v]$  such that  $x_{i_u}$  is outside  $\bar{C}$ , while  $x_{i_v}$  is inside  $\bar{C}$ . W.l.o.g.  $i_u \leq i_v$ . The curve  $\bar{C}$  must intersect the path  $(x_{i_u}, x_{i_u+1}, \dots, x_{i_v})$  at a perimeter vertex  $x_{i_c}$ , where the entire bag  $X_{i_c}$  belongs to the fundamental vortex cycle  $C$ . As  $u, v$  do not belong to  $C$ , it must hold that  $i_c \notin [a_u, b_u] \cup [a_v, b_v]$ , implying that  $a_u \leq i_u \leq b_u < i_c < a_v \leq i_v \leq b_v$ . Thus  $I_u \cap I_v = \emptyset$ , a contradiction to the assumption that  $u$  and  $v$  are neighbors in  $W$ . □

We will use the following lemma, which is a generalization of the celebrated Lipton-Tarjan planar separator theorem [LT79, Tho04b], to planar graphs with vortices. This is a slightly different <sup>12</sup> version of Lemma 6 in [AG06] (Lemma 10 in the full version).

**Lemma 10** ([AG06]). *Consider a graph  $G = G_\Sigma \cup W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_{h'}$ , where  $G_\Sigma$  can be drawn on the plane and  $W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_{h'}$  are vortices glued to a faces of  $G_\Sigma$ . Let  $T_r$  be a spanning tree of  $G$  rooted at  $r$ , and a weight function  $\omega : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  over the vertices. Set  $\mathcal{W} = \sum_{v \in V} \omega(v)$  to be the total vertex weight of  $G$ . Then there is a fundamental vortex cycle  $C$ , such that both the interior and exterior in  $G \setminus C$  has vertex weight at most  $\frac{2\mathcal{W}}{3}$ , i.e.,  $\sum_{v \in \mathcal{I}} \omega(v), \sum_{v \in \mathcal{E}} \omega(v) \leq \frac{2\mathcal{W}}{3}$ .*

## 5 Light Subset Spanners for Minor-Free Metrics

In our construction, we will use *single-source spanners* and *bipartite spanners* as black boxes. These concepts were introduced initially by Klein [Kle06] for planar graphs, and then generalized to general graphs by Le [Le20].

<sup>12</sup>Originally [AG06] used three vortex-paths to separate the graph into components of weight at most  $\mathcal{W}/2$  each. Here we use two vortex-paths, but each component has at weight at most  $\frac{2\mathcal{W}}{3}$  instead. Additionally, [AG06] is more general and holds for an arbitrary number of vortices.



**Lemma 11** (Single-source spanners [Le20]). *Let  $p$  be a vertex and  $P$  be a shortest path in an edge-weighted graph  $G$ . Let  $d(p, P) = R$ . There is a subgraph  $H$  of  $G$  of weight at most  $8R\epsilon^{-2}$  that can be computed in polynomial time such that:*

$$d_G(p, x) \leq d_{P \cup H}(p, x) \leq (1 + \epsilon)d_G(p, x) \quad \forall x \in P \quad (1)$$

**Lemma 12** (Bipartite spanners [Le20]). *Let  $W$  be a path and  $P$  be a shortest path in an edge-weighted graph  $G$ . Let  $R = \min_{v \in W} d_G(v, P)$  be the distance between  $W$  and  $P$ . Then, there is a subgraph  $H$  constructible in polynomial time such that*

$$d_{H \cup P}(p, q) \leq (1 + \epsilon)d_G(p, q) \quad \forall p \in W, q \in P$$

and  $w(H) = O(\epsilon^{-3})w(W) + O(\epsilon^{-2})R$ .

Lemma 11 is extracted from Lemma 4.2 in [Le20], and Lemma 12 is extracted from Corollary 4.3 in [Le20]. Given a shortest path  $P$ , we denote by  $\text{SSP}(t, P, G)$  a single-source spanner from  $t$  to  $P$  with stretch  $(1 + \epsilon)$  constructed using Lemma 11. Given a parameter  $L > 0$ , denote

$$\text{SSP}(t, P, G, L) = \begin{cases} \text{SSP}(t, P, G) & d_G(t, P) \leq L \\ \emptyset & d_G(t, P) > L \end{cases}$$

That is, in case  $d_G(t, P) \leq L$ ,  $\text{SSP}(t, P, G, L) = \text{SSP}(t, P, G)$ , while otherwise it is an empty-set. Similarly, given a path  $W$  and a shortest path  $P$ , let  $\text{BS}(P, W, G)$  be a bipartite spanner  $P$  to  $W$  with stretch  $(1 + \epsilon)$  constructed using Lemma 12.

## 5.1 Step (1): Planar graphs with a single vortex and bounded diameter, proof of Lemma 1

We begin by restating the main lemma of the section:

**Lemma 1** (Single Vortex with Bounded Diameter). *Consider a single-vortex graph  $G = G_\Sigma \cup W$  with diameter  $D = O_h(L)$ , where  $G_\Sigma$  is planar, and  $W$  is a vortex of width at most  $h$  glued to a face of  $G_\Sigma$ . For any terminal set  $K$ , there exists a subset  $L$ -local  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -spanner for  $G$  with respect to  $K$  of weight  $O_h(|K|L \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$ .*

This section contains a considerable amount of notations. Appendix A.1 contains a summary of all the definitions and notations used in the section. The reader is encouraged to refer to this index while reading. Recall that a *vortex* is a graph equipped with a path decomposition  $\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\}$  and a sequence of  $t$  designated vertices  $x_1, \dots, x_t$ , called the *perimeter* of the vortex, such that  $\forall i \in [t]$ ,  $x_i \in X_i$ . The *width* of the vortex is the width of its path decomposition. We say that a vortex  $W$  is *glued* to a face  $F$  of a surface embedded graph  $G_\Sigma$  if  $W \cap F$  is the perimeter of  $W$  whose vertices appear consecutively along the boundary of  $F$ .

**Graph preprocessing.** In order to simplify the spanner construction and its proof, we modify the graph as follows. We add an auxiliary vertex  $\tilde{x}$ , with weight- $D$  edges to all the vertices in the vortex  $W$ , where  $D$  is the diameter of the graph. In the drawing  $G_\Sigma$ , we add an arc between the perimeter vertices  $x_1, x_t$  and draw  $\tilde{x}$  somewhere along this arc.




Figure 2: *The modification step illustrated. On the left there is a planar graph with a single vortex, glued to a face colored in blue. The perimeter vertices are colored in red, while all the edges not in the embedded part are colored in gray. On the right is illustrated a modified graph, where we add a new vertex  $\tilde{x}$  with edges towards all other vortex vertices. The perimeter vertices, and the face upon which the vortex is glued, are updated accordingly.*

$\tilde{x}$  is added to the vortex, which is now considered to have perimeter  $\tilde{x}, x_1, \dots, x_t$ . Note that only the edges  $\{\tilde{x}, x_1\}, \{\tilde{x}, x_2\}$  are added to the embedded part. The bag associated with  $\tilde{x}$  is the singleton  $\{\tilde{x}\}$ . Every other perimeter vertex  $x_i$ , has an associated bag  $X_i \cup \{\tilde{x}\}$ . See Figure 1 for illustration of the modification. As a result, we obtain a planar graph with a single vortex of width at most  $h+1$ . Note that the diameter is still bounded by  $D$ . We abuse notation and call this graph  $G$ , its drawing (i.e. planar part)  $G_\Sigma$ , and its vortex  $W$ . In the following, we show how to construct a subset spanner of this graph. A subset spanner of this graph immediately yields a subset spanner of the original graph, we can simply discard  $\tilde{x}$  and the resulting subset spanner would indeed be a subset spanner of the original graph. To see this, observe that for any pair of terminals  $t, t'$  their shortest path in the subset spanner of  $G$  does not go through  $\tilde{x}$  since otherwise their distance would be greater than  $2D \geq 2 \cdot d_G(t, t')$ .

Next, we construct a tree that will be used later to create separators. Let  $T_\Sigma$  be a shortest path tree of  $G_\Sigma$  rooted in  $W$ . Note that  $T_\Sigma$  has  $t+1$  connected components. Furthermore, every path in  $T_\Sigma$  from a perimeter vertex  $x_j$  to a vertex  $v \in G_\Sigma$  will be fully included in  $G_\Sigma$ , and will have length at most  $D = O_h(L)$ . We extend  $T_W$  to  $T_{\tilde{x}}$ , a spanning tree of  $G$  by adding an edge from  $\tilde{x}$  to every vortex vertex, formally  $T_{\tilde{x}} = T_\Sigma \cup \{(\tilde{x}, v) \mid v \in W \setminus \{\tilde{x}\}\}$ . We think of  $T_{\tilde{x}}$  as a spanning tree rooted at  $\tilde{x}$ . This choice of root and tree, induces a restricted structure on vortex paths and fundamental vortex cycles. Specifically, consider a path  $Q = (\tilde{x} = v_0, \dots, v_q = v)$  from the root  $\tilde{x}$  to a vertex  $v \in G_\Sigma$  and let  $\mathcal{V}[\tilde{x}, v] = P_0 \cap X \cup Y \cup P_1$  be the induced vortex path. As there are no edges from  $\tilde{x}$  towards  $G_\Sigma \setminus W$ , necessarily  $v_1 = x_i$  is a perimeter vertex (there are no other neighbors of  $\tilde{x}$  on a path towards a vertex in  $G_\Sigma$ ). It holds that  $P_0 = (\tilde{x})$  is a singleton path,  $X = \tilde{X}$ ,  $Y = X_i$ , and  $P_1 = (x_i = v_1, v_2, \dots, v_q = v)$ . Furthermore, consider a fundamental vortex cycle  $C$  that consists of the two vortex paths  $\mathcal{V}[\tilde{x}, v], \mathcal{V}[\tilde{x}, u]$ . Then  $C$  actually contains  $\tilde{x}$ , two vortex bags  $X_i, X_j$ , and two paths from in  $T_\Sigma$  from  $x_i, x_j$  to vertices  $v, u$  in  $G_\Sigma$ , of length  $O_h(L)$ .

**Hierarchical tree construction** We recursively apply Lemma 10 to hierarchically divide the vertex set  $V$  into disjoint subsets. Specifically, we have a hierarchical tree  $\tau$  of sets with origin  $V$ .

Each node in  $\tau$  is associated with a subset  $\Upsilon$ , and a graph  $G_\Upsilon$ , which contains  $\Upsilon$  and in addition vertices out of  $\Upsilon$ . We abuse notation and denote the tree node by  $\Upsilon$ . In the same level of  $\tau$ , all the vertex sets will be disjoint, while the same vertex might belong to many different subgraphs. We maintain the following invariant:

**Invariant 1.** *The vertex set of the graph  $G_\Upsilon$  is a subset of  $G$ . It contains a single vortex  $W_\Upsilon$ , and a drawing in the plane which coincides with that of  $G_\Sigma$ . Each perimeter vertex  $x_i^\Upsilon$  of  $W_\Upsilon$  is also a perimeter vertex  $x_{i'}$  in  $G_\Sigma$ . Furthermore, the bag  $X_i^\Upsilon$  associated with  $x_i^\Upsilon$  equals to  $X_{i'} \cap G_\Upsilon$ , the bag associated with  $x_{i'}$ . Finally, there exists a set  $\mathcal{E}$  of perimeter edges that have been added by the algorithm such that the graph  $G_\Upsilon - \mathcal{E}$  is an induced subgraph of  $G$ .*

The root vertex  $\tilde{x}$  belongs to all the subgraphs  $G_\Upsilon$  of all the tree nodes  $\Upsilon \in \tau$ . Consider the subgraph  $T_\Upsilon = T_{\tilde{x}} \cap G_\Upsilon$  rooted at  $\tilde{x}$ . We also maintain the following invariant:

**Invariant 2.**  *$T_\Upsilon$  is a spanning tree of  $G_\Upsilon$ .*

It follows from [Invariant 1](#) and [Invariant 2](#), that in similar manner to  $T_{\tilde{x}}$ , every fundamental vortex cycle consists of  $\tilde{x}$ , two bags and two paths of length  $O_h(L)$  originated in perimeter vertices. Given a fundamental cycle  $C$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{P}(C)$  the set of at most  $2(h+1)+1$  paths from which  $C$  is composed. We abuse notation here and treat the vertices in the deleted bags as singleton paths.

In each hierarchical tree node  $\Upsilon$ , if it contains between 1 to  $2(h+1)$  terminals (that is  $1 \leq |\Upsilon \cap K| \leq 2(h+1)$ ), it is defined as a leaf node in  $\tau$ . Otherwise, we use [Lemma 10](#) to produce a fundamental vortex cycle  $C_\Upsilon$ , w.r.t.  $T_\Upsilon$  and a weight function to be specified later. Using the closed curve  $\bar{C}_\Upsilon$  induced by  $C_\Upsilon$ , the set  $\Upsilon$  is partitioned to interior  $\Upsilon^\mathcal{I}$  and exterior  $\Upsilon^\mathcal{E}$ .  $\Upsilon^\mathcal{I}$  and  $\Upsilon^\mathcal{E}$  are the children of  $\Upsilon$  in  $\tau$  (unless they contain no terminals, in which case they are discarded).

Note that the graph  $G_\Upsilon$  contains vertices out of  $\Upsilon$ . Thus the exterior and interior of  $C_\Upsilon$  in  $G_\Upsilon$  may contain vertices out of  $\Upsilon$ . Nonetheless,  $\Upsilon^\mathcal{E}, \Upsilon^\mathcal{I}$  consists of subsets of  $\Upsilon$ . Formally, they are defined as the intersection of  $\Upsilon$  with the exterior and interior of  $C_\Upsilon$  in  $G_\Upsilon$ , respectively. By the definition of  $T_\Upsilon$  and assuming [Invariant 2](#) indeed holds, we deduce:

**Observation 1.** *Every path  $Q \in \mathcal{P}(C_\Upsilon)$  is one of the following:*

1. *A path  $Q$  in  $T_{\tilde{x}}$  from a perimeter vertex  $x_i$  to a vertex  $v \in G_\Upsilon \setminus W_\Upsilon$ . In particular  $Q$  is a shortest path in  $G$  of length  $O_h(L)$ .*
2. *A singleton vortex vertex  $u \in W_\Upsilon$ .*

Denote by  $\mathcal{C}_\Upsilon$  the set of all the fundamental vortex cycles removed from the ancestors of  $\Upsilon$  in  $\tau$ . Denote by  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_\Upsilon$  the set of paths constituting the fundamental vortex cycles in  $\mathcal{C}_\Upsilon$ . Note that [Observation 1](#) also holds for all the ancestors of  $\Upsilon$  in  $\tau$ . Each path  $Q \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}_\Upsilon$  will have a *representative vertex*  $v_Q$ . Specifically, for a path  $Q$  of type (1), set  $v_Q = v$ , while for a singleton path  $Q = (u)$  (path of type (2)) set  $v_Q = u$ .

Finally, we define  $\mathcal{P}_\Upsilon \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{C}}_\Upsilon$ , the subset of shortest paths that are added to  $G_\Upsilon$ . Intuitively,  $Q \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}_\Upsilon$  joins  $\mathcal{P}_\Upsilon$  if it has a neighbor in  $\Upsilon$ . However, we would like to avoid double counting that might appear due to intersecting paths. Formally this is a recursive definition. For  $\Upsilon = V$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_V = \emptyset$  and  $G_V = G$ . Consider  $\mathcal{P}_\Upsilon$  and  $G_\Upsilon$ . We define next  $\mathcal{P}_{\Upsilon^\mathcal{E}}$  and  $G_{\Upsilon^\mathcal{E}}$  (which will also imply the definition of  $T_{\Upsilon^\mathcal{E}}$ ).  $\mathcal{P}_{\Upsilon^\mathcal{I}}$  and  $G_{\Upsilon^\mathcal{I}}$  are defined symmetrically.  $\mathcal{P}_{\Upsilon^\mathcal{E}}$  will contain all the paths in  $\mathcal{P}(C_\Upsilon)$  (the at most  $2(h+1)+1$  paths composing  $C_\Upsilon$ ). In addition, we add to  $\mathcal{P}_{\Upsilon^\mathcal{E}}$  every path  $Q \in \mathcal{P}_\Upsilon$  such that the representative vertex  $v_Q$  belongs to the exterior of  $C_\Upsilon$  in  $G_\Upsilon$ .

The graph  $G_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon}$  is defined as the graph induced by the vertex set  $\Upsilon^\varepsilon$  and all the vertices belonging to paths in  $\mathcal{P}_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon}$ . In addition, in order to maintain the vortex intact, we add additional edges between the perimeter vertices. Specifically, suppose that the perimeter vertices in  $G_\Upsilon$  are  $\tilde{x}, x_1, \dots, x_q$ , while only  $\tilde{x}, x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_l}$  belong to  $G_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon}$ . Then we add the edges  $\{x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}\}, \{x_{i_{s-1}}, x_{i_s}\}, \dots, \{x_{i_{s-1}}, x_{i_s}\}$  (unless this edges already exist), where the weight of  $\{x_{i_j}, x_{i_{j+1}}\}$  is  $d_G(x_{i_j}, x_{i_{j+1}})$ .

We maintain the following invariant:

**Invariant 3.**  $|\mathcal{P}_\Upsilon| \leq 12 \cdot (h+1)$ .

It is straightforward that [Invariant 1](#) is maintained.

**Claim 2.** *Invariant 2 is maintained.*


*Proof.* We will show that  $T_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon}$  is a tree, the argument for  $T_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon}$  is symmetric. It is clear that  $T_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon}$  is acyclic, thus it will be enough to show that it is connected. As  $\tilde{x}$  is part of the fundamental vortex cycle  $C_\Upsilon$ ,  $\tilde{x} \in G_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon}$ , it thus belongs to  $T_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon}$ . We show that every vertex contains a path towards  $\tilde{x}$ . Consider a vertex  $u \in G_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon}$ . First note that if  $u \in W_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon}$ , then  $(\tilde{x}, u) \in T_\Upsilon \cap G_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon} = T_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon}$ . Next, if  $u \in G_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon} \setminus \Upsilon^\varepsilon$ , then  $u$  is a part of some path  $Q_u \in \mathcal{P}_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon}$  from  $u$  to a perimeter vertex  $x_{i_u}$ . Here  $Q_u \cup (r, x_{i_u}) \subseteq T_\Upsilon \cap G_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon} = T_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon}$ , thus we are done.

For the last case ( $u \in \Upsilon^\varepsilon \setminus W_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon}$ ), let  $x_i, x_j$  be the two perimeter vertices such that the fundamental vortex cycle  $C_\Upsilon$  contains the paths  $Q_i, Q_j$  starting at  $x_i, x_j$ .<sup>13</sup> Let  $Q_u \subseteq T_\Upsilon$  be a path from a perimeter vertex towards  $u$  (exist by the induction hypothesis). Note that the paths  $\tilde{x} \circ Q_i, \tilde{x} \circ Q_j, \tilde{x} \circ Q_v$  are all paths in a tree  $T_\Upsilon$ . In particular, while they might have a mutual prefix, once they diverge, the paths will not intersect again. Denote  $\tilde{x} \circ Q_u = (\tilde{x} = v_0, v_1, \dots, v_q = u)$ . Let  $v_s \in \tilde{x} \circ Q_u$  be the vertex with maximal index intersecting  $Q_i \cup Q_j$ . All the vertices  $(\tilde{x} = v_0, v_1, \dots, v_s)$  belongs to the fundamental vortex cycle, implying that they belong to  $G_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon} \cap T_\Upsilon$ .

As  $u$  is in the exterior of  $\bar{C}_\Upsilon$  (the closed curve associated with  $C_\Upsilon$ ), the entire path  $(v_{s+1}, \dots, v_q = u)$  is in the exterior of  $\bar{C}_\Upsilon$ . First suppose that all the vertices  $v_{s+1}, \dots, v_q = u$  belong to  $\Upsilon$ . It follows that  $v_{s+1}, \dots, v_q = u$  belong to  $\Upsilon^\varepsilon$ , and therefore also to  $G_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon} \cap T_\Upsilon = T_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon}$ .

Finally, assume that not all of  $\{v_{s+1}, \dots, v_q = u\}$  belong to  $\Upsilon$ . Let  $\alpha$  be the maximal index such that  $v_\alpha \in G_\Upsilon \setminus \Upsilon$ . It follows that there is a path  $Q_\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_\Upsilon$  such that  $v_\alpha \in Q_\alpha$ . Note that the intersection of  $Q_\alpha$  with the fundamental cycle  $C_\Upsilon$  equals to  $(\tilde{x} = v_0, v_1, \dots, v_\alpha)$ . It follows that both  $v_\alpha$  and  $v_{Q_\alpha}$  (the representative vertex of  $Q_\alpha$ ) belong to the exterior of  $\bar{C}_\Upsilon$ , implying  $Q_\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon}$ .

We conclude that all the vertices along  $Q_u$  belong to  $G_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon}$ . The claim follows.  $\square$



Next we define the weight function  $\omega$  which we used to invoke [Lemma 10](#). There are two cases. First, if  $|\mathcal{P}_\Upsilon| \leq 10 \cdot (h+1)$ , then  $\omega(t) = 1$  iff  $t$  is a terminal in  $\Upsilon$ , and otherwise  $\omega(t) = 0$ . In the second case (when  $|\mathcal{P}_\Upsilon| > 10 \cdot h$ ), initially the weight of all the vertices is 0. For every  $Q \in \mathcal{P}_\Upsilon$ , the weight of  $v_Q$ , its representative vertex, will increase by 1.

**Claim 3.** *Invariant 3 is maintained. Furthermore, if  $|\mathcal{P}_\Upsilon| > 10 \cdot (h+1)$  then  $|\mathcal{P}_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon}|, |\mathcal{P}_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon}| \leq 10 \cdot (h+1)$ .*

<sup>13</sup>It is possible that  $x_i = x_j$ . In this case, we will abuse notation and treat  $Q_i, Q_j$  as different paths.

*Proof.* Given that  $|\mathcal{P}_\Upsilon| \leq 12 \cdot (h+1)$  we will prove that  $|\mathcal{P}_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon}| \leq 12 \cdot (h+1)$ . The argument for  $\mathcal{P}_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon}$  is symmetric. For  $\Upsilon = V$ ,  $|\mathcal{P}_V| = 0$  and  $|\mathcal{P}_{V^\varepsilon}| \leq 2(h+1) + 1$ . For every other  $\Upsilon$ , as  $\{\tilde{X}\} \in \mathcal{P}_\Upsilon$ , it is clear that

$$|\mathcal{P}_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon}| \leq |\mathcal{P}_\Upsilon| + |\mathcal{P}(C_\Upsilon) \setminus \{\tilde{x}\}| \leq |\mathcal{P}_\Upsilon| + 2(h+1) .$$

Thus in the first case, where  $|\mathcal{P}_\Upsilon| \leq 10 \cdot (h+1)$ , clearly  $|\mathcal{P}_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon}| \leq 12 \cdot (h+1)$ . Otherwise, the total weight of all the vertices is  $|\mathcal{P}_\Upsilon| \leq 12 \cdot (h+1)$ . By [Lemma 10](#), the exterior  $C_\Upsilon$  in  $G_\Upsilon$  contains at most  $\frac{2}{3} \cdot |\mathcal{P}_\Upsilon| \leq \frac{2}{3} \cdot 12 \cdot (h+1) = 8 \cdot (h+1)$  representative vertices. As  $|\mathcal{P}(C_\Upsilon)|$  contains at most  $2(h+1)$  new paths, we conclude  $|\mathcal{P}_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon}| \leq 10 \cdot (h+1) + 2(h+1) = 12 \cdot (h+1)$ , as required.  $\square$

Before we turn to the construction of the spanner, we observe the following crucial fact regarding the graph  $G_\Upsilon$ .

**Claim 4.** *Consider a set  $\Upsilon \in \tau$ . Let  $u$  be some vertex such that  $u$  has a neighbor in  $\Upsilon$ . Then  $v \in G_\Upsilon$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is by induction on the construction of  $\tau$ . Suppose the claim holds for  $\Upsilon$ , we will prove it for  $\Upsilon^\varepsilon$  (the proof for  $\Upsilon^\varepsilon$  is symmetric). Consider a pair of neighboring vertices  $v, u$  where  $v \in \Upsilon^\varepsilon$ . As  $\Upsilon^\varepsilon \subseteq \Upsilon$ ,  $v \in \Upsilon$ . Thus by the induction hypothesis  $u \in G_\Upsilon$ . If  $u \in \Upsilon^\varepsilon$  or  $u \in C_\Upsilon$ , then trivially  $u \in G_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon}$ , and we are done.

Otherwise, according to [Claim 1](#) there are no edges between the exterior and interior of  $C_\Upsilon$ . Thus  $u$  belongs to the exterior of  $C_\Upsilon$  in  $G_\Upsilon$ . Further, as  $u \notin \Upsilon^\varepsilon \cup C_\Upsilon$  it must be that  $u \notin \Upsilon$ . In particular,  $u$  belongs to a path  $Q_u \in \mathcal{P}_\Upsilon$ . We proceed by case analysis.

