

FPT Algorithms for Plane Completion Problems*

Dimitris Chatzidimitriou¹, Archontia C. Giannopoulou², Spyridon Maniatis³, Clément Requilé⁴, Dimitrios M. Thilikos⁵, and Dimitris Zoros⁶

- 1 Department of Mathematics, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece
hatzisdimitris@gmail.com
- 2 Institute of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science, Technische Universität Berlin, Germany
archontia.giannopoulou@tu-berlin.de
- 3 Department of Mathematics, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece
spyridon.maniatis@gmail.com
- 4 Freie Universität Berlin, Institut für Mathematik und Informatik, Berlin, Germany and
Department of Mathematics, Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain
clement.requile@gmail.com
- 5 Department of Mathematics, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece and
ALGCo project team, CNRS, LIRMM, France.
sedthilk@thilikos.info
- 6 Department of Mathematics, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece
dzoros@math.uoa.gr

Abstract

The PLANE SUBGRAPH (resp. TOPOLOGICAL MINOR) COMPLETION problem asks, given a (possibly disconnected) plane (multi)graph Γ and a connected plane (multi)graph Δ , whether it is possible to add edges in Γ without violating the planarity of its embedding so that it contains some subgraph (resp. topological minor) that is topologically isomorphic to Δ . We give FPT algorithms that solve both problems in $f(|E(\Delta)|) \cdot |E(\Gamma)|^2$ steps. Moreover, for the PLANE SUBGRAPH COMPLETION problem we show that $f(k) = 2^{\mathcal{O}(k \log k)}$.

1998 ACM Subject Classification G.2.2 Graph Algorithms

Keywords and phrases Completion problems, FPT, Plane graphs, Topological Isomorphism

Digital Object Identifier 10.4230/LIPIcs.MFCS.2016.26

* The first, the third, the fifth, and the last authors were supported by the E.U. (European Social Fund - ESF) and Greek national funds through the Operational Program “Education and Lifelong Learning” of the National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) - Research Funding Program: “Thales. Investing in knowledge society through the European Social Fund”. The second author’s research has been supported by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (ERC consolidator grant DISTRUCT, agreement No 648527) and by the Warsaw Center of Mathematics and Computer Science. The fourth author was supported by the FP7-PEOPLE-2013-CIG project CountGraph (ref. 630749), and the Berlin Mathematical School.



© Dimitris Chatzidimitriou, Archontia C. Giannopoulou, Spyridon Maniatis, Clément Requilé, Dimitrios M. Thilikos, and Dimitris Zoros;
licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY

41st International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (MFCS 2016).

Editors: Piotr Faliszewski, Anca Muscholl, and Rolf Niedermeier; Article No. 26; pp. 26:1–26:13



Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics

LIPICs Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany

1 Introduction

Completion problems on graphs are defined as follows: Consider a graph class \mathcal{P} and ask whether we may add edges to a given graph G in order to obtain a graph G^+ , where $G^+ \in \mathcal{P}$. Numerous results have appeared for the case where the objective is to minimize the number of edges added in G [13, 9, 11, 8, 3].

In this paper, we consider the PLANE SUBGRAPH (resp. TOPOLOGICAL MINOR) COMPLETION (PSC) (resp. PTMC) problem which, given a (possibly disconnected) plane graph Γ , called the *host graph*, and a connected plane graph Δ , called the *pattern graph*, asks whether it is possible to add edges in Γ such that the resulting graph remains plane and contains some subgraph (resp. topological minor) that is topologically isomorphic to Δ . Both Γ and Δ are allowed to have multiple edges but not loops. When the input graph Γ is planar triangulated, both PSC and PTMC are NP-complete. Indeed, let G be any planar triangulated graph. Note here, that as any planar triangulated graph is 3-connected, G is 3-connected and from Whitney's Theorem [12] admits a unique embedding on the plane (up to equivalence), say Γ . Let also Δ be the cycle on $n = |V(G)|$ vertices. Then Δ also has unique embedding on the plane (up to equivalence). Since Γ is triangulated no edge can be added to it while preserving its planarity. Thus, both PSC and PTMC become equivalent to the HAMILTON CYCLE PROBLEM which is NP-complete on planar triangulated graphs [4] (see also [7]). This observation further implies that PSC and PTMC parameterized by the number of added edges k , and in particular even for $k = 0$, are NP-complete. Thus, PSC and PTMC are not FPT when parameterized by the number of added edges unless $P = NP$. Thus, in order to obtain a tractable algorithm, we need to find an alternative way to parameterize these problems. In particular, we will consider $|E(\Delta)|$ as our parameter. Our two main results are the following.

► **Theorem.** PSC parameterized by the number of edges of the pattern graph Δ , say k , can be solved in $2^{\mathcal{O}(k \log k)} \cdot m^2$ time, where $m = |E(\Gamma)|$.

► **Theorem.** PTMC parameterized by the number of edges of the pattern graph Δ , say k , can be solved in $f(k) \cdot m^2$ time, where $m = |E(\Gamma)|$ and f is a computable function.

For the PTMC algorithm our approach is the following. Let Γ and Δ be an input of the problem as above. We first apply a series of transformations on our input graph Γ that turn it into a combinatorial structure \mathbf{G} whose treewidth is bounded by a function of $|E(\Delta)|$. Then, we apply a series of transformations on our input graph Δ that also turn it into a combinatorial structure \mathbf{D} . Finally, we show that (Δ, Γ) is a yes-instance of our problem if and only if an MSO-expressible relation holds for \mathbf{G} and \mathbf{D} , thus translating our problem into a purely combinatorial one. Then by employing Courcelle's Theorem we prove our algorithm. We remark here that a similar approach could also solve the PLANE SUBGRAPH COMPLETION problem. However, with a more careful analysis we are able to derive an algorithm with much better bounds on the dependence on the parameter.

Our approach towards solving PSC is the following. Let Γ and Δ be an input of PSC, where $|E(\Delta)| = k$ for some positive integer k . We construct a family \mathcal{G} consisting of $\mathcal{O}(n)$ combinatorial structures depending only on Γ whose underlying graphs have treewidth $\mathcal{O}(k)$. We also construct a family \mathcal{H} consisting of $2^{\mathcal{O}(k \log k)}$ combinatorial structures depending only on Δ , again by applying series of appropriate transformations on them (different than the transformations for PTMC). For the graphs Γ and Δ and the families \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{H} , it holds that (Δ, Γ) is a yes-instance if and only if some structure $\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{H}$ is contained as a *contraction* in a structure $\mathbf{G} \in \mathcal{G}$, denoted $\mathbf{D} \leq_c \mathbf{G}$. Therefore, we again translate our problem into one of

combinatorial nature. Finally, for a fixed pair of structures $(\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{G}) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{G}$ with the above properties, we can decide in $2^{\mathcal{O}(k \log k)} \cdot m$ time whether $\mathbf{D} \leq_c \mathbf{G}$. Therefore, by testing for all pairs $(\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{G}) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{G}$ whether $\mathbf{D} \leq_c \mathbf{G}$, we decide in $2^{\mathcal{O}(k \log k)} \cdot m^2$ steps whether (Δ, Γ) is a yes-instance.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we give the necessary definitions. In Section 3 we present the algorithm for the PSC problem and in Section 4 we present the algorithm for the PTMC problem. In the concluding Section 5 we discuss about other completion problems that can be solved by modifying our results, such as the PLANE INDUCED SUBGRAPH COMPLETION, the PLANE MINOR COMPLETION, the PLANAR ROOTED TOPOLOGICAL MINOR, and the PLANAR DISJOINT PATHS COMPLETION problems. The lemmas whose proofs have been omitted due to lack of space are marked with (\star) .

