

# Uncrossed Multiflows and Applications to Disjoint Paths

Chandra Chekuri<sup>1</sup>, Guylain Naves<sup>2</sup>, Joseph Poremba<sup>3</sup>, and F. Bruce Shepherd<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Computer Science, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

<sup>2</sup>Laboratoire d'Informatique et des Systèmes, Aix-Marseille Université

<sup>3</sup>Department of Computer Science, University of British Columbia

## Abstract

A multifold in a planar graph is *uncrossed* if the curves identified by its support paths do not cross in the plane. Recently uncrossed flows played a role in approximation algorithms for maximum disjoint paths in “fully-planar” instances, where the combined supply-plus-demand graph is planar. They were also used in algorithms to find low-congestion unsplitable flows for both fully-planar and single-source instances. For these two instance classes, any fractional multifold can be converted into one that is uncrossed, which these algorithms then exploit to obtain their results.

We expand on the theory of uncrossed flows to investigate their utility more generally, beyond the fully-planar and single-source settings. We ask three key questions. First, are there other interesting planar multifold instances that admit uncrossed flows? We answer this in the affirmative, demonstrating a new family of “pairwise-planar” instances and show their fractional flows can be uncrossed. This family subsumes fully-planar but includes substantially more, such as (2-connected) fully-compliant series-parallel instances. In particular it includes instances which may have arbitrary (i.e. clique) demand graphs. Second, given any fractional uncrossed flow, can we always round it to a “good” integral flow? We again answer positively. For maximization problems (where we seek to maximize the total amount of flow being routed), we show that any fractional uncrossed flow can be rounded to an integral flow with a constant fraction of its original value. For congestion problems (where we must fully route a specific set of given demands), we give a rounding procedure that produces an integral multifold with edge congestion 2. This can be made unsplitable with an additional additive error of the maximum demand value. As a consequence we obtain approximation algorithms for maximum disjoint paths and minimum congestion integer multifold for pairwise-planar instances.

The final question asks, given an arbitrary planar multifold instance, whether we can determine if there exists a congestion 1 uncrossed fractional flow (congestion setting) or find the highest value uncrossed fractional flow (maximization setting). For the congestion model, we show this problem is NP-hard, but the problem of finding uncrossed edge-disjoint paths is polytime solvable if the demands span a bounded number of faces. For the maximization model, we present a strong (almost polynomial) inapproximability result.

## 1 Introduction

In *multicommodity flow*, we are given an edge-capacitated *supply graph*  $(G, u)$  and a set of source-sink pairs called *demands* or *commodities*. The demands are represented by a *demand graph*  $H$  on the same node set as  $G$ . Unless otherwise specified, graphs are *undirected*. We seek to route flow for the demands simultaneously, while respecting the capacities of the supply graph. There are two flavours of the multifold problem. In the *maximization* setting, the objective is to find a flow  $x$  that respects the capacities and maximizes the total sum of demands being routed. A feasible flow for  $(G, H, u)$  needs to respect the capacities, but has freedom in the quantities of each demand that it routes. In the *congestion* setting, we are given target amounts  $d(s, t)$  for each  $(s, t) \in E(H)$ . To be feasible for  $(G, H, u, d)$ , a flow must (in addition to respecting capacities) fully route this amount for each demand. The objective is to determine whether  $d$  can be satisfied in the capacities  $u$ , or to find the minimum scaling factor  $\alpha \geq 1$  such that  $d$  can be satisfied in capacities  $\alpha u$ .

Both fractional and integer versions of these problems are fundamental in combinatorial optimization (cf. [26]). Due to applications, the literature often emphasizes problems where the supply graph is planar [16]. The integer problems are hard even for planar supply graphs with 3 demand edges [30]. There exist, however, good approximation algorithms in so-called *fully-planar* instances where the joint supply-demand graph  $G + H$  is planar<sup>1</sup>. Often approximation algorithms follow a “relax-and-round” approach: relax the integer problem to its fractional version, find a fractional solution with “nice properties”, and then show how to round the nice fractional solution to an integral solution.

A recurring “nice property” for planar multiflow is that the support paths (i.e. paths routing non-zero flow) do not cross in the plane. A multiflow satisfying this property is *uncrossed* (see Figure 1). It is known how to construct uncrossed multiflows for single-source ( $H$  is a star) and fully-planar instances, the latter using an algorithm of Matsumoto et al. [17]. This was recently leveraged to give constant-factor approximation algorithms for *maximum edge-disjoint paths* (MEDP) [11] and *maximum node-disjoint paths* (MNDP) [23, 22] for fully-planar instances. Very recently uncrossed flows were used to round fractional flows to *unsplittable* flows, routing the same demand quantities with small additive error, in both single-source [28] and fully-planar contexts [9]. In an unsplittable flow, each demand is routed on a single path.



Figure 1: A fully-planar multiflow instance with two different multiflows routing its demands. Dashed edges represent demands, and coloured paths are support paths of the flow. The support paths on the left cross, while the multiflow on the right is uncrossed.

In the above results, the uncrossed property of the fractional solution plays a key role, but the arguments are still specialized to the structure of  $(G, H)$ . For example, for the fully-planar context, the uncrossed flow can be shown to be *laminar*: if one considers the family of cycles obtained by joining demand edges of  $H$  to their support paths in  $G$ , the result is a nested family of cycles in the plane. However, this same property does not hold for all instances that admit uncrossed flows. For instance, if  $G$  is a cycle and  $H$  consists of mutually crossing demands, then no paths within  $G$  cross, but the path-plus-demand cycles are not nested. Our aim is to expand on a theory of uncrossed flows - when can we find them, and do they always allow for good rounding algorithms, even outside the laminar/single-source cases? We have three motivating questions.

**Question 1.** Do there exist other (interesting) families of  $(G, H)$  satisfying the following property: for all capacities  $u$  and demands values  $d$ , if  $(G, H, u, d)$  has a feasible (fractional) multiflow  $x$ , then  $(G, H, u, d)$  has a feasible multiflow  $y$  that is uncrossed?

We say  $(G, H)$  is an *uncrossable layout* if it satisfies the conditions of Question 1. For instance, if  $(G, H)$  is fully-planar or  $H$  is single-source, then  $(G, H)$  is an uncrossable layout.

**Question 2.** Suppose we are given a feasible fractional multiflow  $x$  that is uncrossed (not assuming that the multiflow  $x$  is laminar). Can we round  $x$  to a “good” integer multiflow  $y$ ? Specifically:

- i. (Congestion Setting) Given feasible fractional multiflow  $x$  for  $(G, H, u, d)$ , can we compute an integer multiflow  $y$  that is feasible for  $(G, H, \alpha u, d)$ , for some constant  $\alpha$ ?

<sup>1</sup>In this paper, if we say a multiflow instance is *planar* we only mean that the supply graph  $G$  is planar. If we mean  $G + H$  is planar, we will say fully-planar.

- ii. (Maximization Setting) Given feasible fractional multiflow  $x$  for  $(G, H, u)$ , can we compute an integer multiflow  $y$  that is feasible for  $(G, H, u)$  and whose value is  $1/\beta$  times that of  $x$ , for some constant  $\beta$ ?

The answer to Question 1 and both parts of Question 2 is: yes! First, we define a new class of  $(G, H)$  and prove it gives uncrossable layouts.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $G$  be a planar graph with a fixed embedding. Let  $H$  be such that for any pair of demands  $h_1, h_2 \in E(H)$ ,  $h_1$  and  $h_2$  can be embedded inside (possibly different) faces of  $G$  so they do not cross each other. Then  $(G, H)$  is an uncrossable layout.*

We say any  $(G, H)$  satisfying this property is *pairwise-planar* (see Figure 6 in Section 3 for a depiction). The pairwise-planar class includes fully-planar as a subset, but includes substantially more. For instance, it contains layouts where  $G + H$  is highly non-planar (and thus, do not admit laminar flows). It also includes the 2-connected *fully-compliant*<sup>2</sup> family introduced in [5], which were not previously known to give uncrossed layouts to our knowledge. These also differ from previous uncrossable layouts in an important structural sense. Namely, fully-planar and single-source  $(G, H)$  are *cut-sufficient* (essentially, they have a Max-Flow Min-Cut theorem), while some pairwise-planar  $(G, H)$  are not.

As for Question 2, we prove the following results. We begin with the maximization setting.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $(G, H, u)$  be a planar maximization instance where  $u$  is integral. Let  $f$  be a feasible fractional flow that is uncrossed. There exists a feasible integral flow  $f'$  that achieves an  $\Omega(1)$  fraction of the value of  $f$ . For unit capacities, this integral flow can be computed in polynomial time.*

We prove this result by establishing an “approximate integer decomposition property” using uncrossed multiflows. This is proved by exploiting colouring results on a restricted class of string graphs (path intersection graphs). This integer decomposition also implies  $\Omega(1)$  rounding holds for the *weighted* maximization version, where each  $(s, t) \in E(H)$  has an associated weight  $w(s, t)$ , and a flow achieves  $w(s, t)$  value for each unit of  $(s, t)$ -flow that it routes. Additionally, this result extends to *node-capacitated* multiflows (i.e.  $u$  is a capacity function on nodes rather than edges).

For the congestion setting, we give a factor 2 rounding for converting a fractional uncrossed multiflow into an integral multiflow. Moreover, for an extra additive penalty we can round to an unsplittable flow.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $(G, H, u, d)$  be a planar congestion instance where  $u, d$  are integral. Let  $f$  be a feasible fractional multiflow that is strongly uncrossed<sup>3</sup>. Then there exists both:*

1. *an integral multiflow  $f'$  that is feasible for  $(G, H, u', d)$  where  $u'(e) \leq 2u(e)$  for each  $e \in E(G)$ , and*
2. *an unsplittable multiflow  $f''$  that is feasible for  $(G, H, u'', d)$  where  $u''(e) < 2u(e) + d_{\max}$  for every  $e \in E(G)$ , where  $d_{\max} = \max_{h \in E(H)} d(h)$ .*

*The integral and unsplittable multiflows can be computed in polynomial time.*

Using these results, we obtain constant-factor approximation algorithms for MEDP, MNDP, and minimum congestion integer multiflow when  $(G, H)$  is pairwise-planar.

The third key question requires slightly more motivation. If  $(G, H)$  is not an uncrossable layout, it only means the structure of  $(G, H)$  alone is insufficient to guarantee uncrossed solutions. However for specific capacities  $u$  and demands  $d$  we may still be able to find an uncrossed flow and round it. Thus it would be nice to have algorithms to determine whether (in the congestion setting) we can find a feasible fractional flow that is uncrossed, or (in the maximization setting) find the largest feasible flow that is uncrossed.

**Question 3.** Suppose we are given an *arbitrary* planar multiflow instance. Can we solve the fractional multiflow problem if we constrain the feasible space to only allow uncrossed solutions? Specifically:

<sup>2</sup> $(G, H)$  is fully-compliant if  $G$  is series-parallel and  $G + h$  is series-parallel for every  $h \in E(H)$ .

<sup>3</sup>We defer the more technical definition of strongly uncrossed to Section 2.4. Importantly, the uncrossable layouts mentioned in this paper, including pairwise-planar, admit strongly uncrossed flows.

- i. (Congestion Setting) Given  $(G, H, u, d)$ , can we determine whether there exists a feasible fractional multifold  $x$  that is uncrossed?
- ii. (Maximization Setting) Given  $(G, H, u)$  can we compute a feasible fractional uncrossed multifold  $x$  whose value is (approximately) maximum amongst feasible uncrossed solutions (*maximum uncrossed multifold*)?

These questions concern *fractional* multiflows, and thus may feel like linear optimization problems. However the requirement of uncrossed flow paths makes these computationally much more challenging. Interestingly, the positive result of Theorem 1.2 can be combined with results of [6, 7] to establish strong almost-polynomial inapproximability for maximum uncrossed fractional multifold (for both edge and node capacities).

**Theorem 1.4.** *For planar  $G$ , maximum uncrossed fractional multifold is not approximable to within a factor of  $O(2^{\Omega(\log^{1-\epsilon} n)})$  for any  $\epsilon > 0$  assuming that  $NP \not\subseteq DTIME(n^{\text{polylog } n})$ . Moreover, there is no  $O(n^{O(\frac{1}{(\log \log n)^2})})$ -approximation polynomial-time algorithm assuming that for some constant  $\delta > 0$ ,  $NP \not\subseteq DTIME(2^{n^\delta})$ . These results hold even when  $G$  is maximum degree 3 (or even if  $G$  is a wall graph) and the capacities are unit.*

For the congestion setting, we prove that the problem posed by Question 3 is NP-complete.

