Obtaining a Planar Graph by Vertex Deletion

Dániel Marx[1] and Ildikó Schlotter[2]

[1] Institut für Informatik, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin,
Unter den Linden 6, 10099, Berlin, Germany.
dmarx@informatik.hu-berlin.de

[2] Department of Computer Science and Information Theory,
Budapest University of Technology and Economics,
Budapest, H-1521, Hungary.
ildi@cs.bme.hu

Abstract. In the Planar $+k$ vertex problem the task is to find at most k vertices whose deletion makes the given graph planar. The graphs for which there exists a solution form a minor closed class of graphs, hence by the deep results of Robertson and Seymour [19, 18], there is an $O(n^3)$ time algorithm for every fixed value of k. However, the proof is extremely complicated and the constants hidden by the big-O notation are huge. Here we give a much simpler algorithm for this problem with quadratic running time, by iteratively reducing the input graph and then applying techniques for graphs of bounded treewidth.

1 Introduction

Planar graphs are subject of wide research interest in graph theory. There are many generally hard problems which can be solved in polynomial time when considering planar graphs, e.g., Maximum Clique, Maximum Cut, and Subgraph Isomorphism [8, 12]. For problems that remain NP-hard on planar graphs, we often have efficient approximation algorithms. For example, the problems Independent Set, Vertex Cover, and Dominating Set admit an efficient polynomial time approximation scheme (EPTAS) [1, 15]. The research for efficient algorithms for problems on planar graphs is still very intensive.

Many results on planar graphs can be extended to almost planar graphs, which can be defined in various ways. For example, we can consider possible embeddings of a graph in a surface other than the plane. The genus of a graph is the minimum number of handles that must be added to the plane to embed the graph without any crossings. Although determining the genus of a graph is NP-hard [20], the graphs with bounded genus are subjects of wide research. A similar property of graphs is their crossing number, i.e., the minimum possible number of crossings with which the graph can be drawn in the plane. Determining crossing number is also NP-hard [10].

In [3] Cai introduced another notation, based on the number of certain elementary modification steps. He defines the distance of a graph G from a graph class $\mathcal{F}$ as the minimum number of modifying steps needed to make G a member of $\mathcal{F}$. Here modification can mean the deletion or addition of edges or vertices. In this paper we consider the following question: given a graph G and an integer k, is there a set of at most k vertices in G, whose deletion makes G planar?

Since this problem was proved to be NP-hard in [14], we cannot hope to find a polynomial-time algorithm for it. Therefore, we study the problem in the framework of parameterized complexity [7]. This approach deals with problems in which besides the input I an integer k is also given. The integer k is referred to as the parameter. In many cases we can solve the problem in time $O(n^{f(k)})$. Clearly, this is also true for the problem we consider. Although this is polynomial time for each fixed k, these algorithms are practically too slow for large inputs, even if k is relatively small. Therefore, the standard goal of parameterized analysis is to take the parameter out of the exponent in the running time. A problem is called *fixed-parameter tractable* (FPT) if it can be solved in time $O(f(k)p(|I|))$, where p is a polynomial not depending on k, and f is an arbitrary function. An algorithm with such a running time is also called FPT.

The standard parameterized version of our problem is the following: given a graph G and a parameter k, the task is to decide whether deleting at most k vertices from G can result in a planar graph. Following Cai [3], we will denote the class of graphs for which the answer is 'yes' by Planar $+ kv$. This family of graphs is closed under taking minors, so thanks to the results of Robertson and Seymour [19, 18], we know that there exists an algorithm with running time $O(f(k)n^3)$ which can decide membership for this class. However, this result is inherently non-constructive, and so far there is no direct FPT algorithm known for this problem. In this paper we present an algorithm, which solves the question in $O(f(k)n^2)$ time. The algorithm also returns a solution, i.e., a set of at most k vertices whose deletion from G results in a planar graph.

Our algorithm is strongly based on the ideas used by Grohe in [11] for computing crossing number. Grohe uses the fact that the crossing number of a graph is an upper bound for its genus. Since the genus of a graph in Planar$+kv$ cannot be bounded by a function of k, we need some other ideas. As in [11], we exploit the fact that in a graph with large treewidth we can always find a large grid minor [17]. Examining the structure of the graph with such a grid minor, we can reduce our problem to a smaller instance. Applying this reduction several times, we finally get an instance with bounded treewidth. Then we make use of Courcelle's Theorem [4], which states that every graph property that is expressible in monadic second-order logic can be decided in linear time on graphs of bounded treewidth.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 summarizes our notation, Sect. 3 outlines the algorithm, Sect. 4 and 5 describe the two phases of the algorithm.