2 Definitions

For a positive integer n , we denote $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Given a set S , a near-partition of S is a family of sets S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k , where $S_i \cap S_j = \emptyset$, for every $i \neq j$, and $\cup_{i \in [k]} S_i = S$ (note that by the definition it is possible that $S_i = \emptyset$ for some $i \in [k]$). Unless stated otherwise, the graphs considered do not have loops but may have multiple edges. In a graph G we will denote by $V(G)$ the set of its vertices and $E(G)$ the set of its edges. We denote by $\text{dist}_G(u, v)$ the distance of two vertices u and v in the graph G . Also, given a graph G , a vertex $u \in V(G)$, and $V_0 \subseteq V(G)$, we denote by $N_G(u)$ the neighborhood of u in G and by $N_G(V_0) := \bigcup_{v \in V_0} N_G(v) \setminus V_0$. Given a vertex v with exactly two neighbors v_1 and v_2 , the dissolution of v is the operation where we delete v and add an edge $\{v_1, v_2\}$ (even if one existed already).

Let G be a graph. A subset S of its vertices is a *separator* of G if the graph $G - S := (V(G) \setminus S, E[V(G) \setminus S])$ is not connected. The size of a separator S is equal to $|S|$. The vertex contained in a separator of size 1 will be called a *cut-vertex*, while the vertices of a separator of size 2 will be called a *cut-pair*. For every integer $k > 1$, a graph G with at least $k + 1$ vertices is *k-connected* if G has no separators of size less than k . For definitions not explicitly stated on the paper as well as more details on general graphs, see [6]

We say that a graph is *plane* when it is embedded without crossings between its edges on the sphere $\Sigma = \{(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid x^2 + y^2 + z^2 = 1\}$. We treat a plane graph as its embedding in Σ and we simply refer to it as *plane graph*. That is, we do not distinguish between a vertex of the graph and the point of the sphere used in the drawing to represent the vertex or between an edge and the open line segment representing it. We often use the term “general graph” in order to stress that a graph is treated as a combinatorial structure and not as a topological (i.e., embedded) one. Also, given a plane graph Γ we use the term *general graph* of Γ to refer to Γ as a combinatorial structure. We use capital greek letters for plane graphs and capital latin letters for general graphs.

We denote by \subseteq , \subseteq_{sp} , \subseteq_{in} , \leq_m , and \simeq the usual subgraph, spanning subgraph, induced subgraph, minor, and isomorphism relation between two graphs, respectively. Given a graph G and $V_0 \subseteq V(G)$, we denote by $G[V_0]$ the subgraph of G induced by V_0 . We call V_0 *connected* if $G[V_0]$ is connected.

Let Γ be a plane graph and $u \in V(\Gamma)$. Then a tuple (u_1, \dots, u_k) , with possible repetitions, will be called a *cyclic neighborhood* of u , and denoted by $\mathcal{N}_\Gamma(u)$, if $\{u, u_1\}, \dots, \{u, u_k\}$ are exactly the edges incident to u , as we meet them starting from (u, u_1) and proceeding clockwise.

Let A be a subset of \mathbb{R}^n . We define $\text{int}(A)$ to be the interior of A , $\text{cl}(A)$ its closure and $\text{bd}(A) = \text{cl}(A) \setminus \text{int}(A)$ its border. Given a plane graph Γ we denote its *faces* by $F(\Gamma)$, i.e.,

$F(\Gamma)$ is the set of the connected components of $\Sigma \setminus \Gamma$ (in the operation $\Sigma \setminus \Gamma$ we treat Γ as the set of points of Σ corresponding to its vertices and its edges). Given a graph G we denote by $\mathcal{C}(G)$ the set of the connected components of G . For every $f \in F(\Gamma)$ we denote by $B_\Gamma(f)$ the graph induced by the vertices and edges of Γ whose embeddings are subsets of $\mathbf{bd}(f)$ and we call it the *boundary* of f . We also denote by $V(B_\Gamma(f))$ and $E(B_\Gamma(f))$ the vertices and the edges of $B_\Gamma(f)$, respectively.

We define a *closed walk* of a graph G to be a cyclic ordering $w = (v_1, \dots, v_l, v_1)$ of vertices of $V(G)$ such that for any two consecutive vertices, say v_i, v_{i+1} , there is an edge between them in G , i.e., $\{v_i, v_{i+1}\} \in E(G)$. Note here that there may exist two distinct indices i, j such that $v_i, v_j \in w$ and $v_i = v_j$ (the walk can revisit a vertex). We will denote by $\ell_w = l$ the length of the respective closed walk w . We say that a walk w of a plane graph Γ is *facial* if there exists $f_i \in F(\Gamma)$ and $\Theta_j \in \mathcal{C}(B_\Gamma(f_i))$ such that the vertices of w are the vertices of $V(\Theta_j)$ and the cyclic ordering of w indicates the way these vertices are met when making a closed walk along Θ_j while always keeping f_i on the same side of the walk.

Given that Γ is a plane graph and $\mathbf{w} = \{w_1, \dots, w_p\}$ is a non-empty set of closed walks of Γ , we say that \mathbf{w} is a *facial mapping* if there exists some face f of Γ such that $\mathcal{C}(B_\Gamma(f)) = \{\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \dots, \Theta_p\}$ and w_j is a facial walk of Θ_j , $j \in [p]$. We define the length of the facial mapping \mathbf{w} to be $\ell_{\mathbf{w}} = \sum_{i=1}^p \ell_{w_i}$. Given a plane graph Γ and $f \in F(\Gamma)$, we define $\mathbf{w}(f)$ as the facial mapping of Γ corresponding to f and define its length ℓ_f to be the length $\ell_{\mathbf{w}(f)}$ of its corresponding facial mapping. Observe that for every face $f \in F(\Gamma)$, its facial mapping $\mathbf{w}(f)$ is unique (up to permutations). Let C_1, C_2 be two disjoint closed curves of Σ . Let also D_i be the open disk of $\Sigma \setminus C_i$ that does not contain points of C_{3-i} , $i \in [2]$. The *annulus between C_1 and C_2* is the set $\Sigma \setminus (D_1 \cup D_2)$ and we denote it by $A[C_1, C_2]$. Notice that $A[C_1, C_2]$ is a closed set.

Let Γ and Δ be two plane graphs. We say that Γ and Δ are *topologically isomorphic* if they are isomorphic via a bijection $g : V(\Gamma) \rightarrow V(\Delta)$ and there exists a function $h : F(\Gamma) \rightarrow F(\Delta)$, such that for every $f \in F(\Gamma)$, $g(\mathbf{w}(f)) = \mathbf{w}(h(f))$ (where $g(\mathbf{w}(f))$ is the result of applying g to every vertex of every closed walk in \mathbf{w}). We call the function $\alpha : V(\Gamma) \cup F(\Gamma) \rightarrow V(\Delta) \cup F(\Delta)$ such that $\alpha = g \cup h$, a *topological isomorphism* between Γ and Δ .