- First assume that  $u$  belong to the embedded part of  $G_\Upsilon$ . Here  $Q_u$  is a path from a perimeter vertex  $x_l$  towards a representative vertex  $v_{Q_u}$ . Let  $x_i, x_j$  be the two perimeter vertices such that the fundamental vortex cycle  $C_\Upsilon$  contains the paths  $Q_i, Q_j$  starting at  $x_i, x_j$ .<sup>13</sup> Note that the paths  $\tilde{x} \circ Q_i, \tilde{x} \circ Q_j, \tilde{x} \circ Q_u$  are all paths in a tree  $T_\Upsilon$ . In particular, while  $Q_i, Q_j, Q_u$  might have mutual prefix, once they diverge, the paths will not intersect again. It follows that the suffix of the path  $Q_u$  from  $u$  to the representative  $v_{Q_u}$  will not intersect  $Q_i, Q_j$  (as otherwise  $u \in C_\Upsilon$ ). As  $u$  is in the exterior of  $C_\Upsilon$ ,  $v_{Q_u}$  will also belong to the exterior. Thus  $u \in Q_u \subseteq G_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon}$ .
- Second, assume that  $u$  does not belong to the embedded part. It follows that  $Q_u = \{u\}$ . As  $v_{Q_u} = u$  belongs to the exterior of  $C_\Upsilon$ , it follows that  $u \in Q_u \subseteq G_{\Upsilon^\varepsilon}$ .

$\square$

**Construction of the spanner  $H$ , and bounding its weight** For each node  $\Upsilon \in \tau$  of the hierarchical tree, we will construct a spanner  $H_\Upsilon$ . The final spanner  $H = \cup_{\Upsilon \in \tau} H_\Upsilon$  is the union of all these spanners. We argue that  $\tau$  contains  $O(k)$  nodes, and that for every  $\Upsilon \in \tau$ ,  $w(H_\Upsilon) = O_h(L \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$ . It then follows that  $w(H) = O_h(kL \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$ .

First consider a leaf node  $\Upsilon \in \tau$ , let  $K_\Upsilon = \Upsilon \cap K$  be the set of terminals in  $\Upsilon$ . As  $\Upsilon$  is a leaf,  $|K_\Upsilon| = O(h)$ . For every shortest path  $Q \in \mathcal{P}_\Upsilon$  and terminal  $t \in K_\Upsilon$ , we add to  $H_\Upsilon$  a  $(1 + \epsilon)$  single source spanner from  $t$  to  $Q$  (w.r.t.  $G$ ) using [Lemma 11](#). Additionally, for every pair of terminals  $t, t' \in K_\Upsilon$ , we add the shortest path from  $t$  to  $t'$  in  $G$  to  $H_\Upsilon$ . Formally,

$$H_\Upsilon = \cup_{t \in K_\Upsilon} \cup_{Q \in \mathcal{P}_\Upsilon \cup K_\Upsilon} \text{SSP}(t, Q, G) ,$$

where we abuse notation and treat vertices as singleton paths. As each  $Q \in \mathcal{P}_\Upsilon$  is a shortest path in  $G$ , and the distance from every  $t \in K$  is bounded by the diameter  $D = O_h(L)$  of  $G$ , by [Lemma 11](#)  $w(\text{SSP}(t, Q, G)) = O_h(L \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$ . We conclude that  $w(H_\Upsilon) = \sum_{t \in K_\Upsilon} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}_\Upsilon \cup K_\Upsilon} w(\text{SSP}(t, Q, G)) = O_h(L \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$ , where we used [Invariant 3](#) to bound the number of addends by  $O(h^2)$ .

For the general case ( $\Upsilon$  is an internal node), recall that we have a fundamental vortex cycle  $C_\Upsilon$ , which consist of at most  $O(h)$  paths  $\mathcal{P}(C_\Upsilon)$ . First, we add all the paths in  $\mathcal{P}(C_\Upsilon)$  to  $H_\Upsilon$ . Next, for every pair of shortest paths  $Q \in \mathcal{P}_\Upsilon \cup \mathcal{P}(C_\Upsilon)$  and  $Q' \in \mathcal{P}(C_\Upsilon)$ , we add to  $H_\Upsilon$  a  $(1 + \epsilon)$  bipartite spanner between  $Q$  and  $Q'$  (w.r.t.  $G$ ) using [Lemma 12](#). Formally,

$$H_\Upsilon = \mathcal{P}(C_\Upsilon) \cup \left( \cup_{Q \in \mathcal{P}(C_\Upsilon)} \cup_{Q' \in \mathcal{P}_\Upsilon \cup \mathcal{P}(C_\Upsilon)} \text{BS}(Q, Q', G) \right).$$

As each path in the union is a shortest path in  $G$ , so a graph with diameter  $O_h(L)$ , we have by [Lemma 12](#) that  $\forall Q, Q', w(\text{BS}(Q, Q', G)) = O_h(L \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$ . We conclude that  $w(H_\Upsilon) \leq \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}(C_\Upsilon)} w(Q) + \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}(C_\Upsilon)} \sum_{Q' \in \mathcal{P}_\Upsilon \cup \mathcal{P}(C_\Upsilon)} w(\text{BS}(Q, Q', G)) = O_{h \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon})}(L)$ , where we used [Invariant 3](#) to bound the number of addends by  $O(h^2)$ .

Next, we bound the number of nodes in  $\tau$ . We say that a node  $\Upsilon' \in \tau$  is a grandchild of  $\Upsilon \in \tau$  if there is a node  $\Upsilon''$  which is the child of  $\Upsilon$ , and the parent of  $\Upsilon'$ . Consider some node  $\Upsilon$ . It follows from [Claim 3](#) that either  $|\mathcal{P}_\Upsilon| \leq 10 \cdot (h + 1)$  or for both its children  $|\mathcal{P}_{\Upsilon^L}|, |\mathcal{P}_{\Upsilon^R}| \leq 10 \cdot (h + 1)$ . In particular, either in  $\Upsilon$ , or in both its children the number of terminals drops by a  $\frac{2}{3}$  factor. We conclude that if  $\Upsilon'$  is a grandchild of  $\Upsilon$  then  $|K_{\Upsilon'}| \leq \frac{2}{3}|K_\Upsilon|$ .

For the sake of analysis, we will divide  $\tau$  into two trees,  $\tau_O$  and  $\tau_E$ .  $\tau_E$  (resp.  $\tau_O$ ) contains all the nodes of even (resp. odd) depth. There is an edge between  $\Upsilon$  to  $\Upsilon'$  if  $\Upsilon'$  is a grandchild of  $\Upsilon$ . Consider  $\tau_E$ . Note that the number of leafs is bounded by  $k$  (as they are all disjoint and contain at least one terminal). Further, if an internal node  $\Upsilon$  (other than the root  $V$ ) has degree 2 in  $\tau_O$ , it follows that  $\Upsilon$  has a single grandchild in  $\tau$ . There is some terminal in  $\Upsilon \setminus \Upsilon'$  (as  $|K_{\Upsilon'}| \leq \frac{2}{3}|K_\Upsilon|$ ). As there are  $k$  terminals, we conclude that the number of degree 2 nodes is bounded by  $k$ . It follows that  $\tau_E$  has  $O(k)$  nodes. A similar argument will imply that  $\tau_O$  has  $O(k)$  nodes. It follows that  $\tau$  has  $O(k)$  nodes. We conclude

$$w(H) \leq \sum_{\Upsilon \in \tau} w(H_\Upsilon) = O_h(kL \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon})).$$

**Bounding the stretch** The following claim will be useful for bounding the stretch between terminals:

**Claim 5.** *Consider an internal node  $\Upsilon \in \tau$ , and a terminal vertex  $t \in \Upsilon$ . For every fundamental vortex cycle vertex  $u \in C_\Upsilon$ , it holds that  $d_H(t, u) \leq (1 + \epsilon)d_G(t, u)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $Q^u \in \mathcal{P}(C_\Upsilon)$  be the shortest path belonging to the fundamental vortex cycle that contains  $u$ . Let  $Q_{t,u} = \{t = v_0, v_1, \dots, v_s = u\}$  be the shortest path from  $t$  to  $u$  in  $G$ . The proof is by induction on  $s$  (the number of hops in the path). We proceed by case analysis.

- Suppose that not all the vertices in  $Q_{t,u} \setminus \{u\}$  belong to  $\Upsilon$ . Let  $v_i$  be the vertex with minimal index not in  $\Upsilon$ . As  $v_{i-1} \in \Upsilon$ , by [Claim 4](#)  $v_i \in G_\Upsilon$ . In particular, there is some path  $Q^{v_i} \in \mathcal{P}_\Upsilon$  such that  $v_i \in Q^{v_i}$ , where  $Q^{v_i}$  is a path belonging to a fundamental vortex cycle removed in an ancestor of  $\Upsilon$  in  $\tau$ . By the induction hypothesis,  $d_H(t, v_i) \leq (1 + \epsilon)d_G(t, v_i)$ . During the construction of  $H_\Upsilon$ , we added  $\text{BS}(Q^u, Q^{v_i}, G)$ , a bipartite spanner between the paths  $Q^u, Q^{v_i}$ , to  $H_\Upsilon$ . Thus  $d_H(t, u) \leq d_H(t, v_i) + d_H(v_i, u) \leq (1 + \epsilon)(d_G(t, v_i) + d_G(v_i, u)) = (1 + \epsilon)d_G(t, u)$ .



- Otherwise (all vertices in  $Q_{t,u} \setminus \{u\}$  belong to  $\Upsilon$ ), suppose that there is some vertex  $v_i \neq u$  that belongs to  $C_\Upsilon$ . By the induction hypothesis,  $d_H(t, v_i) \leq (1 + \epsilon)d_G(t, v_i)$ . By the construction of  $H_\Upsilon$ ,  $d_{H_\Upsilon}(v_i, u) \leq (1 + \epsilon)d_G(v_i, u)$ . It follows that  $d_H(t, u) \leq (1 + \epsilon)d_G(t, u)$ .
- Otherwise (all vertices in  $Q_{t,u} \setminus \{u\}$  belong to  $\Upsilon$ , and  $u$  is the only vertex in  $Q_{t,u}$  belonging to  $C_\Upsilon$ ), if there exists a future hierarchical step such that in a node  $\Upsilon'$ , some vertices in  $Q_{t,u} \setminus \{u\}$  belongs to the fundamental vortex cycle  $C_{\Upsilon'}$ . Then, let  $\Upsilon'$  be the first such set (that is the closest to  $\Upsilon$  w.r.t.  $\tau$ ). Let  $v_i \in C_{\Upsilon'}$ . By the minimality of  $\Upsilon$ , all the vertices  $\{t = v_0, \dots, v_i, \dots, v_{s-1}\}$  belong to  $\Upsilon'$ . By the induction hypothesis,  $d_H(t, v_i) \leq (1 + \epsilon)d_G(t, v_i)$ . Further, as  $v_{s-1} \in \Upsilon'$ , by [Claim 4](#)  $v_s \in G_{\Upsilon'}$ . In particular the spanner  $H_{\Upsilon'}$  has stretch  $(1 + \epsilon)$  between  $v_i$  and  $u$  (as we added a bipartite spanner between two paths containing  $v_i, u$ ). It follows that  $d_H(t, u) \leq (1 + \epsilon)d_G(t, u)$ .
- Otherwise, (all vertices in  $Q_{t,u} \setminus \{u\}$  belong to  $\Upsilon$ , and  $u$  is the only vertex in  $Q_{t,u}$  belonging to a fundamental cycle in  $\Upsilon$ , and in all future hierarchical steps). Then, all vertices in  $Q_{t,u} \setminus \{u\}$  belong to some leaf node  $\Upsilon' \in \tau$ . By [Claim 4](#)  $v_s \in G_{\Upsilon'}$ . In particular  $u$  belongs to some path in  $\mathcal{P}_{\Upsilon'}$ . During the construction, we added to  $H_{\Upsilon'}$  a single source spanner from  $t$  to this path. It follows that  $d_H(t, u) \leq (1 + \epsilon)d_G(t, u)$ .

□

Consider a pair of terminals  $t, t'$  with a shortest path  $Q_{t,t'}$  in  $G$ . If  $t$  and  $t'$  end up together in a leaf node  $\Upsilon \in \tau$ , then we added a shortest path between them to  $H_\Upsilon$ . Thus  $d_H(t, t') = d_G(t, t')$ . Otherwise, let  $v \in Q_{t,t'}$  be the first vertex which was added to a fundamental vortex cycle during the construction of  $\tau$  (first w.r.t. the order defined by  $\tau$ ). By [Claim 5](#) it holds that

$$d_H(t, t') \leq d_H(t, v_i) + d_H(v_i, t') \leq (1 + \epsilon)(d_G(t, v_i) + d_G(v_i, t')) = (1 + \epsilon)d_G(t, t'),$$

hence the bound on the stretch.

## 5.2 Step (2.0): Unbounded diameter, proof of [Lemma 2](#)

We start by restating the lemma we will prove in this subsection.

**Lemma 2** (Single Vortex). *Consider a graph  $G = G_\Sigma \cup W$  where  $G_\Sigma$  is planar, and  $W$  is a vortex of width at most  $h$  glued to a face of  $G_\Sigma$ . For any terminal set  $K$ , there exists a subset  $L$ -local  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -spanner for  $G$  with respect to  $K$  of weight  $O_h(|K|L \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$ .*

The *strong diameter* <sup>14</sup> of a cluster  $A \subseteq V$  equals to the maximal distance between a pair of vertices  $u, v \in A$  in the induced graph  $G[A]$ . Formally  $\max_{\{u, v \in A\}} d_{G[A]}(u, v)$ . The main tool we will use here is *sparse covers*.

**Definition 5** (Sparse Cover). *Given a weighted graph  $G = (V, E, w)$ , a collection of clusters  $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, \dots, C_t\}$  is called a  $(\rho, s, \Delta)$ -strong sparse cover if the following conditions hold.*

1. *Bounded diameter: The strong diameter of every  $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$  is bounded by  $\rho \cdot \Delta$ .*

<sup>14</sup>On the other hand, the *weak diameter* of a cluster  $A \subseteq V$  equals to the maximal distance between a pair of vertices  $u, v \in A$  in the original graph. Formally  $\max_{\{u, v \in A\}} d_G(u, v)$ . See [[Fil19a](#), [Fil20](#)] for further details on sparse covers and related notions.

2. *Padding:* For each  $v \in V$ , there exists a cluster  $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $B_G(v, \Delta) \subseteq C_i$ .

3. *Overlap:* For each  $v \in V$ , there are at most  $s$  clusters in  $\mathcal{C}$  containing  $v$ .

We say that a graph  $G$  admits a  $(\rho, s)$ -strong sparse cover scheme, if for every parameter  $\Delta > 0$  it admits a  $(\rho, s, \Delta)$ -strong sparse cover. A graph family  $\mathcal{G}$  admits a  $(\rho, s)$ -strong sparse cover scheme, if every  $G \in \mathcal{G}$  admits a  $(\rho, s)$ -strong sparse cover scheme.

Abraham et al. [AGMW10] constructed strong sparse covers.

**Theorem 11** ([AGMW10]). *Every weighted graph excluding  $K_{r,r}$  as a minor admits an  $(O(r^2), 2^{O(r)} \cdot r!)$ -strong sparse cover scheme constructible in polynomial time.*

Consider a graph  $G$  as in the lemma with terminal set  $K$  and parameters  $\epsilon, L$ . Note that  $G$  is  $K_{h+2, h+2}$  free. Using Theorem 11 let  $\{C_1, \dots, C_t\}$  be an  $(O(h^2), 2^{O(h)} \cdot h!, L)$  sparse cover for  $G$ . Note that each cluster  $C_i$  has strong diameter  $O(h^2) \cdot L = O_h(L)$ . For every  $i$ , using Lemma 1, let  $H_i$  be a  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -spanner for  $G[C_i]$ , w.r.t. terminal set  $K_i = C_i \cap K$  and parameters  $L, \epsilon$ . Set  $H = \bigcup H_i$ . Then  $H$  has weight

$$w(H) \leq \sum_i w(H_i) \leq \sum_i O_h(|K_i| \cdot L) = O_h(k \cdot L \cdot 2^{O(h)} \cdot h!) = O_h(k \cdot L),$$

where the first equality follows as every terminal is counted at most  $2^{O(h)} \cdot h!$  times in the sum.

We argue that  $H$  preserves all terminal distances up to  $L$ . Consider a pair of terminals  $t, t'$  such that  $d_G(t, t') \leq L$ . There is a cluster  $C_i$  such that the ball of radius  $L$  around  $t$  contained in  $C_i$ . In particular the entire shortest path from  $t$  to  $t'$  is contained in  $C_i$ . We conclude

$$d_H(t, t') \leq d_{H_i}(t, t') \leq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot d_{G[C_i]}(t, t') = (1 + \epsilon) \cdot d_G(t, t').$$

### 5.3 Step (2.1): Reducing vortices, proof of Lemma 3

We start by restating Lemma 3:

**Lemma 3** (Multiple Vortices). *Consider a graph  $G = G_\Sigma \cup W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_{h'}$ , where  $G_\Sigma$  is planar,  $h' \leq h$ , and each  $W_i$  is a vortex of width at most  $h$  glued to a face of  $G_\Sigma$ . For any terminal set  $K$ , there exists a subset  $L$ -local  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -spanner for  $G$  with respect to  $K$  of weight  $O_h(|K|L \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$ .*

This subsection is essentially devoted to proving the following lemma:

**Lemma 13.** *Consider a graph  $G = G_\Sigma \cup W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_\ell$ , where  $G_\Sigma$  is drawn on plane, and each  $W_i$  is a vortex of width at most  $h$  glued to a face of  $G_\Sigma$ . Then given a terminal set  $K$  of size  $k$ , and parameter  $L > 0$ , there is an induced subgraph  $G'$  of  $G$  and a spanning subgraph  $H_{vo}$  of  $G$  such that:*

- $G'$  can be drawn on the plane with a single vortex of width at most  $h$ .
- $w(H_{vo}) \leq O(k\ell L \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$ .
- For every pair of terminals  $t, t' \in K$  at distance at most  $L$ , either  $d_{G'}(t, t') = d_G(t, t')$  or  $d_{H_{vo}}(t, t') \leq (1 + \epsilon)d_G(t, t')$ .

Given Lemma 13, Lemma 3 easily follows.




Figure 3: The graph  $G$ , who has three vortices  $W, W', W_1$ , is illustrated on the left. The (purple) path  $P$  is a proper vortex path between  $W, W'$ . On the right, we illustrate the vortex merge that creates a new graph  $G'$  by deleting the path  $P$  and adding two new edges.

*Proof of Lemma 3.* We begin by applying Lemma 13 on the graph  $G$ . As a result we receive the graphs  $G', H_{vo}$ , where  $G'$  has a single vortex of width at most  $h$ ,  $H_{vo}$  has weight  $O_h(k\ell L) \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$ , and for every pair of terminals at distance up to  $L$ , either  $d_{G'}(t, t') = d_G(t, t')$  or  $d_{H_{vo}}(t, t') \leq (1 + \epsilon)d_G(t, t')$ .

Next, we apply Lemma 2 on  $G'$  and receive a  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -subset spanner  $H'$  of weight  $O_\epsilon(kL \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$  that preserves all terminal distances up to  $L$  (w.r.t.  $G'$ ). Set  $H = H' \cup H_{vo}$ . Note that  $H$  has weight  $O_h(kL \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$ . Let  $u, v \in K$  be a pair of terminals at distance at most  $L$ . Then either  $d_{H'}(t, t') \leq (1 + \epsilon)d_{G'}(t, t') = (1 + \epsilon)d_G(t, t')$ , or  $d_{H_{vo}}(t, t') \leq (1 + \epsilon)d_G(t, t')$ , implying the lemma.  $\square$

Before turning to the proof of Lemma 13, we introduce the *vortex merge* procedure. Given two vortices  $W, W'$ , a *proper vortex path*  $P$  is a path in  $G$  between a vertex  $v \in W$  to a vertex  $u \in W'$  such that all but the first and last vertices of  $P$  belong to the planar part  $G_\Sigma$ , and  $P$  does not contain any vortex vertices. Given a proper vertex path  $P = \{v = v_0, \dots, v_s = u\}$  from  $v \in W$  to  $u \in W'$ , the following operation is called *vortex merge* w.r.t.  $P$ : Let  $X_1, \dots, X_t$  (respectively  $Y_1, \dots, Y_{t'}$ ) be a path decomposition of  $W$  (respectively  $W'$ ) with perimeter  $x_1, \dots, x_t$  ( $y_1, \dots, y_{t'}$ ) such that  $v = x_i$  ( $u = y_j$ ). Let  $F_W$  and  $F_{W'}$  be respectively the face containing the vertices of  $W$  and  $W'$  in the planar part. The operation consists in *cutting open* the surface along the path  $P$  (see e.g.: [Kle08] for a formal definition), resulting in two copies of the vertices of the path  $P_1, P_2$ . Then for each copy  $P_i$ , delete all the edges that have exactly one endpoint that belongs to  $P_i \cup \{x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, y_{i-1}, y_{i+1}\}$ , and finally contract all the edges in  $P_i$ . This yields edges between either  $\{x_{i-1}, y_{j-1}\}$ , and  $\{x_{i+1}, y_{j+1}\}$ , or  $\{x_{i-1}, y_{j+1}\}$ ,  $\{x_{i+1}, y_{j-1}\}$  – in the following we assume that the former happened. Since contraction and deletion preserve the genus, the genus of the embedded part has not increased.

See Figure 3 for illustration. The process produces a new vortex, glued to the face  $x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, y_{j-1}, \dots, y_1, y_{t'}, \dots, y_{j+1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_t$ , which will be the perimeter vertices. The bags in the path decomposition will be  $X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, Y_{j-1}, \dots, Y_1, Y_{t'}, \dots, Y_{j+1}, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_t$ , respectively (the newly added edges will be part of the embedded graph).

**Observation 2.** Consider a graph  $G = G_\Sigma \cup W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_\ell$ , where  $G_\Sigma$  is drawn on the plane and each  $W_i$  is a vortex of width at most  $h$  glued to a face of  $G_\Sigma$ . Let  $P$  be a proper vortex path between  $W_\ell$  to  $W_{\ell-1}$ , and consider the graph  $G'$  created by a vortex merge w.r.t.  $P$ . Then  $G'$  has planar drawing with vortices  $W_1, \dots, W_{\ell-2}, \tilde{W}_{\ell-1}$  all of width at most  $h$ .

We are now ready to prove the main lemma of the subsection:

---

**Algorithm 1: Contracting Vortices**

---

**input** : Graph  $G = (V, E, w) = G_\Sigma \cup W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_\ell$ ,  $k$  terminals  $K \subseteq V$   
**output**: Induced graph  $G'$  and subgraph  $H_{vo}$  of  $G$

- 1 Let  $G_1 \leftarrow G$ ,  $H_{vo} \leftarrow \emptyset$ ,  $\text{IM} \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 2 **for**  $j = 1$  **to**  $\ell - 1$  **do**
- 3     Let  $P_j$  be the shortest proper vortex path in  $G_j$  between  $x_i \in W$  and  $y_j \in W'$ , let  $\mathcal{P}_j$  be the set of paths consisting of  $P_j$  and all the singleton paths consisting of vertices in  $X_i \cup Y_j$  <sup>15</sup>
- 4      $H_{vo} \leftarrow H_{vo} \cup (\cup_{t \in K \cap G_j} \cup_{P \in \mathcal{P}_j} \text{SSP}(t, P, G_j, L))$
- 5     Create a new graph  $G_{j+1}$  by performing a vortex merge w.r.t.  $P_j$  in  $G_j$
- 6     Add to  $\text{IM}$  the (at most 2) new edges  $G_{j+1} \setminus G_j$
- 7 Remove from  $G_\ell$  and from  $H_{vo}$  all the edges in  $\text{IM}$
- 8 **return**  $G_\ell$  and  $H_{vo}$

---

*Proof of Lemma 13.* The algorithm for constructing  $G'$  and  $H_{vo}$  is described in Algorithm 1. Consider the graphs  $G_\ell, H_{vo}$  just before the removal of the set  $\text{IM}$  in Line 7. By induction and observation 2, we have that  $G_\ell$  has a single vortex of width at most  $h$ . Further,  $G' = G_\ell \setminus \text{IM}$  can also be drawn on the plane with a single vortex of the same width.

Next we bound the weight of  $H_{vo}$ . In each of the  $\ell - 1 \leq h$  rounds of Algorithm 1 we added at most  $k \cdot (2h + 1)$  single source spanners, each of weight  $O(L \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$ . It follows that  $w(H_{vo}) = O(k\ell L \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$ .