2 Notation

Graphs in this paper are assumed to be simple, since both loops and multiple edges are irrelevant in the Planar $+$ k vertex problem. The vertex set and edge set of a graph G are denoted by $V(G)$ and $E(G)$, respectively. The edges of



Fig. 1. The hexagonal grids H_1, H_2, and H_3.

a graph are unordered pairs of its vertices. If G' is a subgraph of G then $G - G'$ denotes the graph obtained by deleting G' from G. For a set of vertices S in G, we will also use $G - S$ to denote the graph obtained by deleting S from G.

A graph H is a minor of a graph G, if it can be obtained from a subgraph of G by contracting some of its edges. Here contracting an edge e with endpoints a and b means deleting e, and then identifying vertices a and b.

A graph H is a subdivision of a graph G, if G can be obtained from H by contracting some of its edges that have at least one endpoint of degree 2. A graph H is a topological minor of G, if G has a subgraph that is a subdivision of H. G and G' are topologically isomorphic if they both are subdivisions of a graph H. If G is a subdivision of H, then an *edge-path* of G with respect to H is a path of G corresponding to exactly one edge of H in the natural way (i.e., a path with inner points only of degree 2, whose vertices are all identified with an endpoint of a certain edge when obtaining H from G as a topological minor).

The $g \times g$ *grid* is the graph $G_{g\times g}$ where $V(G_{g\times g}) = \{v_{ij} \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq g\}$ and $E(G_{g\times g}) = \{v_{ij}v_{i'j'} \mid |i - i'| + |j - j'| = 1\}$.

Instead of giving a formal definition for the *hexagonal grid* of radius r, which we will denote by H_r, we refer to the illustration shown in Fig. 1. A *cell* of a hexagonal grid is one of its cycles of length 6.

A *tree decomposition* of a graph G is a pair $(T, (V_t)_{t\in V(T)})$ where T is a tree, $V_t \subseteq V(G)$ for all $t \in V(T)$, and the following are true:

- for all $v \in V(G)$ there exists a $t \in V(T)$ such that $v \in V_t$,
- for all $xy \in E(G)$ there exists a $t \in V(T)$ such that $x, y \in V_t$,
- if t lies on the path connecting t' and t'' in T, then $V_t \supseteq V_{t'} \cap V_{t''}$.

The *width* of such a tree decomposition is the maximum of $|V_t| - 1$ taken over all $t \in V(T)$. The *treewidth* of a graph G is the smallest possible width of a tree decomposition of G.

3 Problem Definition and Overview of the Algorithm

We are looking for the solution of the following problem:

Planar + k vertex problem:	
Input:	A graph $G = (V, E)$ and an integer k.
Task:	Find a set X of at most k vertices in V such that $G - X$ is planar.

Here we give an algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ which solves this problem in time $O(f(k)n^2)$ for some function f, where n is the number of vertices in the input graph. Algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ works in two phases. In the first phase (Sect. 4) we compress the given graph repeatedly, and finally either conclude that there is no solution for our problem or construct an equivalent problem instance with a graph having bounded treewidth. In the latter case we solve the problem in the second phase of the algorithm (Sect. 5) by applying Courcelle's Theorem concerning the evaluation of MSO-formulae on bounded treewidth graphs.

According to [17, 2, 16] we know that there is a linear-time algorithm which can solve the following problem, for fixed integers w and r:

Input:	A graph G.
Task:	If $\mathrm{tw}(G) \leq w$ then find a tree decomposition of width w, or if $\mathrm{tw}(G) > w$ then find an $r \times r$ grid minor in G if there is one.

It is a well-known fact that if a graph of maximum degree 3 is a minor of another graph, then it is also contained in it as a topological minor. Hence, it will be convenient to work with hexagonal grids instead of grids. Since a hexagonal grid with radius i is a subgraph of the $(4i-1)\times(4i-1)$ grid, we can conclude that for each fixed w and r there is a linear-time algorithm that solves the following modified version of the above problem:

Input:	A graph G.
Task:	If $\mathrm{tw}(G) \leq w$ then find a tree decomposition of width w, or if $\mathrm{tw}(G) > w$ then find a subdivision of H_r in G if there is one.

According to [17] every planar graph with no minor isomorphic to the $r \times r$ grid has treewidth $\leq 6r-5$. Therefore, it is also true that every planar graph with no minor isomorphic to H_r has treewidth $\leq 6(4r-1)-5 = 24r-11$. But adding k vertices to a graph can increase the treewidth of the graph only by at most k, so if $G \in \text{Planar} + kv$ and H_r is not a minor of G, then $\mathrm{tw}(G) \leq 24r - 11 + k$. We can summarize this in the following simple claim.