We say that a general graph G is *uniquely embeddable* if any two plane graphs Γ and Γ' that are embeddings of G in the sphere, are topologically isomorphic. We say that a plane graph Γ is *uniquely embedded* if its general graph G is uniquely embeddable, i.e., Γ is the unique embedding of G , up to topological isomorphism. Given two plane graphs Γ_1 and Γ_2 we say that they are the *same* graph if they are topologically isomorphic (and not just isomorphic).

Let Γ and Δ be two plane graphs and let $Z \subseteq V(\Gamma)$. We say that Δ is a *Z -embedded subgraph* of Γ , and write $\Delta \leq_{es}^Z \Gamma$, if Δ is topologically isomorphic to some subgraph of $\Gamma \setminus Z$. When $Z = \emptyset$, we say that Δ is an *embedded subgraph* of Γ and write $\Delta \leq_{es} \Gamma$.

Let Γ and Δ be two plane graphs and let $Z \subseteq V(\Gamma)$. We say that Δ is a *Z -embedded topological minor* of Γ , and write $\Delta \leq_{etm}^Z \Gamma$ if there exist a function $\rho_1 : V(\Delta) \rightarrow V(\Gamma)$ and a function $\rho_2 : E(\Delta) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\Gamma)$, where $\mathcal{P}(\Gamma)$ denotes the set of all paths of Γ such that

1. For every $v \in V(\Delta)$, $\rho_1(v) \notin Z$.
2. For every $e = \{u, v\} \in E(\Delta)$, the path $\rho_2(e)$ of Γ has $\rho_1(u)$ and $\rho_1(v)$ as its endpoints and if $e_1 \neq e_2$, then $\rho_2(e_1)$ and $\rho_2(e_2)$ are internally vertex-disjoint.
3. If $\Gamma \langle \rho_2 \rangle$ is the graph obtained by the union of all paths in $\rho_2(E(\Delta))$ after we dissolve all vertices that are not vertices in $\rho_1(V(\Delta))$, then there is a topological isomorphism $\alpha : V(\Delta) \cup F(\Delta) \rightarrow V(\Gamma \langle \rho_2 \rangle) \cup F(\Gamma \langle \rho_2 \rangle)$ between Δ and $\Gamma \langle \rho_2 \rangle$ where $\alpha|_{V(\Delta)} = \rho_1$.

When $Z = \emptyset$, we just write $\Delta \leq_{etm} \Gamma$.



■ **Figure 1** A disconnected plane graph Γ and two members of \mathcal{R}_Γ .

If in the 3rd condition of the above definition we replace topological isomorphism by isomorphism and consider general graphs, say H and G , we define the relation of H being a *Z-topological minor* of (G, Z) .

For definitions not explicitly stated on the paper as well as more details on plane graphs, see [10].

2.1 Radial Enhancements

Let Γ be a plane graph. A *subdivided radial enhancement* of Γ is defined as a plane graph that can be constructed as follows: consider Γ , subdivide every edge once, add a vertex v_f inside each face f of Γ . Consider a permutation (H_1, H_2, \dots, H_s) of the connected components of $B_\Gamma(f)$ and a facial walk of each connected component. Then add edges connecting v_f with the vertices incident to $B_\Gamma(f)$ in such a way that the first vertices in the cyclic neighborhood of v_f are the vertices of H_1 and appear in the order of the fixed facial walk. Then the vertices of H_2 follow, etc. Observe that in the resulting embedding, every face that is incident to an edge of $E(\Gamma)$ is (planar) triangulated. This triangulation may have multiple edges unless the boundary of each face of Γ is a cycle, as can be seen in the two distinct examples of a subdivided radial enhancement of a disconnected plane graph Γ in Figure 1.

Notice that the vertices of the resulting plane graph can be partitioned into three independent sets: the *original vertices* of Γ denoted by $V_o(\Gamma)$, the *subdivision vertices* denoted by $V_s(\Gamma)$, which are the ones that were introduced after subdividing the edges, and the *radial vertices* denoted by $V_r(\Gamma)$, which are the ones that were added inside each face. Notice also that the edges of the resulting plane graph can be partitioned into two independent sets: the *subdivision edges* denoted by $E_s(\Gamma)$ and the *radial edges*, denoted by $E_r(\Gamma)$, that were introduced after adding the radial vertices.

We denote by \mathcal{R}_Γ the set of all different (in terms of topological isomorphism) subdivided radial enhancements of Γ . Observe that if Γ is connected, then the boundary of each face of Γ is connected and we obtain the following.

► **Observation 1.** *For every connected plane graph Γ , $R(\Gamma)$ is uniquely defined and thus \mathcal{R}_Γ contains only one member.*

From the subdivided radial enhancement's construction we obtain the following.

► **Observation 2.** *For every plane graph Γ and every $R(\Gamma) \in \mathcal{R}_\Gamma$ it holds that $|E(R(\Gamma))| = \mathcal{O}(|E(\Gamma)|)$.*

Given a plane graph Γ and a graph $R(\Gamma) \in \mathcal{R}_\Gamma$, for every integer $i > 1$, we denote by $R^i(\Gamma)$ the graph $R(R^{i-1}(\Gamma))$, where $R^1(\Gamma) = R(\Gamma)$. We define then $V_o^i(\Gamma) = V(R^{i-1}(\Gamma))$, $V_s^i = V_s(R^{i-1}(\Gamma))$, and $V_r^i = V_r(R^{i-1}(\Gamma))$. For notation consistency, we will denote by

$V_s^1(\Gamma) = V_s(\Gamma)$, $V_r^1(\Gamma) = V_r(\Gamma)$ and $V_o^1(\Gamma) = V_o(\Gamma)$. We also define the sets of edges $E_s^i(\Gamma)$ which are the edges obtained in $R^i(\Gamma)$ after subdividing the edges $E_s^{i-1}(\Gamma)$ and $E_r^i(\Gamma) = E(R^i(\Gamma)) \setminus E_s^i(\Gamma)$.

► Lemma 2.1 (\star). *For every plane graph Γ (with possibly multiple edges) every member of \mathcal{R}_Γ is connected. Moreover, if Γ is i -connected, then $R(\Gamma)$ is $(i+1)$ -connected, for $i \in [2]$.*

► Remark. If Γ is 2-connected then $R(\Gamma)$ can also be shown to be 4-connected. However, 3-connectivity is sufficient for our purposes.

2.2 Graph Structures

A key-concept in our algorithms is the notion of the vertex and the edge structure which is formally defined as follows. Let G be a simple planar graph, $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$, (S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k) be a near-partition of $V(G)$ and E_1, E_2, \dots, E_l be a near-partition of $E(G)$. A *vertex structure* \mathbf{G} is a tuple $(G, S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k)$ and an *edge structure* \mathbf{G}' is a tuple $(G, E_1, E_2, \dots, E_l)$.

Let $\mathbf{G} = (G, A, X_1, \dots, X_l)$ and $\mathbf{D} = (D, B, Y_1, \dots, Y_l)$ be vertex structures, where $l \in \mathbb{N}$. We say that \mathbf{D} is a *contraction* of \mathbf{G} , denoted by $\mathbf{D} \leq_c \mathbf{G}$, if and only if there exists a function $\sigma : V(G) \rightarrow V(D)$ satisfying the following *contraction properties*:

1. if $u, v \in V(D)$, $u \neq v \Leftrightarrow \sigma^{-1}(u) \cap \sigma^{-1}(v) = \emptyset$,
2. for every $u \in V(D)$, $G[\sigma^{-1}(u)]$ is connected,
3. $\{u, v\} \in E(D) \Leftrightarrow G[\sigma^{-1}(u) \cup \sigma^{-1}(v)]$ is connected,
4. $\sigma(A) \subseteq B$, and
5. for every $i \in [l]$ and every $x \in Y_i$ it holds that $|\sigma^{-1}(x)| = 1$ and $\sigma^{-1}(x) \in X_i$.

