

# Drawing Graphs on Few Circles and Few Spheres

Myroslav Kryven<sup>1</sup>, Alexander Ravsky<sup>2</sup>, and Alexander Wolff<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universität Würzburg, Germany; [myroslav.kryven@uni-wuerzburg.de](mailto:myroslav.kryven@uni-wuerzburg.de)

<sup>2</sup> Pidstryhach Institute for Applied Problems of Mechanics and Mathematics,  
National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Lviv, Ukraine;  
[alexander.ravsky@uni-wuerzburg.de](mailto:alexander.ravsky@uni-wuerzburg.de)

<sup>3</sup> Universität Würzburg, Germany; ORCID: [orcid.org/0000-0001-5872-718X](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5872-718X)

**Abstract.** Given a drawing of a graph, its *visual complexity* is defined as the number of geometrical entities in the drawing, for example, the number of segments in a straight-line drawing or the number of arcs in a circular-arc drawing (in 2D).

Recently, Chaplick et al. [4] introduced a different measure for the visual complexity, the *affine cover number*, which is the minimum number of lines (or planes) that together cover a straight-line drawing of a graph  $G$  in 2D (3D).

In this paper, we introduce the *spherical cover number*, which is the number of circles (or spheres) that together cover a circular-arc drawing in 2D (or 3D). It turns out that spherical covers are sometimes significantly smaller than affine covers. Moreover, there are highly symmetric graphs that have symmetric optimum spherical covers but apparently no symmetric optimum affine cover. For complete, complete bipartite, and platonic graphs, we analyze their spherical cover numbers and compare them to their affine cover numbers as well as their segment and arc numbers. We also link the spherical cover number to other graph parameters such as chromatic number, treewidth, and linear arboricity.

## 1 Introduction

A drawing of a given graph can be evaluated by many different quality measures depending on the concrete purpose of the drawing. Classical examples are the number of crossings, the ratio between the lengths of the shortest and the longest edge, or the angular resolution. Clearly, different layouts (and layout algorithms) optimize different measures. Hoffmann et al. [12] studied ratios between optimal values of quality measures implied by different graph drawing styles. They determined bounds for certain pairs of styles and showed that the ratio can be unbounded for others.

A few years ago, a new type of quality measure was introduced: the number of geometric objects that are needed to draw a graph given a certain style. Schulz [16] termed this measure the *visual complexity* of a drawing. More concretely, Dujmović et al. [6] defined the *segment number*  $\text{seg}(G)$  of a graph  $G$  to

be the minimum number of straight-line segments over all straight-line drawings of  $G$ . Similarly, Schulz [16] defined the *arc number*  $\text{arc}(G)$  with respect to circular-arc drawings of  $G$  and showed that circular-arc drawings are an improvement over straight-line drawings not only in terms of visual complexity but also in terms of area consumption.

For this paper, the most important precursor is the work of Chaplick et al. [4] who introduced another measure for the visual complexity, namely the *affine cover number*. Given a graph  $G$ , they defined  $\rho_d^l(G)$  to be the minimum number of  $l$ -dimensional affine subspaces that together cover a straight-line drawing of  $G$  in  $d$ -dimensional space. It turned out that it suffices to investigate the parameters  $\rho_2^1(G)$ ,  $\rho_3^1(G)$ , and  $\rho_3^2(G)$ . Among others, Chaplick et al. showed that the affine cover number can be asymptotically smaller than the segment number, constructing  $n$ -vertex triangulations  $T$  with  $\rho_2^1(T) = O(\sqrt{n})$  and  $\text{seg}(T) = \Omega(n)$ . Conversely,  $\text{seg}(G) = O(\rho_2^1(G)^2)$  for any connected planar graph  $G$ .

*Our contribution.* Combining the approaches of Schulz and Chaplick et al., we introduce the *spherical cover number*  $\sigma_d^l(G)$  of a graph  $G$  to be the minimum number of  $l$ -dimensional spheres in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $G$  has a circular-arc drawing that is contained in the union of these spheres. For  $\sigma_2^1(G)$  we insist that  $G$  is planar. Any straight-line and circular-arc drawing can be transformed into a circular-arc drawing by an inversion map

**Theorem 1.** *For any graph  $G$  and any drawing of  $G$  that represents edges as straight-line segments or circular arcs on  $r$   $l$ -dimensional planes or spheres in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , the drawing can be transformed by the inversion map into a circular-arc drawing of  $G$  on  $r$   $l$ -dimensional spheres in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . In particular,  $\sigma_d^l(G) \leq \rho_d^l(G)$  for any graph  $G$  and  $1 \leq l < d$ .*

*Proof.* Take an arbitrary sphere  $S \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  whose center is not contained in any of given spheres and which does not intersect any of given planes and apply to the drawing the inversion with respect to  $S$ . A resulting drawing is a circular-arc drawing of  $G$  on  $r$   $l$ -dimensional spheres in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Indeed, using basic properties of inversion (see, for instance, [8] or [3, Chapter 5.1]), it can be proved that this inversion transforms planes into spheres of the same dimension and preserves spheres, in other words, the set of images of points on a sphere forms another sphere of the same dimension.  $\square$

Another trivial lower bound on  $\sigma_3^1(G)$  follows from the fact that every circle lies in a plane

**Proposition 1.** *For any graph  $G$ , it holds that  $\rho_3^2(G) \leq \sigma_3^1(G)$ .*

Therefore, we may consider any line a “circle of infinite radius”, any plane a “sphere of infinite radius”, and any affine cover a spherical cover.