Lemma 1. *For arbitrary integers r and k there is a linear-time algorithm $\mathcal{B}$, which can be run with input graph G, and does the following:*

- *it either produces a tree decomposition of G of width $w(r) = 24r-11+k$, or*
- *finds a subdivision of H_r in G, or*
- *correctly concludes that $G \notin \text{Planar} + kv$.*

In algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ we will run $\mathcal{B}$ several times. As long as we get a hexagonal grid of radius r as topological minor as a result, we will run Phase I of algorithm $\mathcal{A}$, which compresses the graph G. If at some step algorithm $\mathcal{B}$ gives us a tree decomposition of width $w(r)$, we run Phase II. (The constant r will be fixed later.) And of course if at some step $\mathcal{B}$ finds out that $G \notin \text{Planar} + kv$, then algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ can stop with the output "No solution."

Clearly, we can assume without loss of generality that the input graph is simple, and it has at least $k+3$ vertices. So if $G \in \text{Planar} + kv$, then deleting k vertices from G (which means the deletion of at most $k(|V(G)|-1)$ edges) results in a planar graph, which has at most $3|V(G)|-6$ edges. Therefore, if $|E(G)| > (k+3)|V(G)|$ then surely $G \notin \text{Planar} + kv$. Since this can be detected in linear time, we can assume that $|E(G)| \leq (k+3)|V(G)|$.

4 Phase I of Algorithm $\mathcal{A}$

In Phase I we assume that after running $\mathcal{B}$ on G we get a subgraph H'_r that is a subdivision of H_r. Our goal is to find a set of vertices X such that $G - X$ is planar, and $|X| \leq k$. Let $\text{PlanarDel}(G, k)$ denote the family of sets of vertices that have these properties, i.e., let $\text{PlanarDel}(G, k) = \{X \subseteq V(G) \mid |X| \leq k$ and $G - X$ is planar$\}$. Since the case $k = 1$ is very simple we can assume that $k > 1$.

Reduction A: Flat zones. In the following we regard the grid H'_r as a fixed subgraph of G. Let us define z zones in it. Here z is a constant depending only on k, which we will determine later. A *zone* is a subgraph of H'_r which is topologically isomorphic to the hexagonal grid H_{2k+5}. We place such zones next to each other in the well-known radial manner with radius q, i.e., we replace each hexagon of H_q with a subdivision of H_{2k+5}. It is easy to show that in a hexagonal grid with radius $(q-1)(4k+9)+(2k+5)$ we can define this way $3q(q-1)+1$ zones that only intersect in their outer circles. So let $r = (q-1)(4k+9)+(2k+5)$, where we choose q big enough to get at least z zones, i.e., q is the smallest integer such that $3q(q-1)+1 \geq z$. Let the subgraph of these z zones in H'_r be R.

Let us define two types of *grid-components*. An edge which is not contained in R is a grid-component if it connects two vertices of R. A subgraph of G is a grid-component if it is a (maximal) connected component of $G - R$. A grid-component K is *attached* to a vertex v of the grid R if it has a vertex adjacent to v, or (if K is an edge) one of its endpoints is v. The *core* of a zone is the (unique) subgraph of the zone which is topologically isomorphic to H_{2k+3} and lies in the middle of the zone. Let us call a zone Z *open* if there is a vertex in its core that is connected to a vertex v of another zone, $v \notin V(Z)$, through a grid-component. A zone is *closed*, if it is not open.

For a subgraph H of R let $T(H)$ denote the subgraph of G spanned by the vertices of H and the vertices of the grid-components which are only attached to H. Let us call a zone Z *flat* if it is closed and $T(Z)$ is planar. Let Z be such a flat zone. A grid-component is an *edge-component* if it is either only attached to one edge-path of Z or only to one vertex of Z. Otherwise, it is a *cell-component*, if it is only attached to vertices of one cell. As a consequence of the fact that all embeddings of a 3-connected graph are equivalent (see e.g. [6]), and Z is a subdivision of such a graph, every grid-component attached to some vertex in the core of Z must be one of these two types. Note that we can assume that in an embedding of $T(Z)$ in the plane, all edge-components are embedded in an arbitrarily small neighborhood of the edge-path (or vertex) which they belong to.

Let us define the *ring* R_i ($1 \leq i \leq 2k+4$) as the union of those cells in Z that have common vertices both with the i-th and the $(i+1)$-th concentrical circle of Z. Let R_0 be the cell of Z that lies in its center. The zone Z can be viewed as the union of $2k+5$ concentrical rings, i.e., the union of the subgraphs R_i for $0 \leq i \leq 2k+4$. Let Q_i denote $T(\bigcup_{j=0}^{i} R_j)$.