In particular, a graph D is a *contraction* of a graph G if $(D, V(D)) \leq_c (G, V(G))$ and we write $D \leq_c G$. Notice that \leq_c defined for graphs is the usual contraction relation where only conditions 1, 2, and 3 apply. Observe that for any two vertex structures \mathbf{G} and \mathbf{D} , where G and D respectively are their associated planar graphs, $\mathbf{D} \leq_c \mathbf{G}$ implies that $D \leq_c G$.

We will also need the following proposition, which follows from the results in [1].

► Proposition 1. *There exists an algorithm that receives as input a vertex structure \mathbf{G} , whose graph has m edges and treewidth at most h , and a vertex structure \mathbf{D} , whose graph is connected and has k edges, and outputs whether $\mathbf{D} \leq_c \mathbf{G}$ in $2^{\mathcal{O}(k+h+k \log h)}$ steps.*

Let $\mathbf{G} = (G, S_1, \dots, S_l)$ be a vertex structure on a planar graph G , where $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Given a possibly empty $Q \subseteq V(G)$, notice that the tuple $(Q, S_1 \setminus Q, \dots, S_l \setminus Q)$ also forms a near-partition of $V(G)$. Then, we can define the following operator on vertex structures:

$$\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{G}, Q) := (G, Q, S_1 \setminus Q, \dots, S_l \setminus Q).$$

Obviously, $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{G}, Q)$ is also a vertex structure on G .

Let Γ be a plane graph and consider an $R(\Gamma) \in \mathcal{R}_\Gamma$. By Lemma 2.1 and Observation 1, the graph $R^3(\Gamma)$ is uniquely defined according to $R(\Gamma)$. The following operators on $(\Gamma, R(\Gamma))$ uniquely define a vertex and an edge structure:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{p}(\Gamma, R(\Gamma)) &:= (R^3(\Gamma), V(\Gamma), V_s^1(\Gamma), V_r^1(\Gamma), V_s^2(\Gamma), V_r^2(\Gamma), V_s^3(\Gamma), V_r^3(\Gamma)) \\ \mathbf{e}(\Gamma, R(\Gamma)) &:= (R^3(\Gamma), E_s^3(\Gamma), E_r^3(\Gamma)). \end{aligned}$$

The underlying graph of the above structure is the general graph of $R^3(\Gamma)$ and the vertex sets that form the partition of $V(R^3(\Gamma))$ are the original vertices $V(\Gamma)$, followed by the sets of the subdivision and the radial vertices of each of the three subdivided radial enhancements.

Moreover, the edges are separated to those that have been obtain in $R^3(\Gamma)$ only by subdividing original edges of the graph and those that where obtained after adding radial vertices and edges and subdividing those edges.

Throughout the rest of the paper we will only use structures defined by those three operators. The main purpose is to associate three subdivided radial enhancements to a given plane graph so that (i) the resulting graph is 3-connected and therefore uniquely embeddable, so we can disregard the embedding and treat it as a combinatorial object, and (ii) the vertices and edges of the original graph and each subdivided radial enhancement are distinguishable. In addition, both in PSC and the PTMC problems we try to match the faces of the pattern graph to faces, or parts of faces, of the host graph, the radial enhancements and the corresponding structures seem to be the appropriate tool to use, since we actually only need to match the radial vertices that are added inside each face.

Given a graph G and a non-negative integer k , we define the *ball* around a vertex v of G as the subgraph $B_G^k(v)$ of G induced by the set of vertices at distance at most k from v . Consider now the subgraph \tilde{G} of G induced by the set of vertices that lay outside a given ball $B_G^k(v)$, i.e., $\tilde{G} = G \setminus B_G^k(v)$, and consider the set $\mathcal{C}(\tilde{G})$ of all its connected components. Then by contracting all the edges of every $C \in \mathcal{C}(\tilde{G})$ to a single vertex in G , denoted v_C , we obtain the *k-contracted graph* around v , that will be denoted by G_v . Given a vertex structure $\mathbf{G} = (G, \emptyset, S_1, \dots, S_l)$ and a non-negative integer k , we define the *k-contracted vertex structure* around a vertex v of the graph G as $\mathbf{G}_v^{(k)} := (G_v, \{v_C \mid C \in \mathcal{C}(\tilde{G})\}, S'_1, \dots, S'_l)$, where $S'_i = S_i \cap B_G^k(v)$ for every $i \in [l]$.

3 An FPT algorithm for the PSC problem

Given a plane graph Γ we define *the set of non-edges of Γ* : $\overline{E(\Gamma)} = \binom{V(\Gamma)}{2} \setminus E(\Gamma)$. A set of non-edges $S \subseteq \overline{E(\Gamma)}$ will be called *insertable* if there is a way to add the edges to Γ such that no two edges of $E(\Gamma) \cup S$ intersect (apart from any common endpoints). Finally, we define the following relation between two plane graphs Γ and Δ . We say that $\Delta \preceq \Gamma$ if there exists a set $S \subseteq \overline{E(\Gamma)}$ of insertable edges of Γ such that $\Delta \leq_{es} \Gamma'$, where Γ' is obtained from Γ after adding S . Then PSC asks, given two plane graphs Γ and Δ , whether $\Delta \preceq \Gamma$.

The main idea of our algorithm is to create two families of vertex structures, one from the host graph Γ and the other from the pattern graph Δ , such that $\Delta \preceq \Gamma$ if and only if there are two structures \mathbf{D} and \mathbf{G} from each of the above families such that $\mathbf{D} \leq_c \mathbf{G}$. Then, we bound the size of these families and use the algorithm from Proposition 1 to check all pairs of their members for the required property. From now on, in this section, whenever we refer to a structure we will assume that it is a vertex structure.

We define the first family of structures based on the host graph. Given a plane graph Γ , a subdivided radial enhancement of it, $R(\Gamma)$, and a positive integer k , we define the following family of structures:

$$\mathcal{G}_{\Gamma, R(\Gamma), k} := \{\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p}(\Gamma, R(\Gamma)), \emptyset)_v^{(k)} \mid v \in V(\Gamma)\}.$$

Obviously, $|\mathcal{G}_{\Gamma, R(\Gamma), k}| = |V(\Gamma)|$, regardless of the choice of $R(\Gamma)$ and k .

► **Lemma 3.1** (\star). *Let Γ be a plane graph, $R(\Gamma)$ a subdivided radial enhancement of Γ , $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $v \in V(\Gamma)$, and $\mathbf{G}_v := \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p}(\Gamma, R(\Gamma)), \emptyset)_v^{(k)} \in \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma, R(\Gamma), k}$. Then the underlying graph G_v of the structure \mathbf{G}_v has treewidth at most $3(k+1)$ and size $\mathcal{O}(|E(\Gamma)|)$.*

In order to define the second family of structures based on the pattern graph we need the following two definitions.