**Theorem 1.5.** *It is NP-complete to determine whether planar congestion instance  $(G, H, u, d)$  has a feasible fractional uncrossed multifold, even with unit-valued capacities and demands.*

We remark that since this problem is not a linear program anymore, it is not even obvious that the problem is in NP, however we establish this in Section C.1.

On the positive side, we show that finding uncrossed edge-disjoint paths can be (polytime) reduced to a node-disjoint paths instance. Hence we may find uncrossed solutions if  $E(H)$  is incident with a bounded number of faces using a result of Schrijver [25].

**Theorem 1.6.** *For instances where  $G$  is planar, the edges of  $H$  are incident with a bounded number of faces, and the capacities and demands are unit-valued, there is a polynomial time algorithm to find a feasible integral uncrossed multifold for  $(G, H, u, d)$  or declare that none exists.*

## 1.1 Organization of the Paper

Section 2 lays the groundwork for the theory of uncrossed flows, including more detailed definitions. Section 3 discusses pairwise-planar instances in more detail, and proves they admit uncrossed flows. Section 4 covers our results for maximization, both rounding (Theorem 1.2) and inapproximability (Theorem 1.4). The rounding result for the congestion setting (Theorem 1.3) appears in Section 5. For length reasons, the NP-completeness result (Theorem 1.5) is deferred to the the appendix (Section C). Section 6 contains the algorithm to solve integral congestion instances when demands are incident with a bounded number of faces (Theorem 1.6).

## 1.2 Related Work

Uncrossed flows have played a role in previous routing algorithms in planar graphs, such as Schrijver’s Homotopy Method [24] for node-disjoint paths. Of particular connection to our work are recent algorithms for maximum disjoint paths in fully-planar instances ( $G + H$  is planar). First, in [14, 11], polynomial time constant factor approximation algorithms are given for maximum edge-disjoint paths. This was then extended to the node-disjoint setting in [23, 22]. These approaches take uncrossed flow paths and join them with their respective demand edges to obtain an uncrossed (laminar) family of cycles in a planar graph. Our rounding algorithms are agnostic in the sense that they just operate on uncrossed flow, and do not make

assumptions that demands lie within a face, or that demands within a common face do not cross (indeed for our pairwise-planar instances, it is even possible for demands within a face to form a clique).

Uncrossed flows for fully-planar instances are typically constructed by means of a primal algorithm [17] that computes an uncrossed flow from scratch. However, we build on a different approach, which takes a given feasible flow (with many crossings) and iteratively decreases the amount of crossing (used for example in [15] to find cycles in higher-genus surfaces that cross at most once). We discuss the obstacles faced in extending this to pairwise-planar in Section 3.

In [11] the initial flow is first rounded to a half-integral flow (using linear programming theory such as total unimodularity), then this half-integral flow is rounded to an integral flow using a 4-colouring of the (planar) intersection graph of the cycles. Extending to the node-disjoint setting, [23] uses a different argument, iteratively constructing a high-value solution by showing one can always find an “efficient” cycle that only intersects the other cycles on a small set of its nodes. Our rounding technique for Theorem 1.2 instead uses an approach based on establishing an “approximate integer decomposition property” [2, 3]. A key ingredient comes from looking at a subset of *string graphs*, which are the intersection graphs from curves in the plane. Specifically, we are interested in those that arise from curves that do not cross, studied for example in [8], and for which an important colouring result was proven by Fox and Pach [10]<sup>4</sup>.

The fully-planar maximum disjoint paths algorithms were extended [23, 15] to uncrossable families of cycles in higher-genus surfaces, yielding approximation algorithms for maximum disjoint paths when  $G + H$  is embedded in a surface of genus  $g$ ; the approximation ratio scales with the genus  $g$ . By contrast our work extends uncrossing techniques to a broader family of multiflow instances (pairwise-planar) while remaining *in the plane*. Some pairwise-planar instances have  $G + H$  of arbitrarily high genus (e.g.  $H$  contains a large clique), but we show nevertheless that they admit uncrossed flows in the plane in order to achieve constant-factor approximations. Results in [23] use the context of uncrossed cycle families, as defined by Goemans and Williamson [13], which is a combinatorial rather than topological definition of crossing.

Other works using uncrossed flow come from the study of unsplittable flow in the congestion model (where specified demand quantities must be fully routed). For directed single-source planar instances ( $H$  is a star) [28], it is shown how to convert a feasible fractional uncrossed flow  $x$  into an unsplittable flow  $y$  that exceeds capacities by a small amount and whose cost is bounded by that of  $x$ . For (undirected) fully-planar instances, [9] shows how to convert a laminar flow into an unsplittable flow  $y$  with small capacity violation (no cost guarantee).

## 2 Uncrossed Multiflows

### 2.1 Multiflow Preliminaries

All graphs are undirected in this paper. Consider a supply graph  $G = (V, E(G))$  and demand graph  $H = (V, E(H))$ . Nodes that are ends of an edge in  $H$  are *terminals*, and the edges themselves are *demands* or *commodities*. Together,  $(G, H)$  define a *layout*<sup>5</sup>. For nodes  $s, t \in V$ , let  $\mathcal{P}_{st}$  denote the set of  $st$ -paths. By *path* we always mean simple path. A *multiflow* is a function  $x : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , where  $\mathcal{P} = \bigcup_{(s,t) \in E(H)} \mathcal{P}_{st}$ . From here on, multiflows are allowed to be fractional unless we explicitly say integral multiflow. A multiflow can also be viewed as a collection of single-commodity flows  $(x^{st} : (s, t) \in E(H))$ . For  $e \in E(G)$ , we let  $x(e) = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}: e \in P} x(P)$  (the amount of flow on  $e$ ), and for  $(s, t) \in E(H)$  we let  $|x^{st}| = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_{st}} x(P)$  (the amount of demand  $(s, t)$  that is routed).

A *maximization instance* has the form  $(G, H, u)$ , where  $u : E(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  are *capacities*. A multiflow  $x$  is *feasible* for the instance if for every  $e \in E(G)$ ,  $x(e) \leq u(e)$ . The objective is to maximize the value of a feasible multiflow, where the value of a multiflow  $x$  is  $|x| = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} x(P) = \sum_{(s,t) \in E(H)} |x^{st}|$ . If  $u = \vec{1}$  and we restrict to integral  $x$ , this problem is the *maximum edge-disjoint paths* problem (MEDP). A *weighted*

<sup>4</sup>This manuscript is unpublished, but the result is referenced in [29] and their writeup was shared with us [20].

<sup>5</sup>Sometimes in the literature,  $(G, H)$  is called a *multiflow topology*. We avoid this term to avoid confusion with the topology of the plane.

maximization instance also comes equipped with per-unit profits  $w : E(H) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , in which case the value of  $x$  is instead defined  $|x|_w = \sum_{(s,t) \in E(H)} w(s,t) |x^{st}|$ .

A *congestion instance* has the form  $(G, H, u, d)$ , where  $u : E(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  are capacities and  $d : E(H) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  are demand values. A multiflow  $x$  is *feasible* for the instance if for every  $e \in E(G)$  we have  $x(e) \leq u(e)$  and for every  $(s, t) \in E(H)$  we have  $|x^{st}| = d(s, t)$ . As a decision problem, the goal is to determine whether  $(G, H, u, d)$  has a feasible multiflow. As an optimization problem, the objective is to find the minimum  $\alpha \geq 1$  such that  $(G, H, \alpha u, d)$  has a feasible multiflow.

In either setting, we say an instance is *planar* if  $G$  is planar. We emphasize that  $G + H$  is not necessarily planar. We always assume we have a fixed embedding of planar graph  $G$ .

## 2.2 Uncrossed Paths and Multiflows

First, we define what it means for paths to cross. Edge-disjoint paths can cross at a common node, but in general we need to consider common subpaths (see Figure 2).




Figure 2: (Left) Two edge-disjoint paths that cross at a common node. (Center) Two paths that cross at a common subpath. (Right) Two paths that share a common subpath, but are uncrossed. Uncoloured edges are shared between the two paths.

**Definition 2.1** (Crossing). Let  $Z$  be a maximal shared subpath of paths  $P$  and  $Q$  that does not include any of their endpoints. Say the ends of  $Z$  are  $z$  and  $z'$ . The edges of  $(P \cup Q) \setminus Z$  incident with  $z$  or  $z'$  have a clockwise ordering about  $Z$  in the plane. The paths *cross* at  $Z$  if the edges of  $P$  and  $Q$  alternate clockwise about  $Z$ . That is, if  $P = P_1, e, Z, e', P_2$  and  $Q = Q_1, g, Z, g', P_2$ , the edges occur  $e, g, e', g'$  or  $e, g', e', g$  clockwise about  $Z$ . Two paths are *uncrossed* if they do not cross on any such subpath.

The *support paths* of a multiflow  $x$  are the paths with  $x(P) > 0$ . The following is the natural extension of “uncrossed” to the multiflow setting (though, we will discuss a stronger condition later).

**Definition 2.2** (Uncrossed Multiflow). A multiflow is *uncrossed* if its support paths are pairwise uncrossed.

We are interested in when a feasible multiflow  $x$  can be converted into one that is uncrossed and routes the same demand quantities. Our discussion here focuses on the congestion setting, but is still useful for the maximization setting (since we can define target demand values  $d$  equal to whatever quantities  $x$  routes). As shown in Figure 4, even if  $(G, H, u, d)$  is feasible, it may not have an uncrossed feasible multiflow<sup>6</sup>. However there are several classes that do admit uncrossed solutions. We say  $(G, H)$  is an *uncrossable layout* if, for all  $u, d$ , if  $(G, H, u, d)$  has a feasible multiflow, then  $(G, H, u, d)$  has a feasible uncrossed multiflow. Matsumoto et al. [17] give an algorithm that given a fully-planar (i.e.  $G + H$  planar) instance  $(G, H, u, d)$  that is feasible, produces a feasible uncrossed flow. Thus fully-planar layouts are uncrossable. It is also well-known that single-source layouts (i.e.  $H$  is a star) are uncrossable. Another uncrossable layout is given when  $G$  is a cycle (possibly with parallel edges) and  $H$  is arbitrary, which we call *ring layouts*. In Section 3 we introduce *pairwise-planar* layouts and prove they are uncrossable.

<sup>6</sup>In fact, it is not always possible to find an uncrossed flow with bounded congestion. One may modify the canonical grid instance [12] so it has a half-integral routing of demands, but any uncrossed multiflow incurs polynomial congestion.

## 2.3 Another View on Crossing: Parallelizations

There are more intuitive ways to think about uncrossed paths that we frequently use.

**Widened Graph:** Suppose we “widen”  $G$ , making its nodes into small disks and its edges into small channels. A family of pairwise uncrossed paths can have its paths drawn as curves simultaneously, each curve following the node disks and edge channels corresponding to its path, so that the curves are disjoint.

**Parallelizations:** To avoid dealing with the formal topology of widened graphs, we use an equivalent notion based on “separating” the paths at each edge. Consider a family of paths  $\mathcal{P}$  and for each  $e \in E(G)$  let  $\mathcal{P}_e = \{P \in \mathcal{P} : e \in E(P)\}$ . Let  $G'$  be obtained by replacing each  $e$  with  $|\mathcal{P}_e|$  parallel copies of itself. Intuitively, the parallel edges represent the curves within the channel of  $e$ .



Figure 3: (Left) An uncrossed parallelization of the uncrossed paths from Figure 2. (Right) Disk-expansion of the node  $z$  after uncrossed parallelization.

Now, for each  $e \in E(G)$  we decide on some one-to-one mapping  $\phi_e$  from  $\mathcal{P}_e$  to the parallel class of  $e$  in  $G'$ . For each  $P \in \mathcal{P}$ , we obtain a path  $P_\phi$  in  $G'$  whose edges are  $\{\phi_e(P) : e \in P\}$ . This induces a family of edge-disjoint paths  $\mathcal{P}_\phi$  in  $G'$ . We call  $\mathcal{P}_\phi$  a *parallelization* of  $\mathcal{P}$ . If we (arbitrarily) orient each  $e \in E(G)$ , it gives a linear ordering  $\leq_e$  of  $\mathcal{P}_e$ . Different choices for  $(\phi_e : e \in E(G))$  yield different parallelizations. The family  $\mathcal{P}$  is pairwise uncrossed if and only if there is some parallelization that is pairwise uncrossed at every node of  $G'$  (rather than needing to consider longer shared subpaths). Using parallelizations helps us simplify subsequent definitions by assuming paths are edge-disjoint. Given a collection of paths, one can compute in polynomial time an uncrossed parallelization or find a crossing pair of paths.