Lemma 2. *Let Z be a flat zone in R, and let G' denote the graph $G - T(R_0)$. Then $X \in \mathrm{PlanarDel}(G', k)$ implies $X \in \mathrm{PlanarDel}(G, k)$.*

Proof. Since $G - T(R_0) - X$ is planar, we can fix a planar embedding ϕ of it. If $R_i \cap X = \emptyset$ for some i ($2 \leq i \leq 2k+2$) then let W_i denote the maximal subgraph of $G - T(R_0) - X$ for which $\phi(W_i)$ is in the region determined by $\phi(R_i)$ (including R_i). If $R_i \cap X$ is not empty then let W_i be the empty graph. Note that if $2 \leq i \leq 2k$ then W_i and W_{i+2} are disjoint. Therefore, there exists an index i for which $W_i \cap X = \emptyset$. Let us fix this i.

We prove the lemma by giving an embedding for $G - X'$ where $X' = X \setminus V(Q_{i-1})$. The region $\phi(R_i)$ divides the plane in two other regions. We can assume that in the finite region only vertices of Q_{i-1} are embedded, so $G - X' - (Q_{i-1} \cup W_i)$ is entirely embedded in the infinite region. Let U denote those vertices in Q_{i-1} which are adjacent to some vertex in $G - Q_{i-1}$. Observe that the restriction of ϕ to $G - X' - (Q_{i-1} - U)$ has a face whose boundary contains U.

Now let θ be a planar embedding of $T(Z)$, and let us restrict θ to Q_{i-1}. Note that U only contains vertices which are either adjacent to some vertex in R_i or are adjacent to cell-components belonging to a cell of R_i. But θ embeds R_i and its cell-components also, and therefore the restriction of θ to Q_{i-1} results in a face whose boundary contains U. Here we used also that R_i is a subdivision of a 3-connected graph whose embeddings are equivalent.

Now it is easy to see that we can combine θ and ϕ in such a way that we embed $G - X' - (Q_{i-1} - U)$ according to ϕ, and similarly Q_{i-1} according to θ, and then "connect" them by identifying $\phi(u)$ and $\theta(u)$ for all $u \in U$. This gives the desired embedding of $G - X'$. Finally, we have to observe that $X' \in \mathrm{PlanarDel}(G, k)$ implies $X \in \mathrm{PlanarDel}(G, k)$, since $X' \subseteq X$ and $|X| \leq k$. □

This lemma has a trivial but crucial consequence: $X \in \mathrm{PlanarDel}(G, k)$ if and only if $X \in \mathrm{PlanarDel}(G - T(R_0), k)$, so deleting $T(R_0)$ reduces our problem to an equivalent instance. Let us denote this deletion as *Reduction A*.

Note that the closedness of a zone Z can be decided by a simple breadth first search, which can also produce the graph $T(Z)$. Planarity can also be tested in linear time [13]. Therefore we can test whether a zone is flat, and if so, we can apply Reduction A on it in linear time.

Later we will see that unless there are some easily recognizable vertices in our graph, which must be included in every solution, then a flat zone can always be found (Lemma 7). This yields an easy way to handle graphs with large treewidth: compressing our graph by repeatedly applying Reduction A we can reduce the problem to an instance with bounded treewidth.

Reduction B: Well-attached vertices. A subgraph of R is a *block*, if it is topologically isomorphic to H_{k+3}. A vertex of a given block is called *inner vertex*, if it is not on the outer circle of the block.

Lemma 3. *Let $X \in \mathrm{PlanarDel}(G, k)$. Let x and y be inner vertices of the disjoint blocks B_x and B_y, respectively. If P is an $x - y$ path that (except its endpoints) doesn't contain any vertex from B_x or B_y, then X must contain a vertex from B_x, B_y or P.*

Proof. Let C_x and C_y denote the outer circle of B_x and B_y, respectively. Let us notice that since B_x and B_y are disjoint blocks, there exist at least $k+3$ vertex disjoint paths between their outer circles, which—apart from their endpoints—do not contain vertices from B_x and B_y. Moreover, it is easy to see that these paths can be defined in a way such that their endpoints that lie on C_x are on the border of different cells of B_x. To see this, note that the number of cells which lie on the border of a given block is $6k + 12$.

At least three of these paths must be in $G - X$ also. Since x can lie only on the border of at most two cells having common vertices with C_x, we get that there is a path P' in $G - X$ whose endpoints are a_x and a_y (lying on C_x and C_y, resp.), and there exist no cell of B_x whose border contains both a_x and x.

Let us suppose that $B_x \cup B_y \cup P$ is a subgraph of $G - X$. Since all embeddings of a 3-connected planar graph are equivalent, we know that if we restrict an arbitrary planar embedding of $G - X$ to B_x, then all faces having x on their border correspond to a cell in B_x. Since x and y are connected through P and $V(P) \cap V(B_x) = \{x\}$, we get that y must be embedded in a region F corresponding to a cell C_F of B_x. But this implies that B_y must entirely be embedded also in F.