Finally we bound the stretch. Consider a pair of terminals  $t, t' \in K$  at distance at most  $d_G(t, t') \leq L$ . Let  $P_{t,t'}$  be the shortest path between  $t$  to  $t'$  in  $G$ . If no vertex of  $P_{t,t'}$  was deleted during the execution of Algorithm 1, then  $d_{G'}(t, t') = d_G(t, t')$  and we are done. Otherwise, let  $s$  be the minimal index where some vertex  $v \in P_{t,t'}$  belongs to a path  $P_v \in \mathcal{P}_s$ , and thus was deleted. By minimality, it holds that  $d_{G_s}(t, P_v) \leq d_{G_v}(t, v) = d_G(t, v) \leq L$ . Similarly  $d_{G_s}(t', P_v) \leq L$ . Using the properties of  $\text{SSP}(t, P_v, G_s, L) \cup \text{SSP}(t', P_v, G_s, L)$ , we conclude

$$d_{H_{vo}}(t, t') \leq d_{\text{SSP}(t, P_v, G_s, L)}(t, v) + d_{\text{SSP}(t', P_v, G_s, L)}(t', v) \leq (1 + \epsilon) (d_{G_s}(t, v) + d_{G_s}(t', v)) = (1 + \epsilon) d_{G_s}(t, t').$$

Note that no edge of  $\text{IM}$  incident on edges of  $H_{vo}$ , as all these edges have weight greater  $\Omega_\epsilon(L)$ . Thus the inequality holds also in  $H_{vo} \setminus \text{IM}$ . The lemma now follows.  $\square$

## 5.4 Step (2.2): Cutting out genus, proof of Lemma 4

We begin by restating Lemma 4.

**Lemma 4** (Multiple Vortices and Genus). *Consider a graph  $G = G_\Sigma \cup W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_{h'}$  where  $G_\Sigma$  is (cellularly) embedded on a surface  $\Sigma$  of genus at most  $g = O(h)$ ,  $h' \leq h$ , and each  $W_i$  is a vortex of width at most  $h$  glued to a face of  $G_\Sigma$ . For any terminal set  $K$ , there exists a subset  $L$ -local  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -spanner for  $G$  with respect to  $K$  of weight  $O_h(|K|L \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$ .*

---

<sup>15</sup> $P_j$  can be picked as the minimal path having its endpoints in two different vortices. By minimality,  $P_j$  necessarily will be a proper vortex path.

Given a graph with an embedded part and some width  $h$  glued vortices, we denote by  $g(G)$  the genus of the surface embedded part, and by  $v(G)$  the number of vortices. Most of this section is essentially devoted to proving the following lemma:

**Lemma 14.** *Consider a graph  $G = G_\Sigma \cup W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_{v(G)}$ , where  $G_\Sigma$  is (cellularly) embedded on a surface  $\Sigma$  of genus  $g(G)$ , and each  $W_i$  is a vortex of width at most  $h$  glued to a face of  $G_\Sigma$ . Then given a terminal set  $K$  of size  $k$  and parameter  $L > 0$ , there is an induced subgraph  $G'$  of  $G$  and a spanning subgraph  $H_g$  of  $G$  such that:*

- $G'$  has genus  $g(G') = 0$  and at most  $v(G') \leq v(G) + g(G)$  vortices, all of width at most  $h$ .
- $w(H_g) \leq O(kL \cdot g(G)(g(G) + v(G))) \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$ .
- For every pair of terminals  $t, t' \in K$  at distance at most  $L$  either  $d_{G'}(t, t') = d_G(t, t')$  or  $d_{H_g}(t, t') \leq (1 + \epsilon)d_G(t, t')$ .

Given Lemma 14, Lemma 4 easily follows.

*Proof of Lemma 4.* Apply Lemma 14 on  $G$ , and let  $G', H_g$  be the output. Construct a  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -subset spanner  $H'$  for  $G'$  using Lemma 3. Set  $H = H' \cup H_g$ . Then  $H$  has weight  $O_h(kL \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$ . To bound the stretch, let  $t, t' \in K$  be a pair of terminals at distance at most  $L$ . Then either  $d_{H'}(t, t') \leq (1 + \epsilon)d_{G'}(t, t') = (1 + \epsilon)d_G(t, t')$ , or  $d_{H_g}(t, t') \leq (1 + \epsilon)d_G(t, t')$ , implying the lemma.  $\square$

Recall the definition of vortex-path (Definition 4). Essentially one can think of a vortex-path as a union of  $V(G) + 1 + 2 \cdot v(G) \cdot h = O(v(G) \cdot h)$  paths (see Section 5.1 for details). A vortex-path is called a *shortest-vortex-path* if all the paths it contains are shortest paths in  $G$ . We will use the following *Cutting Lemma* of Abraham and Gavaille [AG06, Lemma 6, full version].

**Lemma 15** (Cutting Lemma [AG06]). *Given a  $h$ -nearly embeddable graph  $G$ , there are (efficiently computable) two shortest-vortex-paths  $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2$  of  $G$  such that the graph  $G' = G \setminus (\mathcal{V}_1 \cup \mathcal{V}_2)$  is  $h$ -nearly embeddable and has  $v(G') \leq v(G) + 1$  and  $g(G') \leq g(G) - 1$ .*

Intuitively, Lemma 15 says that we can reduce the genus of  $G$  by removing two vortex-paths at the expense of increasing the number of vortices by 1, without affecting their width. Given the characterization above, an immediate corollary is that given a graph  $G$  that embeds on a surface of genus  $g(G)$ , with  $v(G)$  vortices of genus  $g$ , we can remove a set  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $O(v(G) \cdot h)$  shortest paths to obtain a graph  $G' = G \setminus \mathcal{P}$ , where  $v(G') \leq v(G) + 1$  and  $g(G') = g(G) - 1$ . We proceed now to proving Lemma 14.

*Proof of Lemma 14.* In Algorithm 2 below we repeatedly apply Lemma 15, and remove paths until the remaining graph has genus 0.

By induction it holds that  $g(G_j) \leq g(G) - j$  and  $v(G_j) \leq v(G) + j$ . Let  $J$  be final value of  $j$ . Then  $J \leq g(G)$ . Thus  $g(G_J) = 0$  and  $v(G_J) \leq v(G) + g(G)$ . Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} w(H_g) &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \sum_{t \in K} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_j} w(\text{SSP}(t, P, G_j, L)) \leq \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} O(kv(G_j)h \cdot L) \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}) \\ &= O(kL \cdot g(G)(g(G) + v(G))) \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we prove the stretch guarantee. Consider a pair of terminals  $t, t' \in K$  such that  $d_G(t, t') \leq L$ . Let  $P_{t,t'}$  be the shortest path from  $t$  to  $t'$  in  $G$ . If  $P_{t,t'} \subseteq G'$ , then  $d_{G'}(t, t') = d_G(t, t')$  and the we are

---

**Algorithm 2: Genus Reduction**

---

**input** : Embedded graph  $G = (V, E, w)$  with genus  $g(G)$ ,  $v(G)$  vortices, and terminal set  $K$   
**output**: Induced graph  $G'$  and subgraph  $H_g$  of  $G$

```
1 Let  $G_0 \leftarrow G$ ,  $H_g \leftarrow \emptyset$ ,  $j \leftarrow 0$ 
2 while  $g(G_j) > 0$  do
3   Let  $\mathcal{P}_j$  be the set of  $O(h \cdot v(G_j))$  shortest paths as guaranteed by Lemma 15 w.r.t.  $G_j$ 
4   Add to  $H_g$  the set  $\cup_{t \in K} \cup_{P \in \mathcal{P}_j} \text{SSP}(t, P, G_j, L)$ 
5    $G_{j+1} \leftarrow G_j \setminus \mathcal{P}_j$ 
6    $j \leftarrow j + 1$ 
7 return  $G'$  and  $H_g$ 
```

---

done. Otherwise, let  $j$  be the minimal index such that  $P_{t,t'} \cap \mathcal{P}_j \neq \emptyset$ , and let  $v \in P_{t,t'}$  be some vertex that belongs to a path  $Q \in \mathcal{P}_j$ . By minimality, it holds that  $d_{G_j}(t, Q) \leq d_{G_j}(t, v) = d_G(t, v) \leq L$ . Similarly  $d_{G_j}(t', Q) \leq d_{G_j}(t', v) = d_G(t', v) \leq L$ . We conclude

$$d_{H_g}(t, t') \leq d_{\text{SSP}(t, P_s, G_j, L)}(t, v) + d_{\text{SSP}(t', P_s, G_j, L)}(t', v) \leq (1+\epsilon)(d_{G_j}(t, v) + d_{G_j}(t', v)) = (1+\epsilon)d_G(t, t').$$

□

### 5.5 Step (2.3): Removing apices, proof of Lemma 5

**Lemma 5** (Nearly  $h$ -Embeddable). *Consider a nearly  $h$ -embeddable graph  $G$  with a set  $K$  of  $k$  terminals. There exists an  $L$ -local  $(1+\epsilon)$ -spanner for  $K$  of weight  $O_h(kL \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$ .*

*Proof.* Consider an  $h$ -nearly embeddable graph  $G$ . Let  $A$  be the set of apices. By definition  $|A| \leq h$ . Set  $H_A \leftarrow \emptyset$ . For any apex  $a \in A$  and terminal  $t \in K$  such that  $d_G(a, t) \leq L$ , we add the shortest  $a - t$  path in  $G$  to  $H_A$ . Then  $w(H_A) \leq k \cdot h \cdot L$ . Let  $G' = G[V \setminus A]$  be the graph  $G$  after we removed all the apices. Create a subset spanner  $H'$  for  $G'$  using Lemma 4. Set  $H = H' \cup H_A$  to be a subset spanner for  $G$ . Then  $w(H) \leq O_h(kL) \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}) + khl = O_{h,\epsilon}(kL) \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$ . We argue that  $H$  preserves all terminal distances up to  $L$ . Consider a pair of terminals  $t, t' \in K$  such that  $d_G(t, t') \leq L$ . If the shortest path between  $t$  to  $t'$  contains an apex  $a$ , then  $d_H(t, t') \leq d_{H_A}(t, a) + d_{H_A}(a, t') = d_G(t, a) + d_G(a, t') = d_G(t, t')$ . Otherwise,  $d_H(t, t') \leq d_{H'}(t, t') \leq (1+\epsilon)d_{G'}(t, t') = (1+\epsilon)d_G(t, t')$ . □

### 5.6 Step (2.4): Eliminating clique-sums, proof of Proposition 1

In this subsection we generalize to minor free graphs.

**Proposition 1.** *For any edge-weighted  $K_r$ -minor-free graph  $G = (V, E, w)$ , any subset  $K \subseteq V$  of terminals, and any parameter  $L > 0$ , there is a subset  $L$ -local  $(1+\epsilon)$ -spanner for  $G$  with respect to  $K$  of weight  $O_r(|K| \cdot L \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$ .*

The main technical step here is in proving the following lemma, which will allow us to assume that the clique sum decomposition has only  $O(k)$  nodes.

**Lemma 16.** *Consider a weighted graph  $G = (V, E, w)$  with a set  $K \subseteq V$  of  $k$  terminals, and a clique-sum decomposition  $\mathcal{T}$  of  $G$  s.t.  $G = \cup_{X_i, X_j \in E(\mathcal{T})} X_i \oplus_h X_j$ . Then there is a graph  $G' = (V' \subseteq V, E, w)$  containing all the terminals, with a clique-sum decomposition  $\mathcal{T}'$  of  $G'$  s.t.  $G' = \cup_{X_i, X_j \in E(\mathcal{T}')} X_i \oplus_h X_j$ . The weight function  $w$  of  $G'$  gives weight  $d_G(u, v)$  to each edge  $\{u, v\}$ . It holds that:*



- The number of nodes in  $\mathcal{T}'$  is  $O(k)$ .
- For each node  $X \in \mathcal{T}'$ , either  $X \in \mathcal{T}$  or  $X$  contains at most  $2h$  vertices.
- For every pair of terminals  $t, t'$ , it holds that  $d_G(t, t') = d_{G'}(t, t')$ .

We proceed directly to proving [Proposition 1](#).

*Proof of Proposition 1.* According to the [\[RS03\]](#) [Theorem 10](#),  $G$  can be decomposed into a tree  $\mathcal{T}$  where each node of  $\mathcal{T}$  corresponds a nearly  $h$ -embeddable subgraph, such that  $G = \cup_{X_i X_j \in E(\mathcal{T})} X_i \oplus_h X_j$ . We apply [Lemma 16](#) and receive graph  $G'$  with clique-sum decomposition  $\mathcal{T}'$  as above. Set  $K'$  to be the set of all vertices in  $G'$  which belong to at least one clique in the set of clique-sums used by  $\mathcal{T}'$ . Formally,  $K' = \{v \in G' \mid \exists X_i X_j \in E(\mathcal{T}') \text{ such that } v \in X_i \cap X_j\}$ . Note that we add at most  $h$  vertices to  $K'$  per each edge of  $\mathcal{T}'$ , it thus holds that  $|K'| \leq h \cdot (|\mathcal{T}'| - 1) = O_h(k)$ . Set  $\hat{K} = K \setminus K'$  to be the set of terminals out of  $K'$ . For each node  $X \in \mathcal{T}'$ , set  $\hat{K}_X = \hat{K} \cap X$  and  $K'_X = K' \cap X$ . If  $X \in \mathcal{T}$  let  $H_X$  be a subset spanner constructed using [Lemma 5](#) w.r.t. the terminal set  $K'_X \cup \hat{K}_X$ . Note that  $H_X$  is a subgraph of  $G$ , of weight  $O_h(|K'_X \cup \hat{K}_X| \cdot L) \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}) = O_h(|\hat{K}_X| \cdot L + L) \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$ . Else ( $X \notin \mathcal{T}$ ), then  $X$  contains at most  $2h$  vertices. For every  $v, u \in X$ , if  $d_G(u, v) \leq L$ , set  $P_{v,u}^L$  to be an arbitrary shortest path from  $u$  to  $v$  in  $G$ , else ( $d_G(u, v) > L$ ), set  $P_{v,u}^L = \emptyset$ . Let  $H_X = \cup_{u,v \in X} P_{v,u}^L$  to be a subgraph of  $G$  that contains all the shortest paths between  $X$  vertices at distance at most  $L$  in  $G$ . Note that the weight of  $H_X$  is bounded by  $O(h^2 \cdot L) = O_h(L)$ . Set  $H = \cup_{X \in \mathcal{T}'} H_X$ .

It is clear that  $H_{\mathcal{T}'}$  is a subgraph of  $G$ . We first bound the weight of  $H_{\mathcal{T}'}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} w(H) &= \sum_{X \in \mathcal{T}'} w(H_X) = \sum_{X \in \mathcal{T}'} O_h(|\hat{K}_X| \cdot L + L) \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}) \\ &= O_h(|\mathcal{T}'| \cdot L) \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}) + O_h(L) \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}) \cdot \sum_{X \in \mathcal{T}'} |\hat{K}_X| = O_h(kL) \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows as  $\cup_{X \in \mathcal{T}'} \hat{K}_X = \hat{K}$ , and  $\{\hat{K}_X\}_{X \in \mathcal{T}'}$  are disjoint.

Next, we argue that  $H_{\mathcal{T}'}$  preserves terminals distances up to  $L$ . Consider a pair of terminals  $t, t' \in K \cup K'$  at distance at most  $L$ . Let  $P_{t,t'} = \{t = v_0, v_1, \dots, v_s = t'\}$  be a shortest path between  $t$  to  $t'$  in  $G'$ . Let  $\mathcal{I} = \{0 = i_0 < i_1 < \dots < i_q = s\} \subseteq [0, s]$  be a minimal set of indexes such that for every  $j \in [q]$  there is a node  $X_j \in \mathcal{T}'$  such that  $\{v_{i_{j-1}}, v_{i_{j-1}+2}, \dots, v_{i_j}\} \subseteq X_j$ . By the minimality of  $\mathcal{I}$ , it necessarily holds that  $v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}, \dots, v_{i_{q-1}} \in K'$ . Furthermore, as  $P_{t,t'}$  is a shortest path it holds that  $d_{G'}[X_j](v_{i_{j-1}}, v_{i_j}) = d_{G'}(v_{i_{j-1}}, v_{i_j})$ . As  $w(P_{t,t'}) \leq L$ , the spanner  $H_{X_j}$  has distortion  $1 + \epsilon$  w.r.t. the pair  $v_{i_{j-1}}, v_{i_j}$ . We conclude

$$\begin{aligned} d_H(t, t') &\leq \sum_{j=1}^q d_{H_{\mathcal{T}'}}(v_{i_{j-1}}, v_{i_j}) \leq \sum_{j=1}^q d_{H_{X_j}}(v_{i_{j-1}}, v_{i_j}) \\ &\leq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot \sum_{j=1}^q d_{G'}[X_j](v_{i_{j-1}}, v_{i_j}) = (1 + \epsilon) \cdot d_{G'}(t, t') = (1 + \epsilon) \cdot d_G(t, t'). \end{aligned}$$

□

The rest of this subsection is devoted to proving [Lemma 16](#). The modification of  $G$  into  $G'$ , and of  $\mathcal{T}$  into  $\mathcal{T}'$  is described in [Algorithm 3](#). Initially  $\mathcal{T}' \leftarrow \mathcal{T}$  and  $G' \leftarrow G$ . The algorithm has two steps. In the first step, we ensure that the number of leaves is bounded by  $k$ . This is done by repeatedly deleting non-essential leaf nodes from  $\mathcal{T}'$ . In the second step, we bound the number of

nodes of degree two in  $\mathcal{T}'$ . This is done by deleting redundant paths where all the internal nodes have degree two. Here, however, it will be necessary to add a new node to  $\mathcal{T}'$  to compensate for the deleted ones.

---

**Algorithm 3: Clique-Sum Modification**

---

**input** : Graph  $G = (V, E, w)$ , terminals  $K \subseteq V$ , clique-sum decomposition  $\mathcal{T}$  of  $G$  into clique-sums  
**output**: Subgraph  $G'$  of  $G$  and a clique-sum decomposition  $\mathcal{T}'$  of  $G'$ .

- 1 Let  $\mathcal{T}' \leftarrow \mathcal{T}$ ,  $G' \leftarrow G$ ,  $\nu \leftarrow \emptyset$ . /\*\*  $\nu : K \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$  is a function, initially undefined
- 2 **while** there is a leaf  $l \in \mathcal{T}'$  such that  $\nu^{-1}(l) = \emptyset$  **do**
- 3     **if**  $l$  contains a terminal  $t$  such that  $\nu(t)$  is undefined **then**
- 4         Set  $\nu(t) = l$
- 5     **else**
- 6         Delete  $l$  from  $\mathcal{T}'$ , and delete from  $G'$  all the vertices that belong only to  $l$
- 7 **foreach** terminal  $t \in K$  for which  $\nu(t)$  is undefined **do**
- 8     Pick arbitrary node  $X \in \mathcal{T}'$  containing  $t$ . Set  $\nu(t) = X$ .
- 9 A node  $X \in \mathcal{T}'$  is called *redundant* if it has degree 2 in  $\mathcal{T}'$  and  $\nu^{-1}(X) = \emptyset$ .
- 10 A path  $P = \{X_0, X_1, \dots, X_s\}$  in  $\mathcal{T}'$  is called *redundant*, if all the internal nodes  $\{X_1, \dots, X_{s-1}\}$  are redundant.
- 11 **foreach** maximal redundant path  $P = \{X_0, X_1, \dots, X_s\}$  **do**
- 12     Let  $K_0 \subseteq X_0$  (resp.  $K_s \subseteq X_s$ ) be the set used for the clique sum  $X_0 \oplus_h X_1$  (resp.  $X_{s-1} \oplus_h X_s$ )
- 13     Remove  $\{X_1, \dots, X_{s-1}\}$  from  $\mathcal{T}'$ . Delete all vertices  $v$  in  $G'$  that belong only to nodes in  $\{X_1, \dots, X_{s-1}\}$ .
- 14     Add new node  $X$  with  $K_1 \cup K_2$  as vertices, and the complete graph between them as edges (the weight of  $\{v, u\}$  will be  $d_G(u, v)$ ). Add to  $\mathcal{T}'$  the edges  $\{X_0, X\}, \{X_s, X\}$ .  
        Add the respective edges to  $G'$ .
- 15 **return** Graph  $G'$  and clique-sum decomposition  $\mathcal{T}'$

---

By Algorithm 3, it is straightforward that  $\mathcal{T}'$  is a decomposition of  $G'$ . The second property (that for every  $X \in \mathcal{T}'$  either  $X \in \mathcal{T}$  or  $|X| \leq 2h$ ) is also obvious. In Claim 6 we prove that all the terminal distances are preserved exactly by  $\mathcal{T}'$ , while in Claim 7 we prove that  $\mathcal{T}'$  contains  $O(k)$  nodes.

**Claim 6.** For every pair of terminals  $t, t' \in K$ ,  $d_G(t, t') = d_{G'}(t, t')$ .

*Proof.* The proof is by induction on the construction of  $G'$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  following Algorithm 3. Initially  $G = G'$  so the claim obviously holds. There are two types of modifications that occur: (1) deletion of a leaf node. (2) Replacement of a redundant path by a single new node. Let  $G'$  be the graph at some stage with decomposition  $\mathcal{T}'$ . Suppose that  $\tilde{G}$  with decomposition  $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$  is obtained from  $G', \mathcal{T}'$  by a single modification step (of type (1) or (2)). Following the algorithm, it is clear that no terminal vertex is ever deleted (as it necessarily belongs to some non-redundant node). Furthermore, if there is a pair of neighboring vertices,  $v, u \in G'$  who belong to  $\tilde{G}$  then they also neighbors in  $\tilde{G}$ . This holds because if they both belong to a deleted node, then they are necessarily part of some clique in

the clique sum together, and will remain there. Let  $P_{t,t'} = \{t = v_0, \dots, v_s = t'\}$  be the shortest path from  $t$  to  $t'$  in  $G'$ , with the minimal number of hops (that is minimizing  $s$  among all shortest paths). By the induction hypothesis,  $d_G(t, t') = d_{G'}(t, t')$ . If no vertex of  $P_{t,t'}$  is deleted, then obviously  $d_{\tilde{G}}(t, t') = d_{G'}(t, t')$ , and we are done. Else let  $v_i, v_j \in P_{t,t'}$  be the vertices with the minimal and maximal indices among the deleted vertices, respectively.

We first deal with modification of type (1), deletion of a leaf node  $X \in \mathcal{T}'$ . We argue that no vertex of  $P_{t,t'}$  is deleted. Assume toward contradiction that this is not the case. As  $v_i, v_j$  are deleted, they belong to  $X$  and no other node in  $\mathcal{T}'$ . By the minimality of  $v_i$ ,  $v_{i-1}$  was not deleted. Similarly,  $v_{j+1}$  was also not deleted. However, as they are neighbors of deleted vertices, they necessarily belong to the clique sum part in  $X$ . In particular,  $v_{i-1}, v_{j+1}$  are neighbors in  $G'$ . Implying that the path  $\{t = v_0, \dots, v_{i-1}, v_{j+1}, \dots, v_s = t'\}$  has weight  $\leq d_G(t, t')$  but less hops than  $P_{t,t'}$ , a contradiction.

Next, we deal with modification of type (2), deletion of a redundant path  $P = \{X_0, X_1, \dots, X_s\}$ . As  $v_{i-1}, v_{j+1}$  were not deleted, but have deleted neighbors, they necessarily belong to the clique parts in  $X_0$  or  $X_s$  (the one responsible for joining to  $X_1, X_{s-1}$ ). In particular,  $v_{i-1}, v_{j+1}$  belong to the newly created node  $X$ , and are neighbors in  $\tilde{G}$ . We conclude that

$$d_{\tilde{G}}(t, t') \leq d_{G'}(t, v_i) + d_{G'}(v_i, v_j) + d_{G'}(v_j, t') = d_{G'}(t, t') = d_G(t, t') .$$

□

**Claim 7.** *The number of nodes in  $\mathcal{T}'$  is  $O(k)$ .*

*Proof.* We make the following notation for  $\mathcal{T}'$ :  $N$  is the total number of nodes,  $l$  denotes the number of leafs,  $a$  denotes the number of degree 2 nodes for which  $\nu^{-1}(X) \neq \emptyset$ ,  $b$  denotes the number of degree 2 nodes for which  $\nu^{-1}(X) = \emptyset$ , Finally  $c$  denotes the number of nodes of degree at least 3.

Recall that for every leaf  $X \in \mathcal{T}'$  it holds that  $\nu^{-1}(X) \neq \emptyset$  (as otherwise it would've been removed). Thus  $l + a \leq k$ . Furthermore, we called nodes  $X \in \mathcal{T}'$  of degree 2 where  $\nu^{-1}(X) = \emptyset$  *redundant* and removed all paths consisting of such nodes. It follows that there are no pairs of adjacent redundant nodes. In particular, the number of redundant nodes is bounded by half the number of edges, thus  $b \leq \frac{N-1}{2}$ . Using the sum-of-degree formula we conclude,


$$2N - 2 = \sum_{X \in \mathcal{T}'} \deg(X) \geq l + 2(a + b) + 3c = l + 2(a + b) + 3(N - l - a - b) = 3N - 2l - a - b$$

$$N \leq l + (l + a) + b - 2 \leq 2k + \frac{N - 1}{2} - 2$$

$$N \leq 4k - 5 .$$

□

**Remark.** The analysis of the number of nodes in the decomposition  $\mathcal{T}'$  created by Algorithm 3 is tight, as illustrated by the figure on the right. Indeed, suppose that only the leaf nodes (colored in red) contain terminals, one each. Then the number of terminals is  $k = 6$ . However, the number of nodes in the decomposition is  $19 = 4 \cdot k - 5$ , and none of them will be removed in Algorithm 3.



## 6 Embedding Minor-Free Graphs into Small Treewidth Graphs

We refer readers to [Section 2.2](#) for an overview of the argument.