**Disk-Expansion:** After parallelization, we sometimes go a step closer to the widened graph idea by “expanding” a node  $v$ . We draw a small disk with  $v$  at its centre (small enough that its boundary intersects only  $\delta(v)$ , and hits each edge once). Where an edge copy intersects the boundary, we place a new node. We terminate the edges at these new nodes. For an uncrossed parallelization, it is then possible to (simultaneously) draw edges in the open interior of the disk between nodes that correspond to consecutive edges of the same path, such that the drawing is planar. An example is shown in Figure 3.

## 2.4 Strongly Uncrossed Multiflows

We introduce a slightly stronger condition than Theorem 2.2 that we use for Theorem 1.3. To round each commodity’s fractional flow paths, a natural approach is to focus on the topological region where each commodity routes its flow. The support paths of  $(s, t) \in E(H)$  have a clockwise ordering about  $s$  (and  $t$ ) given by the parallelization. We call the regions bounded between consecutive paths *sectors* (defined more formally later). Our arguments assume that sectors of different commodities do not cross. One might think this follows from Theorem 2.2, however Figure 5 is a counterexample<sup>7</sup>. No individual flow paths cross, but one of the green  $s_2t_2$ -paths “slips between” the blue  $s_1t_1$ -paths at the node  $s_1$ ; if we expand  $s_1$  into a disk, we cannot connect the blue paths without crossing the green one. We call this a *quasicrossing* and use it to define *strongly uncrossed* multiflows. Many layout classes admit strongly uncrossed flows, including fully-planar, single-source, and rings, as well as pairwise-planar.

<sup>7</sup>The desired non-crossing sector property does hold for *leaf instances*, where terminals all have degree 1. Moving each terminal to its own new leaf node is a standard pre-processing operation, but this is not safe for uncrossed flows - it may turn an uncrossable layout into one that is not. For example, ring instances admit uncrossed flows but Figure 4 (left) does not, even though it is obtained by adding leaves to a ring instance.



Figure 4: Problematic instances for uncrossability. Capacities  $u$  and demand values  $d$  are unit. (Left) A congestion instance with a feasible multiflow but no uncrossed multifold routing both demands. (Right) The *Keyhole Instance*, a congestion instance with a feasible uncrossed trail-multiflow but no uncrossed path-multiflow.




Figure 5: (Left) An uncrossed multifold where the sectors of the two commodities cross. There is a quasi-crossing at  $s_1$ . (Right) After disk-expansion of  $s_1$  (solid edges), there is no way to add a single terminating node connecting the ends of the blue paths within the interior of the disk without crossing the green edge (a failed attempt is shown with the hollow node and wavy edges).

**Definition 2.3** (Quasicrossing). Let  $f, f'$  be single-commodity flows with edge-disjoint support paths. The flows *quasicross* at  $v$  if there are four distinct edges incident with  $v$  that alternate clockwise between the two flows, and one of the following two conditions holds:

- all four edges terminate their respective support paths, or
- the two edges for one flow terminate their support paths, and the other two are consecutive edges of the same support path for the other flow.

**Definition 2.4** (Strongly Uncrossed). A multiflow is *strongly uncrossed* if there exists a parallelization of its support paths such that no pair of paths cross and no pairs of its single-commodity flows quasicross.

## 2.5 Walk-Multiflows

It is standard for flows to only route on (simple) paths, since a flow walk could just be short-circuited into a flow path. Disturbingly, this operation is not benign in the uncrossed flow setting. The *Keyhole Instance* of Figure 4 is an example that requires the use of a non-simple flow trail to obtain an uncrossed solution. Since we would like to understand which instances have uncrossed solutions, we must consider *trail-multiflows* and *walk-multiflows* in addition to the usual *path-multiflows*. A *trail* can repeat nodes but not edges, while a *walk* can repeat both. Ultimately we can show our rounding results (Theorem 1.2, Theorem 1.3) and hardness results (Theorem 1.4, Theorem 1.5) presented earlier hold for all three models. The necessary modifications are minor and we defer the details to the full version.

## 3 Uncrossed Flows in Pairwise-Planar Instances

Here we introduce a new class of multiflow layouts and prove they are uncrossable. We assume we deal with a fixed embedding of  $G$ . We say  $(s, t) \in E(H)$  *fits* face  $F$  of  $G$  if both  $s, t$  lie in  $F$  (i.e. the demand could be drawn within the face). A layout  $(G, H)$  is *facial* if each  $(s, t)$  fits at least one face of  $G$  (but demands fitting a given face may still cross each other).

**Definition 3.1.** We say  $(G, H)$  is *pairwise-planar* if  $(G, H)$  is facial, and moreover for any pair  $h_1, h_2 \in E(H)$ ,  $h_1$  and  $h_2$  can each be embedded inside (possibly different) faces of  $G$  so that they do not cross each other.

Unlike fully-planar we do not require all demands to be simultaneously embedded so that they are uncrossed. This matters because a demand edge may fit multiple faces. Figure 6 shows an example. However we emphasize that the embedding of  $G$  itself is fixed and does not change as we embed different pairs of  $E(H)$ .

Clearly pairwise-planar generalizes fully-planar, but how substantial is this generalization? We briefly argue that it is a much richer class. First, it is straightforward to construct examples such that  $H$  contains arbitrarily large cliques, meaning  $H$  and  $G + H$  have arbitrarily large genus (though  $G$  is always planar). It also generalizes rings ( $G$  is a cycle with parallel edges,  $H$  is arbitrary). This is worth remarking because fully-planar does not capture even these layouts. However even more broadly it captures what is known in the literature as *fully-compliant* instances (under mild connectivity assumptions). Introduced in [5], in such instances  $G$  is series-parallel and every  $h \in E(H)$  satisfies that  $G + h$  is series-parallel. In the appendix (see Section A.1) we argue the following.

**Proposition 3.2.** *If  $(G, H)$  is fully-compliant and  $G$  is 2-connected, then  $(G, H)$  is pairwise-planar for any planar embedding of  $G$ .*

Pairwise-planar extends further than fully-planar and fully-compliant in another fundamental way through a property known as *cut-sufficiency*. For a multiflow instance  $(G, H, u, d)$ , we say the *cut condition* holds if for every  $S \subseteq V$ ,  $u(\delta_G(S)) \geq d(\delta_H(S))$ , where  $\delta(S)$  denotes the edges with one end in  $S$  and one end in  $V \setminus S$ . The cut condition is necessary, but not in general sufficient, for the existence of a feasible (fractional) multiflow. A layout  $(G, H)$  is called cut-sufficient if, for all capacities and demands  $(u, d)$ , the cut condition

is sufficient for the existence of a feasible multiflow. The Max-Flow Min-Cut Theorem can be equivalently stated as: single-source  $(G, H)$  are cut-sufficient. Understanding the relationship between the cut condition and feasibility is a fundamental question in network flows, and cut-sufficient instances tend to admit stronger integrality properties and approximation algorithms. A result of Seymour [27] shows that fully-planar  $(G, H)$  are cut-sufficient, and Chekuri et al. [5] show that fully-compliant instances are cut-sufficient. However, pairwise-planar instances need not be cut-sufficient. The quintessential examples of series-parallel layouts that are not cut-sufficient are the *odd spindles*<sup>8</sup> [4, 1], but these are pairwise-planar.




Figure 6: A pairwise-planar layout. Each  $G_i$  is some connected planar graph. The demand edges cannot be simultaneously embedded so that  $G + H$  is planar (for instance,  $G + H$  contains a  $K_{3,3}$ -minor and a  $K_5$ -minor). However, taking advantage of the fact that some demands fit multiple faces, any *single pair* of demands can be embedded without crossing. One could make the layout more complicated by putting demands inside the  $G_i$ 's following similar patterns.

### 3.1 Uncrossing Procedure

In this section we show why pairwise-planar instances have uncrossed flows. We only discuss congestion instances  $(G, H, u, d)$  here (where a feasible flow must respect the capacities  $u$  and satisfy all demand values  $d$ ). If one instead has a feasible flow  $x$  for a maximization instance  $(G, H, u)$ , one can define demand values  $d(s, t) = |x^{st}|$  and apply the congestion result.

For fully-planar instances, [11, 9] use an algorithm by Matsumoto et al. [17] that builds an uncrossed flow from scratch starting from the zero flow. Our procedure has more in common with [15] (which concerns finding cycles in higher-genus surfaces that cross at most once) in that we begin with a (potentially highly crossing) feasible flow  $x$  and “uncross” it bit-by-bit. The following is an important lemma.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $(G, H, u, d)$  be a planar congestion instance that is feasible. There exists a feasible flow  $f^*$  such that every pair of support paths crosses at most once, and any pair of support paths that share a terminal do not cross.*

Proving this lemma formally is somewhat tedious, but such arguments have appeared in the literature before - the essence of the argument is in Lemma 1 of [19] and a similar method is used in [15]. Loosely, the argument goes as follows. Begin with a feasible flow  $x$ . One can show that if a pair of support paths cross twice (or cross once but share a terminal), then one can re-route flow on their edges to decrease the “amount

<sup>8</sup>In a *spindle*,  $G = K_{2,p}$  where  $p \geq 3$  and  $H$  consists of a simple  $p$ -cycle between the nodes in the larger side of the partition and an edge between the two nodes in the other side. A spindle is *odd* if  $p$  is odd. In some sense, the odd spindles are known to characterize non-cut-sufficiency for series-parallel layouts, see [1]

of crossing” between the two paths (“uncrossing” the two paths) and argue that this re-routing does not increase crossing with other support paths. Thus the total amount of crossing decreases, and we iterate until  $x$  is uncrossed. For completeness we give a careful proof of this lemma (and precisely define this “amount of crossing”) in the appendix (see Section A.2).

It immediately follows from this lemma that single-source layouts are uncrossable. Additionally, with a small trick we can also use this to prove that fully-planar layouts are uncrossable: augment the instance by adding leaves and move the terminals into the faces where their demands are embedded. At first, adding leaves may actually increase the amount of crossing. However, using the fact that the demands do not cross, it can be shown that every pair of support paths that cross must cross at least twice. Then Theorem 3.3 allows one to conclude there exists a feasible uncrossed flow in the augmented instance. The leaves can then be contracted away without introducing any new crossing.

Extending this trick to pairwise-planar instances is not immediate. After adding leaves, it may not be the case that support paths that cross must cross at least twice. We cannot “commit” a demand to a particular face up front. Consider if a demand  $h$  fits into two different faces  $F_1$  and  $F_2$ , but there are demands  $h_1$  and  $h_2$  that fit those respective faces and cross  $h$  in those faces. If we add leaves into  $F_1$ , then we can “uncross” support paths for  $h$  and  $h_2$ , however we cannot uncross support paths between  $h$  and  $h_1$ , and vice versa.

We take the following approach. Begin with a feasible flow  $z$  that we want to uncross. We temporarily “commit” each demand to one of the faces it fits (if it fits multiple faces, choose arbitrarily). We (again, temporarily) accept that flow paths of demands committed to the same face may cross, but compute a flow  $x$  so that demands committed to different faces do not cross. In fact we aim for a more strict condition on  $x$ : we show how to find  $x$  so that, if we define  $x^F$  as the multiflow corresponding to demands committed to face  $F$ , the  $x^F$ ’s are “uncoupled” from each other. Here, “uncoupled” is a structural property (which we define precisely in a moment) such that we can uncross each  $x^F$  independently, yet we can still safely glue the resulting flows back together without introducing crossing. Then we focus on uncrossing each  $x^F$  inductively.

We now make this “committing” process and “uncoupled” property precise.

**Definition 3.4** (Facial Decomposition). Let  $(G, H, u, d)$  be a facial multiflow instance. Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the set of faces of  $G$ . A *facial decomposition* is a collection  $(H_F : F \in \mathcal{F})$  of subgraphs of  $H$  indexed by  $F$  such that the following holds:

- $(E(H_F) : F \in \mathcal{F})$  forms a partition of  $E(H)$ , and
- for every face  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ , every demand  $h \in E(H_F)$  fits  $F$  (but cannot necessarily all be embedded simultaneously in  $F$  without crossing).

For a facial decomposition  $(H_F : F \in \mathcal{F})$  and a feasible flow  $x$ , we let  $x^F$  be the portion of  $x$  used to route  $H_F$ . Note that for  $h \in E(H)$ , if  $h$  fits multiple faces, the facial decomposition still only puts  $h$  into one of the  $H_F$ ’s.