We obtain bounds for the spherical cover number  $\sigma_3^2$  of the complete and complete bipartite graphs which show that spherical covers can be asymptotically smaller than affine covers; see Table 1 and Section 2

Then we turn to platonic graphs, that is, to 1-skeletons of platonic solids; see Section 3. These graphs possess several nice properties: they are regular, planar and Hamiltonian. We use them as indicators to compare the above-mentioned measures of visual complexity; we provide bounds for their segment and arc numbers (see Table 2) as well as for their affine and spherical cover numbers (see Table 3). For the lower bounds, we present straight-line drawings with (near-) optimal affine cover number  $\rho_2^1$  and circular-arc drawings with optimal spherical cover number  $\sigma_3^1$ ; see Figures 4–6. These illustrate another advantage of optimal spherical covers with respect to affine covers: potentially, the former better reflect symmetry of the given graph.

For general graphs, we present lower bounds for the spherical cover numbers by means of many combinatorial graph characteristics, in particular, by the chromatic number, treewidth, balanced separator size, linear arboricity, and bisection width; see Section 4. It turns out that the spherical cover number  $\sigma_3^2$  can be considered a graph characteristic that is intermediate between the graph's thickness and its book thickness (also called page number), see Section 2.

We conclude with a few open problems.

## 2 Complete and Complete Bipartite Graphs

The spherical cover number  $\sigma_3^2(G)$  can be considered as a characteristic of a graph  $G$  which is intermediate between its thickness  $\theta(G)$  and book thickness  $\text{bt}(G)$  (also called page number). Indeed, since each sphere covers a planar subgraph of  $G$ ,  $\sigma_3^2(G)$  is bounded from below by the *thickness*  $\theta(G)$  of the graph  $G$ , which is the smallest number of planar graphs whose union is  $G$ . On the other hand, given a book embedding of a graph  $G$  with the minimal number of pages (equal to the *book thickness*  $\text{bt}(G)$  of  $G$ ), if we put the vertices from the spine along a circle which is the common intersection of  $\lceil \text{bt}(G)/2 \rceil$  spheres and draw the edges as circular arcs on the respective hemispheres, we obtain an embedding witnessing that  $\sigma_3^2(G) \leq \lceil \text{bt}(G)/2 \rceil$ . As an example, Fig. 2 shows that  $\sigma_3^2(K_5) \leq 2$ .

**Theorem 2.** (a) For any  $n \geq 3$ , it holds that  $\lfloor (n+7)/6 \rfloor \leq \sigma_3^2(K_n) \leq \lceil n/4 \rceil$ .  
 (b) For any  $1 \leq p \leq q$ , it holds that  $pq/(2p+2q-4) \leq \sigma_3^2(K_{p,q}) \leq p$  and, if  $q > p(p-1)$ ,  $\sigma_3^2(K_{p,q}) = \lceil p/2 \rceil$ .

*Proof.* (a) The explanation at the beginning of Section 2 shows that  $\theta(K_n) \leq \sigma_3^2(K_n) \leq \lceil \text{bt}(K_n)/2 \rceil$ . It remains to note that  $\theta(K_n) \geq \lfloor (n+7)/6 \rfloor$  (see, for instance, [7]) and  $\text{bt}(K_n) = \lceil n/2 \rceil$  (see, [2]).

(b) Again, it suffices to bound the values of the graph's thickness and book thickness. It can be easily shown that  $\text{bt}(K_{p,q}) \leq \min\{p, q\}$ . On the other hand,  $pq/(2p+2q-4) \leq \theta(K_{p,q}) \leq \sigma_3^2(K_{p,q})$ , see [11, Sec. 7, Th. 8]. In particular, if  $q > p(p-1)$  then  $\text{bt}(K_{p,q}) = p$  (see, [2, Th. 3.5]) and  $\lceil pq/(2p+2q-4) \rceil = \lceil p/2 \rceil$ , so in this case  $\sigma_3^2(K_{p,q}) = \lceil p/2 \rceil$ .  $\square$

Theorem 2 implies that for each  $n$ -vertex graph  $G$ ,  $\sigma_3^2(G) \leq \lceil n/4 \rceil$ . On the other hand, by Theorem 4(e),  $\sigma_3^1(G) \geq \text{bw}(G)$ , where  $\text{bw}(G)$  is bisection width of the graph  $G$  (defined in Section 4).

**Proposition 2.** *For each  $p, q \geq 1$  and  $d \geq 3$  we have  $\sigma_d^1(K_{p,q}) \leq \lceil p/2 \rceil \lceil q/2 \rceil$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to consider case  $d = 3$ . Let  $p' = \lceil p/2 \rceil \geq p/2$  and  $q' = \lceil q/2 \rceil \geq q/2$ . Draw in space a bipartite graph  $K_{2p', 2q'} \subset K_{p,q}$  as follows. Let  $V(K_{2p', 2q'}) = P \cup Q$  be the natural bipartition of its vertices. Fix in space any family of  $p'$  distinct spheres with a common intersection circle. Place  $2q'$  vertices of  $Q$  into  $q'$  pairs of antipodal points of the circle. Consider a straight line going through the center of the circle and orthogonal to its plane. Place  $2p'$  vertices of  $P$  into  $p'$  pairs of distinct intersection points of the line with the circles of the family, the points from each pair belonging to the same sphere. Now each pair of antipodal points of  $Q$  with each pair of cospheric points of  $P$  determine a unique circle containing all these points and providing a drawing of the four edges between them. The union of all these circles is a required drawing of the graph  $K_{2p', 2q'}$  onto  $p'q'$  circles.  $\square$

**Lemma 1.** *For each  $n, p$ , and  $q$ ,  $\text{bw}(K_n) = \lfloor n^2/4 \rfloor$  and  $\text{bw}(K_{p,q}) = \lceil pq/2 \rceil$ .*