Since $V(P' - a_x - a_y) \cap V(B_x) = \emptyset$ and P' connects $a_x \in V(B_x)$ and $a_y \in V(B_y)$ we have that a_y must lie on the border of F. But then C_F is a cell of B_x containing both a_x and x on its border, which yields the contradiction. $\square$

Using this lemma we can identify certain vertices that have to be deleted. Let x be a *well-attached* vertex in G if there exist paths $P_1, P_2, \ldots, P_{k+2}$ and disjoint blocks $B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_{k+2}$ such that P_i connects x with an inner vertex of B_i $(1 \le i \le k+2)$, the inner vertices of P_i are not in R, and if $i \neq j$ then the only common vertex of P_i and P_j is x.

Lemma 4. *Let $X \in \mathrm{PlanarDel}(G, k)$. If x is well-attached then $x \in X$.*

Proof. If $x \notin X$, then after deleting X from G (which means deleting at most k vertices) there would exist indices i and j such that no vertex from P_i, P_j, B_i, and B_j was deleted. But then the disjoint blocks B_i and B_j were connected by the path $P_i - x - P_j$, and by the previous lemma, this is a contradiction. $\square$

We can decide whether a vertex v is well-attached in time $O(f'(k)e)$ using standard flow techniques, where $e = |E(G)|$. This can be done by simply testing for each possible set of $k+2$ disjoint blocks if there exist the required disjoint paths that lead from x to these blocks. Since the number of blocks in R depends only on k, and we can find p disjoint paths starting from a given vertex of a graph G in time $O(p|E(G)|)$, we can observe that this can be done indeed in time $O(f'(k)e)$.

Finding flat zones. Now we show that if there are no well-attached vertices in the graph G, then a flat zone exists in our grid.

Lemma 5. *Let $X \in \mathrm{PlanarDel}(G,k)$, and let G not include any well-attached vertices. If K is a grid-component then there cannot exist $(k+1)^2$ disjoint blocks such that K is attached to an inner vertex of each block.*

Proof. Let us assume for contradiction that there exist $(k+1)^2$ such blocks. Since $X = k$, at least $(k+1)^2 - k$ of these blocks do not contain any vertex of X. So let x_1, x_2, $\ldots x_{(k+1)^2-k}$ be adjacent to K and let $B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_{(k+1)^2-k}$ be disjoint blocks of $G - X$ such that x_i is an inner vertex of B_i.

Since $G - X$ is planar, it follows from Lemma 3 that a component of $K - X$ cannot be adjacent to different vertices from $\{x_i | 1 \leq i \leq (k+1)^2 - k\}$. So let K_i be the connected component of $K - X$ that is attached to x_i in $G - X$. K is connected in G, hence for every K_i there is a vertex of $T = K \cap X$ that is adjacent to it in G. Since there are no well-attached vertices in G, every vertex of T can be adjacent to at most $k+1$ of these subgraphs. But then $|T| \geq ((k+1)^2 - k)/(k+1) > k$ which is a contradiction since $T \subseteq X$. □

Let us now fix the constant $d = (k+1)((k+1)^2 - 1)$.

Lemma 6. *Let $X \in \mathrm{PlanarDel}(G,k)$, let G not include any well-attached vertices, and let x be a vertex of the grid R. Then there cannot exist $B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_{d+1}$ disjoint blocks such that for all i $(1 \leq i \leq d+1)$ an inner vertex of B_i and x are both attached to some grid-component K_i.*

Proof. As a consequence of Lemma 5 each of the grid-components K_i can be attached to at most $(k+1)^2 - 1$ disjoint blocks. But since x is not a well-attached vertex, there can be only at most $k+1$ different grid-components among the grid-components K_i, $1 \leq i \leq d+1$. So the total number of disjoint blocks that are attached to x through a grid-component is at most $(k+1)((k+1)^2 - 1) = d$. □

Lemma 7. *Let $X \in \mathrm{PlanarDel}(G,k)$, and let G not include any well-attached vertices. Then there exists a flat zone Z in G.*

Proof. Let Z be an open zone which has a vertex z in its core that is attached to a vertex v of another zone ($v \notin V(Z)$) through a grid-component K. By the choice of the size of the zones we have disjoint blocks B_z and B_v containing z and v respectively as inner points. We can also assume that B_z is a subgraph of Z which does not intersect the outer circle of Z.