The “uncoupled” condition is as follows. We let  $\text{supp}(x^F)$  to denote the set of support paths for the flow  $x^F$ , and let  $G[\text{supp}(x^F)]$  denote the graph induced by the edges in those support paths.

**Definition 3.5** (Nested Supports Property). Let  $(G, H, u, d)$  be a facial multiflow instance, and let  $(H_F : F \in \mathcal{F})$  be a facial decomposition. For a flow  $x$  and a face  $F$ , we define the *stellated support graph*  $G[x, F]$  as follows: begin with the support graph  $G[\text{supp}(x^F)]$ , add a node  $v_F$  into the interior of  $F$ , and then for each demand  $(s, t) \in E(H_F)$  add edges  $(s, v_F)$  and  $(t, v_F)$ , embedded (without crossing) in the face  $F$ . We say  $x$  satisfies the *nested supports property* if for every pair of distinct faces  $F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ , the graph  $G[x, F_1]$  is entirely contained within a single face of the graph  $G[x, F_2]$ , and vice versa.

We show that we can find a flow satisfying this property for a given facial decomposition.

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $(G, H, u, d)$  be a facial multiflow instance that is feasible, and let  $(H_F : F \in \mathcal{F})$  be a facial decomposition. There exists a feasible flow  $x$  satisfying the nested supports property.*

The proof of this lemma is slightly tricky to make rigorous, and we relegate it to the appendix (see Section A.3). Assuming such a flow exists, we show that we can focus on uncrossing each face's flow independently.

**Lemma 3.7.** *Let  $(G, H, u, d)$  be a facial multifold instance. Let  $(H_F : F \in \mathcal{F})$  be a facial decomposition, and let  $x$  be a feasible flow satisfying the nested supports property. For every  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ , let  $u_F$  be the capacity vector defined by  $u_F(e) = x^F(e)$  and let  $d_F$  be the demand vector  $d$  restricted to  $H_F$ . If for every  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ , the instance  $(G, H_F, u_F, d_F)$  has a feasible uncrossed solution  $y^F$ , then  $y = \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}} y^F$  is a feasible uncrossed solution for  $(G, H, u, d)$ .*

*Proof.* The feasibility of  $y$  is clear from the construction of the subproblems. Also observe that, by construction,  $y$  still satisfies the nested supports property (since  $G[y, F]$  is a subgraph of  $G[x, F]$  for each face  $F$  of  $G$ ).

We prove that  $y$  is uncrossed assuming each  $y^F$  is uncrossed. It remains to check for distinct faces  $F_1, F_2$  and  $P_1 \in \text{supp}(y^{F_1}), P_2 \in \text{supp}(y^{F_2})$ , that  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  do not cross.

Consider two distinct faces  $F_1, F_2$ . Let  $P_1 \in \text{supp}(y^{F_1}), P_2 \in \text{supp}(y^{F_2})$ . Let  $h_1 = (s_1, t_1), h_2 = (s_2, t_2)$  be the demands routed by  $P_1, P_2$  respectively. Suppose  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  cross, for the sake of contradiction. Consider the (simple) cycle  $C$  in  $G[y, F]$  obtained as  $C = P_1 \bullet (s_1, v_{F_1}) \bullet (v_{F_1}, t_1)$ , where  $\bullet$  denotes concatenation. Since  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  cross,  $P_2$  has some segment in the open exterior of  $C$  and some segment in the open interior of  $C$ . However, since  $C$  is a simple cycle, these two segments of  $P_2$  must lie in distinct faces of  $G[y, F]$ , contradicting that  $y$  satisfies the nested supports property.  $\square$

Now, we give the main result.

**Theorem 3.8.** *Let  $(G, H)$  be pairwise-planar and let  $(G, H, u, d)$  be a congestion instance. If the instance is feasible, there exists a feasible uncrossed flow.*

*Proof.* Suppose not, and let  $(G, H, u, d)$  be a counterexample minimizing  $|E(H)|$ . By Theorem 3.6 and Theorem 3.7, it suffices to consider an instance such that there exists a single face  $F$  such that every demand fits  $F$ . If none of the demands cross within  $F$ , then the instance is fully-planar and we are done. Otherwise, there exists  $h, h' \in E(H)$  such that  $h, h'$  cross when drawn in the face  $F$ . However, since  $(G, H)$  is pairwise-planar, there exists another face  $F' \neq F$  such that at least one of these two demands, without loss of generality say  $h'$ , also fits  $F'$ . Now we define a facial decomposition with  $E(H_F) = E(H) \setminus \{h'\}$  and  $E(H_{F'}) = \{h'\}$  (i.e. we now view  $h'$  as being associated with  $F'$  rather than  $F$ ).

Let  $x$  be a feasible flow for the instance  $(G, H, u, d)$  satisfying the nested supports property for this new facial decomposition. Define capacities  $u_F(e) = x^{F'}(e)$  (we are defining this with respect to our facial decomposition where  $H_F$  does not contain  $h'$ ) and  $u_{F'}(e) = x^F(e)$ , and let  $d_F, d_{F'}$  be the demands  $d$  restricted to  $H_F, H_{F'}$  respectively. Both instances  $(G, H_F, u_F, d_F)$  and  $(G, H_{F'}, u_{F'}, d_{F'})$  are feasible, and by minimality they have uncrossed solutions. But then applying Theorem 3.7 we obtain an uncrossed solution for our original instance.  $\square$

With a little extra effort, we can modify Theorem 3.7 and Theorem 3.8 to show that pairwise-planar instances admit strongly uncrossed flows. However, it requires more work to show how to obtain a (polynomial time) algorithmic version of Theorem 3.8. The challenge is to show that the flow guaranteed by Theorem 3.6 can be computed in polynomial time, which in turn requires a (polynomial time) algorithmic version of Theorem 3.3. We defer the details to the full version, but one can show how to do this while maintaining *approximate* feasibility. The details are similar to the uncrossing algorithm in [15]. We summarize the final result as follows.

**Theorem 3.9.** *Let  $(G, H)$  be pairwise-planar and let  $(G, H, u, d)$  be a planar congestion instance. Let  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$  be any constant. If the instance is feasible, then there exists a strongly uncrossed flow  $f'$  such that  $f'$  is feasible for  $(G, H, (1 + \epsilon)u, d)$ . The flow  $f'$  can be computed in polynomial time.*

Note that  $f'/(1+\epsilon)$  is feasible for  $(G, H, u, d/(1+\epsilon))$ , so this approximate guarantee is useful for maximization as well as congestion. Combining this theorem with our rounding results Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3, we obtain polynomial time constant-factor approximations for MEDP (and MNDP) and minimum congestion integer multiflow for pairwise-planar instances.

## 4 Maximization Setting: Rounding and Hardness

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.4, which cover our rounding and inapproximability results for maximum uncrossed multiflow.

### 4.1 Uncrossed String Graphs and Approximate Integer Decomposition

First we prove Theorem 1.2. Our approach is to establish a so-called approximate integer decomposition property [2, 3] for uncrossed multiflows. The outline of the strategy is as follows. Suppose we are given an uncrossed multiflow  $f$ , which achieves a value of  $\beta$ . Imagine scaling  $f$  by a positive integer  $k$  such that  $kf$  is integral. Of course,  $kf$  is unlikely to be feasible. However suppose we are able to show that  $kf$  can be decomposed as the sum of a small number  $b$  of feasible integral flows. That is  $kf = \sum_{i=1}^b f^i$  where each  $f^i$  is integral and feasible. At least one of the  $f^i$  flows achieves a  $1/b$  fraction of the value of  $kf$ , and hence a  $k/b$  fraction of the value of  $f$ .

How can we achieve such a decomposition? Suppose (for simplicity) that  $kf$  sends 1 unit of flow along paths  $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \dots, P_\ell\}$ . Furthermore suppose that each edge of  $G$  has unit capacity and hence each appears on at most  $k$  paths. Our goal then is to partition the paths into classes such that every edge appears at most once in each class; the classes then define the flows  $f^i$ . Equivalently, we seek to partition the paths so that paths in the same class do not share an edge. Phrased this way, we can recognize this as a graph colouring problem on the edge-intersection graph of  $\mathcal{P}$ .

The edge-intersection graph  $U$  of  $(G, \mathcal{P})$  has node set  $\mathcal{P}$ , and an edge between distinct  $P_1, P_2 \in \mathcal{P}$  if there exists  $e \in E(P_1) \cap E(P_2)$ . The *load* of  $e \in E(G)$  is the number of paths in which  $e$  occurs, and the *load* of  $(G, \mathcal{P})$  is the maximum load of an edge  $e \in E(G)$ . Graphs  $U$  constructed in this way are a special type of the well-studied family of *string graphs*, which are the intersection graphs of curves in the plane.

**Definition 4.1** (Uncrossed String Graph, Realization). An *uncrossed string graph*  $U$  is the edge-intersection graph of a family of uncrossed paths  $\mathcal{P}$  in a planar graph  $G$ . We say  $(G, \mathcal{P})$  is a *realization* of  $U$ .

Uncrossed string graphs have been studied before for their own sake [8, 29]. Given that  $U$  has a load  $k$  realization, we want that its chromatic number  $\chi(U)$  is some small function of  $k$ , ideally  $O(k)$ . This question is strongly related to the concept of a  $\chi$ -bounded graph family. A family of graphs  $\mathcal{G}$  is  $\chi$ -bounded if there exists a function  $f$  such that for all  $U \in \mathcal{G}$ ,  $\chi(U) \leq f(\omega(U))$ , where  $\omega(U)$  is the clique number of  $U$ . It is worth noting that general string graphs are not  $\chi$ -bounded, and it is not obvious that uncrossed string graphs should be. An  $O(k)$  bound was conjectured originally in [8], and eventually proven by Fox and Pach [10].

**Theorem 4.2.** [Fox and Pach] *Let  $U$  be an uncrossed string graph with realization  $(G, \mathcal{P})$  such that each edge  $e \in E(G)$  has load at most  $k$ . Then  $\chi(U) \leq 6ek + 1$ .*

The result of Fox and Pach has not been published, however the proof is elegant and short. It establishes via a probabilistic proof (similar to a standard proof giving a bound on the crossing number of a graph) that  $U$  has at most  $3ek|\mathcal{P}|$  edges. Hence a greedy colouring procedure that removes the minimum degree vertex (which has degree at most  $6ek$ ) and colours the rest of the graph inductively obtains a  $6ek + 1$  colouring. We were not initially aware of Fox and Pach's result and independently proved a weaker bound that  $\chi(U) \leq O(k^2 \log |\mathcal{P}|)$ . For the sake of completeness we present this proof in Section D.

We now use the colouring result to establish an approximate integer decomposition property and prove the following theorem, which is a generalization of Theorem 1.2 with weighted profits on  $E(H)$ .

**Theorem 4.3.** *There exists a universal constant  $\gamma \geq 1$  such that the following holds. Let  $(G, H, u)$  be a planar maximization instance where  $u$  is integral, equipped with per-unit profits  $w(h) \geq 0$  for  $h \in E(H)$ . Let  $f$  be a feasible uncrossed multiflow. There exists a feasible integral multiflow  $f^*$  that is uncrossed and achieves value  $|f^*|_w \geq \frac{1}{\gamma}|f|_w$ . This solution can be computed in polynomial time if the capacities are unit-valued.*

*Proof.* We focus on the unit capacity case. For general capacities, it is straightforward to reduce to the unit capacity case by splitting each edge  $e$  into  $u(e)$  copies<sup>9</sup>.

Suppose  $u = \vec{1}$ . Let  $\beta = |f|_w$ . Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be the family of support paths for  $f$ . First, we may assume that  $f(P) < 1$  for each  $P \in \mathcal{P}$ ; otherwise we define an integral flow  $\lfloor f \rfloor$  by  $\lfloor f \rfloor(P) = \lfloor f(P) \rfloor$ , and instead apply the lemma to  $\tilde{f} = f - \lfloor f \rfloor$  to obtain  $\tilde{f}^*$ , then output  $f^* = \tilde{f}^* + \lfloor f \rfloor$ .

Now, let  $k$  be a positive integer such that  $kf$  is integral. Since  $kf$  is integral, for each  $P$  we have that  $f(P) = \alpha_P/k$  where  $\alpha_P \leq k$  is a positive integer. By treating each  $P$  as  $\alpha_P$  distinct paths, we may assume that each path routes exactly  $\frac{1}{k}$  units of flow. Then, since  $\sum_{P:e \in P} f(P) \leq 1$  by feasibility, at most  $k$  paths use each edge of  $G$ .