*Proof.* Routine calculation of a minimum of an integer quadratic polynomial.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.** *For each  $n, p, q$ , and  $d \geq 3$ ,  $\sigma_d^1(K_n) \geq \lfloor n^2/8 \rfloor$  and  $\lceil pq/4 \rceil \leq \sigma_d^1(K_{p,q}) \leq \lceil p/2 \rceil \lceil q/2 \rceil$ .*

*Proof.* The lower bounds follow from Theorem 4(e) and Lemma 1. The upper bound is proved in Proposition 2  $\square$

By Proposition 1 and Theorem 1,  $\rho_3^2(G) \leq \sigma_3^1(G) \leq \rho_3^1(G)$  for each graph  $G$ . But for  $\sigma_3^1(K_n)$  we can improve the upper bound using a combinatorial cover of  $K_n$  by copies of  $K_3$  (proof of [4, Th. 13] easily implies that it suffices to use  $\frac{n^2+5n+6}{6}$  copies), placing vertices of  $K_n$  in general position in space and then drawing each copy as a circle. For complete bipartite graphs  $K_{p,q}$  with  $3 \leq p \leq q$  it is known [4] that  $\rho_3^1(K_{p,q}) = pq - \lfloor p/2 \rfloor - \lfloor q/2 \rfloor$ ,  $\rho_3^1(K_{1,q}) = \rho_2^1(K_{1,q}) = \lceil q/2 \rceil$ , and  $\rho_3^1(K_{2,q}) = \rho_2^1(K_{2,q}) = \lceil (3q-1)/2 \rceil$ . We summarize the bounds for the affine cover and spherical cover numbers for complete and complete bipartite graphs in Table 1.

### 3 Platonic Graphs

In this section we analyze the segment numbers, arc numbers, affine cover numbers, and spherical cover numbers of platonic graphs. We provide the upper bounds via the corresponding drawings; see Figs. 3–6. Our lower bounds (see Tables 2–3) on the segment numbers and affine cover numbers for some of the platonic graphs rest on the following simple observation.

$G$	$\rho_3^1$	$\rho_3^2$	$\sigma_3^1$	$\sigma_3^2$
$K_n$	$\binom{n}{2}$	$\frac{n^2-n}{12} \dots \frac{n^2+5n+6}{6}$	$\lfloor \frac{n^2}{8} \rfloor \dots \frac{n^2+5n+6}{6}$	$\lfloor \frac{(n+7)}{6} \rfloor \dots \lfloor \frac{n}{4} \rfloor$
$K_{p,q}$	$pq - \lfloor \frac{p}{2} \rfloor - \lfloor \frac{q}{2} \rfloor$	$\lceil \frac{\min\{p,q\}}{2} \rceil$	$\lceil \frac{pq}{4} \rceil \dots \lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil \lceil \frac{q}{2} \rceil$	$\lceil \frac{pq}{2(p+q-2)} \rceil \dots \lceil \frac{\min\{p,q\}}{2} \rceil$

**Table 1:** Bounds on the affine cover numbers  $\rho_d^l$  and the spherical cover numbers  $\sigma_d^l$  of  $K_n$  for any  $n \geq 1$  and of  $K_{p,q}$  for any  $p, q \geq 3$ .

**Lemma 2.** *If the outer face of a plane graph  $G$  is a triangle  $T$  then at least  $(\sum_{v \in T} \deg(v)) - 3$  straight lines or straight-line segments are needed to cover any straight-line drawing of  $G$ .*

For the proof it is easy to check that no two edges incident to a vertex of  $T$  can be collinear.

**Proposition 3.** (a)  $\rho_2^1(C) \geq 7$ ; (b)  $\rho_2^1(D) \geq 9$ .

*Proof.* (a) We shall show that any straight-line drawing of a cube needs at least seven straight lines to be covered. Each embedding of the cube contains two nested cycles, namely, the boundary of the outer face and the innermost face. If the outer face is drawn as a convex quadrilateral, then none of the straight lines covering its sides can be used to cover the edges of the innermost cycle, therefore, it needs three additional straight lines. If the outer face is drawn as a non-convex quadrilateral, then we need three additional straight lines to cover the three edges going from its three convex angles to the innermost cycle. Now assume that the outer cycle is drawn as a triangle. Then none of the straight lines covering its sides can be used to cover the edges of the innermost cycle. If it is drawn as a quadrilateral, then we need four additional straight lines to cover its sides. If the innermost cycle is drawn as a triangle, then we need three lines for the triangle and an additional line to cover the edge incident to the vertex of the innermost cycle which is not a vertex of the triangle.

(b) Consider a straight-line drawing of a dodecahedron  $D$  covered by a family  $\mathcal{L}$  of  $\rho$  straight lines. To cover the edges on the outer face, we need a family  $\mathcal{L}_0$  consisting of at least 3 straight lines. If the outer face is convex then none of them covers any of 15 vertices remaining in its interior. Thus each of these vertices should be an intersection point of two lines of a family  $\mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{L}_0$ . Since this family consists of at most  $\rho - 3$  straight lines, it can generate at most  $\binom{\rho-3}{2}$  intersection points. Then  $\binom{\rho-3}{2} \geq 15$  so  $\rho \geq 9$ .


Assume the outer face is drawn as a non-convex quadrilateral. Then the drawing is contained in a convex angle opposite to the reflex angle. To cover the angle sides, we need a family  $\mathcal{L}_0$  consisting of at least 2 straight lines. None of them covers any of at least  $15 + 1$  vertices remaining in the interior of the angle. Similarly to the previous paragraph we obtain  $\binom{\rho-2}{2} \geq 16$ , and  $\rho \geq 9$ .