By Lemma 3 we know that B_z, B_v or K contains a vertex from X. Let $\mathcal{Z}_1$ denote the set of zones with a core vertex in X, let $\mathcal{Z}_2$ denote the set of open zones with a core vertex to which a grid-component, having a common vertex with X, is attached, and finally let $\mathcal{Z}_3$ be the set of the remaining open zones. Since $|X| \leq k$ and a grid-component can be attached to inner vertices of at most $(k+1)^2$ disjoint blocks by Lemma 5, we have that $|\mathcal{Z}_1| \leq k$ and $|\mathcal{Z}_2| \leq k(k+1)^2$.

Let us count the number of zones in $\mathcal{Z}_3$. To each zone Z in $\mathcal{Z}_3$ we assign a vertex $u(Z)$ of the grid not in Z, which is connected to the core of Z by a grid-component. First let us bound the number of zones in $\mathcal{Z}_3$ to which we assigned a vertex in X. Lemma 6 implies that $v \in X$ can be connected this way to at most d zones, so we can have only at most kd such zones.

Now let $U = \{v \mid v = u(Z), Z \in \mathcal{Z}_3\}$. Let a and b be different members of U, and let a be connected through the grid-component K_a with the core vertex z_a of $Z_a \in \mathcal{Z}_3$. Let B_a denote a block which only contains vertices that are inner vertices of Z_a, and contains z_a as inner vertex. Such a block can be given due to the size of a zone and its core. Let us define K_b, z_b, Z_b, and B_b similarly. Note that $V(Z_a) \cap X = V(Z_b) \cap X = \emptyset$.

Now let us assume that a and b are in the same component of $R - X$. Let P be a path connecting them in $R - X$. If P has common vertices with B_a (or B_b) then we modify P the following way. If the first and last vertices reached by P in Z_a (or Z_b, resp.) are w and w', then we swap the $w - w'$ section of P using the outer circle of Z_a (or Z_b, resp.). This way we can fix a path in $R - X$ that connects a and b, and does not include any vertex from B_a and B_b. But this path together with K_a and K_b would yield a path in $G - X$ that connects two inner vertices of B_a and B_b, contradicting Lemma 3.

Therefore, each vertex of U lies in a different component of $R - X$. But we can only delete at most k vertices and each vertex in a hexagonal grid has at most 3 neighbors, thus we can conclude that $|U| \leq 3k$. As for different zones Z_1 and Z_2 we cannot have $u(Z_1) = u(Z_2)$ (which is also a consequence of Lemma 3) we have that $|\mathcal{Z}_3| \leq 3k$. So if we choose the number of zones in R to be $z = 7k + k(k+1)^2 + kd + 1$ we have that there are at least $3k + 1$ zones in R, which are not contained in $\mathcal{Z}_1 \cup \mathcal{Z}_2 \cup \mathcal{Z}_3$, indicating that they are closed. Since a vertex can be contained by at most 3 zones, $|X| \leq k$ implies that there exist a closed zone Z^*, which does not contain any vertex from X, and all grid-components attached to Z^* are also disjoint from X. This immediately implies that $T(Z^*)$ is a subgraph of $G - X$, and thus $T(Z^*)$ is planar. □

Algorithm for Phase I. The exact steps of Phase I of the algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ are shown in Fig. 2. It starts with running algorithm $\mathcal{B}$ on the graph G and integers $w(r)$ and r. If $\mathcal{B}$ returns a hexagonal grid as a topological minor, then the algorithm proceeds with the next step. If $\mathcal{B}$ returns a tree decomposition $\mathcal{T}$ of width $w(r)$, then Phase I returns the triple $(G, W, \mathcal{T})$. Otherwise G does not have H_r as minor and its treewidth is larger than $w(r)$, so by Lemma 1 we can conclude that $G \notin \text{Planar} + kv$.

In the next step the algorithm tries to find a flat zone Z. If such a zone is found, then the algorithm executes a deletion whose correctness is implied

Phase I of algorithm $\mathcal{A}$:

Input: $G = (V, E)$.

Let $W = \emptyset$.

1. Run algorithm $\mathcal{B}$ on G, $w(r)$, and r.
   If it returns a subgraph H'_r topologically isomorphic to H_r then go to Step 2. If it returns a tree decomposition $\mathcal{T}$ of G, then output(G, W, $\mathcal{T}$). Otherwise output("No solution.").
2. For all zones Z do:
   If Z is flat then $G := G - T(R_0)$, and go to Step 1.
3. Let $U = \emptyset$. For all $x \in V$: if x is well-attached then $U := U \cup \{x\}$.
   If $|U| = \emptyset$ or $|W| + |U| > k$ then output("No solution.").
   Otherwise $W := W \cup U$, $G := G - U$ and go to Step 1.

Fig. 2. Phase I of algorithm $\mathcal{A}$.

by Lemma 2. Note that after altering the graph the algorithm must find the hexagonal grid again, and thus has to run $\mathcal{B}$ several times.