### 6.1 Step (1): Planar graphs with a single vortex, proof of [Lemma 6](#)

We begin by restating the main lemma of the section:

**Lemma 6** (Single Vortex with Bounded Diameter). *Given a single-vortex graph  $G = G_\Sigma \cup W$  where the vortex  $W$  has width  $h$ . There is a one-to-many, clique-preserving embedding  $f$  from  $G$  to a graph  $H$  with treewidth  $O(\frac{h \log n}{\epsilon})$  and additive distortion  $\epsilon D$  where  $D$  is diameter of  $G$ .*

Our construction here follows the same steps as the proof of [Lemma 1](#) in [Section 5.1](#). The main difference is that we aim for a clique-preserving embedding, and thus the embedding will be one-to-many. Our first step is to construct the same hierarchical partition tree  $\tau$  as in [Section 5.1](#), where the set of terminal is the entire set of vertices (i.e.  $K = V$ ). Recall that each node  $\Upsilon \in \tau$  is associated with some cluster  $\Upsilon \subseteq V$ , and some subgraph  $G_\Upsilon$  of  $G$ . There is a spanning tree  $T_\Upsilon$  of  $G$ , such that for every  $\Upsilon \in \tau$ ,  $T_\Upsilon = T_\Sigma \cap G_\Upsilon$  is a spanning tree of  $G_\Upsilon$  (see [Invariant 1](#) and [Invariant 2](#)). We used a fundamental vortex cycle  $C_\Upsilon$  in  $G_\Upsilon$  w.r.t.  $T_\Upsilon$  to partition  $\Upsilon$  into two parts  $\Upsilon^\mathcal{I}, \Upsilon^\mathcal{E}$  and apply this recursively. The fundamental cycle  $C_\Upsilon$  consists of at most  $2(h+1)$  shortest paths denoted  $\mathcal{P}(C_\Upsilon)$ , all of length at most  $D$  ([Observation 1](#)). By [Claim 3](#), and the choice of fundamental vortex cycles, the number of terminals, i.e. vertices, in a cluster  $\Upsilon$  drops in every two steps of the hierarchy  $\tau$ . It follows that the depth of  $\tau$  is bounded by  $O(\log n)$ .<sup>16</sup>

For a node  $\Upsilon \in \tau$ , denote by  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_\Upsilon$  the set of all paths, in all the fundamental vortex cycles  $\mathcal{P}(C_{\Upsilon'})$  in all the ancestors  $\Upsilon'$  of  $\Upsilon$  in  $\tau$ . Note that the set  $\mathcal{P}_\Upsilon$  defined during the proof of [Lemma 6](#) is only a subset of  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_\Upsilon$ . As each fundamental vortex cycle consist of at most  $2(h+1)$  paths, and  $\tau$  has depth  $O(\log n)$ , it follows that  $|\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_\Upsilon| = O(h \log n)$ .

For each path  $Q$  and a parameter  $\delta > 0$ , let  $\text{Portalize}(Q, \delta)$  be a  $\delta$ -net of  $Q$ . Vertices in  $\text{Portalize}(Q, \delta)$  are called  $\delta$ -portals of  $Q$ . When  $\delta$  is clear from the context, we drop the prefix  $\delta$ . For a collection of paths  $\mathcal{P}$  we denote  $\text{Portalize}(\mathcal{P}, \delta) = \cup_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Portalize}(Q, \delta)$ .

**Algorithm** We now describe a tree decomposition  $\mathcal{T}$  for the vertex set  $V$ . For each bag  $B$  in the decomposition we add edges between all the vertices in the bag (where the weight of an edge  $u, v$  is  $d_G(u, v)$ ). However, the bags containing a vertex  $v$  does not necessarily induce a connected subgraph of  $\mathcal{T}$ . Thus our embedding is one-to-many. Specifically, in the sub-tree decomposition of  $\mathcal{T}$  induced by bags containing  $v$ , each connected component corresponds to a different copy of  $v$ . Note that the portal vertices have only a single copy, as all the bags containing such a vertex are connected. It is thus straightforward that the embedding is dominating. What needs to be proven is that the additive distortion is at most  $\epsilon$  times the diameter of the input graph and that the embedding clique preserving.

For a node  $\Upsilon$ , consider the graph  $\tilde{G}_\Upsilon = G[\Upsilon \cup (\cup \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_\Upsilon)]$  induced by  $\Upsilon$  and all the fundamental cycles in all its ancestors (note that the graph  $G_\Upsilon$  defined in [Section 5.1](#) is only a subgraph of  $\tilde{G}_\Upsilon$ ). For each node  $\Upsilon \in \tau$ , we create a bag  $B_\Upsilon$  that contains  $\text{Portalize}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_\Upsilon, \epsilon D/2)$ . The bags

<sup>16</sup>Actually there is no need to control for the size of  $\mathcal{P}_\Upsilon$  here. Thus a simpler rule for choosing  $C_\Upsilon$  could be applied (compared to [Section 5.1](#)). For continuity considerations, we will not take advantage of this.

are connected in the same way as the  $\tau$  nodes they represent. In addition, each leaf node  $\Upsilon_l \in \tau$ ,  $B_{\Upsilon_l}$  also contains all the vertices in  $\Upsilon_l$ . For every maximal clique <sup>17</sup>  $Z$  in  $\tilde{G}_{\Upsilon_l}$ , we create a bag  $B_Z$ , connected in  $\mathcal{T}$  only to  $B_{\Upsilon_l}$ , where  $B_Z$  contains vertices in  $Z \cup \text{Portalize}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\Upsilon_l}, \epsilon D/2)$ . This concludes the construction.

First observe that the maximal size of a clique in  $G$  is  $O(h)$ . Furthermore, according to the construction of  $\tau$ , every leaf node  $\Upsilon_l$  contains at most  $O(h)$  vertices. Finally, for every node  $\Upsilon \in \tau$ ,  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\Upsilon}$  contains at most  $O(h \log n)$  paths and every path in  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\Upsilon}$  has weight at most  $D$ . Thus, it holds that  $|\text{Portalize}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\Upsilon}, \epsilon D/2)| \leq O(h \cdot \log n) \cdot O(\frac{1}{\epsilon}) = O(\frac{h \log n}{\epsilon})$ . From the definition we immediately have,

**Observation 3.** *The decomposition  $\mathcal{T}$  is a valid tree-decomposition of width  $O(\frac{h \log n}{\epsilon})$ .*

Next we argue that our embedding is clique-preserving. By induction, in every level of  $\tau$ , there is a node  $\Upsilon$  such that  $Z \subseteq \tilde{G}_{\Upsilon}$ . That is, every vertex  $v \in Z$  either belongs to  $\Upsilon$ , or belongs to a fundamental vortex cycle  $C_{\Upsilon'}$  of an ancestor  $\Upsilon'$  of  $\Upsilon$ . In particular, there is a leaf node  $\Upsilon_l$  such that  $Z \subseteq \tilde{G}_{\Upsilon_l}$ . Let  $Z'$  be some maximal clique in  $\tilde{G}_{\Upsilon_l}$  containing  $Z$ . By the construction, there is a bag  $B_{Z'}$  containing all the vertices in  $Z'$ , and in particular  $Z$ .

Finally we bound the distortion. Consider a pair of vertices  $u, v$ . We then show that for every two copies  $u', v'$  it holds that  $d_H(u', v') \leq d_G(u, v) + \epsilon D$ . Consider first the case where there is a leaf node  $\Upsilon_l$  containing both  $u, v$ . In this case there is a single copy of  $u, v$ , which belongs to the same bag and therefore it holds that  $d_H(u, v) = d_G(u, v)$ . Else, let  $P_{u,v}$  be some shortest path between  $u$  and  $v$  in  $G$ . Let  $\Upsilon_{u,v} \in \tau$  be the first node such that its fundamental vortex cycle  $C_{\Upsilon_{u,v}}$  intersects  $P_{u,v}$  at some vertex  $z$ . Specifically, there is a path  $Q_z \in \mathcal{P}(C_{\Upsilon_{u,v}})$  such that  $z \in Q_z \cap P_{u,v}$ . There is some portal  $z' \in \text{Pt}_{Q_z}$  such that  $d_G(z, \hat{z}) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} D$ . Further, by the construction of  $H$ , any bag associated with a descendent of  $\Upsilon_{u,v}$  contains  $\hat{z}$ . In particular, every bag  $B$  containing either a copy of  $u$  or  $v$ , also contains  $\hat{z}$ . We conclude

$$\begin{aligned} d_H(u', v') &\leq d_H(u', \hat{z}) + d_H(\hat{z}, v') = d_G(u, \hat{z}) + d_G(\hat{z}, v) \\ &\leq d_G(\hat{z}, z) + d_G(u, z) + d_G(z, v) + d_G(z, \hat{z}) \leq d_G(u, v) + \epsilon D. \end{aligned}$$

Note that this argument applies also to two copies  $u_1, u_2$  of the same vertex  $u$ , where  $P_{u,u} = \{u\}$ .

## 6.2 A Cutting Lemma

Let  $H$  be a connected subgraph of an arbitrary graph  $G$ . Let  $I(H)$  be the set of all edges incident to vertices in  $H$  that do not belong to  $E(H)$ . Let  $LE(H)$  (left edges) and  $RE(H)$  (right edges) be a partition of  $I(H)$ . We say a graph obtained from  $G$  by *cutting along*  $H$ , denoted by  $G \bowtie H$ , is the graph obtained by: (1) removing all the vertices of  $H$  from  $G$ , (2) making two copies of  $H$ , say  $H^l$  and  $H^r$ , (3) adding an edge between two copies of the endpoints of an edge  $e$  in  $H^l$  ( $H^r$ ) for every edge  $e \in LE(H)$  ( $e \in RE(H)$ ), and (4) adding an edge  $uv^l$  ( $uv^r$ ) for each edge  $uv \in LE(H)$  ( $uv \in RE(H)$ ) where  $v^l$  ( $v^r$ ) is the copy of  $v$  in  $H^l$  ( $H^r$ ). We say that  $H$  is *separating* if  $G \bowtie H$  is disconnected, and *non-separating* otherwise. The following lemma will be useful in for our embedding framework.

**Lemma 17.** *Let  $H$  be a non-separating connected subgraph of  $G$ . Then:*

$$\text{DIAM}(G \bowtie H) \leq 4\text{DIAM}(G) + 2\text{DIAM}(H)$$

<sup>17</sup>A set  $Z$  of vertices is a maximal clique if  $Z$  is a clique, and there is no clique that strictly contains  $Z$ . Since  $\tilde{G}_{\Upsilon_l}$  is  $O(h)$ -degenerated, all maximal cliques of  $\tilde{G}_{\Upsilon_l}$  can be found in time  $O_h(n)$  [ELS10].

*Proof.* Let  $\Delta = \text{DIAM}(G)$  and  $L = \text{DIAM}(H)$ . For every vertex  $v \in V$   $d_G(v, H) \leq \Delta$ , which implies  $\min(d_{G \bowtie H}(v, H^l), d_{G \bowtie H}(v, H^r)) \leq \Delta$  (go along the path realizing the distance  $d_G(v, H)$  until we meet a vertex of  $H^l \cup H^r$ ). Since  $H$  is non-separating, there is a path  $P = v_0, \dots, v_s$  from  $v_0 \in H^l$  to  $v_s \in H^r$ . Since  $d_{G \bowtie H}(v_0, H^l) = 0$  and  $d_{G \bowtie H}(v_s, H^r) = 0$ , there is an index  $i$  such that  $d_{G \bowtie H}(v_i, H^l) \leq \Delta$  and  $d_{G \bowtie H}(v_{i+1}, H^r) \leq \Delta$ . It follows that  $d_{G \bowtie H}(H^l, H^r) \leq 2\Delta + d_G(v_i, v_{i+1}) \leq 3\Delta$ . By triangle inequality, for any two vertices  $x, y \in H^l \cup H^r$ ,  $d_{G \bowtie H}(x, y) \leq 2L + 3\Delta$ .

Let  $u$  and  $v$  be two vertices in  $G \bowtie H$  and a shortest path  $P$  between  $u$  and  $v$  in  $G$ . If  $P \cap H = \emptyset$ , then  $d_{G \bowtie H}(u, v) = w(P) \leq \text{DIAM}(G)$ . Otherwise, let  $v_i$  and  $v_j$  be the first and last vertices belonging to  $H_l \cup H_r$  when we follow  $P$  from  $u$  to  $v$  in  $G \bowtie H$ . Then  $d_{G \bowtie H}(u, v) \leq d_{G \bowtie H}(u, v_i) + d_{G \bowtie H}(v_i, v_j) + d_{G \bowtie H}(v_j, v) \leq \Delta + d_{G \bowtie H}(v_i, v_j) \leq 4\Delta + 2L$ .  $\square$

### 6.3 Step (2.1): Planar graphs with more than one vortex, proof of Lemma 7

We begin by restating the main lemma of the section:

**Lemma 7** (Multiple Vortices). *Consider a graph  $G = G_\Sigma \cup W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_{v(G)}$  of diameter  $D$ , where  $G_\Sigma$  can be drawn on the plane, and each  $W_i$  is a vortex of width at most  $h$  glued to a face of  $G_\Sigma$ , and  $v(G)$  is the number of vortices in  $G$ . There is a one-to-many, clique-preserving embedding  $f$  from  $G$  to a graph  $H$  of treewidth at most  $\frac{h2^{O(v(G))} \log n}{\epsilon}$  with additive distortion  $\epsilon D$ .*

The embedding algorithm is presented in Algorithm 4. Parameter  $s$  represents the step number of the recursion. Initially  $s = 0$  and  $G_0$  is the input graph with diameter  $D$ .

---

#### Algorithm 4: EmbedPlanarMultipleVortices

---

**input** : Graph  $G = (V, E, w) = G_\Sigma \cup W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_{v(G)}$ , parameter  $\epsilon$ , and step number  $s$   
**output**: An embedding  $f$  to a graph  $H$  with tree decomposition  $\mathcal{T}$  with additive distortion  $\epsilon D$

- 1 **if**  $v(G) = 1$  **then**
- 2      $\{f, H, \mathcal{T}\} \leftarrow \text{EmbedPlanarOneVortex}(G, \frac{\epsilon}{10^{v(G_0)-1}})$
- 3     **return**  $\{f, H, \mathcal{T}\}$ ;
- 4 Let  $P$  be the shortest proper vortex path in  $G$  between  $x_i \in W$  and  $y_j \in W'$  and  $\mathcal{P}$  be vortex path  $X_i \cup Y_j \cup P$
- 5  $K$  be  $G[X_i] \cup G[Y_j] \cup P$
- 6  $G' \leftarrow G \bowtie K$
- 7  $\{f', H', \mathcal{T}'\} \leftarrow \text{EmbedPlanarMultipleVortices}(G', \epsilon, s+1)$
- 8 Add  $\text{Pt} = \text{Portalize}(\mathcal{P}, \epsilon D/2)$  to every bag of  $\mathcal{T}'$
- 9 **for** each maximal clique  $Q$  of  $G$  such that  $Q \cap K \neq \emptyset$  **do**
- 10     Let  $B$  be the bag that contains an image of  $Q \setminus K$
- 11     Create a bag  $B_Q = (Q \cap K) \cup B$  and make  $B_Q$  adjacent to  $B$
- 12 Let  $\mathcal{T} \leftarrow \mathcal{T}'$  and  $\{f, H, \mathcal{T}\}$  be the resulting embedding; **return**  $f, H$  and  $\mathcal{T}$

---

Recall that a *proper vortex path*  $P$  is a path in  $G$  between a vertex  $v$  in a vortex  $W$  to a vertex  $u$  in a vortex  $W'$  such all the vertices on  $P$  belong to the planar part  $G_\Sigma$ , and other than the first and last vertices,  $P$  do not contain any vortex vertices. The path  $P$  picked in line 4 is the minimal






Figure 4: Cutting the left graph along a vortex path  $X_i \cup P \cup Y_j$  (highlighted purple) to obtain the graph on the right figure.

path having its endpoints in two different vortices. By minimality,  $P$  is necessarily a proper vortex path.

In line 5, we cut  $G$  along  $K = G[X_i] \cup G[Y_j] \cup P$ . In this cutting procedure, we define  $LE(K), RE(K)$  as follows. For  $P$ , we define left edges  $LE(P)$  and right edges  $RE(P)$  of  $P$  w.r.t the drawing of the planar part of  $G$  as follows:  $LE(P)$  ( $RE(P)$ ) contains edges drawn on the (right) left side of the path as we walk on the path from  $x_i$  to  $y_j$ <sup>18</sup>. For  $X_i$ , assume that the path decomposition of the vortex containing  $X_i$  is  $\{X_1, \dots, X_i, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_t\}$  where the perimeter vertex  $x_{i+1}$  of  $X_{i+1}$  is incident to a right edge of  $P$ ; in this case, we define  $RE(X_i)$  (respectively  $LE(X_i)$ ) to be the set of edges incident to vertices of  $X_i$  in  $G[X_{i+1} \cup \dots \cup X_t]$  (respectively  $G[X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_{i-1}]$ ). Similarly, assume that the path decomposition of the vortex containing  $Y_j$  is  $\{Y_1, \dots, Y_j, Y_{j+1}, \dots, Y_{t'}\}$  where the perimeter vertex  $y_{j+1}$  of  $Y_{j+1}$  is incident to a right edge of  $P$ ; in this case, we define  $RE(Y_j)$  ( $LE(Y_j)$ ) be the set of edges incident to vertices of  $Y_j$  in  $G[Y_{j+1} \cup \dots \cup Y_{t'}]$  ( $G[Y_1 \cup \dots \cup Y_{j-1}]$ ). Finally, we define  $LE(K) = LE(X_i) \cup LE(P) \cup LE(Y_j)$  and  $RE(K) = RE(X_i) \cup RE(P) \cup RE(Y_j)$ . By cutting  $G$  along  $H$  we essentially merge two vortices of  $G$  into a single vortex (see Figure 4).

Let  $P^l = \{x_i^l = p_0^l, p_1^l, \dots, p_k^l = y_j^l\}$  be the left copy of  $P$  and  $P^r = \{x_i^r = p_0^r, p_1^r, \dots, p_k^r = y_j^r\}$  be the right copy of  $P$ . The path decomposition of the new vortex is

$$\{X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, X_i^l, p_1^l, \dots, p_{k-1}^l, Y_j^l, Y_{j-1}, \dots, Y_1, Y_{t'}, \dots, Y_{j+1}, Y_j^r, p_{k-1}^r, \dots, p_1^r, X_i^r, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_t\}$$

that has width at most  $h$ ; here  $X_i^l, X_i^r$  ( $Y_j^l, Y_j^r$ ) are left and right copies of  $X_i$  ( $Y_j$ ), respectively.

Since the vortex merging step reduces the number of vortices by 1,  $v(G') = v(G) - 1$ . Note that cutting  $G$  along  $K$  does not destroy the connectivity of  $G$  as we can walk from the left copy of  $x_i$  to a right copy of  $x_i$  along the face where  $W$  is attached to. We then recursively apply Algorithm 4 to  $G'$ . To account for the damage caused by cutting  $G$  along  $K$ , we add all the portals of each shortest path in  $\mathcal{P}$  to every bag of  $\mathcal{T}'$ . In the for loop at line 9, we make the embedding clique-preserving. We will show later by induction that  $f'(\cdot)$  is clique-preserving and thus, bag  $B$  in line 10 indeed exists.

The base case is when  $v(G) = 1$ ; in this case, we use the embedding in Lemma 6 (line 2). This completes the embedding procedure.

<sup>18</sup>It could be that an edge  $e = (u, v)$  where  $u, v \in P$  such that it is drawn on the left side of  $v$  and on the right side of  $u$ . In this case, we simply assign  $e$  to  $LE(P)$ .

**Claim 8.** For any step  $s$ ,  $\text{DIAM}(G) \leq 10^s D$ . Furthermore,  $s \leq v(G_0) - 1$ .

*Proof.* The path  $P$  in [line 4](#) has weight  $w(P) \leq \text{DIAM}(G)$  since it is a shortest path, and since every edge between two vertices in the vortex has length at most  $D$ ,  $\text{DIAM}(H) \leq \text{DIAM}(G) + 2D \leq 3\text{DIAM}(G)$ . Thus, by [Lemma 17](#),  $\text{DIAM}(G') \leq 4\text{DIAM}(G) + 2(3\text{DIAM}(G)) = 10\text{DIAM}(G)$ . Hence, by induction, at step  $s$ , we have:

$$\text{DIAM}(G) \leq 10^s \text{DIAM}(G_0) = 10^s D \quad (2)$$

□

Finally, observe that the recursion has  $v(G_0) - 1$  steps since after every step, we reduce the number of vortices by 1.

*Proof of Lemma 7.* We first bound the width of the tree decomposition output by the algorithm. Let  $\text{tw}(\mathcal{T}')$  be the treewidth of  $\mathcal{T}'$  in [line 7](#). By [Claim 8](#), the size of the portal set  $\text{Pt}$  in [line 8](#) is  $O(h^{\frac{10^{s-1}}{\epsilon}}) = \frac{h^{2^{O(v(G_0))}}}{\epsilon}$ . Since  $G$  is  $O(h)$ -degenerate, every clique  $Q$  in [line 9](#) has size  $O(h)$ . Thus,  $|B_Q| = \text{tw}(\mathcal{T}') + \frac{h^{2^{O(v(G_0))}}}{\epsilon} + O(h)$ ; this implies

$$\text{tw}(\mathcal{T}) = \text{tw}(\mathcal{T}') + \frac{h^{2^{O(v(G_0))}}}{\epsilon} + O(h) = \text{tw}(\mathcal{T}') + \frac{h^{2^{O(v(G_0))}}}{\epsilon} \quad (3)$$

In the base case, the treewidth of the embedding in [line 2](#) is  $O(\frac{h^{2^{O(v(G_0)) \log n}}}{\epsilon})$ . Thus, the total treewidth after  $v(G_0) - 1$  steps of recursion is  $O(v(G_0)) \cdot O(\frac{h^{2^{O(v(G_0)) \log n}}}{\epsilon}) = O(\frac{h^{2^{O(v(G_0)) \log n}}}{\epsilon})$ .

We next argue that the embedding is clique-preserving by induction. The base case where  $v(G) = 1$ ,  $f(\cdot)$  is clique-preserving by [Lemma 6](#). By the induction hypothesis, we assume that  $f'(\cdot)$  in [line 7](#) is clique-preserving. Let  $Q$  be a clique of  $G$ . If  $K \cap Q = \emptyset$ , then  $Q$  is a clique in  $G'$  and hence  $f(\cdot)$  preserves  $Q$  as  $f'(\cdot)$  preserves  $Q$ . Otherwise, since  $Q \setminus K$  is a clique in  $G'$ , there is a bag of  $\mathcal{T}'$  containing an image of  $Q \setminus K$ . Thus there exist a bag  $B \in \mathcal{T}'$  containing  $Q \setminus K$  ([line 10](#)). This implies that  $\mathcal{T}$  has a bag  $B_Q$  containing an image of  $Q$  ([line 11](#)); We conclude that  $f(\cdot)$  is clique-preserving.

It remains to bound the distortion. For the base case, since the diameter is at most  $10^{v(G_0)-1} D$ , the distortion is at most  $\frac{\epsilon}{10^{v(G_0)-1}} 10^{v(G_0)-1} D = \epsilon D$ . For the inductive step, suppose that we have additive distortion  $\epsilon D$  for  $G'$ . The set  $\text{Pt}$  is contained in every bag of  $\mathcal{T}$  ([line 8](#)), where each vertex in  $v \in Q$  has a portal vertex  $t \in \text{Pt}$  at distance at most  $\frac{\epsilon}{2} D$ . Thus, if a shortest path between  $u$  and  $v$  intersects  $K$ , then by rerouting the path through the nearest portal in  $\text{Pt}$ , we obtain a new path with length at most  $w(P(u, v)) + 2\epsilon D/2 = w(P(u, v)) + \epsilon D$  for every two copies  $u', v'$  of  $u, v$ . Note that this argument holds in particular for all  $K$  vertices. Otherwise, using the induction hypothesis the distance between any two copies of  $u$  and  $v$  is preserved with additive distortion  $\epsilon D$  (note that no new copies are created in this step). □

## 6.4 Step (2.2): Cutting out genus, proof of [Lemma 8](#)

We begin by restating the main lemma of the section:

**Lemma 8** (Multiple Vortices and Genus). Consider a graph  $G = G_\Sigma \cup W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_{v(G)}$  of diameter  $D$ , where  $G_\Sigma$  is (cellularly) embedded on a surface  $\Sigma$  of genus  $g(G)$ , and each  $W_i$  is a vortex of width at most  $h$  glued to a face of  $G_\Sigma$ . There is a one-to-many clique-preserving embedding  $f$  from  $G$  to a graph  $H$  of treewidth at most  $\frac{h^{2^{O(v(G)g(G)) \log n}}}{\epsilon}$  with additive distortion  $\epsilon D$ .

The main tool we will use in this section is to cut along a vortex cycle to reduce the genus of the surface embedded part of  $G$  without disconnecting  $GG$ . We assume that every face of  $G_\Sigma$  is a simple cycle since we can always add more edges to  $G_\Sigma$  without destroying the shortest path metric.