A *facial extension* of a connected plane graph Δ is a connected plane graph Δ^+ satisfying the following properties:

1. $\Delta \subseteq \Delta^+$,
2. $V(\Delta^+) \setminus V(\Delta)$ is an independent set in Δ^+ , and
3. for every distinct $x, y \in V(\Delta^+) \setminus V(\Delta)$, $N_{\Delta^+}(x) \not\subseteq N_{\Delta^+}(y)$.

We will denote by \mathcal{F}_Δ the family of all facial extensions of the graph Δ .

Given a connected plane graph Δ and a subset $L \subseteq E(\Delta)$ of its edges, we denote by $\text{span}(\Delta, L)$ the set of all spanning subgraphs of Δ that contain all the edges in $E(\Delta) \setminus L$. Note that such subgraphs could also contain some edges in L . A *pattern-guess* of a connected plane graph Δ is an element Δ^* of $\text{span}(\Delta^+, E(\Delta))$, for $\Delta^+ \in \mathcal{F}_\Delta$. That is, a spanning subgraph of a facial extension Δ^+ of Δ containing at least all the edges in $E(\Delta^+) \setminus E(\Delta)$. The family of all possible pattern-guesses Δ^* of Δ will be denoted by \mathcal{PG}_Δ .

Now, given a connected plane graph Δ we define the following family of structures: $\mathcal{H}_\Delta := \{\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p}(\Delta^*, R(\Delta^*)), V(\Delta^*) \setminus V(\Delta)) \mid \Delta^* \in \mathcal{PG}_\Delta, R(\Delta^*) \in \mathcal{R}_{\Delta^*}\}$.

► **Lemma 3.2** (\star). *If Δ is a connected plane graph then $|\mathcal{H}_\Delta| = 2^{\mathcal{O}(|E(\Delta)| \cdot \log |E(\Delta)|)}$ and, for any structure $\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{H}_\Delta$, the underlying graph D of \mathbf{D} has size and diameter bounded by $\mathcal{O}(|E(\Delta)|)$.*

► **Lemma 3.3** (\star). *Let $\mathbf{G} = (G, \emptyset, S_1, \dots, S_l)$ and $\mathbf{D} = (D, B, Z_1, \dots, Z_l)$ be two structures, where B is an independent set and $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\mathbf{D} \leq_c \mathbf{G}$ if and only if there exists some $v \in V(G)$ such that $\mathbf{D} \leq_c \mathbf{G}_v^{(k)}$, where $k := \text{diam}(D)$.*

The next theorem ensures the correctness of our algorithm.

► **Theorem 3.4**. *Let Γ be a plane graph and Δ be a connected plane graph. It holds that $\Delta \preceq \Gamma$ if and only if for every $R(\Gamma) \in \mathcal{R}_\Gamma$ there exist two structures $\mathbf{G} \in \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma, R(\Gamma), c}$ and $\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{H}_\Delta$, such that $\mathbf{D} \leq_c \mathbf{G}$, where c is a constant such that $\max_{\Delta^*} \{\text{diam}(R^3(\Delta^*))\} \leq c$.*

Proof. First of all, we know that such a constant c exists from Lemma 3.2 and that in fact $c = \mathcal{O}(|E(\Delta)|)$. Let us first assume that $\Delta \preceq \Gamma$. Then there exists an insertable set of non-edges $S \subseteq \overline{E(\Gamma)}$ and two plane graphs $\Gamma' = (V(\Gamma), E(\Gamma) \cup S)$ and Γ_0 , such that $\Gamma_0 \subseteq \Gamma'$ and $\Delta \simeq_{tp} \Gamma_0$. Without loss of generality we may assume that all edges of S are also edges of Γ_0 . Let then $\alpha : V(\Gamma_0) \cup F(\Gamma_0) \rightarrow V(\Delta) \cup F(\Delta)$ be a topological isomorphism between Γ_0 and Δ . For every edge $e = \{u, v\}$ of S let $e_\alpha = \{\alpha(u), \alpha(v)\}$. We define the sets $S_\alpha = \{e_\alpha \mid e \in S\}$, $S_\alpha^\Delta = S_\alpha \cap E(\Delta)$, and $S_\alpha^\Gamma = S_\alpha \setminus S_\alpha^\Delta$.

We first construct a graph $\Delta^+ \in \mathcal{F}_\Delta$. For this, we add a set of vertices and edges embedded inside some of the faces of Δ in such a way that edges intersect only at their common endpoints. In particular, for each face $f \in F(\Delta)$ with facial mapping $\mathbf{w}(f)$ do the following:

- For each edge $e = \{u, v\}$ that lies inside the region enclosed by $\alpha^{-1}(\mathbf{w}(f))$ in Γ and whose endpoints belong to Γ' , add the edge $\{\alpha(u), \alpha(v)\}$ in the interior of f in Δ in such a way that (i) edges intersect only at their common endpoints and (ii) after we extend the mapping α so that it takes into account those edges of Γ that were added in Δ , the following must hold: for any connected component that was inside f and, after the addition of the edges, is in a face f' , the preimages of the vertices of that connected component in Γ_0 are inside the region enclosed by $\alpha^{-1}(\mathbf{w}(f'))$.
- Consider the faces f_1, f_2, \dots, f_j that form the partition of f after the addition of the new edges. For every such face f_i let p_i be the region enclosed by $\alpha^{-1}(\mathbf{w}(f_i))$ in Γ' . Notice that since Δ^+ is connected, the boundary of $\alpha^{-1}(\mathbf{w}(f_i))$ is connected. For every $i \in [j]$

let \mathcal{C}_{p_i} be the set of all connected components that lie entirely in the region enclosed by $\alpha^{-1}(\mathbf{w}(f_i))$ in Γ' . Let $\mathcal{C}_{p_i}^\emptyset$ denote the set of all connected components in \mathcal{C}_{p_i} that do not have any neighbors in $B_{\Gamma'}(f_i)$. For every $C_w \in \mathcal{C}_{p_i}$, let S_w be its neighborhood in $B_\Gamma(f_i)$. Consider the Hasse diagram defined by the sets S_w and without loss of generality, let S_1, S_2, \dots, S_q be its maximal elements. Let then $O_t = \{C_l \in \mathcal{C}_{p_i} \setminus \mathcal{C}_{p_i}^\emptyset \mid S_l \subseteq S_t\}$, $t \in [q]$. For every $t \in [q]$, add a vertex u_t in f_i and make it adjacent to the vertices in $\alpha(S_t)$ (notice that since the boundary is again connected there is a unique way to construct the cyclic neighborhood of u_t up to cyclic permutations). We call O_t the *origin* of u_t .

The resulting graph Δ^+ is, by definition, a member of \mathcal{F}_Δ .

To construct Δ^* from Δ^+ , for every edge $\{u, v\} \in S$, we remove the edge $\{\alpha(u), \alpha(v)\}$ from Δ^+ . Since $\{\alpha(u), \alpha(v)\} \in E(\Delta)$, it follows that

$$\Delta^* \in \text{span}(\Delta^+, E(\Delta)).$$

We now define a function $g_0 : E(\Delta^*) \cup F(\Delta^*) \mapsto E(\Gamma) \cup F(\Gamma)$. Let $f \in F(\Delta^*)$ with facial mapping $\mathbf{w}(f)$. Observe that there is at least one face $f' \in F(\Gamma)$ with facial mapping $\mathbf{w}(f')$, such that for every facial walk $w = (u_1, \dots, u_k) \in \mathbf{w}(f)$ there is a facial walk $w' \in \mathbf{w}(f')$ of length at least k and a subsequence (v_1, \dots, v_k) of w' (up to cyclic permutations) with the following properties: $v_i = \alpha(u_i)$ if $v_i \in \Delta$ and $v_i \in V(C)$, for some C in the origin of u_i , if $u_i \in V(\Delta^*) \setminus V(\Delta)$.