If no flat zone was found in Step 2, the algorithm removes well-attached vertices from the graph in Step 3. The vertices already removed this way are stored in W, and U is the set of vertices to be removed in the actual step. By Lemma 4, if $X \in \text{PlanarDel}(G, k)$ then $W \cup U \subseteq X$, so $|W| + |U| > k$ means that there is no solution. By Lemma 7 the case $U = \emptyset$ means also that there is no solution for the problem instance. In these cases the algorithm stops with output "No solution." Otherwise it proceeds with updating the variables W and G, and continues with Step 1.

The output of the algorithm can be of two types: it either refuses the instance (outputting "No solution.") or it returns an instance for Phase II. For the above mentioned purposes the new instance is equivalent with the original problem instance in the following sense:

Theorem 1. *Let $(G', W, \mathcal{T})$ be the triple returned by $\mathcal{A}$ at the end of Phase I. Then for all $X \subseteq V(G)$ it is true that $X \in \text{PlanarDel}(G, k)$ if and only if $W \subseteq X$ and $(X \setminus W) \in \text{PlanarDel}(G', k - |W|)$.*

Now let us examine the running time of this phase. The first step can be done in time $O(f''(k)n)$ according to [17, 2, 16] where $n = |V(G)|$. Since the algorithm only runs algorithm $\mathcal{B}$ again after reducing the number of the vertices in G, we have that $\mathcal{B}$ runs at most n times. This takes $O(f''(k)n^2)$ time. The second step requires only linear time (a breadth first search and a planarity test). Deciding whether a vertex is well-attached can be done in time $O(f'(k)e)$ (where $e = |E(G)|$), so we need $O(f'(k)ne)$ time to check every vertex at a given iteration in Step 3. Note that the third step is executed at most $k + 1$ times, since in each iteration $|W|$ increases. Hence, this phase of algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ uses total time $O(f''(k)n^2 + f'(k)kne) = O(f(k)n^2)$ as the number of edges is $O(kn)$.

5 Phase II of Algorithm $\mathcal{A}$

At the end of Phase I of algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ we either conclude that there is no solution, or we have a triple $(G', W, \mathcal{T})$ for which Theorem 1 holds. Here $\mathcal{T}$ is a tree decomposition for G' of width at most $w(r)$. This bound only depends on r which is a function of k. From the choice of the constants r, q, z, and d we can easily derive that $\mathrm{tw}(G') \leq w(r) \leq 100(k+2)^{7/2}$.

In order to solve our problem we only have to find out if there is a set $Y \in \mathrm{PlanarDel}(G', k')$ where $k' = k - |W|$. For such a set, $Y \cup W$ would yield a solution for the original PLANAR + k VERTEX problem.

A theorem by Courcelle states that every graph property defined by a formula in monadic second-order logic (MSO) can be evaluated in linear time if the input graph has bounded treewidth. Here we consider graphs as relational structures of vocabulary $\{V, E, I\}$, where V and E denote unary relations interpreted as the vertex set and the edge set of the graph, and I is a binary relation interpreted as the incidence relation. We will denote by U^G the universe of the graph G, i.e., $U^G = V(G) \cup E(G)$. Variables in monadic second-order logic can be element or set variables. For a survey on MSO logic on graphs see [5].

Following Grohe [11], we use a strengthened version of Courcelle's Theorem:

Theorem 2. ([9]) *Let $\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_i, X_1, \ldots, X_j, y_1, \ldots, y_p, Y_1, \ldots, Y_q)$ denote an MSO-formula and let $w \geq 1$. Then there is a linear-time algorithm that, given a graph G with $\mathrm{tw}(G) \leq w$ and $b_1, \ldots, b_p \in U^G, B_1, \ldots, B_q \subseteq U^G$, decides whether there exist $a_1, \ldots, a_i \in U^G, A_1, \ldots, A_j \subseteq U^G$ such that*

$$G \models \varphi(a_1, \ldots, a_i, A_1, \ldots, A_j, b_1, \ldots, b_p, B_1, \ldots, B_q),$$

and, if this is the case, computes such elements $a_1, \ldots, a_i$ and sets $A_1, \ldots, A_j$.

It is well-known that there is an MSO-formula $\varphi_{\mathrm{planar}}$ which describes the planarity of graphs, i.e., for every graph G the statement $G \models \varphi_{\mathrm{planar}}$ holds if and only if G is planar. This can be easily seen thanks to the simple characterization of planar graphs by Kuratowski's Theorem: a graph is planar if and only if it does not contain any subgraph topologically isomorphic to K_5 or $K_{3,3}$. The existence of these subgraphs can be formulated using vertex sets as variables.