#### 6.4.1 Cutting Along a Vortex Cycle

Let  $F_i$  be the face that  $W_i$  is glued to,  $1 \leq i \leq v(G)$ . Let  $K_\Sigma$  be the graph obtained from  $G_\Sigma$  by, for any  $i \in [1, v(G)]$ , adding virtual vertex  $f_i$  to each face  $F_i$  and connect  $f_i$  to every other vertex of  $F_i$  by an edge of length 0. Let  $U = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^{v(G)}$  and  $B = \cup_{i=1}^{v(G)} F_i$ . For simplicity of presentation, we assume that every edge of  $G$  has positive length. Pick a vertex  $r \in V(G) \setminus (U \cup B)$  and compute a shortest path tree  $T$  of  $K_\Sigma$  from  $r$ .

Let  $K_\Sigma^*$  be the dual graph of  $K_\Sigma$ . A *tree-cotree decomposition* w.r.t.  $T$  is a partition of  $E(K_\Sigma) \setminus T$  into two sets  $(C, X)$  such that  $C^*$  is a spanning tree of  $K_\Sigma^*$ ; by Euler formula,  $|X| = 2g$  of  $\Sigma$  is orientable and  $|X| = g$  if  $\Sigma$  is non-orientable. For each  $e \in E(K_\Sigma) \setminus T$ , define  $C_e$  be the fundamental cycle of  $T$  w.r.t.  $e$ . By Lemma 2 of [Epp03], there is an edge  $e \in X$  such that cutting  $\Sigma$  along  $C_e$  does not disconnect the resulting surface and that  $\Sigma \bowtie C_e$  has smaller Euler genus. Since every face  $K_\Sigma$  is a simple cycle, we have:

**Claim 9.** *There is an edge  $e \in X$  such that  $K_\Sigma \bowtie C_e$  is connected and that  $g(K_\Sigma \bowtie C_e) \leq g(K_\Sigma) - 1$ .*

In cutting  $K_\Sigma$  along  $C_e$ , we define "left edges" and "right edges" w.r.t the embedding of  $C_e$  on  $\Sigma$  (see page 106-107 in the book by Mohar and Thomassen [MT01] for details on how to define left and right sides of a cycle embedded on a surface-embedded graph.).

Fix an edge  $e$  in Claim 9. (Such an edge can be found in polynomial time by trying all possible edges.) Let  $C_e = T[r_0, u] \circ (u, v) \circ T[v, r_0]$  where  $(u, v) = e$  and  $r_0$  is the lowest common ancestor of  $u$  and  $v$  in  $T$ . We have the following claim whose proof is deferred to Appendix B.1.

**Claim 10** (Single Vortex with Bounded Diameter). *For  $i \in [1, v(G)]$ ,  $|C_e \cap F_i| \leq 2$  and if  $|C_e \cap F_i| = 2$ , then  $x_1, f_i, x_2$  is a subpath of  $C_e$  where  $C_e \cap F_i = \{x_1, x_2\}$ .*

**Induced vortex cycles** Fix an orientation of  $C_e$  from  $r_0$  to  $u$ , then  $v$  and back to  $r_0$ . Let  $F_{i_1}, \dots, F_{i_k}$  be a sequence of faces such that  $C_e \cap F_{i_j} \neq \emptyset$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq k$  and that is ordered by the direction from  $r_0$  along  $C_e$  back to  $r_0$ . Let  $\{x_j, y_j\}$  be two vertices of  $C_e \cap F_{i_j}$ ; if  $|C_e \cap F_{i_j}| = 1$ , then we let  $x_j = y_j = C_e \cap F_{i_j}$ . Cycle  $C_e$  induces a vortex cycle  $\mathcal{C}_e = Y_1 \cup P_1 \cup \dots \cup X_k \cup Y_k \cup P_k \cup X_1$  where:

- $P_j$  is  $C_e[y_j, x_{j+1}]$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq k$  with convention  $x_{k+1} = x_1$ .
- $X_j$  is the bag of  $W_{i_j}$  attached to  $x_j$  and  $Y_j$  is the bag of  $W_{i_j}$  attached to  $y_j$ .

**Cutting along a vortex cycle** First, we perform a cut along each path  $P_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq k$ ; each vertex of the path will have two copies. The left edges and right edges are defined w.r.t the embedding of  $G_\Sigma$ . Now, for each vortex  $W_{i_j} = \{X_1, \dots, X_t\}$  that has (at most) two perimeter vertices  $x_j$  and  $y_j$ , let  $X_p$  and  $X_q$  be two bags containing  $x_j$  and  $y_j$  respectively. Assume that  $p \neq q$  (the case  $p = q$  is handled in the same way.) We makes two copies  $X_p^1$  and  $X_p^2$  of  $X_p$  and two copies  $X_q^1$  and  $X_q^2$  of  $X_q$ . Let  $x_j^1, x_j^2$  be two copies of  $x_j$  such that the neighbor of  $x_j^1$  in  $F_j$  is the perimeter vertex of




Figure 5: *Cutting along a fundamental vortex cycle to reduce the genus of the graph. The cutting operation induces two new vortices of the resulting graph.*

$X_{p-1}$ . Let  $y_j^1, y_j^2$  be two copies of  $y_j$  such that the neighbor of  $y_j^2$  in  $F_j$  is the perimeter vertex of  $X_{q+1}$ . We make a new path decomposition  $W'_{ij} = \{X_1, \dots, X_p^1, X_p^2, \dots, X_q^1, X_q^2, \dots, X_t\}$  where:

- $X_p^i (Y_q^i)$  is attached to  $x_j^i (y_i^i)$  for  $i = 1, 2$ .
- Each vertex  $x \in X_p$  appears in  $\{X_1, \dots, X_{p-1}\}$  will be replaced by the copy of  $x \in X_p^1$ . Each vertex  $y \in X_q$  appears in  $\{X_{q+1}, \dots, X_t\}$  will be replaced by the copy of  $y \in X_q^2$ .
- For each vertex  $x \in X_p$ , we replace the occurrence of  $x$  in  $\{X_p^2, \dots, X_q^1\}$  by the copy of  $x$  in  $X_p^2$ . For each vertex  $y \in X_q \setminus X_p$ , we replace the occurrence of  $y$  in  $\{X_p^2, \dots, X_q^1\}$  by the copy of  $y$  in  $X_q^1$ .

See Figure 5 for an illustration. We denote the graph after cutting  $G$  along  $\mathcal{C}_e$  by  $G \bowtie \mathcal{C}_e$ . We show that:

**Lemma 18.** *There is a vortex cycle  $\mathcal{C} = Y_1 \cup P_1 \cup X_2 \cup \dots \cup X_k \cup Y_k \cup P_k \cup X_1$  such that (a)  $G \bowtie \mathcal{C}$  is connected, (b)  $g(G \bowtie \mathcal{C}) \leq g(G) - 1$ , (c)  $v(G \bowtie \mathcal{C}) \leq v(G) + 1$ , (d)  $w(P_i) \leq 3\text{DIAM}(G)$  for every  $1 \leq i \leq k$  and (e)  $\text{DIAM}(G \bowtie \mathcal{C}) \leq 2^{O(v(G))}\text{DIAM}(G)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $G' = G \bowtie \mathcal{C}$ . Property (a) and (b) follow directly from Claim 9. Since cutting long a vortex cycle can create at most independent two copies of the vortex cycle which become two new vortices,  $v(G') \leq v(G) + 1$ .

For property (d), we observe that  $P_i$  is either a shortest path of  $G$ , or is composed of two shortest paths of  $G$  share the same endpoint  $r_0$  or three shortest paths of  $G$  containing edge  $(u, v)$ . Thus,  $w(P_i) \leq 3\text{DIAM}(G)$ .

To prove (e), it is helpful to think of the process of cutting along  $\mathcal{C}_e$  as cutting along each vortex path  $\{Y_i \cup P_2 \cup X_{i+1}\}$  for  $i \in [1, v(G)]$  one by one. Since  $\text{DIAM}(G[Y_i] \cup P_2 \cup G[X_{i+1}]) \leq 5\text{DIAM}(G)$ , by Lemma 17, each cut increases the diameter of the graph by a constant factor (of 14). Thus, cutting along at most  $v(G)$  vortex paths increases the diameter of  $G$  by a factor of  $2^{O(v(G))}$ .  $\square$

#### 6.4.2 The proof

The embedding algorithm is presented in Algorithm 5. Parameter  $s$  represents the depth of the recursion. Initially  $s = 0$  and  $G_0$  is the input graph with diameter  $D$ . In line 6, we cut  $G$  along  $\mathcal{C}$ ; the goal is to reduce the genus of the surface embedded part of  $G$  using Lemma 18. In line 5 we

---

**Algorithm 5: GenusReduction**


---

**input** : Graph  $G = (V, E, w)$  with genus  $g(G)$  and  $v(G)$  vortices, parameter  $\epsilon < 1$ , and step number  $s$

**output**: An embedding  $f$  to a graph  $H$  with tree decomposition  $\mathcal{T}$  with additive distortion  $\epsilon D$

- 1 **if**  $g(G) = 0$  **then**
- 2      $\{f, H, \mathcal{T}\} \leftarrow \text{EmbedPlanarMultipleVortices}(G, \frac{\epsilon}{2^{c(g(G_0)v(G_0))}})$  for some big constant  $c$
- 3     **return**  $\{f, H, \mathcal{T}\}$ ;
- 4 Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the vortex cycle guaranteed by [Lemma 18](#) w.r.t.  $G$
- 5  $\text{Pt} \leftarrow \text{Portalize}(\mathcal{C}, \epsilon D/2)$
- 6  $G' \leftarrow G \bowtie \mathcal{C}$
- 7  $\{f', H', \mathcal{T}'\} \leftarrow \text{GenusReduction}(G', \epsilon, s+1)$
- 8 Add  $\text{Pt}$  to every bag of  $\mathcal{T}'$
- 9 **for** each maximal clique  $Q$  of  $G$  such that  $Q \cap \mathcal{C} \neq \emptyset$  **do**
- 10     Let  $B$  be the bag that contains an image of  $Q \setminus \mathcal{C}$
- 11     Create a bag  $B_Q = (Q \cap \mathcal{C}) \cup B$  and make  $B_Q$  adjacent to  $B$
- 12 Let  $\mathcal{T} \leftarrow \mathcal{T}'$  and  $\{f, H, \mathcal{T}\}$  be the resulting embedding
- 13 **return**  $f, H$  and  $\mathcal{T}$

---

*portalize* the vortex cycle  $\mathcal{C}$ ; we regard  $\mathcal{C}$  is a collection of paths where each vertex in a vortex bag is a singleton path. In the for loop at [line 9](#) we make the embedding clique-preserving.

We first bound the treewidth of the embedding. Let  $s_m$  be the maximum of recursion depth of the algorithm. We have  $s_m \leq g(G_0)$ . By [Lemma 18](#),  $v(G') \leq v(G) + 1$  and hence for every step  $s$ ,

$$\text{DIAM}(G) \leq 2^{O(\sum_{i=1}^s v(G_0) + i)} \text{DIAM}(G_0) = 2^{O(v(G_0)g(G_0))} D \quad (4)$$

Thus, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{Pt}| &= |\text{Portalize}(\mathcal{C}, \epsilon D/2)| \\ &= 2 \left( O(v(G)h) + \frac{v(G)2^{O(v(G_0)g(G_0))}}{\epsilon} \right) = \frac{h2^{O(v(G_0)g(G_0))}}{\epsilon} \end{aligned}$$

Since  $G$  is  $O(h + g(G))$ -degenerate, every clique  $Q$  in [line 9](#) has size  $O(v(G) + g(G))$ . Thus,  $|B_Q| = \text{tw}(\mathcal{T}') + \frac{h2^{O(v(G_0)g(G_0))}}{\epsilon} + O(h + g(G))$ ; this implies

$$\text{tw}(\mathcal{T}) = \text{tw}(\mathcal{T}') + \frac{h2^{O(v(G_0)g(G_0))}}{\epsilon} \quad (5)$$

For the base case when  $s = s_{\max}$ ,  $v(G) \leq v(G_0) + g(G_0)$  and hence according to [Lemma 7](#) the treewidth of  $\mathcal{T}$  in [line 2](#) is  $O(\frac{h2^{O(v(G_0)g(G_0)) \log n}}{\epsilon})$ . Thus, the total treewidth after  $g(G_0)$  steps of recursion by equation (5) is  $O(g(G_0) \frac{h2^{O(v(G_0)g(G_0)) \log n}}{\epsilon}) = O(\frac{h2^{O(v(G_0)) \log n}}{\epsilon})$ .

To show that the embedding is clique-preserving, we use induction. The base case where  $g(G) = 0$ ,  $f(\cdot)$  is clique-preserving by [Lemma 7](#). By the induction hypothesis, we assume that  $f'(\cdot)$  in [line 7](#) is clique-preserving. Let  $Q$  be a clique of  $G$ . If  $\mathcal{C} \cap Q = \emptyset$ , then  $Q$  is a clique in  $G'$  and hence  $f(\cdot)$

preserves  $Q$  as  $f'(\cdot)$  preserves  $Q$ . Otherwise, since  $Q \setminus \mathcal{C}$  is a clique in  $G'$ , there is a bag of  $\mathcal{T}'$  containing an image of  $Q \setminus \mathcal{C}$ ; bag  $B$  in [line 10](#) exists. This implies that  $\mathcal{T}$  has a bag  $B_Q$  containing an image of  $Q$ , and thus  $f(\cdot)$  is clique-preserving.

We now bound the distortion. In the base case, the diameter of  $G$  is at most  $2^{O(v(G_0)g(G_0))}D$  by equation (4). Thus, the distortion is at most  $\frac{\epsilon}{2^{c(v(G_0)g(G_0))}} 2^{O(v(G_0)g(G_0))}D = \epsilon D$  when  $c$  is sufficiently big; recall that in [line 2](#) we apply [Lemma 7](#) with parameter  $\frac{\epsilon}{2^{c(v(G_0)g(G_0))}}$ . For the inductive case, we observe that  $\text{Pt}$  is contained in every bag of  $\mathcal{T}$  since in [line 8](#), we add  $\text{Pt}$  to every bag of  $\mathcal{T}'$ . Thus, if a shortest path between  $u$  and  $v$  intersects  $\mathcal{C}$ , then by rerouting the path through the nearest portal in  $\text{Pt}$ , we obtain a new path with length at most  $w(P(u, v)) + 2\epsilon D/2 = w(P(u, v)) + \epsilon D$ . Otherwise, by induction  $d_G(u, v) \leq d_{H'}(u, v) + \epsilon D = d_H(u, v) + \epsilon D$ .

## 6.5 Step (2.3): Removing apices, proof of [Lemma 9](#)

Recall that a nearly  $h$ -embeddable graph  $G$  has an apex set  $A$  of size at most  $h$  such that  $G \setminus A = G_\Sigma \cup \{W_1 \dots \cup W_h\}$ . In this section, we will devise a *stochastic* embedding of  $G$  into a small treewidth graph with *expected* additive distortion  $\epsilon D$ .

**Lemma 9** (Nearly  $h$ -Embeddable). *Given a nearly  $h$ -embeddable graph  $G$  of diameter  $D$ , there is a one-to-many stochastic clique-preserving embedding into graphs with treewidth  $O_h(\frac{\log n}{\epsilon^2})$  and expected additive distortion  $\epsilon D$ . Furthermore, every bag of the tree decomposition of every graph in the support contains (the image of) the apex set of  $G$ .*

The main tool we use in the proof of [Lemma 9](#) is *padded decompositions*. Given a partition  $\mathcal{Q}$  of  $V(G)$ ,  $\mathcal{Q}(v)$  denotes the cluster containing  $v$ . A partition  $\mathcal{Q}$  of  $V(G)$  is  $\Delta$ -bounded if for every cluster  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ ,  $\text{DIAM}(Q) \leq \Delta$ . Similarly, a distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  is  $\Delta$  bounded if every partition  $\mathcal{Q} \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{D})$  is  $\Delta$ -bounded. We denote by  $B_G(v, r) = \{u \in V(G) \mid d_G(u, v) \leq r\}$  the ball of radius  $r$  around  $v$ .

**Theorem 12** (Theorem 15 [\[Fil19a\]](#)). *Consider a  $K_r$ -minor-free graph  $G$ , and parameter  $\Delta$ . There is an  $O(r\Delta)$ -bounded distribution over partitions  $\mathcal{D}$ , such that for every  $v \in V(G)$  and  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ ,*

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{Q} \sim \mathcal{D}}[B_G(v, \gamma\Delta) \subseteq \mathcal{Q}(v)] \geq e^{-\gamma} \quad (6)$$

Let  $G^- = G \setminus A$ . Note that the diameter of  $G^-$  may be unboundedly greater than  $D$ . Note that nearly  $h$ -embeddable graphs exclude  $K_{r(h)}$  as a minor where  $r(h)$  is some constant depending on  $h$  only (indeed,  $r(h) = O(h)$ ). Thus we can apply [Theorem 12](#) with parameter  $\Delta = \frac{8D}{\epsilon}$  to obtain an  $O(h \cdot \frac{D}{\epsilon})$ -bounded partition  $\mathcal{Q}$  of  $G^-$ . For each cluster  $C \in \mathcal{Q}$ , let  $N_G(C)$  be the set of vertices with a neighbor in  $C$ . Let  $G_C^- \leftarrow G[C \cup N_G(C)]$  be the graph induced by  $C \cup N_G(C)$ . We apply [Lemma 8](#) to  $G_C^-$  with accuracy parameter  $\Omega(\frac{\epsilon^2}{h})$ . Thus we obtain a one-to-many, clique preserving embedding  $f_C$  into  $H_C$  which has tree decomposition  $\mathcal{T}_C$  of width  $O_h(\frac{\log n}{\epsilon^2})$ , and additive distortion  $\Omega(\frac{\epsilon^2}{h}) \cdot O(h \cdot \frac{D}{\epsilon}) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}D$ . Next we combine all the graphs  $\cup_{C \in \mathcal{Q}} H_C$  into a single graph  $H$ . This is done by adding the set of apices  $A$  with edges towards all the other vertices (where the weight of the edge  $\{u, v\}$  is  $d_G(u, v)$ ). Note that if a vertex  $v$  belongs to both  $G_C^-$  and  $G_{C'}^-$ , its copies in  $H_C$  and  $H_{C'}$  will not be merged. The tree decomposition  $\mathcal{T}$  of  $H$  can be constructed by adding  $A$  to all the bags, and connecting the tree decompositions of all the clusters  $\cup_{C \in \mathcal{Q}} \mathcal{T}_C$  arbitrarily. Finally we define the embedding  $f$ . For apex vertices it is straightforward, as there is a single copy. For a vertex  $v \in V(G) \setminus A$ ,  $f(v) = \cup_C \text{ s.t. } v \in C f_C(v)$ . See [Algorithm 6](#) for illustration.



---

**Algorithm 6:** EmbedNearlyEmbeddableGraphs

---

**input** : A nearly  $h$ -embeddable graph  $G = (V, E, w)$   
**output**: A stochastic embedding  $f$  to a graph  $H$  with tree decomposition  $\mathcal{T}$  of width  $O_h(\frac{\log n}{\epsilon^2})$  and expected additive distortion  $\epsilon D$

- 1 Let  $G^- \leftarrow G \setminus A$  and  $\Delta \leftarrow \frac{8D}{\epsilon}$
- 2 Sample a partition  $\mathcal{Q}$  from the distribution promised by Theorem 12 with parameter  $\Delta$
- 3 **foreach** cluster  $C \in \mathcal{Q}$  **do**
- 4      $G_C^- \leftarrow G[C \cup N_G(C)]$  /\*\* subgraph induced by  $C$  and its neighbors in  $G$  \*/
- 5      $\{f_C, H_C, \mathcal{T}_C\} \leftarrow \text{GenusReduction}(G_C^-, \Omega(\epsilon^2))$  /\*\* Algorithm 5 \*/
- 6     Add  $A$  to all bags of  $\mathcal{T}_C$
- 7  $\mathcal{T}$  obtained by connecting the tree decompositions  $\mathcal{T}_C$  of all the clusters in  $\mathcal{Q}$  arbitrarily
- 8  $H \leftarrow$  the graph induced by  $\mathcal{T}$
- 9 Set  $f(v) \leftarrow \cup_{C \in \mathcal{Q}} \mathcal{T}_C$  for each  $v \in V$
- 10 **return**  $f, H$  and  $\mathcal{T}$

---

It is straightforward that  $\mathcal{T}$  has treewidth  $O_h(\frac{\log n}{\epsilon^2}) + |A| = O_h(\frac{\log n}{\epsilon^2})$ . Next, we argue that  $f$  preserves cliques. Consider a clique  $Q$ . If  $Q \subseteq A$  then every bag contains  $Q$  and we are done. Otherwise, let  $C$  be some cluster that contains a vertex  $v \in Q \setminus A$ . By definition of  $N_G(C)$ , it holds that  $Q \setminus A \subseteq C \cup N_G(C)$ . Thus there is a bag in  $\mathcal{T}_C$  containing (copies of) all the vertices in  $Q \setminus A$ . In particular, by construction, there is a bag in  $\mathcal{T}$  containing (copies of) all the vertices in  $Q$ .

It remains to bound the expected distortion of  $f$ . First note that as all the vertices are connected to all the vertices in  $A$  by edges of weight at most  $D$ ,  $H$  has diameter at most  $2D$ . Let  $u, v$  be two vertices of  $G$  (it could be that  $u = v$ ). Let  $P(u, v)$  be (some) shortest path in  $G$  between  $u$  and  $v$ . We consider two cases:

**Case 1.**  $P(u, v) \cap A \neq \emptyset$ : Let  $t \in P(u, v) \cap A$ . Then for every  $u' \in f(u), v' \in f(v)$ , it holds that  $d_H(u', v') \leq d_H(u', t) + d_H(t, v') = d_G(u, t) + d_G(t, v) = d_G(u, v)$ .

**Case 2.**  $P(u, v) \cap A = \emptyset$ : In this case,  $P(u, v) \subseteq G^-$  and hence  $d_{G^-}(u, v) = d_G(u, v) \leq D$ . By equation (6),

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{Q} \sim \mathcal{D}}[B_{G^-}(v, 2D) \subseteq \mathcal{Q}(v)] = \Pr_{\mathcal{Q} \sim \mathcal{D}}[B_{G^-}(v, \frac{\epsilon}{4}\Delta) \subseteq \mathcal{Q}(v)] \geq e^{-\frac{\epsilon}{4}} \geq 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{4}.$$

Denote the event that  $B_{G^-}(v, 2D) \subseteq \mathcal{Q}(v)$  by  $\Phi$ . If  $\Phi$  occurred, then both  $u, v$ , all their neighbors, and all the vertices in  $P(u, v)$  belong to  $\mathcal{Q}(v)$ . It follows that  $u$  and  $v$  do not belong to any graph  $G_C^-$  for  $C \neq \mathcal{Q}(v)$ , and further that  $d_{G_{\mathcal{Q}(v)}^-}(u, v) = d_G(u, v)$ . By the guarantee of Lemma 8, it holds that

$$\max_{u' \in f(u), v' \in f(v)} d_H(u', v') \leq \max_{u' \in f_{\mathcal{Q}(v)}(u), v' \in f_{\mathcal{Q}(v)}(v)} d_{H_{\mathcal{Q}(v)}}(u', v') \leq d_{G_{\mathcal{Q}(v)}^-}(u, v) + \frac{\epsilon}{2}D = d_G(u, v) + \frac{\epsilon}{2}D.$$

From the other hand, if  $\Phi$  did not occurred, the maximal distance between every two copies of  $u$

and  $v$  is at most  $2D$  (the diameter of  $H$ ). We conclude:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{u' \in f(u), v' \in f(v)} d_H(u', v') \right] \\
&= \Pr[\Phi] \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{u' \in f(u), v' \in f(v)} d_H(u', v') \mid \Phi \right] + \Pr[\bar{\Phi}] \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{u' \in f(u), v' \in f(v)} d_H(u', v') \mid \bar{\Phi} \right] \\
&\leq 1 \cdot \left( d_G(u, v) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} D \right) + \Pr[\bar{\Phi}] \cdot 2D \\
&\leq d_G(u, v) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} D + \frac{\epsilon}{4} \cdot 2D = d_G(u, v) + \epsilon D
\end{aligned}$$

## 6.6 Step (2.4): General minor-free graphs, proof of Theorem 2

In this section, we prove the following lemma that together with Lemma 9 imply Theorem 2. Let  $h(r)$  be a function of  $r$ , such that every  $K_r$ -minor-free graph can be decomposed into a clique-decomposition of nearly  $h(r)$ -embeddable graphs (Theorem 10).

**Lemma 19.** *If nearly  $h$ -embeddable graphs have a stochastic one-to-many embedding  $f$  into treewidth- $\text{tw}(h, \epsilon)$  graphs such that:*

- (1)  $f$  is clique-preserving
- (2) the expected additive distortion of  $f$  is at most  $\epsilon D$ .