Notice that due to planarity the regions defined by those walks (unless the walks are trivial) are mutually nested. Of all such faces (if there are multiple), let f' be the one whose region contains all other regions. Then, $g_0(f) = f'$. We will call the connected component whose vertices belong to that walk the *outermost connected component*.

Recall that, by construction, the new vertices of $V(\Delta^*) \setminus V(\Delta)$ form an independent set. Thus, for each edge $e = \{u, v\} \in E(\Delta^*)$ at most one of its endpoints belongs in $V(\Delta^*) \setminus V(\Delta)$. If both endpoints u, v of e belong to $V(\Delta)$, then we define $g_0(e) = \{\alpha^{-1}(u), \alpha^{-1}(v)\} \in E(\Gamma)$. Otherwise exactly one of u and v , say v , belongs to $V(\Delta^*) \setminus V(\Delta)$. In this case, we define $g_0(e) = \{\alpha^{-1}(u), v'\} \in E(\Gamma)$, where v' is a neighbor of $\alpha^{-1}(u)$ in the outermost connected component in the origin of v .

Let now $R(\Gamma)$ be an arbitrary subdivided radial enhancement of Γ . In order to construct a subdivided radial enhancement $R(\Delta^*)$ of Δ recall that we first subdivide all edges of $R(\Delta^*)$ and then add a radial vertex u_f inside each face $f \in F(\Delta^*)$. For every f let $r_{g_0}(f)$ be the radial vertex of $R(\Gamma)$ that was added in $g_0(f)$. Consider the cyclic neighborhood of $r_{g_0}(f)$ in $R(\Gamma)$. Notice that it can be broken down in s_1, s_2, \dots, s_l segments where s_i is a facial walk w_i of $\mathbf{w}(g_0(f))$. Let w'_i be the subsequence of the walk that corresponds to a walk z_i in $\mathbf{w}(f)$. Add edges between the u_f and the vertices of the boundary of u_f in such a way that the cyclic neighborhood of u_f is (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_l) . Notice that for every subdivision vertex x of $R(\Delta^*)$ that appears between u_i and u_{i+1} in the facial walk of w , there is a subdivision vertex v_x appearing between v_i and v_{i+1} in the walk w of $\mathbf{w}(f)$. We add an edge $\{u_f, v_x\}$ so that v_x appears between u_i and u_{i+1} in the cyclic neighborhood of u_f (this can be done in a unique way). We extend the mapping g_0 restricted to $E(\Delta^*)$ to the mapping g_1 by mapping every edge $\{u_f, u_i\}$ to the edge $\{r_{g_0}(f), v_i\}$. We also map the edges $\{u_f, x\}$ to the edges $\{r_{g_0}(f), v_x\}$. Notice that g_1 can be extended to $F(R(\Delta^*))$ similarly to g_0 . In the same fashion we extend g_1 to the function g_2 on the graphs $R^2(\Gamma)$ and $R^2(\Delta^*)$ and then to g_3 on the graphs $R^3(\Gamma)$ and $R^3(\Delta^*)$. Recall that

$$\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p}(\Gamma, R(\Gamma)), \emptyset) = (R^3(\Gamma), \emptyset, V(\Gamma), V_s^1(\Gamma), V_r^1(\Gamma), \dots, V_s^3(\Gamma), V_r^3(\Gamma)),$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p}(\Delta^*, R(\Delta^*)), B) &= \\ &= (R^3(\Delta^*), V(\Delta^*) \setminus V(\Delta), V(\Delta), V_s^1(\Delta^*), V_r^1(\Delta^*), \dots, V_s^3(\Delta^*), V_r^3(\Delta^*)). \end{aligned}$$

Let now $\sigma : V(R^3(\Gamma)) \rightarrow V(R^3(\Delta^*))$ such that:

$$\sigma(v) = \begin{cases} u & \text{if } v \in V(\Gamma), u \in V(\Delta), \text{ and } \alpha^{-1}(u) = v \in V(\Gamma) \\ z & \text{if } v \in V_s^i(\Gamma) \text{ and there exists } u \in V_s^i(\Delta^*) \text{ with } g^i(e) = e', i \in [3], \\ & \text{where } z \text{ (resp. } v) \text{ is the subdivision vertex of the edge } e \text{ (resp. } e') \\ w & \text{if } v \in V_r^i(\Gamma) \text{ and there exists } u \in V_r^i(\Delta^*) \text{ with } g^i(f) = f', i \in [3], \\ & \text{where } w \text{ (resp. } v) \text{ is the radial vertex added in face } f \text{ (resp. } f') \\ x & \text{where } x \in B \text{ such that the distance between } v \text{ and the vertices in} \\ & O_x \text{ in } R^3(\Gamma) \text{ is minimized} \end{cases}$$

It is quite straightforward to verify that σ satisfies the five required contraction properties and thus $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p}(\Delta^*, R(\Delta^*)), B) \leq_c \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p}(\Gamma, R(\Gamma)), \emptyset)$. Therefore, since these two structures satisfy the conditions of Lemma 3.3, we conclude that there exists some $v \in V(\Gamma)$ such that $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p}(\Delta^*, R(\Delta^*)), B) \leq_c \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p}(\Gamma, R(\Gamma)), \emptyset)_v^{\text{diam}(R^3(\Delta^*))}$. Notice now that $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p}(\Delta^*, R(\Delta^*)), B) \in \mathcal{H}_\Delta$ and that $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p}(\Gamma, R(\Gamma)), \emptyset)_v^{\text{diam}(R^3(\Delta^*))}$ is a minor of $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p}(\Gamma, R(\Gamma)), \emptyset)_v^c \in \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma, R(\Gamma), c}$ and we have proven the first direction.

Suppose now that for every $R(\Gamma) \in \mathcal{R}_\Gamma$ there exist two structures $\mathbf{G} \in \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma, R(\Gamma), c}$ and $\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{H}_\Delta$, such that $\mathbf{D} \leq_c \mathbf{G}$. This is the same as saying that for every $R(\Gamma) \in \mathcal{R}_\Gamma$ there exist a $\Delta^+ \in \mathcal{F}_\Delta$, a $\Delta^* \in \text{span}(\Delta^+, E(\Delta))$, and an $R(\Delta^*) \in \mathcal{R}_{\Delta^*}$ such that $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p}(\Delta^*, R(\Delta^*)), B) \leq_c \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p}(\Gamma, R(\Gamma)), \emptyset)$. Let then Γ' be the plane graph that results from $R^3(\Gamma)$ if we contract all connected components of $R^3(\Gamma)[\sigma^{-1}(B)]$. It follows immediately that $\Gamma' \simeq_{tp} R^3(\Delta^*)$. Let

$$\alpha : V(\Gamma') \cup F(\Gamma') \rightarrow V(R^3(\Delta^*)) \cup F(R^3(\Delta^*))$$


be a topological isomorphism between Γ' and $R^3(\Delta^*)$. Then, for each edge $\{u, v\} \in E(\Delta) \setminus E(\Delta^*)$ there is a face $f \in F(\Gamma)$ such that both $\alpha^{-1}(u)$ and $\alpha^{-1}(v)$ belong to a member of the facial mapping of f . Hence, the set $S = \{\{\alpha^{-1}(u), \alpha^{-1}(v)\} \mid \{u, v\} \in E(\Delta) \setminus E(\Delta^*)\}$ is insertable in Γ . Hence, $\Delta \preceq \Gamma$. \blacktriangleleft

► **Theorem 3.5** (*). *There exists an algorithm that, given as input an n -edge plane graph Γ and a connected k -edge plane graph Δ , decides whether $\Delta \preceq \Gamma$ in $2^{\mathcal{O}(k \log k)} \cdot n^2$ steps.*

4 An FPT algorithm for the PTMC problem

We need the following definitions and results before we are ready to prove the main result of this section.