It is easy to modify $\varphi_{\mathrm{planar}}$ so that we obtain a formula $\varphi^*(x_1, \ldots, x_{k'})$ that expresses the following: if we delete the vertices $x_1, \ldots, x_{k'}$ from the graph, then the resulting graph is planar. All we have to ensure is that the subgraphs that we obstruct in $\varphi_{\mathrm{planar}}$ (i.e., the subdivisions of the graphs K_5 and $K_{3,3}$) are disjoint from the vertices $x_1, \ldots, x_{k'}$. So we can state the following:

Theorem 3. *There exists an MSO-formula $\varphi^*(x_1, \ldots, x_{k'})$ for which the statement $G \models \varphi^*(v_1, \ldots, v_{k'})$ holds if and only if $G - \{v_1, \ldots, v_{k'}\}$ is planar.*

Now let us apply Theorem 2. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the algorithm which, given a graph G of bounded treewidth, decides whether there exist $v_1, \ldots, v_{k'} \in U^G$ such that $G \models \varphi*(v_1, \ldots, v_{k'})$ is true, and if possible, also produces such variables. By Theorem 3, running $\mathcal{C}$ on G' either returns a set of vertices $U \in \mathrm{PlanarDel}(G', k')$, or reports that this is not possible. Hence, we can finish algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ in the following way: if $\mathcal{C}$ returns U then output($U \cup W$), otherwise output("No solution").

The running time of Phase II is $O(g(k)n)$ for some function g.

Remark 1. Phase II of the algorithm can also be done by applying dynamic programming, using the tree decomposition $\mathcal{T}$ returned by $\mathcal{B}$. This also yields a linear-time algorithm, with a double exponential dependence on $\mathrm{tw}(G')$. Since the proof is quite technical and detailed, we omit it.

References

1. Baker, B. S.: Approximation algorithms for NP-complete problems on planar graphs. *J. ACM* **41** (1994) 153–180.
2. Bodlaender, H. L.: A linear-time algorithm for finding tree-decompositions of small treewidth. *SIAM J. Comput.* **25** (1996) 1305–1317.
3. Cai, L.: Fixed-parameter tractability of graph modification problems for hereditary properties. *Inform. Process. Lett.* **58** (1996) 171–176.
4. Courcelle, B.: *Graph rewriting: an algebraic and logic approach. Handbook of Theoretical Computer Science* , Elsevier, Amsterdam. **2** (1990) 194–242.
5. Courcelle, B.: *The expression of graph properties and graph transformations in monadic second-order logic. Handbook of graph grammars and computing by graph transformations* , World Scientific, New-Jersey, **1**, Chapter 5, (1997) 313-400.
6. Diestel, R.: *Graph Theory*, Springer, Berlin. (2000)
7. Downey, R. G., Fellows, M. R.: *Parameterized Complexity* , Springer-Verlag, New York. (1999)
8. Eppstein, D.: Subgraph isomorphism in planar graphs and related problems. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.* **3** (1999) 1–27.
9. Flum, J., Frick, M., Grohe, M.: Query evaluation via tree-decompositions. *J. ACM* **49** (2002) 716–752.
10. Garey, M. R., Johnson, D. S.: Crossing Number is NP-Complete. *SIAM J. Algebraic Discrete Methods* **4** (1983) 312-316.
11. Grohe, M.: Computing crossing number in quadratic time. *J. Comput. System Sci.* **68** (2004) 285–302.
12. Hadlock, F.: Finding a maximum cut of a planar graph in polynomial time. *SIAM J. Comput.* **4** (1975) 221–225.
13. Hopcroft, J. E., Tarjan, R. E.: Efficient planarity testing. *J. ACM* **21** (1974) 549–568.
14. Lewis, J. M., Yannakakis, M.: The vertex-deletion problem for hereditary properties is NP-complete. *J. Comput. System Sci.* **20** (1980) 219–230.
15. Lipton, R. J., Tarjan, R. E.: Applications of a planar separator theorem. *SIAM J. Comput.* **9** (1980) 615–627.
16. Perkovic, L., Reed, B.: An improved algorithm for finding tree decompositions of small width. *Internat. J. Found. Comput. Sci.* **11** (2000) 365–371.
17. Robertson, N., Seymour, P. D., Thomas, R.: Quickly excluding a planar graph. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B.* **62** (1994) 323–348.
18. Robertson, N., Seymour, P. D.: Graph minors. XX. Wagner's conjecture. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B.* **92** (2004) 325–357.
19. Robertson, N., Seymour, P. D.: Graph minors. XIII. The disjoint paths problem. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B.* **63** (1995) 65–110.
20. Thomassen, C.: The graph genus problem is NP-complete. *J. Algorithms.* **10** (1989) 568–576.