Assume that the outer face is drawn as a pentagon  $P$ . Since the sum of the angles of a pentagon is  $3\pi$ , it has at most two reflex angles, therefore, at least

three convex angles. Each vertex of  $D$  drawn as a vertex of a convex angle is an intersection point of (at least) three covering straight lines, because it has degree three. There exists side  $e$  of  $P$  such that  $P$  is contained in one of the half-planes created by the straight line  $\ell$  spanned by  $e$  (see, for instance, [14]). It is easy to check that  $\ell$  can cover only edge  $e$  of the outer face of  $D$ . Then the family of  $\mathcal{L} \setminus \ell$  covers all edges of  $G$  but  $e$ . The angles of  $P$ , incident to  $e$  are convex. Let  $v$  be a vertex of  $D$  drawn as a vertex of a convex angle not incident to  $e$ . Then to cover  $D$  we need at least one pair of intersecting lines from  $\mathcal{L} \setminus \{\ell\}$  for each its vertex different from  $v$  and least three such pairs for  $v$ , that is at least  $19 + 3 = 22$  intersecting straight line pairs in total. Then  $\binom{\rho-1}{2} \geq 22$ , so  $\rho \geq 9$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 4.**  $\text{arc}(I) = 7$ ;

*Proof.* First we cover the edges of the icosahedron by seven objects, which we group into three subsets  $K = \{\kappa\}$ ,  $L = \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3\}$ , and  $M = \{\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3\}$ , where  $\kappa$  is a cycle of length 6 and the elements of  $L$  and  $M$  are all simple paths of length 4; see Figure 1a. We identify the paths and cycles with the arcs and circles that we will use to draw them. In our construction, the arcs in  $L$  will all have the same radius  $r_L$  and will be drawn symmetrically around the origin, similarly with the arcs in  $M$ .



**Fig. 1:** Bounding the arc number of the icosahedron

First, we realize  $\kappa$  as a unit circle centered at the origin. Let  $d_L$  be the common distance of the centers of arcs in  $L$  from the origin. For  $i = 1, 2, 3$ ,

we center the arc  $\lambda_1$  – using polar coordinates – at  $c_1 = (d_L, 0)$ , the arc  $\lambda_2$  at  $c_2 = (d_L, \frac{2\pi}{3})$ , and the arc  $\lambda_3$  at  $c_3 = (d_L, \frac{4\pi}{3})$ ; see Figure 1b.

In the following proof, indices will be modulo 3. Let  $A_i$  and  $B_i$  be the intersection points of the arcs  $\lambda_i$  and  $\lambda_{i+1}$  such that  $B_i$  is closer to the origin than  $A_i$ . Given  $d_L$ , we choose  $r_L$  such that  $B_1, B_2$ , and  $B_3$  lie on  $\kappa$ , that is, by the law of cosines,  $r_L^2 = 1 + d_L^2 - 2d_L \cos \frac{\pi}{3} = d_L^2 - d_L + 1$ . If  $d_L = 2$ ,  $r_L = \sqrt{3}$  and  $A_i$  and  $B_i$  coincide. So  $d_L$  must be greater than 2.

To realize the arcs from  $M$  we firstly realize one arc  $\mu_1$  and then make two copies of it rotated by the angles  $\frac{2\pi}{3}$  and  $\frac{4\pi}{3}$  clockwise around the origin. We rotate every point  $B_i$  clockwise around the origin by an angle  $0 \leq \theta \leq \pi/3$  obtaining  $B'_i$ . Then, for every  $i = 1, 2, 3$  we draw a diameter of the circle  $\kappa$  through  $B'_i$ . We denote the intersection point of the diameter through the point  $B'_i$  with the arc  $\lambda_{i-1}$  as  $M_{i-1}$ . We draw the arc  $\mu_1$  through the points  $M_3, M_1, B'_1$ ; see Figure 1b. In the convex quadrilateral  $M_1 B'_1 M_3 B'_2$ , the sum of opposite angles are equal to  $\pi$  since the triangles  $B'_2 B'_1 M_3$  and  $B'_1 B'_2 M_1$  are congruent. The congruence is due to the following facts: (i)  $B'_2 B'_1 = B'_1 B'_2$  is a side that is common to the two triangles, (ii)  $|B'_2 M_1| = |B'_1 M_3|$  because  $B'_1 M_3$  is obtained from  $B'_2 M_1$  by rotation by the angle  $\pi/3$  clockwise around the origin, and (iii)  $\angle M_1 B'_2 B'_1 = \angle M_3 B'_1 B'_2 = \pi/6$ . Now it is clear that the sum of the opposite angles is indeed  $\pi$  because the points  $M_1$  and  $M_3$  are on the same side of the line  $B'_1 B'_2$ . Therefore, the circle of the arc  $\mu_1$  also contains the point  $B'_2$ .

If the intersection point  $Q$  of  $\mu_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  coincides with  $A_1$ , it would suffice to copy  $\mu_1$  twice and rotate one copy by  $\frac{2\pi}{3}$  and another one by  $\frac{4\pi}{3}$  to get the realization of the other arcs in  $M$  which would complete the construction. It remains to show that, for sufficiently small  $\theta$ , there exists a value of  $d_L$  such that  $Q$  coincides with  $A_1$ .

Let us fix  $\theta$  and  $d_L$  such that the arc  $\mu_1$  crosses the arc  $\lambda_1$  at a point  $Q$  between its intersection points  $A_1$  and  $B_1$  with the arc  $\lambda_2$ ; the arc  $\lambda_i$  crosses the median at  $B'_{i+1}$  of the triangle  $B'_1 B'_2 B'_3$  at point  $M_i$  and the slope of the tangent of the arc  $\mu_1$  at  $M_3$  is larger than that of  $\lambda_3$ .