Given a plane graph Γ and a non-negative integer k , we say that a graph Γ' is a k -face completion of Γ if it can be obtained from Γ in the following way; for every $f \in F(\Gamma)$ we add a set E_f of at most k edges to Γ such that the endpoints of the edges in E_f are vertices of Γ that belong to the boundary of f , all the edges E_f lie inside f , they do not intersect Γ in any points other than their endpoints, and finally they do not intersect each other.



■ **Figure 2** This figure depicts the construction of $\Gamma_{3,2}$ from Γ (Γ is the graph on the left).

Let r and q be integers such that $r \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 3}, q \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$. A (r, q) -cylinder, denoted by $C_{r,q}$, is the Cartesian product of a cycle on r vertices and a path on q vertices. We will refer to r as the *length* and q as the *width* of $C_{r,q}$. Note here that $C_{r,q}$ is a 3-connected graph and thus, by Whitney's Theorem, it is uniquely embeddable (up to homeomorphism) in the sphere. Furthermore, $C_{r,q}$ has exactly two non-square faces f_1 and f_2 that are incident only with vertices of degree 3. We call one of the faces f_1 and f_2 the *interior* of $C_{r,q}$ and the other the *exterior* of $C_{r,q}$. We call the vertices incident to the interior (exterior) of $C_{r,q}$ *base* (*roof*) of $C_{r,q}$.

Let Γ be a plane graph. We give the definition of the graph $\Gamma_{r,q}$ for $r \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 3}$ and $q \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 3}$. Let $f_i \in F(\Gamma)$ and let $\Theta_1^i, \dots, \Theta_{\rho_i}^i$ be the connected components of $B_\Gamma(f_i)$. For each Θ_j^i , we denote by $\sigma_{j,i}$ the length of a facial walk of Θ_j^i . We then add a copy C_j^i of $(\sigma_{j,i} \cdot r, q)$ -cylinder in the embedding of Γ such that Θ_j^i is contained in the interior of C_j^i and all $\Theta_1^i, \dots, \Theta_{j-1}^i, \dots, \Theta_{j+1}^i, \dots, \Theta_{\rho_i}^i$ are contained in the exterior of C_j^i . Then we partition the base of C_j^i into $\sigma_{j,i}$ parts $Q_l, l \in \sigma_{j,i}$ each consisting of r consecutive base vertices. Let $(u_{j,i}^1, u_{j,i}^2, \dots, u_{j,i}^{\sigma_{j,i}}, u_{j,i}^1)$ be a facial walk of $\Theta_{j,i}$. We join by r edges the vertex $u_{j,i}^x$ to all the vertices of the set $Q_l, l \in \sigma_{j,i}$. We apply this enhancement for each connected component of the boundary of each face of Γ and we denote the resulting graph by $\widehat{\Gamma}_{r,q}$.

We call a face f_i of $\widehat{\Gamma}_{r,q}$ non-trivial if $B_{\widehat{\Gamma}_{r,q}}(f_i)$ has more than one connected components $\Theta_1^i, \dots, \Theta_{\rho_i}^i$. Notice that if f_i is non-trivial, each Θ_j^i is the roof of some previously added cylinder. For each such cylinder, let J_j^i be a set of r consecutive vertices of its roof. We add inside f_i a copy C_{f_i} of $C_{\rho_i \cdot r, q}$ such that its base is a subset of f_i and let $\{I_1, \dots, I_{\rho_i}\}$ be a partition of its roof in ρ_i parts, each consisting of r consecutive base vertices. For each $x \in \{1, \dots, \rho_i\}$ we add r edges each connecting a vertex of J_j^i with some vertex of I_x in a way that the resulting embedding remains plane (there is a unique way for this to be done). We apply this enhancement for each non-trivial face of $\widehat{\Gamma}_{r,q}$ and the resulting graph is the graph $\Gamma_{r,q}$. Notice that $\Gamma_{r,q}$ is not uniquely defined as its definition depends on the choice of the sets J_x . From now on, we always consider an arbitrary choice for $\Gamma_{r,q}$ and we call $\Gamma_{r,q}$ the (r, q) -cylindrical enhancement of Γ . Finally, given a plane graph Γ and $r, q \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 3}$. Let $V_{\Gamma_{r,q}}^0 = V(\Gamma)$ and $V_{\Gamma_{r,q}}^n = V(\Gamma_{r,q}) \setminus V(\Gamma)$ and notice that $\deg_{\Gamma_{r,q}}(v) \leq 4$, for every $v \in V_{\Gamma_{r,q}}^n$. (For an example, see Figure 2.) Given a positive integer k , we denote by $\tilde{\Gamma}_k$ the graph $\Gamma_{2 \cdot k, 8 \cdot k}$.

We are now ready to state one of the main results of this section.

► **Theorem 4.1** (\star). *Let Γ and Δ be plane graphs where Δ is connected and $k = |E(\Delta)|^{2|E(\Delta)|}$. There exists a k -face completion Γ^+ of Γ such that $\Delta \leq_{etm} \Gamma^+$ if and only if $\Delta \leq_{etm}^S \tilde{\Gamma}_k$ where $S = V(\tilde{\Gamma}_k) \setminus V(\Gamma) = V_{\Gamma_{2 \cdot k, 8 \cdot k}}^n$.*

Moreover, we have the following.

► **Theorem 4.2** (\star). *There exists an algorithm that given two plane graphs Γ and Δ and a set $V \subseteq V(\Gamma)$ with $\deg_\Gamma(z) \leq c$, for every $z \in V$ outputs a graph Γ' , with $\Gamma' \subseteq_{sp} \Gamma$ and $\mathbf{tw}(\Gamma') = \mathcal{O}(f(|E(\Delta)|))$, for some computable function f such that $\Delta \leq_{etm}^V \Gamma$ if and only if $\Delta \leq_{etm}^V \Gamma'$. This algorithm runs in $\mathcal{O}_{|E(\Delta)|}(|E(\Gamma)|)$ steps.*

Let Γ be a connected plane graph and $Z \subseteq V(\Gamma)$, we define the following pair of vertex and edge structures:

$$\mathbf{G}_{\Gamma,Z} := (\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p}(\Gamma, R(\Gamma)), Z), \mathbf{e}(\Gamma, R(\Gamma))).$$

Given two connected plane graphs Δ and Γ and $Z \subseteq V(\Gamma)$ we say that $\mathbf{G}_{\Delta,\emptyset}$ is a *restricted topological minor* of $\mathbf{G}_{\Gamma,Z}$, denoted by $\mathbf{G}_{\Delta,\emptyset} \leq_{rtm} \mathbf{G}_{\Gamma,Z}$, if and only if there exist two functions $f_1 : V(R^3(\Delta)) \rightarrow 2^{V(R^3(\Gamma))}$ and $f_2 : E(R^3(\Delta)) \rightarrow 2^{E(R^3(\Gamma))}$ satisfying the following:

1. for every $x \in V(\Delta)$, $f_1(x) \in V(\Gamma) \setminus Z$ and $|f_1(x)| = 1$,
2. for every $x \in \cup_{i \in [3]} V(R_s^i(\Delta))$, $f_1(x) \notin \cup_{i \in [3]} (V(R_r^i(\Gamma)))$ and $|f_1(x)| = 1$,
3. for every $x, y \in \cup_{i \in [3]} V(R_r^i(\Delta))$ is connected and $f_1(x) \cap f_1(y) = \emptyset$,
4. for every $xy \in E_s^3(\Delta)$, $G[f_2(xy)]$ is a path between $f_1(x)$ and $f_1(y)$ and $f_2(xy) \subseteq E_s^3(\Gamma)$, and
5. for every $xy \in E_r^3(\Delta)$, $G[f_2(xy)]$ is a path between some vertex of $f_1(x)$ and some vertex of $f_1(y)$.

► **Theorem 4.3.** *Let Γ, Δ be two connected plane graphs and $Z \subseteq V(\Gamma)$. Then $\Delta \leq_{etm}^Z \Gamma$ if and only if $\mathbf{G}_{\Delta,\emptyset} \leq_{rtm} \mathbf{G}_{\Gamma,Z}$.*

Our algorithm for PTMC . Let Γ and Δ be two plane graphs, where Δ is connected. From Theorem 4.1 we construct a cylindrical enhancement $\tilde{\Gamma}_k$ of Γ , where the vertices of the set $S = V_{\Gamma,2,k,8,k}^n$ have degree bounded by a constant such that Δ, Γ are a yes instance if and only if $\Delta \leq_{etm}^S \tilde{\Gamma}_k$. Then, the algorithm of Theorem 4.1 with inputs $\tilde{\Gamma}_k, \Delta, S$ outputs a graph Γ' with $\Gamma' \subseteq_{sp} \Gamma$ and $\mathbf{tw}(\Gamma') = \mathcal{O}(f(|E(\Delta)|))$. Moreover, Theorem 4.3 translates Γ', Δ , and S to two structures $\mathbf{G}_{\Delta,\emptyset}$ and $\mathbf{G}_{\Gamma,S}$, for which $\Delta \leq_{etm}^S \Gamma$ if and only if $\mathbf{G}_{\Delta,\emptyset} \leq_{rtm} \mathbf{G}_{\Gamma,S}$. Notice that the relation $\mathbf{G}_{\Delta,\emptyset} \leq_{rtm} \mathbf{G}_{\Gamma,S}$ can be expressed in Monadic Second Order Logic. Finally, by observing that $\mathbf{tw}(R^3(\Gamma)) = \mathcal{O}(f(|E(\Delta)|))$ we can employ Courcelle's Theorem [5] to obtain an $f(|E(\Delta)|) \cdot m^2$ time algorithm, for some computable function f .

5 Extensions

Our approach for the PSC problem can also solve the PLANE INDUCED SUBGRAPH COMPLETION problem, with the same running time, where instead of an embedded subgraph we ask for an embedded *induced subgraph*. The only modification would be at the definition of a facial extension of Δ where we would additionally require that every connected graph Δ^+ contains Δ as an *induced* subgraph.

In the PTMC problem the connectivity of Δ is only required in the proof of Theorem 4.1 (that has been omitted). We would like to remark here that if we disregard the embedding of Δ then the Proposition holds for disconnected graphs as well. In this case by modifying the algorithm for PTMC we may obtain an FPT algorithm that given a plane graph Γ and a *planar* graph D decides whether there exists a face completion of Γ , say Γ^+ , such that D is a rooted topological minor of Γ . That is, each vertex of D is mapped to a specified vertex of Γ . Notice that this approach also permits us to solve the PLANAR DISJOINT PATHS COMPLETION problem where we allow edge additions inside all faces of Γ (in contrast to [2] where edge additions are allowed only inside a specified face of Γ).

Finally, with the same cylindrical enhancement that we apply for PTMC and the extra restriction that the sets of vertices of the enhanced graph that are contracted to a vertex of the pattern graph Δ contain only vertices of the initial graph we can solve the PLANE MINOR COMPLETION problem. In these last two cases, however, only the existence of an FPT algorithm is verified (since both would be derived by Courcelle's Theorem).

References

- 1 Isolde Adler, Frederic Dorn, Fedor V. Fomin, Ignasi Sau, and Dimitrios M. Thilikos. Fast minor testing in planar graphs. *Algorithmica*, 64(1):69–84, 2012.
- 2 Isolde Adler, Stavros G. Kolliopoulos, and Dimitrios M. Thilikos. Planar disjoint-paths completion. In Dániel Marx and Peter Rossmanith, editors, *Parameterized and Exact Computation - 6th International Symposium, IPEC 2011, Saarbrücken, Germany, September 6-8, 2011. Revised Selected Papers*, volume 7112 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 80–93. Springer, 2011.
- 3 Ivan Bliznets, Fedor V. Fomin, Marcin Pilipczuk, and Michal Pilipczuk. A subexponential parameterized algorithm for proper interval completion. In *Algorithms - ESA 2014 - 22th Annual European Symposium, Wroclaw, Poland, September 8-10, 2014. Proceedings*, pages 173–184, 2014.
- 4 V. Chvatal. Hamiltonian cycles. In E.L. Lawler, J.K. Lenstra, A.H.G.Rinnooy Kan, and D.B. Shmoys (Eds.), editors, *The Traveling Salesman Problem*, pages 403–429. Wiley, New York, 1985.
- 5 Bruno Courcelle. The monadic second-order logic of graphs III: tree-decompositions, minor and complexity issues. *ITA*, 26:257–286, 1992.
- 6 Reinhard Diestel. *Graph Theory, 4th Edition*, volume 173 of *Graduate texts in mathematics*. Springer, 2012.
- 7 Michael B. Dillencourt. Finding hamiltonian cycles in delaunay triangulations is np-complete. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 64(3):207 – 217, 1996.
- 8 Pål Grønås Drange, Fedor V. Fomin, Michal Pilipczuk, and Yngve Villanger. Exploring subexponential parameterized complexity of completion problems. In *31st International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS 2014), STACS 2014, March 5-8, 2014, Lyon, France*, pages 288–299, 2014.
- 9 Haim Kaplan, Ron Shamir, and Robert Endre Tarjan. Tractability of parameterized completion problems on chordal, strongly chordal, and proper interval graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 28(5):1906–1922, 1999.
- 10 Bojan Mohar and Carsten Thomassen. *Graphs on Surfaces*. Johns Hopkins series in the mathematical sciences. Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.
- 11 Yngve Villanger, Pinar Heggernes, Christophe Paul, and Jan Arne Telle. Interval completion is fixed parameter tractable. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 38(5):2007–2020, 2009.
- 12 Hassler Whitney. Congruent graphs and the connectivity of graphs. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 54(1):pp. 150–168, 1932.
- 13 M. Yannakakis. Computing the minimum fill-in is np-complete. *SIAM Journal on Algebraic Discrete Methods*, 2(1):77–79, 1981.