Let  $U$  be the edge-intersection graph of  $(G, \mathcal{P})$ , which has load at most  $k$ . By Theorem 4.2,  $U$  is  $b$ -colourable where  $b = O(k)$ . Now for each colour class  $i$ , we let  $f_i$  denote the flow obtained by sending one unit of flow on each path in that colour class, and zero flow on all other paths. Then  $f_i$  is integral and satisfies that  $\sum_{P:e \in P} f_i(P) \leq 1$  for each  $e \in E(G)$ , and  $kf = \sum_{i=1}^b f_i$  since each path's flow was blown up by a factor of  $k$ . Since the value of  $kf$  is  $k\beta$ , at least one of the  $f_i$  flows has a value of  $k\beta/b$ . Since  $b = O(k)$ , then this flow has value  $\Omega(1)$  times that of  $f$ , as desired.

However, this proof is existential thus far, and does not immediately give a polynomial time algorithm because  $k$  could be very large. To fix this, we first have a pre-processing step where we convert  $f$  into a feasible flow  $\hat{f}$  that uses a subset of  $f$ 's support paths (so that it remains uncrossed) such that each value  $\hat{f}(P)$  is a multiple of  $\frac{1}{\text{poly}(n)}$ , and so that  $|\hat{f}|_w$  is a large fraction of  $|f|_w$ . We then run the above procedure on  $\hat{f}$  instead of  $f$ , giving a polynomial time algorithm. We prove the following.

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$  be any constant. There exists a positive constant  $N_\epsilon$  so that the following holds. Let  $(G, H, u = \vec{1})$  be a unit-capacity planar maximization instance on  $n \geq N_\epsilon$  nodes, equipped with per-unit profits  $w(h) \geq 0$  for  $h \in E(H)$ . Let  $f$  be a feasible multiflow such that  $|f|_w \geq w_{\max} = \max_{h \in E(H)} w(h)$ . There exists a multiflow  $\hat{f}$  satisfying:*

1.  $\hat{f}$  is feasible,
2. the support paths of  $\hat{f}$  are a subset of the support paths of  $f$ ,
3.  $|\hat{f}|_w \geq (1 - \epsilon)|f|_w$ , and
4. for every path  $P$ ,  $\hat{f}(P)$  is a multiple of  $\frac{1}{\log^2 n}$ .

There is a polynomial time algorithm that computes such an  $\hat{f}$ .

We prove this in Section B using a randomized rounding and re-scaling argument (which can be derandomized to give a deterministic algorithm).

The two conditions that  $|f|_w \geq w_{\max}$  and  $n \geq N_\epsilon$  are only minor technicalities. If  $|f|_w < w_{\max}$ , then we need not bother with rounding  $f$ : simply take  $f^*$  as routing one unit of flow on any  $st$ -path where  $w(s, t) = w_{\max}$ . The  $n \geq N_\epsilon$  condition is also not a huge obstacle. If  $n < N_\epsilon$  then  $n$  is bounded by a constant, and we can obtain  $\hat{f}$  whose fractionality is constant as follows. We set up a linear program formulation of the  $w$ -weighted maximum multiflow problem using path-variables  $x(P)$ , but only using paths  $P$  where  $P$  is a support path of  $f$ . Standard linear programming theory implies there is a feasible solution  $\hat{f}$  whose value is at least that of  $f$ , is uncrossed (since its support paths are a subset of  $f$ 's), and whose fractionality is bounded as a function of  $n \leq N_\epsilon$ , but this is still constant. □

---

<sup>9</sup>This reduction is not polynomial time. We believe the general capacity case can be solved in polytime but defer this to the full version. However, unit capacities suffice for the maximum edge-disjoint paths problem

It is straightforward to generalize this to the node-capacitated setting - the colouring and integer decomposition property proceed in exactly the same way.

## 4.2 Inapproximability of Maximum Uncrossed Fractional Multiflow

Next we prove Theorem 1.4 on the inapproximability of maximum uncrossed (fractional) multiflow. We make use of a strong inapproximability result given by Chuzhoy, Kim, and Nimavat for maximum edge-disjoint paths (MEDP) and maximum node-disjoint paths (MNDP) in planar graphs; i.e. maximum integer multiflow for unit capacities. One minor technicality is that in their formulation, a feasible solution is only allowed to route one unit of flow for each demand. We thus call these problems *capped MEDP* and *capped MNDP* respectively.

**Theorem 4.5** (Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, [7]). *For every constant  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is no  $2^{\Omega(\log^{1-\epsilon} n)}$ -approximation polynomial-time algorithm for capped MEDP or capped MNDP, assuming that  $NP \not\subseteq DTIME(n^{\text{polylog } n})$ . Moreover, there is no  $n^{O(\frac{1}{(\log \log n)^2})}$ -approximation polynomial-time algorithm for capped MEDP or capped MNDP, assuming that for some constant  $\delta > 0$ ,  $NP \not\subseteq DTIME(2^{n^\delta})$ . These results hold even when the input graph is a maximum degree 3 planar graph, or even if  $G$  is a wall graph.*

We now prove Theorem 1.4 which relies on this result. We focus on the edge-capacitated version (the node-capacitated version is similar).

*Proof of Theorem 1.4.* We prove that result by giving a polytime reduction from capped MEDP in wall graphs to maximum uncrossed multiflow in wall graphs, that preserves the approximation ratio up to a constant factor. For an instance  $(G, H)$  of the capped MEDP problem where  $G$  is a wall graph (which is planar and has maximum degree 3), define the following quantities.

- Let  $D_E(G, H)$  denote the maximum number of demands in  $H$  which can be routed on edge-disjoint paths in  $G$  (i.e. the optimal value for capped MEDP).
- Let  $U_E(G, H)$  denote the maximum value of a (fractional) uncrossed multiflow for  $(G, H, u = \vec{1})$ .

Observe that any capped MEDP solution for  $(G, H)$  is a feasible (integral) uncrossed multiflow for  $(G, H, u = \vec{1})$ . To see this, consider a collection of edge-disjoint paths that form a capped MEDP solution. Recall from Section 2.2 that two edge-disjoint paths cross only if they cross at a node (rather than a longer common subpath). Since  $G$  has maximum degree 3, a node crossing is not possible. Thus we have  $D_E(G, H) \leq U_E(G, H)$ .

Suppose we have a  $\beta$ -approximation algorithm for maximum uncrossed (fractional) multiflow in wall graphs. We obtain an approximation algorithm for capped MEDP as follows. We run our  $\beta$ -approximation algorithm for maximum uncrossed multiflow on  $(G, H, u = \vec{1})$  to obtain flow  $f$  whose value is at least  $U_E(G, H)/\beta$ . We apply the polytime algorithm from Theorem 4.3 to compute a feasible uncrossed integral multiflow  $f'$  whose value is  $1/\gamma$  that of  $f$ . It may still not be a valid capped MEDP solution, since it may route more than one flow path for the same commodity. However, since  $G$  has maximum degree 3, it routes on at most 3 paths for each commodity, so by selecting exactly one path for each commodity we obtain a capped MEDP solution whose value is at least  $\frac{1}{3}$  that of  $f'$ . Thus this algorithm outputs a capped MEDP solution whose value is at least  $\frac{U_E(G, H)}{3\gamma\beta} \geq \frac{D_E(G, H)}{3\gamma\beta}$ , and is thus a  $3\gamma\beta$ -approximation algorithm.  $\square$

## 5 Congestion Setting: Rounding

In this section, we focus on planar congestion instances  $(G, H, u, d)$  where the demands must be fully routed. We show Theorem 1.3, which states that we can convert (fractional) strongly uncrossed multiflows into integral flows that violate the capacities by a factor of at most 2, and if we accept an additional additive error of less than  $d_{\max} = \max_{h \in E(H)} d(h)$  the flow can be made unsplittable. Section 5.1 presents the relevant properties of strongly uncrossed flows, and Section 5.2 gives the proof of Theorem 1.3.

## 5.1 Clockwise Orderings and Sectors

Let  $f$  be a strongly uncrossed multiflow for planar congestion instance  $(G, H, u, d)$ . Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be the set of support paths, and let  $\mathcal{P}^h$  be the set of support paths routing demand  $h \in E(H)$ . Fix a strongly uncrossed parallelization  $\phi$ . We parallelize the edges and perform disk-expansion at each node (see Section 2.2) so that the paths become node-disjoint. Then, for each commodity  $h = (s, t) \in E(H)$ , we add a node into the disk corresponding to  $s$  to join the endpoints of the paths for  $h$ , and similarly for the disk of  $t$ . This can be done in a planar fashion for all demands simultaneously since the flow is strongly uncrossed (see Section 2.4). We denote the new graph  $G_\phi$ . For a path  $P \in \mathcal{P}$ , we let  $\widehat{P}$  be its corresponding path in  $G_\phi$ . For  $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}^h$ ,  $\widehat{P}$  and  $\widehat{Q}$  are internally node-disjoint paths that share their endpoints. For  $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$  routing different demands,  $\widehat{P}$  and  $\widehat{Q}$  are (completely) node-disjoint.

Consider a commodity  $h = (s, t) \in E(H)$ . We use the notation  $G_\phi[h]$  to mean the subgraph of  $G_\phi$  induced by the paths  $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}^h = \{\widehat{P} : P \in \mathcal{P}^h\}$ . In  $G_\phi$ , the paths of  $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}^h$  have a clockwise cyclic ordering about  $s$ , say  $\widehat{P}_1, \dots, \widehat{P}_k$ . Informally, a *sector* is the region between consecutive paths in the clockwise ordering. We make this more precise as follows.

Consider two paths  $\widehat{P}_i$  and  $\widehat{P}_j$  in  $G_\phi$ . Orient  $\widehat{P}_i$  from  $s$  to  $t$ , and orient  $\widehat{P}_j$  from  $t$  to  $s$ . The directed curve  $\widehat{P}_i \bullet \widehat{P}_j$ , obtained by concatenating these oriented curves, is a simple closed (Jordan) curve, and partitions the plane into two regions. We define  $\text{CW}^\circ(\widehat{P}_i, \widehat{P}_j)$  to be the set of points  $q$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus (\widehat{P}_i \cup \widehat{P}_j)$  such that  $p$  is “to the right” of  $\widehat{P}_i \bullet \widehat{P}_j$ ; that is, if we draw a directed curve from  $q$  to  $\widehat{P}_i \bullet \widehat{P}_j$  (avoiding  $\widehat{P}_i \bullet \widehat{P}_j$  except at the extremity), it hits  $\widehat{P}_i \bullet \widehat{P}_j$  from the right. We let  $\text{CW}(\widehat{P}_i, \widehat{P}_j)$  denote the closed region  $\text{CW}^\circ(\widehat{P}_i, \widehat{P}_j) \cup \widehat{P}_i \cup \widehat{P}_j$ . We analogously define  $\text{ACW}^\circ(\widehat{P}_i, \widehat{P}_j)$  and  $\text{ACW}(\widehat{P}_i, \widehat{P}_j)$  by taking the opposite orientation. Any curve that does not cross and is internally disjoint from  $\widehat{P}_i$  and  $\widehat{P}_j$  either stays entirely within  $\text{CW}(\widehat{P}_i, \widehat{P}_j)$  or stays entirely within  $\text{ACW}(\widehat{P}_i, \widehat{P}_j)$ .

Now, for our clockwise-ordered family of paths  $\widehat{P}_1, \dots, \widehat{P}_k$ , we refer to  $\text{CW}^\circ(\widehat{P}_i, \widehat{P}_{i+1})$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k$  (addition modulo  $k$ ) as the *open sectors* of  $f^h$ , and define the *closed sectors* similarly using  $\text{CW}(\widehat{P}_i, \widehat{P}_{i+1})$ . The open sectors partition  $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus (\widehat{P}_1 \cup \dots \cup \widehat{P}_k)$ . One sector contains the infinite face of  $G_\phi[h]$ ; we call this the *outer sector* of  $h$ , and the others the *inner sectors* of  $h$ . The *outer paths* of  $h$  are the two paths  $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}^h$  whose corresponding paths  $\widehat{P}, \widehat{Q} \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}^h$  define the outer sector of  $h$ .

Now consider an edge  $e$  of the original graph  $G$  that appears in  $\mathcal{P}^h$ . If  $e$  lies in any outer path of  $\mathcal{P}^h$ , it is an *outer edge* of  $h$ , otherwise it is an *inner edge* of  $h$ . For our congestion result, we exploit the following key properties.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $f$  be a strongly uncrossed walk-multiflow, with a fixed strongly uncrossed parallelization  $\phi$ . For distinct commodities  $h, h' \in E(H)$ , the sets of inner edges of  $h$  and  $h'$  are disjoint.*

*Proof.* To prove the result, we show that if an edge  $e$  is shared between the two single-commodity flows in  $G$ , then it is an outer edge for one of the commodities.