By decreasing the distance  $d_L$  from the center of the arc  $\lambda_i \in L$  to the origin the intersection points  $A_i$  and  $B_i$  move towards each other. In what follows we show that, by applying this deformation, the distance between the intersection point  $Q$  of the arc  $\mu_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  and the point  $B_1$  is bounded from below and, thus, since the points  $B_1, Q$ , and  $A_1$  lie on the same arc  $\lambda_2$ , the point  $Q$  will meet  $A_1$  before  $B_1$  meets  $A_1$ .

The deformed arcs  $\lambda'_1, \lambda'_2, \lambda'_3$  will get closer to the origin compared to the original arcs  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$ . Therefore, they will cross the medians at  $B'_1$  and at  $B'_2$  of the equilateral triangle  $B'_1 B'_2 B'_3$  at the two points  $M'_1$  and  $M'_3$  which closer to the origin. We draw an arc  $\mu'_1$  through  $M'_1, M'_3$ , and  $B'_1$ .

Note that both arcs  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu'_1$  cross the red circle at  $B'_1$  and touch it at  $B'_2$ .

Furthermore,  $\mu_1$  encloses  $\mu'_1$  inside  $\kappa$  because  $\mu_1$  encloses the two points  $M'_1$  and  $M'_3$ . Therefore,  $\mu'_1$  encloses  $\mu_1$  outside  $\kappa$ . Thus, by applying this deformation, the distance  $|B_1 Q|$  cannot become smaller than the distance from  $B_1$  to the arc  $\mu_1$ . Hence,  $Q$  will meet  $A_1$  before  $B_1$  meets  $A_1$ .

$G = (V, E)$	$ V $	$ E $	$ F $	$\text{seg}(G)$	upper bd.	$\text{arc}(G)$	lower bd.	upper bd.
tetrahedron	4	6	4	6		3		
octahedron	6	12	8	9	Fig. 3a	3		Fig. 3c
cube	8	12	6	7	Fig. 4a	4	[6, Lem. 5]	Fig. 4d
dodecahedron	20	30	12	13	Fig. 5a	10	[6, Lem. 5]	Fig. 5d
icosahedron	12	30	20	15	Fig. 6a	7	Thm. 4.a	Fig. 6b

**Table 2:** Bounds on  $\text{seg}(G)$  and  $\text{arc}(G)$ . For the lower bounds on  $\text{seg}(G)$ , see Table 4.

$G = (V, E)$	$\rho_2^1$	low. bd.	upp. bd.	$\rho_3^1$	$\sigma_2^1$	low. bd.	upp. bd.	$\sigma_3^1$
tetrahedron	$T$	6		6	3			3
octahedron	$O$	9	Lem. 2	Fig. 3a	9	3	Thm. 4.a	Fig. 3c
cube	$C$	7	Prop. 3	Fig. 4a	7	4	Thm. 4.a	Fig. 4d
dodecahedron	$D$	9...10	Prop. 3	Fig. 5a	7*...10	5	Thm. 4.a	Fig. 5d
icosahedron	$I$	12...15	Lem. 2	Fig. 6a	12...15	7	Thm. 4.a	Fig. 6c

**Table 3:** Bounds on the affine cover numbers  $\rho_d^l$  and the spherical cover numbers  $\sigma_d^l$  for platonic graphs. \*) see the proof of [4, Lemma 7]:  $(\rho_3^1(G)) \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in V(G)} \lceil \frac{\deg v}{2} \rceil (\lceil \frac{\deg v}{2} \rceil - 1)$ .

Now it is clear that there exists a value of  $d_L$  such that, in the construction described above, the intersection point  $Q$  of  $\lambda_2$  and  $\mu_1$  coincides with the intersection point  $A_1$  of  $\lambda_2$  and  $\lambda_1$ .  $\square$

The drawing in Figure 6c was constructed by numerically solving the equation  $|QA_1(d_L)| = 0$  for  $\theta = \frac{\pi}{6}$ .



To lowerbound the spherical cover number  $\sigma_2^1$  of the platonic solids, we use a single combinatorial argument—Theorem 4.a. For the affine cover number  $\rho_2^1$ , a similar combinatorial arguments fails [4, Lemma 9.a].

## 4 Lower Bounds for $\sigma_d^1$


Given a graph  $G$ , we obtain lower bounds for  $\sigma_d^1(G)$  via standard combinatorial characteristics of  $G$  similarly to bounds for  $\rho_d^1(G)$  [4]. In particular, we prove a general lower bound for  $\sigma_d^1(G)$  in terms of the treewidth  $\text{tw}(G)$  of  $G$ , which follows from the fact that graphs with low parameter  $\sigma_d^1(G)$  have small separators. This fact is interesting by itself and has yet another consequence: graphs with bounded vertex degree can have linearly large value of  $\sigma_d^1(G)$  (hence, the factor of  $n$  in the trivial bound  $\sigma_d^1(G) \leq m \leq \frac{1}{2} n \Delta(G)$  is best possible).

We need the following definitions. The *linear arboricity*  $\text{la}(G)$  of a graph  $G$  is the minimum number of linear forests which partition the edge set of  $G$  [10]. Let  $W \subseteq V(G)$ . A set of vertices  $S \subset V(G)$  is a *balanced  $W$ -separator* of the graph  $G$  if  $|W \cap C| \leq |W|/2$  for every connected component  $C$  of  $G \setminus S$ . Moreover,  $S$  is a *strongly balanced  $W$ -separator* if there is a partition  $W \setminus S = W_1 \cup W_2$




**Fig. 2:**  $\sigma_3^2(K_5) \leq 2$ 


(a) 9 segm. / lines




(b) 4 arcs




(c) 3 arcs

**Fig. 3:** Drawings of the octahedron


(a) 7 segm. / lines








(b) 8 segm. / lines




(c) 6 arcs / 4 circles




(d) 4 arcs

**Fig. 4:** Drawings of the cube(a)  
13 segm. / 10 lines [15](b)  
10 arcs / 10 circ. [16](c)  
13 arcs / 8 circ. [15](d)  
10 arcs / 5 circles**Fig. 5:** Drawings of the dodecahedron