*then there is a stochastic embedding of  $K_r$ -minor-free graphs into graphs of treewidth at most  $\text{tw}(h(r), \epsilon) + h(r) \cdot \log n$  with expected additive distortion  $\epsilon D$ .*

*Here  $\text{tw}(h, \epsilon)$  is some function depending only on  $h$  and  $\epsilon$ .*

*Proof of Lemma 19.* Consider a  $K_r$ -minor-free graph  $G$ , and let  $\mathbb{T}$  be its clique-sum decomposition. That is  $G = \cup_{(G_i, G_j) \in E(\mathbb{T})} G_i \oplus_h G_j$  where each  $G_i$  is a nearly  $h(r)$ -embeddable graph. We call the clique involved in the clique-sum of  $G_i$  and  $G_j$  the *joint set* of the two graphs. The embedding of  $G$  is defined recursively. Specifically, we will prove by induction that  $G$  can be stochastically embedded into  $(\text{tw}(h(r), \epsilon) + h(r) \cdot \log |\mathbb{T}|)$ -treewidth graphs with expected additive distortion  $\epsilon D$ .

Note that  $\mathbb{T}$  is a tree. Let  $\tilde{G}_i \in \mathbb{T}$  be the *central piece* of  $\mathbb{T}$  chosen using the following lemma.

**Lemma 20** ([Jor69]). *Given a tree  $T$  of  $n$  vertices, there is a vertex  $v$  such that every connected component of  $T \setminus \{v\}$  has at most  $\frac{n}{2}$  vertices.*

Let  $G_1, \dots, G_p$  be the neighbors of  $\tilde{G}$  in  $\mathbb{T}$ . Note that  $\mathbb{T} \setminus \tilde{G}$  contains  $p$  connected components  $\mathbb{T}_1, \dots, \mathbb{T}_p$ , where  $G_i \in \mathbb{T}_i$ , and  $\mathbb{T}_i$  contains at most  $|\mathbb{T}|/2$  pieces. We will abuse notation and refer to  $\mathbb{T}_i$  also as the graph induced by the vertices in all the pieces in  $\mathbb{T}_i$ . Note that  $\mathbb{T}_i$  is  $K_r$ -minor-free. Further, for every  $u, v \in \mathbb{T}_i$  (or  $u, v \in \tilde{G}$ ) it holds that  $d_{\mathbb{T}_i}(u, v) = d_G(u, v)$  ( $d_{\tilde{G}}(u, v) = d_G(u, v)$ )<sup>19</sup>. In particular, the diameter of the graphs  $\mathbb{T}_1, \dots, \mathbb{T}_p, \tilde{G}$  is bounded by  $D$ .

First we use the assumption on  $\tilde{G}$ , and sample a clique preserving, one-to-many embedding  $\tilde{f}$  of  $\tilde{G}$  into graph  $\tilde{H}$  with tree decomposition  $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$  of width at most  $\text{tw}(h, \epsilon)$ , and expected additive distortion  $\epsilon D$ . Next, for every  $i$ , we use the inductive hypothesis on  $\mathbb{T}_i$ , and sample a clique

<sup>19</sup>To see this consider a shortest path  $P(u, v) : u = z_0, \dots, z_q = v$  from  $u$  to  $v$  in  $G$ . If  $P(u, v) \subseteq \mathbb{T}_i$  then we are done. Else, let  $a$  ( $b$ ) be the minimal (maximal) index s.t.  $z_a \notin \mathbb{T}_i$  ( $z_b \notin \mathbb{T}_i$ ). Necessarily  $z_{a-1}, z_{b+1} \in C_i \subseteq \mathbb{T}_i$  where  $C_i$  is the joint set between  $G_i$  and  $\tilde{G}$ . Moreover, they are neighbors. Thus  $z_0, \dots, z_{a-1}, z_{b+1}, \dots, z_q$  is a path from  $u$  to  $v$  in  $\mathbb{T}_i$  of length  $d_G(u, v)$ . Similarly (with some additional steps) one can prove  $d_{\tilde{G}}(u, v) = d_G(u, v)$  for  $u, v \in \tilde{G}$ .

preserving, one-to-many embedding  $f_i$  of  $G_i$  into graph  $H_i$  with tree decomposition  $\mathcal{T}_i$  of width at most  $\text{tw}(h, \epsilon) + h(r) \cdot \log |\mathbb{T}_i|$ , and expected additive distortion  $\epsilon D$ .

Next, we create a single one-to-many embedding  $f$  of  $G$  into a graph  $H$  with tree decomposition  $\mathcal{T}$ . We combine the  $p+1$  different embeddings as follows. Initially, we just take a disjoint union of all the graphs  $\tilde{H}, H_1, \dots, H_p$ , keeping all copies of the different vertices separately. Next, we will identify some copies, and add some edges. For each  $i$ , let  $C_i$  be the joint set of  $\tilde{G}$  and  $G_i$ , i.e., the clique used for their clique sum. As both  $\tilde{f}$  and  $f_i$  are clique-preserving, there are bags  $\tilde{B}_{C_i} \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}$  and  $B_{C_i} \in \mathcal{T}_i$  containing copies of  $C_i$ . Identify the copies of  $C_i$  in  $\tilde{B}_{C_i}$  and  $B_{C_i}$ . Denote this copy by  $\bar{C}_i$ . Add an edge in  $H$  between every vertex  $v' \in \bar{C}_i$  to every other vertex  $u' \in H_i$ . Here if  $v'$  ( $u'$ ) is a copy of  $v \in V(G)$  ( $u \in V(G)$ ) the weight of the edge  $\{u', v'\}$  will be  $d_G(u, v)$ . This finished the construction of  $H$ . The embedding  $f$  is defined naturally. For  $v \in \mathbb{T}_i \setminus \tilde{G}$  let  $f(v) = f_i(v)$ . For  $v \in \tilde{G}$  let  $\mathcal{I}_v = \{i \mid v \in \mathbb{T}_i\}$  be the indices of the joint sets  $v$  belongs to (it might be an empty set). Then  $f(v) = \tilde{f}(v) \cup \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{I}_v} f_i(v)$  (note that we identified the copies  $\bar{C}_i$  for each  $i$  previously). Finally, the tree decomposition  $\mathcal{T}$  of  $H$  is constructed by first taking  $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ , and for every  $i$ , adding  $\mathcal{T}_i$  to  $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$  via an edge between the bags  $\tilde{B}_{C_i}$  and  $B_{C_i}$ . Further, the vertices  $\bar{C}_i$  will be added to all the bags in  $\mathcal{T}_i$ .

It is straightforward to verify that  $\mathcal{T}$  is a legal tree decomposition for  $H$ . The width of every bag in the central part  $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$  is at most  $\text{tw}(h, \epsilon)$ . While for every bag  $B$  from  $\mathcal{T}_i$ , using the induction hypothesis its width is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tw}(h, \epsilon) + h(r) \cdot \log |\mathbb{T}_i| + |\bar{C}_i| &\leq \text{tw}(h, \epsilon) + h(r) \cdot (\log |\mathbb{T}| - 1) + h(r) \\ &= \text{tw}(h, \epsilon) + h(r) \cdot \log |\mathbb{T}|. \end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward that the one-to-many embedding  $f$  is dominating (as  $\tilde{f}, f_1, \dots, f_p$  were dominating, and the newly add edges dominate the original distances). It is left to prove that  $f$  has expected additive distortion  $\epsilon D$ . Consider a pair of vertices  $u, v \in G$ . We proceed by case analysis:

- If there is an index  $i$  such that  $u, v \in \mathbb{T}_i \setminus \tilde{G}$ . Then by the induction hypothesis,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{u' \in f(u), v' \in f(v)} d_H(u', v') \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{u' \in f_i(u), v' \in f_i(v)} d_{H_i}(u', v') \right] \leq d_{\mathbb{T}_i}(u, v) + \epsilon D = d_G(u, v) + \epsilon D$$

- If both  $u, v$  belong to  $\tilde{G}$ . Consider some general vertex  $z \in \tilde{G}$ . If  $z \in \mathbb{T}_i$ , then there is some copy  $\bar{z}_i \in \bar{C}_i$  such that we added an edge of weight 0 from  $\bar{z}_i$  to any copy in  $f_i(z)$ . In other words, for every copy  $z' \in f(z)$  there is a copy  $\bar{z} \in \tilde{f}(z)$  at distance 0.

Considering  $u, v \in \tilde{G}$ , by the assumption on  $\tilde{f}$  it holds that,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{u' \in f(u), v' \in f(v)} d_H(u', v') \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{\bar{u}' \in \tilde{f}(u), \bar{v}' \in \tilde{f}(v)} d_{\tilde{H}}(\bar{u}', \bar{v}') \right] \leq d_{\tilde{G}}(u, v) + \epsilon D = d_G(u, v) + \epsilon D.$$

- If there is an index  $i$  such that  $u \in \mathbb{T}_i \setminus \tilde{G}$  and  $v \in \tilde{G}$  (the case  $v \in \mathbb{T}_i \setminus \tilde{G}$  and  $u \in \tilde{G}$  is symmetric). Then necessarily, there is a vertex  $z \in C_i$  laying on a shortest path from  $v$  to  $u$  in  $G$ . By construction, we added an edge between the copy  $\bar{z} \in \bar{C}_i$  to any copy  $u' \in f(u)$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{u' \in f(u), v' \in f(v)} d_H(u', v') \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{u' \in f(u), v' \in f(v)} d_H(u', \bar{z}) + d_G(\bar{z}, v) \right] \\ &\leq d_G(u, z) + \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{z' \in f(z), u' \in f(u)} d_H(z', v') \right] \\ &\leq d_G(u, z) + d_G(z, v) + \epsilon D = d_G(u, v) + \epsilon D, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows by the previous case.

- If there are indices  $i_u \neq i_v$  such that  $u \in \mathbb{T}_{i_u} \setminus \tilde{G}$  and  $v \in \mathbb{T}_{i_v} \setminus \tilde{G}$ . Then necessarily, there are vertices  $z_u \in C_{i_u}$  and  $z_v \in C_{i_v}$  laying on a shortest path from  $v$  to  $u$  in  $G$ . By construction, we added an edge between  $\bar{z}_u \in \bar{C}_{i_u}$  ( $\bar{z}_v \in \bar{C}_{i_v}$ ) to every copy in  $f(u)$  ( $f(v)$ ). It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\max_{u' \in f(u), v' \in f(v)} d_H(u', v')] &\leq \mathbb{E}[\max_{u' \in f(u), v' \in f(v)} d_H(u', \bar{z}_u) + d_H(\bar{z}_u, \bar{z}_v) + d_H(\bar{z}_v, v')] \\
&\leq d_G(u, z_u) + \mathbb{E}[\max_{z'_u \in f(z_u), z'_v \in f(z_v)} d_H(z'_u, z'_v)] + d_G(z_v, v) \\
&\leq d_G(u, z_u) + d_G(z_u, z_v) + \epsilon D + d_G(z_v, v) = d_G(u, v) + \epsilon D,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality followed by the second case. □

**Remark** The stochastic embedding  $f$  we constructed is one-to-many, but we can keep it one-to-one by simply retaining (any) one vertex in the image of  $u$ .

## 6.7 Corollaries

In the case where there are no vortices, we can use our constructions, combined with the  $\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$ -treewidth embedding of [FKS19] to generalize their bound to graphs of bounded genus, and to apex graphs (for the latter the embedding is stochastic).

**Theorem 13** (Theorem 1.3 [FKS19]). *Given a planar graph  $G$  of diameter  $D$  and a parameter  $\epsilon < 1$ , there exists a deterministic embedding  $f$  from  $G$  to a graph  $H$  of treewidth  $O(\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$  such that for every  $x, y \in G$ :*

$$d_G(x, y) \leq d_H(x, y) \leq d_G(x, y) + \epsilon D \quad (7)$$

By using the same cutting approach (using Lemma 18) in Algorithm 5, we can reduce the problem to the case where the graph  $G$  in line 2 Algorithm 5 is planar. Thus, we can invoke the embedding algorithm in Theorem 13 to embed  $G$  with additive distortion  $\frac{\epsilon D}{2cg(G)}$  and treewidth  $O_g(\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$ .

**Corollary 1.** *Given a graph  $G$  with diameter  $D$  embedded on a surface with genus  $g$  and a parameter  $\epsilon < 1$ , there exists an embedding  $f$  from  $G$  to a graph  $H$  of treewidth at most  $O_g(\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$  such that for every  $x, y \in G$ :*

$$d_G(x, y) \leq d_H(f(x), f(y)) \leq d_G(x, y) + \epsilon D \quad (8)$$

For a bounded genus graphs with a constant number of apices, we can design a stochastic embedding with constant treewidth using padded decomposition [Fil19a] as in Algorithm 6. In this case, since we do not need to preserve triangles and vortices, we do not need to extend  $G_C^-$  to include neighbors  $N_G(C)$  as in line 4 of Algorithm 6.

**Corollary 2.** *Let  $G$  be a graph of diameter  $D$  that has a set of vertices  $A$  called apices such that  $G \setminus A$  can be (cellularly) embedded on a surface of genus  $g$ . Given any parameter  $\epsilon < 1$ , there exists a stochastic embedding of  $G$  into treewidth  $O_g(\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon})) + |A|$  graphs with expected additive distortion  $\epsilon D$ .*

## 7 Algorithmic Applications

### 7.1 EPTAS for subset TSP

Given a subset spanner with lightness  $\Psi(\epsilon)$ , we can design an efficient PTAS for Subset TSP in time  $2^{O(\Psi(\epsilon)/\epsilon)} n^{O(1)}$  using the contraction decomposition framework by Demaine et al. [DHK11] (originally introduced by Klein [Kle05] for the planar case). The framework has four steps:

- **Step 1** Find a subset spanner  $H$  with lightness  $\Psi(\epsilon)$ .
- **Step 2** Partition the edge sets of  $H$  into  $s = \Theta_h(\Psi(\epsilon)/\epsilon)$  sets  $E_1, E_2, \dots, E_s$  such that for any set  $E_i$ , the graph  $H_i = H/E_i$  obtained by contracting all edges in  $E_i$  has treewidth at most  $O(s)$ .
- **Step 3** For each  $i$ , solve the Subset TSP problem in treewidth- $O(s)$  graphs in time  $2^{O(s)} n^{O(1)}$  (see Appendix D in the full version of [Le20]).
- **Step 4** Lift the solution found in Step 3 for each  $i \in [1, s]$  to a solution  $G$  and return the minimum solution over all  $i$  (see Section 3 in [Le20] for details of the lifting procedure).

The overall running time is hence  $2^{O(s)} n^{O(1)} = 2^{O(\Psi(\epsilon)/\epsilon)} n^{O(1)}$ . This in combination with Theorem 1 implies Theorem 5.

### 7.2 Approximation schemes for vehicle routing

We consider a uniform-capacity vehicle-routing problem. An instance consists of:

- a graph  $G = (V, E)$  and cost function  $\text{cost} : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ ,
- a *capacity*  $Q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ ,
- a function  $d : V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ , called the *delivery requirement function*, and
- a vertex  $r$ , called the *depot*.

To describe a solution, we introduce some terminology that will also be helpful later, in describing the algorithm.

For each pair  $u, v$  of vertices of  $G$ , fix a min-cost  $u$ -to- $v$  path. We define a *route* to be a sequence that alternates between nonnegative integers and vertices of  $G$ . The *start* of the route is the first vertex, and the *end* of the route is the last. For a route  $R$  consisting of vertices  $v_0, \dots, v_k$ , and an edge  $e$ , the multiplicity  $m(e, R)$  of  $e$  in  $R$  is  $|\{i : e \text{ is in the min-cost } v_{i-1}\text{-to-}v_i \text{ path}\}|$ . The *cost* of  $R$  is  $\sum_{e \in E} m(e, R) \text{cost}(e)$ , or equivalently  $\sum_{i=1}^k \text{distance}_G(v_{i-1}, v_i)$ . The integers are used to indicate deliveries: the integer appearing immediately after a vertex  $v$  indicates the number of deliveries made at that vertex. An integer before the first vertex of a route is naturally interpreted as representing deliveries that a vehicle makes *before* following that route but, for technical reasons to be apparent later, this is not enforced. We refer to the integer in a route before the first vertex as the route's *pre-delivery number*. We refer to the sum of the other integers as the route's *internal delivery number*. We refer to the sum of pre-delivery and internal delivery numbers as the route's *total delivery number*. A route is *feasible* if the total delivery number is at most  $Q$ , and if either the internal delivery number is positive or the start or end is the depot.

We say a feasible route is a *tour* if it starts and ends at the depot. A *solution* is a multiset of tours, each starting and ending at the depot, such that for each vertex  $v$  the total number of deliveries made at  $v$  is  $d(v)$ . The objective is to find a solution of minimum total cost.

We prove the following theorem in Section 7.2.2.

**Theorem 14.** *Let  $\epsilon > 0$ . There exists an algorithm that, for any instance of the vehicle routing problem  $(G, \text{cost}(\cdot), Q, d(\cdot), r)$  outputs a  $(1 + O(\epsilon))$ -approximate solution in time  $(Q\epsilon^{-1} \log n)^{O(wQ/\epsilon)} n^3$  where  $n = |V(G)|$  and  $w$  is the treewidth of  $G$ .*

Note that, for bounded width  $w$  and bounded capacity  $Q$ , this is an efficient PTAS.<sup>20</sup> Previously no efficient PTAS was known for bounded width and bounded capacity.

From there, an immediate application of the framework of Becker, Klein, Schild [BKS19] yields a serie of corollaries. The framework of Becker, Klein, Schild implies that for any graph  $G$  in some graph class  $\mathcal{G}$ , if there exists a polynomial time algorithm that computes a stochastic embedding into a dominating graph  $H$  with treewidth  $w$  such that:

$$E_{f \sim \mathcal{D}}[d_H(f(u), f(v))] \leq d_G(u, v) + \epsilon(d_G(s, u) + d_G(s, v)),$$

then there exists an approximation scheme for vehicle routing with bounded capacity for  $\mathcal{G}$  with running time  $n^{O(1)} + T(w, \epsilon, n)$ , where  $T(w, \epsilon, n)$  is the best running time for an approximation scheme for  $n$ -vertex graphs of treewidth at most  $w$ .

As a consequence, we obtain the following corollary:

**Corollary 3.** *There is an efficient PTAS for bounded-capacity vehicle routing in planar metrics.*

Moreover, again as a consequence of the results of Becker, Klein, and Saulpic [BKS18], we have:

**Corollary 4.** *There is an efficient PTAS for bounded-capacity vehicle routing in metrics of bounded highway dimension.*

As corollaries of Lemma 21 and Lemma 7 below, we obtain the two following results.

**Corollary 5.** *There is a QPTAS for bounded-capacity vehicle routing in minor-free metrics.*

**Corollary 6.** *There is an efficient PTAS for bounded-capacity vehicle routing in bounded genus metrics.*

### 7.2.1 Reduction to the bounded treewidth case

We first prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 21.** *Given an  $n$ -vertex edge-weighted  $K_r$ -minor-free graph  $G$  and a distinguished vertex  $s$ , in polynomial time, one can embed  $G$  stochastically into a dominating graph  $H$  with treewidth  $O_r(2^{\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon})} \log n)$  such that:*

$$E_{f \sim \mathcal{D}}[d_H(f(u), f(v))] \leq d_G(u, v) + \epsilon(d_G(s, u) + d_G(s, v)) . \quad (9)$$

<sup>20</sup>Note that in Theorem 14 exponential dependencies on  $w$  and  $Q$  are needed to get a polynomial time approximation scheme since the problem with arbitrary capacity  $Q$  is APX-hard on trees [Bec18] and the problem with bounded capacity is APX-hard graphs on graphs of arbitrary treewidth.



*Proof.* The proof closely follows the proof of Theorem 2 in Becker et al. [BKS19]. Assume that the minimum edge weight is 1. Choose a random  $x \in [0, 1]$ . We partition  $V(G)$  into bands  $\mathcal{B} = \{B_0, B_1, \dots, B_m\}$  such that:

- $B_0 = \{u \mid d_G(s, u) \leq \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{\frac{x}{\epsilon}}\}$ .
- $B_i = \{u \mid \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{\frac{i-x}{\epsilon}} \leq d_G(s, u) \leq \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{\frac{i+x}{\epsilon}}\}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ .
- $\cup_{i=0}^m B_i = V(G)$ .

Let  $\mathcal{B}(u)$  be the band containing vertex  $u$ . The key property of this random partition is that (Lemma 2 [BKS19]):

$$\Pr[\mathcal{B}(u) \neq \mathcal{B}(v)] \leq \epsilon \quad \text{for } u, v \text{ s.t. } \epsilon d_G(s, v) \leq d_G(s, u) \leq d_G(s, v) \quad (10)$$

Let  $G_i$  be the graph that contains all pairwise shortest paths between vertices in  $\{r\} \cup B_i$ . Let  $L_0 = 1$  and  $L_i = \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{\frac{i-x}{\epsilon}}$  for  $i \in [1, m]$  and  $U_i = \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{\frac{i+x}{\epsilon}}$  for  $i \in [0, m]$ . Let  $\delta_i = U_i/L_i$ . Observe that for every  $i \in [0, m]$

$$\delta_i \leq \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{\frac{2x}{\epsilon}} \leq \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{\frac{2}{\epsilon}} \quad (11)$$

and that each graph  $G_i$  has  $\text{DIAM}(G_i) \leq 2U_i$ . Since  $G_i$  is a  $K_r$ -minor-free graph, we apply Theorem 2 to stochastically embed  $G_i$  into  $H_i$  with additive distortion  $\frac{\epsilon}{\delta_i} U_i$  and of treewidth:

$$\text{tw}(H_i) = O_r\left(\frac{2\delta_i \log n}{\epsilon}\right) = O_r(2^{\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon})} \log n) \quad (12)$$

We can construct the graph  $H$  and the corresponding embedding by adding an edge of weight  $d_G(s, v)$  from  $s$  to every vertex  $v$  of  $\cup_{i=1}^m H_i$  that has (one) preimage in  $G$ . Clearly  $H$  has treewidth  $\max_{i=1}^m \text{tw}(H_i) + 1 = O_r(2^{\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon})} \log n)$ .

It remains to bound the distortion between  $u, v \in V(G)$ . We assume w.l.o.g that  $d_G(s, u) \leq d_G(s, v)$ .