**Claim 5.2.**  *$G_\phi[h']$  is entirely contained within a single sector of  $h$ , and  $G_\phi[h]$  is entirely contained within a single sector of  $h'$ .*

*Proof.* By symmetry, it suffices to prove the first part. Recall that in  $G_\phi$ , two paths for distinct commodities are completely disjoint, so each individual  $\widehat{P} \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}^{h'}$  lies in at most one sector of  $h$ . However, all paths of  $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}^{h'}$  share common terminals in  $G_\phi$ , so it must be the same sector for all of  $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}^{h'}$ .  $\diamond$

**Claim 5.3.** *Either  $G_\phi[h']$  is contained in the outer sector of  $h$ , or  $G_\phi[h]$  is contained in the outer sector of  $h'$ .*

*Proof.* By the previous claim and by symmetry, it suffices to show that if  $G_\phi[h']$  is contained within an inner sector of  $h$ , then  $G_\phi[h]$  is contained within the outer sector of  $h'$ . Suppose  $G_\phi[h']$  is contained within the inner sector of  $h$  defined by paths  $\widehat{P}_i$  and  $\widehat{P}_{i+1}$ . Since  $\text{CW}(\widehat{P}_i, \widehat{P}_{i+1})$  is an inner sector, it is bounded, which means  $G_\phi[h']$  is contained in the interior of the curve  $\widehat{P}_i \bullet \widehat{P}_j$  rather than the exterior. This implies that  $\widehat{P}_i$

and  $\widehat{P}_{i+1}$  are contained within the infinite face of  $G_\phi[h']$ , and so therefore are in the outer sector of  $h'$ . Since the entirety of  $G_\phi[h]$  is within the same sector of  $h'$ , it is within the outer sector of  $h'$ .  $\diamond$

Now, without loss of generality, suppose that  $G_\phi[h]$  is contained within the outer sector of  $h'$ . Then  $G_\phi[h]$  and  $G_\phi[h']$  both contain one of the copies of the shared edge  $e$ . The copy belonging to  $h$  is contained in the infinite face of  $G_\phi[h']$ , and (by how  $G_\phi$  is constructed) so too is the copy belonging to  $h'$ . So then  $e$  is an outer edge of  $h'$ , not an inner edge.  $\square$

Now, associating the circular ordering  $P_1, \dots, P_k$  to  $\mathcal{P}^h$  corresponding to the clockwise ordering  $\widehat{P}_1, \dots, \widehat{P}_k$  of  $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}^h$ , we prove the second key property.

**Lemma 5.4.** *Suppose that in  $G$ ,  $P_i, P_j \in \mathcal{P}^h$  share an edge  $e$ . One of the following holds:*

- every path between  $P_i$  and  $P_j$  in the circular ordering also uses  $e$ , or
- every path between  $P_j$  and  $P_i$  in the circular ordering also uses  $e$ .

*Proof.* In  $G_\phi$ , consider subdividing the copies of  $e$  belonging to  $\widehat{P}_i$  and  $\widehat{P}_j$  by adding one node into each edge. Then add an edge  $e'$  between the two new nodes, adding  $e'$  such that it only crosses copies of  $e$ . The new edge either separates CW( $\widehat{P}_i, \widehat{P}_j$ ) or it separates ACW( $\widehat{P}_i, \widehat{P}_j$ ), where by separates we mean that any path of  $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}^h$  that is within the sector must cross  $e'$ . The paths between  $\widehat{P}_i$  and  $\widehat{P}_j$  in the clockwise ordering all lie in CW( $\widehat{P}_i, \widehat{P}_j$ ), and the paths between  $\widehat{P}_j$  and  $\widehat{P}_i$  in the clockwise ordering all lie in ACW( $\widehat{P}_i, \widehat{P}_j$ ). If a path  $\mathcal{P}_r$  crosses  $e'$ , then it means that it uses a copy of  $e$ , and hence its corresponding path  $P_r$  in  $G$  also uses  $e$ . The result follows.  $\square$

## 5.2 Main Congestion Argument

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.3.

*Proof of Theorem 1.3.* First, we show how to prove Item 2 (unsplittable flow), since Item 1 ultimately follows from it. Let  $f$  be a feasible strongly uncrossed flow with a fixed strongly uncrossed parallelization  $\phi$ . Recall that we let  $f(e) = \sum_{P:e \in P} f(P)$  and let  $f^h$  be the single-commodity flow for  $h \in E(H)$ .

Consider a commodity  $h$ . Let  $P_1, \dots, P_k$  be paths of  $\mathcal{P}^h$ , ordered according to the cyclic clockwise ordering of their corresponding paths  $\widehat{P}_1, \dots, \widehat{P}_k \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}^h$  in  $G_\phi$ . Re-index so that  $P_1$  and  $P_k$  are the outer paths. Let  $i^*$  be the smallest index  $i$  such that  $\sum_{j \leq i} f^h(P_j) \geq \frac{d(h)}{2}$ . We define  $Q^h = P_{i^*}$ , and call it the *central path* for  $h$ . Note that it is straightforward to find  $Q^h$  in polynomial time.

**Claim 5.5.** *If  $e \in Q^h$  and  $e$  is an outer edge for  $h$  (i.e. it lies in  $P_1$  or  $P_k$ ), then  $f^h(e) \geq \frac{d(h)}{2}$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $e$  is an outer edge, it is in either  $P_1$  or  $P_k$ , in addition to  $Q^h = P_{i^*}$ . From Theorem 5.4 we have that  $e \in P_r$  either for all  $1 \leq r \leq i^*$  or for all  $i^* \leq r \leq k$ . In the former case,  $f^h(e) \geq \sum_{1 \leq r \leq i^*} f^h(P_r) \geq \frac{d(h)}{2}$ . For the latter case,  $f^h(e) \geq \sum_{i^* \leq r \leq k} f^h(P_r) = d(h) - \sum_{1 \leq r < i^*} f^h(P_r) > d(h) - \frac{d(h)}{2} = \frac{d(h)}{2}$ , where the last inequality follows since  $\sum_{1 \leq r < i^*} f^h(P_r) < \frac{d(h)}{2}$  by definition of  $i^*$ .  $\diamond$

To obtain an unsplittable flow  $f'$ , for each  $h \in E(H)$  we route  $d(h)$  units of flow along the path  $Q^h$ . For the congestion bound, consider an arbitrary edge  $e \in E(G)$ . We will bound the amount of flow through  $e$ . Let  $H_e = \{h \in E(H) : e \in Q^h\}$ , so  $f'(e) = \sum_{h \in H_e} d(h)$ . Define  $O_e = \{h \in H_e : e \text{ is an outer edge of } h\}$  and also  $I_e = \{h \in H_e : e \text{ is an inner edge of } h\}$ . These sets partition  $H_e$ , so  $f'(e) = \sum_{h \in O_e} d(h) + \sum_{h \in I_e} d(h)$ . We know that  $|I_e| \leq 1$  from Theorem 5.1. Additionally, by Theorem 5.5, for each  $h \in O_e$  we have that  $f^h(e) \geq \frac{d(h)}{2}$ . We now split into two cases.

Case 1:  $\sum_{h \in O_e} \frac{d(h)}{2} < u(e)$ . Then,

$$f'(e) < 2u(e) + \sum_{h \in I_e} d(h) \leq 2u(e) + d_{\max}.$$

Case 2:  $\sum_{h \in O_e} \frac{d(h)}{2} \geq u(e)$ . Then  $\sum_{h \in O_e} f^h(e) \geq \sum_{h \in O_e} \frac{d(h)}{2} \geq u(e)$ , so the commodities of  $O_e$  saturate  $e$  in  $f$ . It follows that  $I_e = \emptyset$ . Hence,

$$f'(e) = \sum_{h \in O_e} d(h) \leq \sum_{h \in O_e} 2f^h(e) \leq 2f(e) \leq 2u(e) < 2u(e) + d_{\max}.$$

This concludes the proof of Item 2. The above is easily turned into a polynomial time algorithm. We now prove Item 1 from Item 2.

First, we split each  $e \in E(G)$  into  $u(e)$  parallel copies with capacity 1, and each  $h \in E(H)$  into  $d(h)$  parallel copies with demand 1, so that we have a new planar multiflow instance  $(G', H', u' = \vec{1}, d' = \vec{1})$  with unit capacities and demands. The splitting step is technically not polynomial time, but at the end we discuss how to convert this to an efficient algorithm. An integral congestion 2 multiflow for the new instance clearly implies an integral congestion 2 multiflow for the original instance. Given the feasible strongly uncrossed multiflow for the original instance, it is straightforward to construct a feasible strongly uncrossed multiflow for the new instance. To do this, for commodity  $h = (s, t) \in E(H)$ , order the support paths clockwise about  $s$ . The first unit-demand  $st$ -flow is obtained by iterating over the paths, assigning up to  $f^h(P)$  amount of flow on each path  $P$ , until 1 unit of flow has been routed. We then continue iterating from this path and assign flow for the second unit-demand  $st$ -flow, ensuring we do not assign more than  $f^h(P)$  flow in total to each path  $P$ , and so on.

Then, Item 2 implies there exists an unsplittable (and hence, integral) multiflow  $f'$  for the unit weight instance, where the congestion on each edge is strictly less than 3. Since the flow is integral, the congestion is at most 2.

We now briefly explain how to convert this into a polynomial time algorithm. Consider a demand  $h = (s, t) \in E(H)$ . The following is an equivalent description of how the pseudo-polynomial time algorithm above behaves. It picks a starting support path and scans clockwise about  $s$  counting the total amount of flow it sees, finding the first path at which 0.5 units of total flow has been routed, then 1.5 units in total, then 2.5 units in total, and so on. These are what would be the central paths were we to split  $h$  up into  $d(h)$  separate demands. The algorithm iterates over this list, and routes one unit of flow on each path (if a walk appears multiple times in the list because its flow is large, we route one unit of flow on it each time it appears). However, this can be implemented in polynomial time: just by scanning clockwise about  $s$  and performing a constant number of simple arithmetic calculations at each path, we can determine how many times each path  $P$  would appear in this list of central paths without explicitly constructing the list, which tells us how much flow to route on  $P$ .  $\square$

## 6 Reducing Uncrossed Edge-Disjoint Paths to Planar Node-Disjoint Paths

In this section we prove Theorem 1.6. An instance of edge- or node-disjoint paths consists of  $G, H$  (we can think of these as having unit capacities and demands). We must find (integral) edge- or node-disjoint paths respectively that fully route  $H$  in  $G$ . The problem of interest for Theorem 1.6 is *uncrossed* edge-disjoint paths, where  $G$  is planar and we add the extra constraint that the paths are uncrossed. We reduce to the standard planar node-disjoint paths problem, and then use a result of Schrijver [24] which says that node-disjoint paths can be solved in polynomial time in planar graphs if the number of faces the demand edges are incident upon is bounded.

Our proof uses contractions. We let  $G/e$  to denote the graph obtained by contracting edge  $e$  in a graph  $G$ ; we use similar notation for a multiflow  $f$ .

**Lemma 6.1.** *Let  $f$  be an uncrossed flow in  $G$  and  $e$  some supply edge. Then  $f/e$  is uncrossed for  $G/e, H/e$ .*

We first present a gadget that reduces the degree of an arbitrary vertex of degree at least 5, by one, adding vertices of maximum degree 4. Using this gadget repeatedly, we get an equivalent instance with




Figure 7: A gadget to replace a degree-4 vertex by 4 degree-3 vertices.

maximum degree 4. Then every degree-4 vertex can be replaced by a  $C_4$ , as illustrated in Figure 7, to obtain a graph with maximum degree 3.

Consider a vertex  $v$  with  $\deg(v) \geq 5$ . In order to obtain maximum degree 4, the natural approach replaces  $v$  by a grid large enough to make any routing incident to  $v$  feasible in that grid. This is more straightforward in instances where the terminals are leaves. As we have seen however, creating leaves may destroy uncrossability. We need to be more careful then because  $v$  can be a terminal for some of the demand pairs. Therefore we must pre-specify some vertices in the grid to substitute  $v$  in those demand pairs. Because of the uncrossed constraint, the choice of these new terminals is more delicate. We give an explicit construction, presented in a recursive fashion: by showing how to decrease the degree of  $v$  by one in  $G$  and  $H$  simultaneously.