(a) 15 segments / lines



(b) 10 arcs / 7 circles



(c) 7 arcs / 7 circles

**Fig. 6:** Drawings of the icosahedron

such that  $|W_i| \leq |W|/2$  for both  $i = 1, 2$  and there is no path between  $W_1$  and  $W_2$  avoiding  $S$ . Let  $\text{sep}_W(G)$  (resp.  $\text{sep}_W^*(G)$ ) denote the minimum  $k$  such that  $G$  has a (resp. strongly) balanced  $W$ -separator  $S$  with  $|S| = k$ . Furthermore, let  $\text{sep}(G) = \text{sep}_{V(G)}(G)$  and  $\text{sep}^*(G) = \text{sep}_{V(G)}^*(G)$ . Note that  $\text{sep}_W(G) \leq \text{sep}_W^*(G)$  for any  $W$  and, in particular,  $\text{sep}(G) \leq \text{sep}^*(G)$ .

It is known [9, Theorem 11.17] that  $\text{sep}_W(G) \leq \text{tw}(G) + 1$  for every  $W \subseteq V(G)$ . On the other hand, if  $\text{sep}_W(G) \leq k$  for all  $W$  with  $|W| = 2k + 1$ , then  $\text{tw}(G) \leq 3k$ .

The *bisection width*  $\text{bw}(G)$  of a graph  $G$  is the minimum possible number of edges between two sets of vertices  $W_1$  and  $W_2$  with  $|W_1| = \lceil n/2 \rceil$  and  $|W_2| = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$  partitioning  $V(G)$ . Note that  $\text{sep}^*(G) \leq \text{bw}(G) + 1$ .

Now we show how all these graph parameters can be used to provide lower bounds for the spherical cover number. The proofs follow those for similar statements regarding the affine cover number [4].

**Theorem 4.** *For any integer  $d \geq 1$  and any graph  $G$  with  $n$  vertices and  $m$  edges, the following bounds hold:*

- (a)  $\sigma_d^1(G) \geq \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \sqrt{1 + 2 \sum_{v \in V(G)} \left\lceil \frac{\deg v}{2} \right\rceil \left( \left\lceil \frac{\deg v}{2} \right\rceil - 1 \right)} \right)$ ,
- (b)  $\sigma_d^1(G) \geq \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \sqrt{2m^2/n - 2m + 1} \right)$  for any graph  $G$  with  $m \geq n \geq 1$ .
- (c)  $\sigma_d^1(G) \geq \chi_e(G)/3$ ;
- (d)  $\lceil \frac{3}{2} \sigma_d^1(G) \rceil \geq \text{la}(G)$ ;
- (e)  $\sigma_d^1(G) \geq \text{bw}(G)/2$ ;
- (f)  $\sigma_d^1(G) > n/10$  for almost all cubic graphs with  $n$  vertices;
- (g)  $\sigma_d^1(G) \geq \text{sep}_W^*(G)/2$  for every  $W \subseteq V(G)$ ;
- (h)  $\sigma_d^1(G) \geq \text{tw}(G)/6$ .

*Proof.* The proofs for (a), (b), (c), (e), (g), and (h) are similar to that of Lemma 9.a, Lemma 9.b, Theorem 8, Theorem 11.a, Theorem 11.c, and Theorem 11.d in [4], respectively. (d) Given the drawing of the graph  $G$  on  $r = \sigma_d^1(G)$  circles, we remove an edge from each of the circles (provided such an edge exists), obtaining at (most)  $r$  linear forests. The removed edges we group into (possible, degenerated) pairs, obtaining at most  $\lceil r/2 \rceil$  additional linear forests. So,  $\text{la}(G) \leq r + \lceil r/2 \rceil$ . (f) The proof is similar to that of Theorem 11.b from [4]. It follows from Part (e) and the fact that a random cubic graph on  $n$  vertices has bisection width at least  $n/4.95$  with probability  $1 - o(1)$  (see Kostochka and Melnikov [13]).  $\square$

**Corollary 1.**  $\sigma_d^1(G)$  cannot be bounded from above by a function of  $\text{la}(G)$  or  $v_{\geq 3}(G)$  or  $\text{tw}(G)$ , where  $v_{\geq 3}(G)$  is the number of vertices with degree at least 3.

*Proof.*  $\text{la}(G)$ . Let  $G$  be an arbitrary cubic graph. Akiyama et al. [1] showed that  $\text{la}(G) = 2$ . On the other hand,  $v_{\geq 3}(G) = n$ , so  $\sigma_3^1(G) > \sqrt{n}$  by Theorem 4(a). Theorem 4.(f) shows an even larger gap.

$v_{\geq 3}(G)$ . In a disjoint union of  $k$  cycles each vertex has degree 2, but each cycle will need 2 intersection points of circles or a whole circle, so  $\sigma_d^1(G) \in \Omega(\sqrt{k})$ .

$\text{tw}(G)$ . By Theorem 4(b) we have  $\sigma_d^1(T) = \Omega(\sqrt{n})$  for every caterpillar  $T$  with linearly many vertices of degree 3. Going in this direction we can show that  $\sigma_3^1(G) \leq m < n \text{tw}(G)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.** *A planar circular drawing  $\Gamma$  of a graph  $G$  containing  $k$  nested cycles cannot be covered by less than  $k$  circles.*

*Proof.* Fix any point inside the closed Jordan curve in  $\Gamma$  that corresponds to the innermost cycle of  $G$ . Let  $\ell$  be an arbitrary straight line through this point. Then  $\ell$  crosses at least twice each of the  $j$  Jordan curves that correspond to the  $k$  nested cycles in  $G$ . Hence, there are at least  $2k$  points where  $\ell$  crosses  $\Gamma$ .