- **Case 1**  $d_G(s, u) < \epsilon d_G(s, v)$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[d_H(u, v)] &\leq \mathbb{E}[d_H(s, u) + d_H(s, v)] = d_G(s, u) + d_G(s, v) \\ &\leq d_G(s, u) + d_G(s, u) + d_G(u, v) \leq d_G(u, v) + 2\epsilon d_G(s, v) \end{aligned}$$

- **Case 2**  $\epsilon d_G(s, v) \leq d_G(s, v)$ . Let  $\Phi$  be the event that  $u$  and  $v$  are in the same band  $B_i$  for some  $i \in [0, m]$ . By Equation (10),  $\Pr[\bar{\Phi}] \leq \epsilon$ . We have:

$$\mathbb{E}[d_H(u, v) | \Phi] = \mathbb{E}[d_{H_i}(u, v)] \leq d_{G_i}(u, v) + \frac{\epsilon}{\delta_i} U_i = d_G(u, v) + \epsilon L_i \leq d_G(u, v) + \epsilon d_G(s, u)$$

and:

$$\mathbb{E}[d_H(u, v) | \bar{\Phi}] \leq \mathbb{E}[d_H(s, u) + d_H(s, v)] = d_G(s, u) + d_G(s, v)$$

That implies:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[d_H(u, v)] &= \Pr[\Phi] \mathbb{E}[d_H(u, v) | \Phi] + \Pr[\bar{\Phi}] \mathbb{E}[d_H(u, v) | \bar{\Phi}] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[d_H(u, v) | \Phi] + \epsilon \mathbb{E}[d_H(u, v) | \bar{\Phi}] \\ &\leq d_G(u, v) + \epsilon d_G(s, u) + \epsilon(d_G(s, u) + d_G(s, v)) \\ &\leq d_G(u, v) + 2\epsilon(d_G(s, u) + d_G(s, v)) \end{aligned}$$

In both cases,  $\mathbb{E}[d_H(u, v) \leq qd_G(u, v) + 2\epsilon(d_G(s, u) + d_G(s, v))]$ . By scaling  $\epsilon \leftarrow \epsilon/2$  we obtain the desired distortion with the same treewidth bound.  $\square$

By applying the same argument to bounded genus graphs and using [Theorem 4](#) to embed  $G_i$ , we obtain the following corollary:

**Corollary 7.** *Given an  $n$ -vertex edge-weighted graph  $G$  of genus  $g$  and a distinguished vertex  $s$ , in polynomial time, one can embed  $G$  stochastically into a dominating graph  $H$  with treewidth  $O_g(2^{\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon})})$  such that:*

$$E_{f \sim \mathcal{D}}[d_H(f(u), f(v))] \leq d_G(u, v) + \epsilon(d_G(s, u) + d_G(s, v)) . \quad (13)$$

*Proof of Theorem 6.* To obtain an approximation scheme for vehicle routing problem with bounded capacity, namely where  $Q$  is considered a fixed constant, using [Lemma 21](#), the idea is to embed an instance of the vehicle routing problem to a graph  $H$  with parameter  $\hat{\epsilon} = \epsilon/Q$  and hence treewidth  $\text{tw} = O_r(\log n \cdot 2^{\text{poly}(Q/\epsilon)})$  by [Lemma 21](#). We then solve the instance of the vehicle routing problem on  $H$  and "lift" the solution to the solution of the original graph: for each tour  $T_H$  in  $H$  starting from  $\Phi(s)$  covering an order sequence of points  $f(v_1), f(v_2), \dots, f(v_q)$  where  $v_i$  is a vertex of  $G$ ,  $i \in [1, q]$ , and  $q \leq Q$ , we convert it into a tour  $T_H$  starting from  $s$  covering points  $v_1, \dots, v_q$  in this order. The expected total cost of the lifted solution is at most  $(1 + \epsilon)$  times the optimal cost by [Lemma 5](#) in [\[BKS19\]](#). The running time, by [Theorem 8](#), is:

$$(Q\epsilon^{-1} \log n)^{O_r(\log n) 2^{\text{poly}(\frac{Q}{\epsilon})} Q/\epsilon} n^{O(1)} = n^{O_{\epsilon, r, q}(\log \log n)} . \quad (14)$$

$\square$

*Proof of Theorem 7.* The algorithm for genus- $g$  graphs is exactly the same. However, the treewidth of  $H$  in this case is  $O_g(2^{\text{poly}(\frac{Q}{\epsilon})})$ . Thus, the running time, by [Theorem 8](#), is:

$$(Q\epsilon^{-1} \log n)^{O_g(2^{\text{poly}(\frac{Q}{\epsilon})} Q/\epsilon)} n^{O(1)} = 2^{O_g(\text{poly}(\frac{Q}{\epsilon}))} n^{O(1)} \quad (15)$$

In the above equation, we use the following inequality:

$$(\log n)^d n^c \leq n^{c+1} 2^{d^2} \quad \text{when } n \text{ is sufficiently big}$$

which can be proved as follows. If  $d \geq \log \log n$ , then:

$$d \log \log n + c \log n \leq d^2 + c \log n \leq (c+1) \log n + d^2$$

Otherwise,

$$d \log \log n + c \log n \leq (\log \log n)^2 + c \log n \leq (c+1) \log n \leq (c+1) \log n + d^2$$

when  $n$  is sufficiently big.  $\square$

### 7.2.2 An FPT-approximation scheme for vehicle routing with bounded capacity in bounded treewidth graphs

**Preliminaries** For simplicity, we work with branch decompositions instead of tree decompositions. A branch decomposition of a graph  $G$  is a maximal collection  $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k\}$  of nonempty mutually noncrossing sets of edges. Equivalently, there is a binary tree each node of which is a set  $C$  of edges, where each leaf is a singleton set and each nonleaf  $C$  has two children,  $C'$  and  $C''$ , such that  $C' \cap C'' = \emptyset$  and  $C = C' \cup C''$ . We refer to the sets  $C_i$  forming the branch decomposition as *branch clusters*<sup>21</sup> or simply *clusters*. Given a cluster  $C$ , we denote by  $\partial_G(C)$  the set of vertices  $v$  such that  $v$  is incident to some edge in  $C$  and some edge not in  $C$ . We refer to the vertices of  $\partial_G(C)$  as *portals* of  $C$ .<sup>22</sup> We refer to other vertices incident to edges of  $C$  as *internal* vertices. The *width* of  $\{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k\}$  is  $\max_i |\partial_G(C_i)|$ . The branchwidth of a graph is the minimum width of a branch decomposition. It is known that a graph of branchwidth  $w$  has treewidth  $O(w)$  and vice versa.

Now we outline concepts underlying the algorithm. The input consists of the graph  $G$ , cost function  $\text{cost}(\cdot)$ , capacity  $Q$ , delivery requirement function  $d(\cdot)$ , and depot  $r$ . We assume that  $G$  comes equipped with a branch decomposition.<sup>23</sup> We assume moreover that the depth of the branch decomposition tree is at most  $c \log n$  where  $c$  is a constant and  $n = |V(G)|$ .<sup>24</sup> We assume that the depot is *not* a portal of any cluster.<sup>25</sup> Specify for each vertex a leaf cluster that contains an edge incident to that vertex. The vertex is said to be *inside* this cluster and inside every ancestor of this cluster in the branch decomposition.

We say a route  $R$  is *good* with respect to a cluster  $C$  if every vertex of  $R$  is incident to  $C$  or is the depot, and if the start and end of  $R$  are portals of  $C$  or the depot, and if every vertex  $v$  that appears in  $R$  followed immediately by a positive integer is a vertex that is inside  $C$ .

We now define *concatenation* of routes, a binary operation denoted by  $\circ$ . If

$$R_1 = j \ u \ s_1 \ v \ k$$

(where  $j$  and  $k$  are integers,  $u$  and  $v$  are vertices, and  $s_1$  is a sequence) is a route with start  $u$  and end  $v$  and pre-delivery number  $j$  and total delivery number  $q$ , and

$$R_2 = q \ v \ \ell \ s_2$$

(where  $q$  and  $\ell$  are integers and  $v$  is a vertex and  $s_2$  is a sequence) is a route with start  $v$  and pre-delivery number  $q$  then

$$R_1 \circ R_2 = j \ u \ s_1 \ v \ (k + \ell) \ s_2$$

is a route with pre-delivery number  $j$ .

A partial solution for  $C$  is supposed to capture how a solution might intersect  $C$ . A *partial solution* for  $C$  is a multiset  $\mathcal{R}$  of feasible routes, each good with respect to  $C$ , such that, for each vertex  $v$  inside  $C$ , the number of deliveries to  $v$  is  $d(v)$ .

<sup>21</sup>This is not (yet) standard terminology.

<sup>22</sup>This is not (yet) standard terminology.

<sup>23</sup>An optimal branch decomposition can be found in time exponential in the width.

<sup>24</sup>One can transform a branch decomposition to one of depth  $O(\log n)$  while at most doubling the width. See [EKM12].

<sup>25</sup>This can be achieved by introducing a zero-cost edge  $uv$  where  $v$  is the original depot and  $u$  is a new vertex and is the new depot.

Because we seek an *efficient* dynamic program, we want to consider only partial solutions that are constrained in a way that allows for more efficient computation. We will prove that there is a near-optimal solution that satisfies these constraints.

Let  $\mathcal{R}$  be a partial solution for  $C$ . For a portal  $p$  of  $C$  and integer  $q \in \{0, 1, \dots, Q\}$ , we define the *outflow of  $\mathcal{R}$  at  $p$  with delivery  $q$*  to be the number of routes  $R$  in  $\mathcal{R}$  that end at  $p$  and that have total delivery number  $q$ . Similarly, the *inflow of  $\mathcal{R}$  at  $p$  with delivery  $q$*  is the number of routes in  $\mathcal{R}$  that start at  $p$  and that have pre-delivery number  $q$ .

A *configuration*  $\kappa$  for  $C$  specifies, for each portal  $p$  of  $C$  and each  $q \in \{0, 1, \dots, Q\}$ , an integer  $f_{p,q}^{\text{in}}(\kappa)$  and an integer  $f_{p,q}^{\text{out}}(\kappa)$ . A partial solution for  $C$  *induces* a configuration  $\kappa$  for  $C$  if, for each portal  $p$  and  $q \in \{0, 1, \dots, Q\}$ ,  $f_{p,q}^{\text{in}}(\kappa)$  is the inflow at  $p$  with delivery  $q$  and  $f_{p,q}^{\text{out}}(\kappa)$  is the outflow. The configuration is *constrained* if each integer is the ceiling of a power of  $1 + \frac{\epsilon}{cQ \log n}$ .

**Algorithm** The algorithm first computes all-pairs shortest paths for the input graph  $G$  with respect to the given cost function. The algorithm then executes a dynamic program that processes the clusters in some leaf-to-root order (e.g. in nondecreasing order of the size of cluster). For each cluster  $C$ , it computes a table  $T_C[\cdot]$  that maps each configuration  $\kappa$  in a subset of the constrained configurations for  $C$  to a partial solution for  $C$  that induces  $\kappa$ . Once the algorithm has constructed the table  $T_{\hat{C}}$  for the root cluster  $\hat{C}$ , it outputs the sole entry in that table. There is only one configuration  $\hat{\kappa}$  for  $\hat{C}$  because  $\hat{C}$  has no portals. Furthermore, because  $T_{\hat{C}}[\hat{\kappa}]$  is good with respect to  $\hat{C}$ , which has no portals, it follows that every route in  $T_{\hat{C}}[\hat{\kappa}]$  is a tour and that these tours jointly handle the delivery requirements.

Now we describe how the algorithm populates the table  $T_C[\cdot]$  for  $C$ . For each constrained configuration  $\kappa$  of  $C$ , the algorithm proceeds as follows. If  $C$  is a leaf cluster, it suffices to consider a constant number of partial solutions that are good with respect to  $C$  and that induce  $\kappa$ . The algorithm enumerates these, finds the partial solution  $\mathcal{R}$  of minimum cost, and assigns it to  $T_C[\kappa]$ .

Suppose  $C$  has children  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ . In this case, the algorithm iterates over pairs  $(\kappa_1, \kappa_2)$  of configurations for which  $T_{C_1}[\kappa_1]$  and  $T_{C_2}[\kappa_2]$  are defined. For each pair, the algorithm constructs an instance of a min-cost flow problem with no capacities. The algorithm finds the minimum solution and uses it (as described below) to construct a partial solution  $\mathcal{R}$  for  $C$ . Finally, the algorithm assigns to  $T_C[\kappa]$  the cheapest partial solution for  $C$  that it found.

Now we describe the instance of the transportation problem. For convenience, we let  $C_0$  denote  $C$  and we let  $\kappa_0$  denote  $\kappa$ . The flow network consists of a subnetwork for each  $q \in \{0, 1, \dots, Q\}$ , as follows:

- For each  $p \in \partial(C_1) \cup \partial(C_2)$ , for, the network has a node  $v_{p,q}$ . For  $i = 0, 1, 2$ , define  $g(i, p, q)$  to be  $f_{p,q}^{\text{in}}(\kappa_i) - f_{p,q}^{\text{out}}(\kappa_i)$  if  $p \in \partial(C_i)$  and zero if  $p \notin \partial(C_i)$ . The *supply* of  $v_{p,q}$  is  $g(0, p, q) + g(1, p, q) + g(2, p, q)$ .
- The network also has a node  $s_q$  and a node  $t_q$ , both representing the depot. The supply of  $s_q$  is required only to be nonnegative, and the supply of  $t_q$  is required only to be nonpositive.
- For each pair  $p, \bar{p} \in \partial(C_1) \cup \partial(C_2)$ , there is an arc  $v_{p,q} \rightarrow v_{\bar{p},q}$  whose cost is the  $p$ -to- $\bar{p}$  distance.
- For each  $p \in \partial(C_1) \cup \partial(C_2)$ , there is an arc  $s_q \rightarrow v_{p,q}$  and an arc  $v_{p,q} \rightarrow t_q$ , each of whose cost is the  $p$ -to-depot distance.

A multiset  $\mathcal{S}$  of arcs is a feasible solution if the following holds for each node  $v$ :

- If the supply of  $v$  is positive then the number of arcs in  $\mathcal{S}$  with tail  $v$  is equal to the supply.
- If the supply of  $v$  is negative (in which case we treat it as a demand) then the number of arcs in  $\mathcal{S}$  with head  $v$  is equal to the negative of the supply.

The algorithm finds the minimum-cost feasible solution  $\mathcal{S}$ , and calls  $\text{COMBINESOLUTIONS}_C(C, \mathcal{S}, T_{C_1}(\kappa_1), T_{C_2}[\kappa_2])$  to combine recursively computed solutions to form a partial solution for  $C$ .

$\text{COMBINESOLUTIONS}_C(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2)$ :

initialize  $\mathcal{R}$  to consist of  $\mathcal{R}_{C_1} \cup \mathcal{R}_{C_2}$   
 for each copy in  $\mathcal{S}$  of an arc  $s_q \rightarrow v_{p,q}$ , add to  $\mathcal{R}$  a route  $q \ r \ 0 \ p \ 0$   
 for each copy in  $\mathcal{S}$  of an arc  $v_{p,q} \rightarrow t_q$ , add to  $\mathcal{R}$  a route  $q \ p \ 0 \ r \ 0$   
 while possible  
   find two routes  $R_1, R_2 \in \mathcal{R}$  such that  $R_1 \circ R_2$  is defined,  
   and replace them in  $\mathcal{R}$  with  $R_1 \circ R_2$ .

**Lemma 22.** *The cost of the solution obtained by  $\text{COMBINESOLUTIONS}_C(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2)$  is the sum of costs of  $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2$ .*

Because the solution to the min-cost flow problem achieves the given supplies, and because the partial solutions  $T_{C_1}(\kappa_1)$  and  $T_{C_2}(\kappa_2)$  induce the configurations  $\kappa_1$  and  $\kappa_2$  respectively, one can prove the following:

**Lemma 23.** *The multiset found by  $\text{COMBINESOLUTIONS}$  is (1) a partial solution (2) that is good with respect to  $C$  and (3) that induces  $\kappa$ .*

**Overview of analysis** Now we show that the algorithm returns a solution of cost at most  $1 + \epsilon$  times optimal. First we outline the analysis. Say a route is *degenerate* if it has the form  $q \ r \ 0 \ p \ 0$  or  $q \ v \ 0 \ r \ 0$ . Let  $\mathcal{T}^*$  be the optimal solution. We derive, for each cluster  $C$ , a partial solution  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_C$  that induces a constrained configuration  $\kappa_C$ , and a set  $\mathcal{X}_C \subset \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_C$  of degenerate routes with the following property:

**Property 1:** The cost of  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_C$  equals  $\sum_{e \in C} m(e, \mathcal{R}^*) \text{cost}(e)$  plus the cost of

$$\bigcup \{ \mathcal{X}_{\bar{C}} : \bar{C} \text{ a descendant of } C \} \quad (16)$$

In particular, for  $C = \hat{C}$ , the root cluster, the total cost of  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\hat{C}}$  exceeds that of  $\mathcal{R}^*$  by the total cost of (16). We will show that the latter is at most  $c'\epsilon$  times the cost of  $\mathcal{R}^*$  where  $c'$  is a constant.

For each nonleaf cluster  $C$ , the partial solution  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_C$  is the output of  $\text{COMBINESOLUTIONS}_C(\mathcal{S}, \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{C_1}, \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{C_2})$  where  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are the children of  $C$  and  $\mathcal{S}$  is a feasible solution to the min-cost flow instance.

Therefore, it follows by induction that, in the dynamic program, for each cluster  $C$  the cost of  $T_C[\kappa_C]$  is at most the cost of  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_C$ . In particular, for  $C = \hat{C}$ , the root cluster, we will show that the cost of (16) is at most  $c'\epsilon$  times the cost of  $\mathcal{R}^*$  where  $c'$  is a constant, so the cost of  $T_{\hat{C}}[\kappa_{\hat{C}}]$  is at most  $1 + c'\epsilon$  times optimal.

To bound the cost of (16) for  $C = \hat{C}$ , we will show how to construct a rooted forest  $\mathcal{F}$ . Each leaf is a triple  $(R, C, v)$  where  $R$  is a route in  $\mathcal{R}^*$ ,  $C$  is a cluster, and  $v$  is a vertex inside  $C$  at which  $R$

does a delivery. Because each such route  $R$  delivers to at most  $Q$  vertices  $v$ , each vertex  $v$  is inside at most  $c \log n$  clusters  $C$ , each tour  $R \in \mathcal{R}^*$  appears in a leaf at most  $Qc \log n$  times. Thus, if we define the cost of  $(T, C, v)$  to be the cost of  $T$ ,

$$(cQ \log n) \text{ cost}(\mathcal{T}^*) \geq \text{total cost of the leaves}$$

Each nonleaf of  $\mathcal{F}$  is an element of (16), and has at least  $\epsilon^{-1}cQ \log n$  children, each of which has cost at least that of its parent. Hence

$$\text{total cost of the leaves} \geq (\epsilon^{-1}cQ \log n - 1) \cdot \text{total cost of nonleaf tours}$$

which implies that the sum of costs of (16) is at most  $\epsilon \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{cQ \log n}\right)$  times the optimal value.

**Construction** For each leaf cluster  $C = \{e\}$ , one can derive a partial solution  $\mathcal{R}_C$  good for  $C$  such that  $m(e, \mathcal{R}_C)$  is the number of occurrences of  $e$  in tours in  $\mathcal{R}^*$  where a delivery is made to an endpoint of  $e$  inside  $C$ . However, the induced configuration is not necessarily constrained. We obtain a solution  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_C$  from  $\mathcal{R}_C$  by adding a set  $\mathcal{X}_C$  of degenerate paths:

```

initialize  $\mathcal{X}_C$  to empty
for each vertex  $p \in e$ , for each  $q = 0, 1, \dots, Q$ ,
  let  $f_{p,q}^{\text{out}}$  be the outflow of  $\mathcal{R}_C$  at  $p$  with delivery  $q$ 
  let  $\Delta_{p,q}^{\text{out}}$  be the smallest nonnegative integer such that  $f_{p,q}^{\text{out}} + \Delta_{p,q}^{\text{out}}$  is the ceiling
    of a power of  $1 + \frac{\epsilon}{cQ \log |V|}$ 
  add  $\Delta_{p,q}^{\text{out}}$  copies of the route  $q \rightarrow p \rightarrow 0$  to  $\mathcal{X}_C$ 
  let  $f_{p,q}^{\text{in}}$  be the inflow of  $\mathcal{R}_C$  at  $p$  with delivery  $q$ 
  let  $\Delta_{p,q}^{\text{in}}$  be the smallest nonnegative integer such that  $f_{p,q}^{\text{in}} + \Delta_{p,q}^{\text{in}}$  is the ceiling
    of a power of  $1 + \frac{\epsilon}{cQ \log |V|}$ 
  add the route  $q \rightarrow p \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow r$  to  $\mathcal{X}_C$ 

```

The construction ensures that  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_C$  induces a constrained configuration  $\kappa_C$ . Furthermore, for each  $p \in e$ , for each  $q = 0, 1, \dots, Q$ ,  $\Delta_{p,q}^{\text{out}} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{cQ \log n} f_{p,q}^{\text{out}}$  so each of the corresponding  $\Delta_{p,q}^{\text{out}}$  degenerate routes can be assigned  $\epsilon^{-1}cQ \log n$  routes that pass through  $p$  and do deliveries to one of the vertices in  $C$ . Thus the lowest levels of the forest  $\mathcal{F}$  are defined.

The construction for a nonleaf cluster  $C$  is similar. There is a natural partial solution for  $C$  that is derived from  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{C_1}$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{C_2}$  and  $\mathcal{R}^*$  but the configuration induced is not necessarily constrained, so degenerate routes are added to bump the integers in the configuration up to ceilings of powers of  $1 + \frac{\epsilon}{cQ \log |V|}$ . Each degenerate route starting/ending at portal  $p$  can be assigned  $\epsilon^{-1}cQ \log n$  routes in  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{C_1}$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{C_2}$  that pass through  $p$ ; these are the children of the degenerate route in  $\mathcal{F}$ .

## 8 Lower bound for deterministic embedding into bounded treewidth graphs

Given an unweighted graph  $H = (V, E)$ , denote by  $H_k$  the  $k$ -subdivision of  $H$  (the graph where each edge is replaced by a  $k$ -path). Our proof is based on the following lemma by Carrol and Goel [CG04]:



**Lemma 24** ([CG04] Lemma 1). *Let  $G$  be a (possibly weighted) graph that excludes  $H$  as a minor. Every dominating embedding from  $H_k$  to  $G$  has multiplicative distortion at least  $\frac{k-3}{6}$ .*

We now prove Theorem 3; we start by restating the theorem.

**Theorem 3.** *There is an infinite graph family  $\mathcal{H}$  of  $K_6$ -free graphs, such that for every  $H \in \mathcal{H}$  with  $n$  vertices and diameter  $D$ , every dominating embedding of  $H$  into a treewidth- $o(\sqrt{n})$  graph has additive distortion at least  $\frac{1}{20} \cdot D$ .*

*Proof.* Set  $k = 90$ . For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $H^n$  be the unweighted graph consisting of an  $n \times n$  grid, with an additional vertex  $\psi$  who is a common neighbor of all other vertices. Define  $\mathcal{H} = \{H_k^n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . Note that  $H_k^n$  has  $|H_k^n| = \Theta(n^2 \cdot k) = \Theta(n^2)$  vertices. In addition, all the graphs in  $\mathcal{H}$  are  $K_6$  free. Furthermore, for each  $n$ ,  $H^n$  has diameter 2, and thus  $H_k^n$  has diameter  $2k + 2 \lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor \leq 3k$ .

Consider some  $H_k^n \in \mathcal{H}$ , as  $H_k^n$  includes the  $n \times n$  as a minor, it has treewidth at least  $n$  (see e.g. [?]). Using Lemma 24, every embedding  $f$  of  $H_k^n$  into a graph  $G$  with treewidth at most  $o(\sqrt{|V(H_k^n)|}) < n - 1$  will have multiplicative distortion at least  $\frac{k-3}{6}$ . In particular, there is an edge  $(u, v)$  in  $H_k^n$  with such a multiplicative distortion (as otherwise using the triangle inequality all pairs of vertices will have distortion smaller than  $\frac{k-3}{6}$ ). We conclude:

$$d_G(f(u), f(v)) \geq \frac{k-3}{6} = d_{H_k^n}(u, v) + \frac{k-9}{6} \geq d_{H_k^n}(u, v) + \frac{k-9}{18k} \cdot D = d_{H_k^n}(u, v) + \frac{1}{20} \cdot D.$$

□

## 9 Conclusion

We have proved two structural results for minor-free graphs: (a) a subset spanner with constant lightness exists and (b) there is a stochastic embedding of diameter  $D$  minor-free graphs into treewidth  $O(\frac{\log n}{\epsilon^2})$  graphs and additive distortion  $\epsilon D$ . The results are obtained from a new multi-step framework for designing algorithms in minor-free graphs, which we believe is of independent interest. There are two major algorithmic applications of our structural results: an EPTAS for TSP and the first QPTAS for the vehicle routing with bounded capacity problem, both in minor-free graphs.

We also provide an efficient FPT approximation scheme for the vehicle routing with bounded capacity problem in bounded treewidth graphs. As corollaries, we obtain EPTASes for the same problem in planar graphs, bounded genus graphs and graphs with bounded highway dimension. Major open problems from our work are:

1. Can a minor-free graph of diameter  $D$  be stochastically embedded into a graph with treewidth  $c(\epsilon)$  and distortion  $\epsilon D$  in polynomial time, where  $c(\epsilon)$  only depends on  $\epsilon$ ? If the answer to this question is positive, one can immediately get a PTAS for the vehicle routing problem with bounded capacity in minor-free graphs.
2. Can one design a PTAS or QPTAS for Steiner tree, Steiner forest, survivable network design problems in minor-free graphs?

**Acknowledgement** Part of this work was initiated at the workshop *The Traveling Salesman Problem: Algorithms & Optimization* at Banff International Research Station; Hung Le and Vincent Cohen-Addad thank the organizers of the workshop and Banff for their hospitality. Arnold Filtser is supported by the Simons Foundation. Philip Klein is supported by NSF Grant CCF-1841954. Hung Le is supported by an NSERC grant, a PIMS postdoctoral fellowship, and a start-up grant from Umass Amherst.