Figure 8: The spider web gadget: how to decrease the degree of a vertex by one in  $G$  and  $H$ , adding only vertices of degree at most 4. Notice the red terminal that can be used as terminal for one of the demand pair ending at this vertex. In highlight with colors, an example of reconfiguration of four paths as given by the proof, with two paths which had been ending at  $v$  (red and blue), and two paths passing through  $v$  (yellow and green).

**Proposition 6.2.** *Let  $G, H$  be an instance of the uncrossed edge-disjoint paths problem, and  $v$  be a vertex of  $G$  with  $\deg_G(v) > 4$ , or  $\deg_G(v) \geq 2$  and  $\deg_H(v) \geq 1$ . Define  $G', H'$  from  $G, H$  by replacing  $v$  in  $G, H$  by the spider web gadget from Figure 8. If  $d_H(v) \geq 1$ , then replace arbitrary demand  $(s, v)$  in  $H$  by a demand  $(s, t)$  where  $t$  is the red terminal in the gadget (which then has degree 1 in  $H'$ ). Any other terminals at  $v$  are located at  $v'$ . Then  $G, H$  admits an uncrossed routing if and only if  $G', H'$  does.*

*Proof.* Let  $d = \deg(v)$ . We label each vertex except  $v$  in the spider web as  $u_{i,j}$  such that  $u_{i,j}$  is at the polar coordinate  $(\frac{2i\pi}{d}, j)$  (for instance  $t = u_{0,1}$ ), with  $i \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$  and  $j \in \{1, \dots, d-1\}$ . Let  $v_0, \dots, v_{d-1}$

be the neighbours of  $v$ , with  $v_i$  adjacent to  $u_{i,d-1}$ . To avoid confusion, we will call  $v'$  the central vertex in the spider web, and  $v$  the original vertex in  $G$ . Also we will consider all indices modulo  $d$ . Given a routing in  $G', H'$  by contracting all new vertices in the web (and deleting loops) they become the original  $v$ , and we obtain a routing in  $G, H$ , proving the *if* implication.

Consider an uncrossed routing  $\mathcal{P}$  in  $G, H$ . We compute a corresponding uncrossed routing in  $G', H'$ . The first case is when  $H$  does not contain a demand ending at  $v$ . We claim then there is a routing that does not use  $v'$ . Note that our figure does not depict this case and in particular  $v'$  will not be used and can be safely removed, so that all of the new nodes have degree at most 4. Indeed to see this routing, consider a support flow path  $P$  containing  $v_i v, v v_j$  (with  $i < j$ ). Let  $P'$  be the flow path obtained from  $P$  by replacing  $v_i v, v v_j$  by a subpath  $v_i, u_{i,d-1}, u_{i,d-2}, \dots, u_{i,d-k}, u_{i+1,d-k}, u_{i+2,d-k}, \dots, u_{j,d-k}, u_{j,d-k+1}, \dots, u_{j,d-1}, v_j$ , with  $k = j - i + 1$ . This subpath uses the rays indexed by  $i$  and  $j$  and the ring indexed by  $d - k$ . We claim that no two such subpaths share an edge. Indeed all the rays are distinct, and if two paths used the same ring, one from  $v_i$  to  $v_j$  and the other from  $v_{i'}$  to  $v_{j'}$ , as  $j - i = j' - i'$ , we must have  $v_i, v_{i'}, v_j, v_{j'}$  appearing in that order cyclically around  $v$ . Hence the two corresponding paths cross, contradiction.

In the second case  $H$  has some demands terminating at  $v$ ; this case is depicted in Figure 8. Let  $(s, v)$  be the arbitrary demand in  $H$  terminating at  $v$  that is replaced in  $H'$  by a demand  $(s, t)$ , where  $t = u_{0,1}$ . Let  $v_i v$  be the last edge in the  $s, v$ -path  $P$  in  $\mathcal{P}$ . Replace in  $P$  the edge  $v_i v$  by the subpath  $v_i, v_{i,d-1}, v_{i,d-2}, \dots, v_{i,i}, v_{i-1,i}, v_{i-1,i-1}, \dots, v_{2,2}, v_{1,2}, v_{1,1}, v_{0,1} = t$ . For any other edge  $v v_j$  in  $H$  that appears in some path  $Q \in \mathcal{P}$  (either transiting through or terminating at  $v$ ), similarly replace  $v v_j$  in  $H$  by a subpath  $v, v_{j-k,1}, v_{j-k+1,1}, v_{j-k+1,2}, \dots, v_{j-k+i,i} = v_{j,i}, v_{j,i+1}, \dots, v_{j,d-1}, v_j$ . Each such subpath is thus spiraling counterclockwise from  $v$  (or  $t$  for  $P$ ) into the  $i$  innermost rings, then goes straight on its own ray, and thus all such subpaths, which are rotations of each other, are disjoint. Moreover, the relative cyclic order of the paths incident to  $v'$  is the same as in  $v$  (except for the path  $P$  that is not incident to  $v'$ ). Therefore, this routing in  $G', H'$  is uncrossed.  $\square$

We may repeatedly apply the preceding lemma, in polytime until we have a new "equivalent" instance  $G', H'$  with the following properties. If  $v$  has no terminals, then it has degree at most four and any terminal node has degree at most 3. The last step of the reduction now applies a degree 4 reduction (Figure 7) to each remaining vertex of degree 4. For each terminal node of degree at most 2 in  $G$ , we leave it. If a terminal node  $v$  has  $d_G(v) = 3$ , then we subdivide each edge incident to  $v$  and add a triangle onto these new degree 2 nodes. We show that this last reduction step is fine as follows.

**Lemma 6.3.** *Let  $G$  be a maximum degree 4 planar graph and  $H$  an associated demand graph which forms a matching and if  $\deg_H(v) = 1$ , then  $\deg_G(v) \leq 3$ . Let  $G''$  be the graph obtained by performing the last phase of reductions.  $H$  has an integral uncrossed flow in  $G$  if and only if it has a totally node-disjoint flow in  $G''$ .*

*Proof.* We use the familiar idea that feasibility of edge- versus node-disjoint paths are equivalent in maximum degree three instances. If  $H$  has a node-disjoint solution in  $G''$ , then by planarity, there is an uncrossed edge-disjoint solution in  $G$ . We obtain an edge-disjoint solution in  $G$  by first contracting the new 4 cycles. This cannot create a crossing at the contracted node due to the fact we had a node-disjoint solution. Second, consider one of the nodes  $v$  where we applied triangle operation. Regardless of whether a demand transits through the triangle gadget, we obtain an uncrossed edge-disjoint flow by contracting  $v$  together with the new degree 2 nodes.

Conversely, suppose that we have an uncrossed edge-disjoint path solution in  $G$ . At any non-terminal node  $v$ , if there are two paths using it, since they are non-crossing they can be realized as node-disjoint on the 4-cycle introduced by the reduction. Now consider a terminal node  $v$ . If it has degree at most 2, then no other path could use edges incident to  $v$ , so assume it has degree 3. We can convert this to a node-disjoint solution by first letting the terminal  $v$  route via the node which subdivided the edge it used in  $G$ . This allows us to use the edge between the two other subdivided nodes for the transiting demand, thus keeping node disjointness at the gadget.  $\square$

This completes the proof of the overall reduction.

**Theorem 6.4.** *Suppose that  $G, H$  is a planar instance of edge-disjoint paths. We can compute a planar instance  $\hat{G}, \hat{H}$  of node-disjoint paths such that  $G, H$  has an integral uncrossed flow if and only if  $\hat{G}, \hat{H}$  has (totally) node-disjoint paths for the demands in  $\hat{H}$ . Moreover,  $\hat{G}, \hat{H}$  can be computed in polytime, and  $|V(\hat{G})| \leq c\Delta^3|V(G)|$  where  $\Delta$  is the maximum degree in  $G$  and  $c$  is a constant.*

## References

- [1] Amit Chakrabarti, Lisa Fleischer, and Christophe Weibel. When the cut condition is enough: A complete characterization for multifold problems in series-parallel networks. In *Proceedings of the forty-fourth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 19–26. ACM, 2012.
- [2] Chandra Chekuri, Marcelo Mydlarz, and F Bruce Shepherd. Multicommodity demand flow in a tree and packing integer programs. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)*, 3(3):27, 2007.
- [3] Chandra Chekuri and F Bruce Shepherd. Approximate integer decompositions for undirected network design problems. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 23(1):163–177, 2009.
- [4] Chandra Chekuri, F Bruce Shepherd, and Christophe Weibel. Flow-cut gaps for integer and fractional multiflows. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1198–1208. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2010.
- [5] Chandra Chekuri, F Bruce Shepherd, and Christophe Weibel. Flow-cut gaps for integer and fractional multiflows. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 103(2):248–273, 2013.
- [6] Julia Chuzhoy, David HK Kim, and Rachit Nimavat. Almost polynomial hardness of node-disjoint paths in grids. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 1220–1233, 2018.
- [7] Julia Chuzhoy, David Hong Kyun Kim, and Rachit Nimavat. Almost polynomial hardness of node-disjoint paths in grids. *Theory of Computing*, 17(6):1–57, 2021.
- [8] Louis Esperet, Daniel Gonçalves, and Arnaud Labourel. Coloring a set of touching strings. *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics*, 34:213–217, August 2009.
- [9] David Alemán Espinosa, Nikhil Kumar, Joseph Poremba, and Bruce Shepherd. Unsplittable flow cut gap in undirected graphs. In *Proceedings of the 2026 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1570–1605. SIAM, 2026.
- [10] Jacob Fox and János Pach. Touching Strings. 2012.
- [11] Naveen Garg, Nikhil Kumar, and András Sebő. Integer plane multifold maximisation: one-quarter-approximation and gaps. *Mathematical Programming*, 195(1):403–419, 2022.
- [12] Naveen Garg, Vijay V. Vazirani, and Mihalis Yannakakis. Primal-dual approximation algorithms for integral flow and multicut in trees. *Algorithmica*, 18(1):3–20, 1997.
- [13] Michel X Goemans and David P Williamson. Primal-dual approximation algorithms for feedback problems in planar graphs. *Combinatorica*, 1(18):37–59, 1998.
- [14] Chien-Chung Huang, Mathieu Mari, Claire Mathieu, Kevin Schewior, and Jens Vygen. An approximation algorithm for fully planar edge-disjoint paths. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 35(2):752–769, 2021.
- [15] Chien-Chung Huang, Mathieu Mari, Claire Mathieu, and Jens Vygen. Approximating maximum integral multiflows on bounded genus graphs. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 70(4):1266–1291, 2023.

- [16] Bernhard Korte, László Lovász, Hans Jürgen Prömel, and Alexander Schrijver. *Paths, flows, and VLSI-layout*. Springer-Verlag, 1990.
- [17] Kazuhiko Matsumoto, Takao Nishizeki, and Nobuji Saito. Planar multicommodity flows, maximum matchings and negative cycles. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 15(2):495–510, 1986.
- [18] Matthias Middendorf and Frank Pfeiffer. On the complexity of the disjoint paths problem. *Combinatorica*, 13(1):97–107, March 1993.
- [19] Guylain Naves. The hardness of routing two pairs on one face. *Mathematical Programming*, 131(1-2):49–69, February 2012.
- [20] Janos Pácz. personal communication.
- [21] Prabhakar Raghavan. Probabilistic construction of deterministic algorithms: Approximating packing integer programs. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 37(2):130–143, October 1988.
- [22] Niklas Schlöberg. An improved integrality gap for disjoint cycles in planar graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.17813*, 2024.
- [23] Niklas Schlöberg, Hanjo Thiele, and Jens Vygen. Packing cycles in planar and bounded-genus graphs. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 2069–2086. SIAM, 2023.
- [24] Alexander Schrijver. Homotopic routing methods. *Paths, Flows, and VLSI-layout*, pages 329–371, 1990.
- [25] Alexander Schrijver. Disjoint homotopic paths and trees in a planar graph. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 6:527–574, 1991.
- [26] Alexander Schrijver. *Combinatorial optimization: polyhedra and efficiency*, volume 24. Springer, 2003.
- [27] Paul D Seymour. Matroids and multicommodity flows. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 2(3):257–290, 1981.
- [28] Vera Traub, Laura Vargas Koch, and Rico Zenklusen. Single-source unsplittable flows in planar graphs. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 639–668. SIAM, 2024.
- [29] Wouter Cames Van Batenburg, Louis Esperet, and Tobias Müller. Coloring Jordan Regions and Curves. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 31(3):1670–1684, January 2017.
- [30] Jens Vygen. Np-completeness of some edge-disjoint paths problems. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 61(1):83–90, 1995.