On the other hand, consider any set of  $r$  circles whose union covers  $\Gamma$ . Then it is clear that  $\ell$  crosses each of these  $r$  circles in at most two points, so there are at most  $2r$  points where  $\ell$  crosses  $\Gamma$ . Putting together the two inequalities, we get  $r \geq k$  as desired.  $\square$

At last we remark that  $\sigma_3^1(G)$  is a lot smaller than  $\sigma_2^1(G)$  for some graphs  $G$ .

**Theorem 5.** *For infinitely many  $n$ , there is a planar graph  $G$  on  $n$  vertices with  $\sigma_2^1(G) = \Omega(n)$  and  $\sigma_3^1(G) = O(n^{2/3})$ .*

*Proof.* We use the graph  $G$  of [4, Theorem 24(b)] that yields the same bounds for  $\rho_2^1(G)$  and  $\rho_3^1(G)$ . Then the upper bound on  $\sigma_3^1(G)$  follows from the fact that  $\sigma_d^l(G) \leq \rho_d^l(G)$  for any choice of  $1 \leq l < d$ . The lower bound on  $\sigma_2^1(G)$  follows from Lemma 3.  $\square$

## 5 Open Problems

What are optimal affine covers for the icosahedron and dodecahedron? What is the arc number of the icosahedron?

We have already seen that  $\sigma_3^2(K_n)$  grows asymptotically more slowly than  $\rho_3^2(K_n)$ . Is there a family of planar graphs where  $\sigma_2^1$  grows asymptotically more slowly than  $\rho_2^1$ ?

## References

1. J. Akiyama, G. Exoo, and F. Harary. Covering and packing in graphs III: Cyclic and acyclic invariants. *Math. Slovaca*, 30:405–417, 1980.
2. F. Bernhart and P. C. Kainen. The book thickness of a graph. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 27(3):320 – 331, 1979.
3. D. A. Brannan. *Geometry*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge New York, 1999.

4. S. Chaplick, K. Fleszar, F. Lipp, A. Ravsky, O. Verbitsky, and A. Wolff. Drawing graphs on few lines and few planes. In Y. Hu and M. Nöllenburg, editors, *Proc. 24th Int. Symp. Graph Drawing & Network Vis. (GD'16)*, volume 9801 of *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci.*, pages 166–180. Springer-Verlag, 2016. Available at [arxiv.org/abs/1607.01196](https://arxiv.org/abs/1607.01196).
5. G. Di Battista, P. Eades, R. Tamassia, and I. G. Tollis. *Graph Drawing: Algorithms for the Visualization of Graphs*. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ, 1999.
6. V. Dujmović, D. Eppstein, M. Suderman, and D. R. Wood. Drawings of planar graphs with few slopes and segments. *Comput. Geom. Theory Appl.*, 38:194–212, 2007.
7. C. A. Duncan. On graph thickness, geometric thickness, and separator theorems. *Computational Geometry*, 44(2):95 – 99, 2011. Special issue of selected papers from the 21st Annual Canadian Conference on Computational Geometry.
8. H. Edelsbrunner. Lecture notes for Computational Topology (CPS296.1). <https://www.cs.duke.edu/courses/fall106/cps296.1/Lectures/sec-III-3.pdf>, 2006.
9. J. Flum and M. Grohe. *Parametrized Complexity Theory*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006.
10. F. Harary. Covering and packing in graphs I. *Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci.*, 175:198–205, 1970.
11. F. Harary. *A Seminar on Graph Theory*. Dover Publications, New York, 2015.
12. M. Hoffmann, M. van Kreveld, V. Kusters, and G. Rote. Quality ratios of measures for graph drawing styles. In *Proc. 26th Canadian Conf. Comput. Geom. (CCCG'14)*, pages 33–39, 2014.
13. A. V. Kostochka and L. S. Melnikov. On a lower bound for the isoperimetric number of cubic graphs. In *Proc. 3rd Int. Petrozavodsk. Conf. Probabilistic Methods in Discrete Mathematics*, pages 251–265. Moskva: TVP; Utrecht: VSP, 1993.
14. Moscow Mathematical Olympiad, problem no. 78223. [http://www.problems.ru/view\\_problem\\_details\\_new.php?id=78223](http://www.problems.ru/view_problem_details_new.php?id=78223), 1960. In Russian.
15. U. Scherm. Minimale Überdeckung von Knoten und Kanten in Graphen durch Geraden. Bachelor's Thesis, Institut für Informatik, Universität Würzburg, 2016.
16. A. Schulz. Drawing graphs with few arcs. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.*, 19(1):393–412, 2015.

## Appendix: ILP Formulation for Optimal Segment Drawing


To obtain lower bounds on the segment numbers of planar graphs, we formulate an ILP. For the platonic graphs, the bounds are tight; see Tables 2 and 4.