## References

- [ABP92] B. Awerbuch, A. Baratz, and D. Peleg. Efficient broadcast and light-weight spanners. *Technical Report CS92-22, Weizmann Institute*, October, 1992. 13
- [ABS<sup>+</sup>19] R. Ahmed, G. Bodwin, F. D. Sahneh, K. Hamm, M. J. L. Jebelli, S. Kobourov, and R. Spence. Graph spanners: A tutorial review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.03152*, 2019. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.03152>. 13
- [ACL09] A. Adamaszek, A. Czumaj, and A. Lingas. PTAS for  $k$ -tour cover problem on the plane for moderately large values of  $k$ . In *International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation, ISAAC '09*, pages 994–1003, 2009, doi:10.1007/978-3-642-10631-6\_100. 14
- [ADD<sup>+</sup>93] I. Althöfer, G. Das, D. Dobkin, D. Joseph, and J. Soares. On sparse spanners of weighted graphs. *Discrete Computational Geometry*, 9(1):81–100, 1993, doi:10.1007/BF02189308. 2, 14
- [AFGN18] I. Abraham, A. Filtser, A. Gupta, and O. Neiman. Metric embedding via shortest path decompositions. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2018, Los Angeles, CA, USA, June 25-29, 2018*, pages 952–963, 2018. full version: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1708.04073>, doi:10.1145/3188745.3188808. 3
- [AG06] I. Abraham and C. Gavoille. Object location using path separators. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-fifth Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, PODC '06, pages 188–197, 2006. Full version: <https://www.cse.huji.ac.il/~ittaia/papers/AG-TR.pdf>, doi:10.1145/1146381.1146411. 5, 8, 9, 16, 18, 29
- [AGG<sup>+</sup>19] I. Abraham, C. Gavoille, A. Gupta, O. Neiman, and K. Talwar. Cops, robbers, and threatening skeletons: Padded decomposition for minor-free graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 48(3):1120–1145, 2019, doi:10.1137/17M1112406. 1
- [AGK<sup>+</sup>98] S. Arora, M. Grigni, D. R. Karger, P. N. Klein, and A. Woloszyn. A polynomial-time approximation scheme for weighted planar graph TSP. In *Proceedings of the Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, 25-27 January 1998, San Francisco, California, USA*, pages 33–41, 1998. 1, 5, 13
- [AGMW10] I. Abraham, C. Gavoille, D. Malkhi, and U. Wieder. Strong-diameter decompositions of minor free graphs. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 47(4):837–855, 2010, doi:10.1007/s00224-010-9283-6. 5, 8, 26

- [AKTT97] T. Asano, N. Katoh, H. Tamaki, and T. Tokuyama. Covering points in the plane by  $k$ -tours: Towards a polynomial time approximation scheme for general  $k$ . In *Proceedings of the 29th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '97, page 275283, 1997, doi:[10.1145/258533.258602](https://doi.org/10.1145/258533.258602). 1, 2, 14
- [Aro97] S. Arora. Nearly linear time approximation schemes for euclidean TSP and other geometric problems. In *38th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS '97, Miami Beach, Florida, USA, October 19-22, 1997*, pages 554–563, 1997, doi:[10.1109/SFCS.1997.646145](https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1997.646145). 1, 13
- [Awe85] B. Awerbuch. Communication-time trade-offs in network synchronization. In *Proc. of 4th PODC*, pages 272–276, 1985. 13
- [Bar96] Y. Bartal. Probabilistic approximations of metric spaces and its algorithmic applications. In *37th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS '96, Burlington, Vermont, USA, 14-16 October, 1996*, pages 184–193, 1996, doi:[10.1109/SFCS.1996.548477](https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1996.548477). 3
- [BDT14] G. Borradaile, E. D. Demaine, and S. Tazari. Polynomial-time approximation schemes for subset-connectivity problems in bounded-genus graphs. *Algorithmica*, 68(2):287–311, 2014, doi:[10.1007/s00453-012-9662-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-012-9662-2). 2, 13, 14
- [Bec18] A. Becker. A tight  $4/3$  approximation for capacitated vehicle routing in trees. In 118, editor, *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques (APPROX/RANDOM 2018)*, pages 3:1–3:15, 2018, doi:[10.4230/LIPIcs.APPROX-RANDOM.2018.3](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.APPROX-RANDOM.2018.3). 2, 14, 48
- [BG13] Y. Bartal and L. Gottlieb. A linear time approximation scheme for euclidean TSP. In *FOCS*, pages 698–706, 2013, doi:[10.1109/FOCS.2013.80](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2013.80). 1, 13
- [BGK16] Y. Bartal, L. Gottlieb, and R. Krauthgamer. The traveling salesman problem: Low-dimensionality implies a polynomial time approximation scheme. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 45(4):1563–1581, 2016, doi:[10.1137/130913328](https://doi.org/10.1137/130913328). 13
- [BK08] G. Borradaile and P. N. Klein. The two-edge connectivity survivable network problem in planar graphs. In *Automata, Languages and Programming, 35th International Colloquium, ICALP 2008, Reykjavik, Iceland, July 7-11, 2008, Proceedings, Part I: Track A: Algorithms, Automata, Complexity, and Games*, pages 485–501, 2008, doi:[10.1007/978-3-540-70575-8\\_40](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-70575-8_40). 5
- [BKM09] G. Borradaile, P. N. Klein, and C. Mathieu. An  $O(n \log n)$  approximation scheme for Steiner tree in planar graphs. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)*, 5(3):31:1–31:31, 2009, doi:[10.1145/1541885.1541892](https://doi.org/10.1145/1541885.1541892). 1
- [BKMK07] G. Borradaile, C. Kenyon-Mathieu, and P. N. Klein. A polynomial-time approximation scheme for Steiner tree in planar graphs. In *Proceedings of the Eighteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, SODA '07, pages 1285–1294, 2007, doi:[10.5555/1283383.1283521](https://doi.org/10.5555/1283383.1283521). 5

- [BKS17] A. Becker, P. N. Klein, and D. Saulpic. A quasi-polynomial-time approximation scheme for vehicle routing on planar and bounded-genus graphs. In *25th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms*, volume 87 of *ESA '17*, pages 12:1–12:15, 2017, doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.ESA.2017.12. 2, 14
- [BKS18] A. Becker, P. N. Klein, and D. Saulpic. Polynomial-time approximation schemes for  $k$ -center,  $k$ -median, and capacitated vehicle routing in bounded highway dimension. In *26th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms*, volume 112 of *ESA '18*, pages 8:1–8:15, 2018, doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.ESA.2018.8. 4, 14, 48
- [BKS19] A. Becker, P. N. Klein, and A. Schild. A PTAS for bounded-capacity vehicle routing in planar graphs. In *Algorithms and Data Structures*, WADS '19, pages 99–111, 2019, doi:10.1007/978-3-030-24766-9\_8. 2, 14, 48, 49, 50
- [BLW17] G. Borradaile, H. Le, and C. Wulff-Nilsen. Minor-free graphs have light spanners. In *2017 IEEE 58th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, FOCS '17, pages 767–778, 2017, doi:10.1109/FOCS.2017.76. 1, 2, 13, 14
- [BLW19] G. Borradaile, H. Le, and C. Wulff-Nilsen. Greedy spanners are optimal in doubling metrics. In *Proceedings of the 30th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, SODA '19, pages 2371–2379, 2019, doi:10.1137/1.9781611975482.145. 2, 14
- [BMT13] S. Borne, A. R. Mahjoub, and R. Taktak. A branch-and-cut algorithm for the multiple Steiner TSP with order constraints. *Electron. Notes Discret. Math.*, 41:487–494, 2013, doi:10.1016/j.endm.2013.05.129. 1
- [BP19] A. Becker and A. Paul. A framework for vehicle routing approximation schemes in trees. In *Algorithms and Data Structures*, WADS '19, pages 112–125, 2019, doi:10.1007/978-3-030-24766-9\_9. 14
- [CFN85] G. Cornuéjols, J. Fonlupt, and D. Naddef. The traveling salesman problem on a graph and some related integer polyhedra. *Mathematical Programming*, 33(1):1–27, 1985. 1
- [CG04] D. E. Carroll and A. Goel. lower bounds for embedding into distributions over excluded minor graph families. In *Algorithms – ESA 2004*, pages 146–156, 2004. Full version <https://arxiv.org/abs/0807.4582>, doi:10.1007/978-3-540-30140-0\_15. 54, 55
- [Chr76] N. Christofides. Worst-case analysis of a new heuristic for the travelling salesman problem. Technical Report 388, Graduate School of Industrial Administration, Carnegie Mellon University, 1976. 1
- [CJLV08] A. Chakrabarti, A. Jaffe, J. R. Lee, and J. Vincent. Embeddings of topological graphs: Lossy invariants, linearization, and 2-sums. In *49th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2008, October 25-28, 2008, Philadelphia, PA, USA*, pages 761–770, 2008, doi:10.1109/FOCS.2008.79. 3
- [CXKR06] T.-H. Chan, D. Xia, G. Konjevod, and A. Richa. A tight lower bound for the Steiner point removal problem on trees. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on*

- Approximation Algorithms for Combinatorial Optimization Problems, and 10th International Conference on Randomization and Computation, APPROX'06/RANDOM'06*, pages 70–81, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006. Springer-Verlag, [doi:10.1007/11830924\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/11830924_9). 13
- [DHK05] E. D. Demaine, M. Hajiaghayi, and K. Kawarabayashi. Algorithmic graph minor theory: Decomposition, approximation, and coloring. In *Proceedings of the 46th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 637–646, 2005, [doi:10.1109/SFCS.2005.14](https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.2005.14). 5, 10
- [DHK11] E. D. Demaine, M. Hajiaghayi, and K. Kawarabayashi. Contraction decomposition in h-minor-free graphs and algorithmic applications. In *Proceedings of the 43rd ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2011, San Jose, CA, USA, 6-8 June 2011*, pages 441–450, 2011, [doi:10.1145/1993636.1993696](https://doi.org/10.1145/1993636.1993696). 2, 13, 47
- [DM15] A. Das and C. Mathieu. A quasipolynomial time approximation scheme for euclidean capacitated vehicle routing. *Algorithmica*, 73(1):115142, 2015, [doi:10.1007/s00453-014-9906-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-014-9906-4). 2, 14
- [DR59] G. B. Dantzig and J. H. Ramser. The truck dispatching problem. *Management science*, 6(1):80–91, 1959. 2
- [EKM12] D. Eisenstat, P. Klein, and C. Mathieu. An efficient polynomial-time approximation scheme for Steiner forest in planar graphs. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA '12*, page 626638, 2012, [doi:10.5555/2095116.2095169](https://doi.org/10.5555/2095116.2095169). 51
- [EKM14] D. Eisenstat, P. N. Klein, and C. Mathieu. Approximating  $k$ -center in planar graphs. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2014, Portland, Oregon, USA, January 5-7, 2014*, pages 617–627, 2014, [doi:10.1137/1.9781611973402.47](https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611973402.47). 3, 5
- [ELS10] D. Eppstein, M. Löffler, and D. Strash. Listing all maximal cliques in sparse graphs in near-optimal time. In *International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation*, pages 403–414, 2010, [doi:10.1007/978-3-642-17517-6\\_36](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-17517-6_36). 11, 35
- [Epp03] D. Eppstein. Dynamic generators of topologically embedded graphs. In *Proceedings of the 14th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA '03*, pages 599–608, 2003, [doi:10.5555/644108.644208](https://doi.org/10.5555/644108.644208). 39
- [Fil19a] A. Filtser. On strong diameter padded decompositions. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques, APPROX/RANDOM 2019, September 20-22, 2019, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA*, pages 6:1–6:21, 2019, [doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.APPROX-RANDOM.2019.6](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.APPROX-RANDOM.2019.6). 1, 10, 12, 25, 42, 46
- [Fil19b] A. Filtser. Steiner point removal with distortion  $O(\log k)$  using the relaxed-voronoi algorithm. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 48(2):249–278, 2019, [doi:10.1137/18M1184400](https://doi.org/10.1137/18M1184400). 13
- [Fil20] A. Filtser. Scattering and sparse partitions, and their applications. *CoRR*, abs/2001.04447, 2020. To appear in ICALP 2020, [arXiv:2001.04447](https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.04447). 13, 25

- [FKS19] E. Fox-Epstein, P. N. Klein, and A. Schild. Embedding planar graphs into low-treewidth graphs with applications to efficient approximation schemes for metric problems. In *Proceedings of the 30th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, SODA '19, page 10691088, 2019, doi:[10.1137/1.9781611975482.66](https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611975482.66). 3, 4, 10, 46
- [FRT04] J. Fakcharoenphol, S. Rao, and K. Talwar. A tight bound on approximating arbitrary metrics by tree metrics. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 69(3):485–497, 2004, doi:[10.1016/j.jcss.2004.04.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcss.2004.04.011). 3
- [FS16] A. Filtser and S. Solomon. The greedy spanner is existentially optimal. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, PODC '16, pages 9–17, 2016. to appear in SICOMP 2020, doi:[10.1145/2933057.2933114](https://doi.org/10.1145/2933057.2933114). 2
- [FT03] J. Fakcharoenphol and K. Talwar. An improved decomposition theorem for graphs excluding a fixed minor. In *International Workshop on Approximation Algorithms for Combinatorial Optimization*, APPROX '03, pages 36–46, 2003, doi:[10.1007/978-3-540-45198-3\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-45198-3_4). 1
- [GKP95] M. Grigni, E. Koutsoupias, and C. H. Papadimitriou. An approximation scheme for planar graph TSP. In *36th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA, 23-25 October 1995*, pages 640–645, 1995, doi:[10.1109/SFCS.1995.492665](https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1995.492665). 1, 13
- [Got15] L. Gottlieb. A light metric spanner. In *IEEE 56th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2015, Berkeley, CA, USA, 17-20 October, 2015*, pages 759–772, 2015, doi:[10.1109/FOCS.2015.52](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2015.52). 1, 2, 13, 14
- [Gri00] M. Grigni. Approximate TSP in graphs with forbidden minors. In *Automata, Languages and Programming, 27th International Colloquium, ICALP 2000, Geneva, Switzerland, July 9-15, 2000, Proceedings*, pages 869–877, 2000, doi:[10.1007/3-540-45022-X\\_73](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45022-X_73). 1, 13, 14
- [Gro03] M. Grohe. Local tree-width, excluded minors, and approximation algorithms. *Combinatorica*, 23(4):613–632, 2003, doi:[10.1007/s00493-003-0037-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00493-003-0037-9). 5, 10
- [HK85] M. Haimovich and A. H. G. R. Kan. Bounds and heuristics for capacitated routing problems. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 10(4):527–542, 1985, doi:[10.2307/3689422](https://doi.org/10.2307/3689422). 1, 14
- [Jor69] C. Jordan. Sur les assemblages de lignes. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, 70:185–190, 1869. 44
- [KD16] M. Khachay and R. Dubinin. PTAS for the euclidean capacitated vehicle routing problem in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . In *Discrete Optimization and Operations Research*, pages 193–205, 2016, doi:[10.1007/978-3-319-44914-2\\_16](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-44914-2_16). 14
- [KKS11] K. Kawarabayashi, P. N. Klein, and C. Sommer. Linear-space approximate distance oracles for planar, bounded-genus and minor-free graphs. In *The 38th International*



- Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming*, ICALP '11, pages 135–146, 2011, [doi:10.1007/978-3-642-22006-7\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-22006-7_12). 5
- [Kle05] P. N. Klein. A linear-time approximation scheme for planar weighted TSP. In *Proceedings of the 46th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, FOCS '05, pages 647–657, 2005, [doi:10.1109/SFCS.2005.7](https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.2005.7). 1, 2, 13, 47
- [Kle06] P. N. Klein. Subset spanner for planar graphs, with application to subset TSP. In *Proceedings of the 38th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '06, pages 749–756, 2006, [doi:http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1132516.1132620](https://doi.org/http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1132516.1132620). 1, 2, 5, 13, 14, 18
- [Kle08] P. N. Klein. A linear-time approximation scheme for TSP in undirected planar graphs with edge-weights. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 37(6):1926–1952, 2008, [doi:10.1137/060649562](https://doi.org/10.1137/060649562). 1, 27
- [KLMN05] R. Krauthgamer, J. R. Lee, M. Mendel, and A. Naor. Measured descent: a new embedding method for finite metrics. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 15(4):839–858, 2005, [doi:10.1007/s00039-005-0527-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00039-005-0527-6). 3
- [KNZ14] R. Krauthgamer, H. L. Nguyen, and T. Zondiner. Preserving terminal distances using minors. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 28(1):127–141, 2014, [doi:10.1137/120888843](https://doi.org/10.1137/120888843). 13
- [KPR93] P. N. Klein, S. A. Plotkin, and S. Rao. Excluded minors, network decomposition, and multicommodity flow. In *Proceedings of the 25th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '93, page 682690, 1993, [doi:10.1145/167088.167261](https://doi.org/10.1145/167088.167261). 1
- [Le20] H. Le. A PTAS for subset TSP in minor-free graphs. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2020, Salt Lake City, UT, USA, January 5-8, 2020*, pages 2279–2298, 2020. Full version: [arxiv:1804.01588](https://arxiv.org/abs/1804.01588), [doi:10.1137/1.9781611975994.140](https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611975994.140). 1, 2, 5, 7, 13, 14, 18, 19, 47
- [LN15] A. N. Letchford and S. D. Nasiri. the Steiner travelling salesman problem with correlated costs. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 245(1):62–69, 2015, [doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2015.02.044](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2015.02.044). 1
- [LS19] H. Le and S. Solomon. Truly optimal euclidean spanners. In *60th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2019, Baltimore, Maryland, USA, November 9-12, 2019*, pages 1078–1100, 2019, [doi:10.1109/FOCS.2019.00069](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2019.00069). 2, 14
- [LT79] R. Lipton and R. Tarjan. A separator theorem for planar graphs. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 36(2):177–189, 1979. 18
- [Mit99] J. S. B. Mitchell. Guillotine subdivisions approximate polygonal subdivisions: A simple polynomial-time approximation scheme for geometric tsp, k-mst, and related problems. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 28(4):1298–1309, 1999, [doi:10.1137/S0097539796309764](https://doi.org/10.1137/S0097539796309764). 1, 13
- [MT01] B. Mohar and C. Thomassen. *Graphs on Surfaces*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001. 39

- [PS89] D. Peleg and A. A. Schäffer. Graph spanners. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 13(1):99–116, 1989, doi:10.1002/jgt.3190130114. 13
- [PY93] C. H. Papadimitriou and M. Yannakakis. The Traveling Salesman Problem with distances one and two. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 18(1):1–11, 1993, doi:10.2307/3690150. 1
- [Rao99] S. Rao. Small distortion and volume preserving embeddings for planar and Euclidean metrics. In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry, Miami Beach, Florida, USA, June 13-16, 1999*, pages 300–306, 1999, doi:10.1145/304893.304983. 3
- [RS98] S. B. Rao and W. D. Smith. Approximating geometrical graphs via “spanners” and “banyans”. In *Proceedings of the 30th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC ’98*, pages 540–550, 1998. Full version at <http://graphics.stanford.edu/courses/cs468-06-winter/Papers/rs-tsp.pdf>, doi:10.1145/276698.276868. 2, 13, 14
- [RS03] N. Robertson and P. D. Seymour. Graph minors. XVI. Excluding a non-planar graph. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory Series B*, 89(1):43–76, 2003, doi:10.1016/S0095-8956(03)00042-X. 1, 5, 9, 15, 31
- [SG03] J. Salazar-González. The Steiner cycle polytope. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 147(3):671–679, 2003. 1
- [Tal04] K. Talwar. Bypassing the embedding: algorithms for low dimensional metrics. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, Chicago, IL, USA, June 13-16, 2004*, pages 281–290, 2004, doi:10.1145/1007352.1007399. 1, 13
- [Tho04a] M. Thorup. Compact oracles for reachability and approximate distances in planar digraphs. *Journal of the ACM*, 51(6):9931024, 2004, doi:10.1145/1039488.1039493. 5
- [Tho04b] M. Thorup. Compact oracles for reachability and approximate distances in planar digraphs. *J. ACM*, 51(6):993–1024, November 2004, doi:10.1145/1039488.1039493. 5, 18
- [ZTXL15] H. Zhang, W. Tong, Y. Xu, and G. Lin. The Steiner traveling salesman problem with online edge blockages. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 243(1):30–40, 2015. 1
- [ZTXL16] H. Zhang, W. Tong, Y. Xu, and G. Lin. The Steiner traveling salesman problem with online advanced edge blockages. *Computers and Operations Research*, 70:22–38, 2016. 1




Figure 6: An example of a vortex path (purple-highlighted)  $\mathcal{V}[u, v] = P_0 \cup X_1 \cup Y_1 \cup P_1 \cup X_2 \cup Y_2 \cup P_2$  induced by a path  $P[u, v]$  between  $u$  and  $v$ . It could be that a vortex  $W_{i_3}$  contains a vertex of  $P[u, v]$  but is disjoint from the vortex path  $\mathcal{V}[u, v]$

## A Additional Notation

**Tree decomposition** A tree decomposition of  $G(V, E)$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{T}$ , satisfying the following conditions:

1. Each node  $i \in V(\mathcal{T})$  corresponds to a subset of vertices  $X_i$  of  $V$  (called bags), such that  $\cup_{i \in V(\mathcal{T})} X_i = V$ .
2. For each edge  $uv \in E$ , there is a bag  $X_i$  containing both  $u, v$ .
3. For a vertex  $v \in V$ , all the bags containing  $v$  make up a subtree of  $\mathcal{T}$ .

The *width* of a tree decomposition  $\mathcal{T}$  is  $\max_{i \in V(\mathcal{T})} |X_i| - 1$  and the treewidth of  $G$ , denoted by  $\text{tw}$ , is the minimum width among all possible tree decompositions of  $G$ . A *path decomposition* of a graph  $G(V, E)$  is a tree decomposition where the underlying tree is a path. The pathwidth of  $G$ , denoted by  $\text{pw}$ , defined accordingly.

### A.1 Key notation for Section 5.1

$G = (V, E, w)$  : planar graph with a single vortex.

$K$  : terminal set of size  $k$ .

$D = O_h(L)$  : the diameter of  $G$ .

$G_\Sigma$  : the embedded part.

$W$  : vortex.

$\{X_1, \dots, X_t\}$  : path decomposition of  $W$  of width  $h$ .

$\{x_1, \dots, x_t\}$  : perimeter vertices.

$\mathcal{V}[u, v] = P_0 \cup X \cup Y \cup P_1$  : vortex path.

$\bar{\mathcal{V}}[u, v]$  : projection of a vortex path.

$\tilde{x}$  : auxiliary perimeter vertex with bag  $\tilde{X} = \{\tilde{x}\}$ ,  $\tilde{x}$  is a neighbor of all the other vertices in  $W$ .

$T_\Sigma$  : shortest path tree of  $G_\Sigma$  rooted at  $\{x_1, \dots, x_t\}$ .

$T_{\tilde{x}} = T_\Sigma \cup \{(\tilde{x}, v) \mid v \in W \setminus \{\tilde{x}\}\}$  : spanning tree of  $G$ .

$C = \mathcal{V}_1[r, u] \cup \mathcal{V}_2[r, v]$  : fundamental vortex cycle.

$\mathcal{P}(C)$  : set paths constituting  $C$  ( $|\mathcal{P}(C)| \leq 2(h+1) + 1$ ).

$\bar{C}$  : closed curve induced by  $C$ .

$\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{E}$  : interior and exterior of  $C$ .

$\tau$  : hierarchical partition tree of  $V$ .

$\Upsilon$  : subset of  $V$ , and node of  $\tau$ .

$G_\Upsilon$  : graph associated with  $\Upsilon$ .

$W_\Upsilon$  : the vortex of  $G_\Upsilon$ .

$T_\Upsilon = T_{\tilde{x}} \cap G_\Upsilon$  : spanning tree of  $G_\Upsilon$  rooted in  $\tilde{x}$ .

$C_\Upsilon$  : a fundamental vortex cycle of  $\Upsilon$  w.r.t.  $T_\Upsilon$ .

$\bar{C}_\Upsilon$  : closed curve induced by  $C_\Upsilon$ .

$\Upsilon^\varepsilon, \Upsilon^\mathcal{I}$  : interior and exterior of  $C_\Upsilon$  Also the children of  $\Upsilon$  in  $\tau$ .

$\mathcal{P}(C)$  : set of paths constituting fund. vor. cycle  $C$ .

$\mathcal{C}_\Upsilon$  : the set of all the fundamental vortex cycles removed from the ancestors of  $\Upsilon$  in  $\tau$ .

$\bar{\mathcal{C}}_\Upsilon$  : the set of paths constituting  $\mathcal{C}_\Upsilon$ .

$\mathcal{P}_\Upsilon \subseteq \mathcal{C}_\Upsilon$  : subset of shortest paths that is added to  $G_\Upsilon$ .

$v_Q$  : representative vertex of a path  $Q \in \mathcal{P}_\Upsilon$ .

$\omega$  : weight function over the vertices.

$K_\Upsilon = \Upsilon \cap K$  : the set of terminals in  $\Upsilon$ .

## B Missing Proofs

### B.1 Proof of Observation 4

We begin by restating the claim

**Claim 10** (Single Vortex with Bounded Diameter). *For  $i \in [1, v(G)]$ ,  $|C_e \cap F_i| \leq 2$  and if  $|C_e \cap F_i| = 2$ , then  $x_1, f_i, x_2$  is a subpath of  $C_e$  where  $C_e \cap F_i = \{x_1, x_2\}$ .*

*Proof.* First, we observe that

$$d(x, y) = 0 \quad \forall x, y \in F_i, 1 \leq i \leq v(G) \quad (17)$$

since edges  $(f_i, x), (f_i, y)$  have weight 0.

**Observation 4.** *For any  $u \in V(K_\Sigma)$  and any  $i \in [1, v(G)]$ ,  $|T[r, u] \cap F_i| \leq 2$  and if  $|T[r, u] \cap F_i| = 2$ , then  $x_1, f_i, x_2$  is a subpath of  $T[r, u]$  where  $T[r, u] \cap F_i = \{x_1, x_2\}$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $|T[r, u] \cap F_i| \geq 3$ , then there must be two vertices  $x_1, x_2 \in F_i$  such that  $T[x_1, x_2] \subseteq T[r, u]$  does not go through  $f_i$ . Since  $T[x_1, x_2]$  is a shortest path of positive length, this contradicts Equation (17). This argument also implies that if  $T[r, u] \cap F_i = \{x_1, x_2\}$ , then  $\{x_1, f_i, x_2\}$  must be a subpath of  $T[r, u]$ .  $\square$

If  $r_0 \neq f_i$ , then by Claim 4, there is only one path among  $T[r_0, u], T[r_0, v]$  that can contain a vertex of  $F_i$ ; otherwise, both paths share the same vertex  $f_i$  which contradicts that they are vertex disjoint. If  $r_0 = f_i$ , then  $|T[r_0, u] \cap F_i| = |T[r_0, v] \cap F_i| = 1$ . Thus, the claim holds.  $\square$   $\square$