Our ILP determines a locally consistent angle assignment [5] with the maximum number of  $\pi$ -angles between incident edges. Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph with fixed embedding  $\mathcal{F}$  and outer face  $f_0$ . For any  $v \in V$  and  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ , we introduce a variable  $x_{v,f}$  with  $0 < x_{v,f} \leq 2$  whose value is intended to be the angle of vertex  $v$  in face  $f$  divided by  $\pi$ . Thus  $(\pi \cdot x_{v,f})_{v \in V, f \in \mathcal{F}}$  is an angle assignment. The following constraints guarantee that the assignment is locally consistent.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{f \sim v} x_{v,f} &= 2 && \text{for each } v \in V; \\ \sum_{v \sim f} x_{v,f} &= (\deg f - 2) && \text{for each } f \neq f_0 \in \mathcal{F}; \\ \sum_{v \sim f_0} x_{v,f_0} &= (\deg f + 2) \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a planar 3-connected graph with a given embedding  $\mathcal{F}$ , and let  $v \in V$ . Let vertices  $u$  and  $w$  be incident to  $v$  and consecutive in the circular order around  $v$ . Then  $v, u$ , and  $w$  uniquely define a face.*

*Proof.* Let  $v, u$ , and  $w$  be incident on two different faces  $f$  and  $g$  (Figure 7a) then there is no path between  $v$  and  $u$  or  $v$  and  $w$  except of the edges  $vu$  or  $vw$  respectively because otherwise the three vertices would not be consecutive in the embedding. Thus, removing these two edges would isolate the component containing vertex  $v$ , contradiction. Now let  $v, u, w$  be incident on some face  $f$  and  $u^*, w^*$  be another pair of vertices incident to  $v$  and consecutive in the embedding such that they are incident on the same face  $f$  (Figure 7b). Any path connecting  $u, w$  must go through  $v$  otherwise  $v, u, w$  would define a different face, the same for  $v, u^*, w^*$ . Therefore, removing the vertex  $v$  from the graph isolates  $u$  from  $w$  as well as  $u^*$  from  $w^*$ , contradiction.  $\square$



**Fig. 7:** Illustration for the proof of Lemma 4

For any vertex  $v$ , let  $L_v = \langle v_1, \dots, v_k \rangle$  be the vertices adjacent to  $v$ , in clockwise order as they appear in the embedding. According to Lemma 4 any two

consecutive vertices  $v_t, v_{t+1}$  adjacent to  $v$  uniquely define a face  $f \sim v, v_t, v_{t+1}$ . The angle between two adjacent vertices  $v_i, v_j$ ,  $i < j$  of  $v$  will be expressed as the sum of angles assigned to faces at  $v$  between  $v_i$  and  $v_j$ :

$$\angle(v_i v v_j) = \pi \cdot \sum_{t=i}^{j-1} x_{v, f \sim v, v_t, v_{t+1}}.$$

We want to maximize the number of  $\pi$ -angles between any two edges incident to the same vertex. To this end, we introduce a 0–1 variable  $s_{v, v_i, v_j}$  for any vertex  $v$  with two different neighbors  $v_i$  and  $v_j$ . The intended meaning of  $s_{v, v_i, v_j} = 1$  is that  $\angle(v_i v v_j) = \pi$ . We add the following constraints to the ILP:

$$\frac{\angle(v_i v v_j)}{\pi} \leq 2 - s_{v, v_i, v_j} \quad \text{for each } v \in V \text{ and } v_i, v_j \in L_v \text{ with } i < j; \quad (1)$$

$$s_{v, v_i, v_j} \leq \frac{\angle(v_i v v_j)}{\pi} \quad \text{for each } v \in V \text{ and } v_i, v_j \in L_v \text{ with } i < j. \quad (2)$$

If  $\angle(v_i v v_j) > \pi$ , constraint (1) will force  $s_{v, v_i, v_j}$  to be 0 and constraint (2) will not be effective. If  $\angle(v_i v v_j) < \pi$ , constraint (2) will force  $s_{v, v_i, v_j}$  to be 0 and constraint (1) will not be effective. Only if  $\angle(v_i v v_j) = \pi$ , both constraints will allow  $s_{v, v_i, v_j}$  to be 1.

To obtain the most balanced angle assignment we introduce the following additional variables  $\alpha_l, \alpha_u \in (0, 2)$  which are intended to describe the smallest and the largest angles in the angle assignment, respectively. To implement the intended meaning of the new variables, we introduce the following constraints:

$$\begin{aligned} x_{v, f} &\geq \alpha_l && \text{for each } v \in V \text{ and } f \in \mathcal{F}; \\ x_{v, f} &\leq \alpha_u && \text{for each } v \in V \text{ and } f \in \mathcal{F}. \end{aligned}$$

Primarily, we want to maximize the number of  $\pi$ -angles between incident edges. As a secondary objective, we want to maximize the angle resolution. The following linear objective function achieves both our primary and our secondary objective by weighing them accordingly:

$$\text{maximize} \quad \sum_{v \in V, v_i, v_j \in L_v, i < j} s_{v, v_i, v_j} + (\alpha_l - \alpha_u)/2.$$

We denote the number of  $\pi$ -angles in the optimal segment drawing of a graph  $G$  by  $\text{ang}_\pi(G)$ . For every  $\pi$ -angle between incident edges, we can use an already drawn segment to accommodate another edge; hence,

$$\text{seg}(G) = |E| - \text{ang}_\pi(G). \quad (3)$$

The ILP gives an upper bound on  $\text{ang}_\pi(G)$ , thus Equation (3) provides a lower bound for the segment number  $\text{seg}(G)$ .

The experimental results for the platonic graphs are displayed in Table 4.

graph $G$	octahedron	cube	dodecahedron	icosahedron
$\text{ang}_\pi(G) \leq$	3	5	17	15
$\text{seg}(G) \geq$	9	7	13	15
variables	62	50	122	182
constraints	185	162	387	515
runtime [s]	0.2	0.2	0.2	2.8

**Table 4:** Upper bounds on  $\text{ang}_\pi(G)$  and corresponding lower bounds on  $\text{seg}(G)$  obtained by the ILP together with sizes of the ILP formulation. The runtimes were measured on a 64-bit machine with four Intel i5 cores with 1.90 GHz and 7.7 GB main memory, using the ILP solver in IBM ILOG CPLEX Optimization Studio 12.6.2