## A Uncrossing Procedures and Uncrossable Classes

By cycle we always mean simple cycle. For a cycle  $C$ , we use  $\text{Int}(C)$  and  $\text{int}(C)$  for the closed and open interior respectively of the region bounded by  $C$ .

### A.1 Fully-Compliant Layouts

Let  $G$  be series-parallel. A demand  $h$  is *fully-compliant* if  $G + h$  is series-parallel. We say  $(G, H)$  is *fully-compliant* if every  $h \in E(H)$  is fully-compliant. This notion was introduced in [5], where it was also proven that such  $(G, H)$  are cut-sufficient. Here, we prove Theorem 3.2

*Proof of Theorem 3.2.* To show  $(G, H)$  is pairwise-planar, it suffices to show for each demand  $h = (s, t)$  that either  $(s, t) \in E(G)$  or there exist two distinct faces  $F_1, F_2$  of  $G$  such that  $s, t \in V(F_1)$  and  $s, t \in V(F_2)$ . Suppose  $(s, t) \notin E(G)$ . Let  $C_0$  be a cycle<sup>10</sup> containing both  $s$  and  $t$  (take two internally node-disjoint  $st$ -paths).

Now, select a cycle  $C$  containing both  $s$  and  $t$  such that  $\text{Int}(C) \subseteq \text{Int}(C_0)$ ; subject to these constraints, choose  $C$  such that  $\text{Int}(C)$  is minimal. Let  $G_C$  be the graph induced by  $V(\text{Int}(C))$ . Let  $P, Q$  be the two internally node-disjoint  $st$ -paths comprising  $C$ .

Let  $V_P = V(P) \setminus \{s, t\}$  and  $V_Q = V(Q) \setminus \{s, t\}$ . Since  $(s, t) \notin E(G)$ , neither of these sets is empty. Observe that there is no path in  $G_C - \{s, t\}$  between  $V_P$  and  $V_Q$ , as otherwise  $G_C + h$  contains a  $K_4$ -minor, contradicting that  $G + h$  is series-parallel. That is,  $\{s, t\}$  is a 2-cut of  $G_C$  separating  $V_P$  and  $V_Q$ . Note that  $G_C - \{s, t\}$  can only contain two connected components (one containing  $V_P$ , another containing  $V_Q$ ), since if there were another in the interior of  $G_C$  then we could find a cycle  $C'$  containing  $s, t$  such that  $\text{Int}(C') \subsetneq \text{Int}(C)$ , contradicting our choice of  $C$ . Let  $G_P$  and  $G_Q$  denote the two connected components plus their respective edges to  $s$  and  $t$ . Since  $G_P$  and  $G_Q$  are disjoint except at  $s, t$ , one can draw a curve in  $\text{Int}(C)$  between  $s$  and  $t$  that is disjoint from the embeddings of  $G_P$  and  $G_Q$  - this means there is a face  $F_1$  of  $G$  inside  $\text{Int}(C)$  containing both  $s, t$ .

Now, we can play the same game using cycle exteriors. Let  $D$  be a simple cycle containing both  $s$  and  $t$  such that  $\text{Ext}(D) \subseteq \text{Ext}(C_0)$  (i.e.  $\text{Int}(C_0) \subseteq \text{Int}(D)$ ); subject to these constraints, choose  $D$  so that  $\text{Ext}(D)$  is minimal. By the same argument, there exists a face  $F_2$  of  $G$  in  $\text{Ext}(D)$  such that  $F_2$  contains both  $s, t$ . Since  $\text{Ext}(D) \subseteq \text{Ext}(C_0)$ ,  $F_2 \neq F_1$ . □

## A.2 Local Uncrossing Lemma

In this subsection, we prove Theorem 3.3.

We always discuss a flow  $f$  with a particular parallelization (not necessarily uncrossed, see Section 2.2), so we can assume support paths are edge-disjoint and thus cross only at nodes. We define the following. For  $v \in V$  and distinct paths  $P, Q$ , let  $\kappa(f, v, P, Q)$  be  $f(P) \cdot f(Q)$  if  $P$  and  $Q$  cross at  $v$ , and 0 otherwise. For  $v \in V$  and  $h_1, h_2 \in E(H)$  (not necessarily distinct), let  $\kappa(f, v, h_1, h_2)$  be the sum over all distinct paths  $P, Q$  such that  $P$  is an  $h_1$ -path and  $Q$  is an  $h_2$ -path of  $\kappa(f, v, P, Q)$ . We define the *crossing weight* of  $f$  to be  $\sum_v \sum_{h_1, h_2 \in E(H)} \kappa(f, v, h_1, h_2)$ <sup>11</sup>.

We rely on the following lemma.

**Lemma A.1** (Local Uncrossing Lemma). *Let  $(G, H, u, d)$  be a feasible planar multiframe instance. Let  $f$  be a feasible flow that is minimum cost under unit edge costs. Suppose there exist support paths  $P, Q$  that cross at two distinct nodes  $z_1$  and  $z_2$ . Then there exists a feasible flow  $f'$  for  $(G, H, u, d)$  such that:*

- $f'$  is minimum cost,
- $\kappa(f', v) \leq \kappa(f, v)$  for all  $v \notin \{z_1, z_2\}$ , and
- $\kappa(f', z_i) < \kappa(f, z_i)$  for  $i = 1, 2$ .

*Proof.* Let  $f$  be a flow with a given parallelization. Let  $P, Q$  be two (edge-disjoint) support paths that cross at nodes  $z_1$  and  $z_2$ . Let  $h_P = (s_P, t_P), h_Q = (s_Q, t_Q)$  be their respective demands (possibly equal). By re-labeling their extremities, we may assume both  $P$  and  $Q$  use  $z_1$  before  $z_2$  starting from  $s_P$  and  $s_Q$  respectively. Let  $\epsilon = \min\{f(P), f(Q)\}$ . By embedding new edge-disjoint copies of  $P, Q$  immediately beside their original copies, we can assume that  $f(P) = f(Q) = \epsilon$ .

We decompose each of  $P, Q$  into three subpaths: for  $P$  these are  $P_1 = P[s_P, z_1], P_2 = P[z_1, z_2], P_3 = P[z_2, t_P]$ , and for  $Q$  these are  $Q_1 = Q[s_Q, z_1], Q_2 = Q[z_1, z_2], Q_3 = Q[z_2, t_Q]$ . Now, define  $P' = P_1 \bullet Q_2 \bullet P_3$

<sup>10</sup>Recall that by cycle we always mean simple cycle.

<sup>11</sup>You could order the paths  $P, Q$  or the demands  $h_1, h_2$  to avoid double-counting them in the sums, but it ultimately does not matter for this proof.

and  $Q' = Q_1 \bullet Q_2 \bullet Q_3$ . We transfer the  $\epsilon$  units of flow on each of  $P, Q$  to  $P', Q'$  respectively to define a new flow  $f'$  that routes the same demands  $d$  and has the same cost as  $f$ .

One important catch is that  $P', Q'$  may not be (simple) paths, even if  $P, Q$  are paths. For example,  $Q_2$  may share nodes with  $P_3$ . As discussed in Section 2.5, short-cutting walks can introduce new crossings. However, if  $P', Q'$  are not paths, then by short-cutting we obtain a flow whose cost is strictly less than that of  $f$ , a contradiction.<sup>12</sup>

Consider the change in the crossing weight contributions. First, consider any  $v \notin \{z_1, z_2\}$ . The pair of edges that are consecutive for support paths transiting through  $v$  are the same for both  $f$  and  $f'$  (just possibly not belonging to the same support paths, because of swapping  $P_2$  and  $Q_2$ ), and moreover the amount of flow on those edges is the same between  $f$  and  $f'$ . Hence,  $\kappa(f', v) = \kappa(f, v)$  for such  $v$ .

Now consider  $v \in \{z_1, z_2\}$  and a support path  $R \notin \{P, Q, P', Q'\}$  that transits through  $v$ . Of course, for any support path  $T \notin \{P, Q, P', Q'\}$ , we have that  $\kappa(f', v, R, T) = \kappa(f, v, R, T)$ , so we are interested in how  $R$  interacts with  $P, Q, P', Q'$ . Consider a sufficiently small disc centered at  $v$ . The edges from the crossing paths  $P, Q$  divide the disc into four regions. The path  $R$  starts in one region, then transits through  $v$  into another region. If the second region is consecutive (clockwise or counterclockwise) with the first, then  $R$  crosses exactly one of  $P, Q$  and it also crosses exactly one of  $P', Q'$ , and hence  $\sum_{T \in \{P', Q'\}} \kappa(f', v, R, T) = \sum_{T \in \{P, Q\}} \kappa(f, v, R, T)$ . If the second region is instead opposite the first, then  $R$  crosses both  $P$  and  $Q$ , and regardless how many of  $P', Q'$  it also crosses we have that  $\sum_{T \in \{P', Q'\}} \kappa(f', v, R, T) \leq \sum_{T \in \{P, Q\}} \kappa(f, v, R, T)$ .

Finally, consider  $v \in \{z_1, z_2\}$  and the contributions from the paths  $P, Q, P', Q'$ . The paths  $P$  and  $Q$  cross with  $\kappa(f, v, P, Q) = f(P) \cdot f(Q) = \epsilon^2$ , while  $P'$  and  $Q'$  do not cross, so  $\kappa(f', v, P', Q') = 0$ .

Hence, for any  $v \notin \{z_1, z_2\}$  we have that  $\kappa(f', v) \leq \kappa(f, v)$ , and for  $v \in \{z_1, z_2\}$  we have that  $\kappa(f', v) < \kappa(f, v)$ , a contradiction. □

By a very similar proof, one can show how to decrease the crossing weight when there exist two support paths that share a terminal and cross once at another node. A consequence of this lemma is that by taking a minimum cost flow, which subject to that also minimizes the crossing weight, we may assume flow paths cross at most once. We thus obtain Theorem 3.3 as a corollary.

### A.3 Nested Supports Lemma

This subsection is dedicated to a proof of Theorem 3.6.

For a face  $F$  and support path  $P \in \text{supp}(x^F)$ , we let  $C(P)$  be the embedded cycle obtained by taking the demand  $h$  that  $P$  routes and embedding it within the open interior of the face  $F$  to join the ends of  $P$ . Note that the embeddings of different demand edges within a face  $F$  may cross each other (but of course, for different faces the demands do not cross, and moreover no demand edge crosses any supply edge).

Finally, some more terminology and notation. Recall that for a (simple) cycle  $C$ , we use  $\text{Int}(C)$  and  $\text{int}(C)$  for the closed and open interior respectively of the region bounded by  $C$ . Additionally, when we say an object is contained within a face  $F$ , we are not referring to the boundary of  $F$ , but the region of the plane that corresponds to  $F$ .

**Lemma A.2** (Face Uncrossing Lemma). *Let  $(G, H, u, d)$  be a facial multifold instance that is feasible, and let  $(H_F : F \in \mathcal{F})$  be a facial decomposition. There exists a feasible flow  $x$  such that the following holds: for every pair of distinct faces  $F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{F}$  and any  $P_1 \in \text{supp}(x^{F_1})$  and  $P_2 \in \text{supp}(x^{F_2})$ , the paths  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  do not cross, and (more strongly) the cycles  $C(P_1)$  and  $C(P_2)$  do not cross.*

*Proof.* Augment the instance by adding leaves as follows: for every face  $F$  and demand  $h = (s, t) \in H_F$ , add leaves  $(s_h, s), (t_h, t)$  of capacity equal to  $d(h)$  and embed the leaves into the face  $F$ , and move the demand  $h$  from  $(s, t)$  to  $(s_h, t_h)$ . We keep the same facial decomposition and still embed the demand edge  $(s_h, t_h)$  within the face  $F$  (accepting that demand edges within  $F$  may cross). It suffices to prove that, for

<sup>12</sup>Instead of using the minimum cost assumption, one could instead generalize the lemma to show how to decrease the crossing for non-simple flows. We use the minimum cost assumption only because the argument is more concise.

this augmented instance, there exists a feasible flow  $x$  such that for distinct faces  $F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{F}$  and paths  $P_1 \in \text{supp}(x^{F_1}), P_2 \in \text{supp}(x^{F_2})$ , the cycles  $C(P_1)$  and  $C(P_2)$  do not cross (since by contracting the added leaves, we obtain the desired flow for the original instance).

Let  $x$  be a feasible flow for the augmented instance such that any pair of support paths crosses at most once, which exists by Theorem 3.3. Let  $F_1, F_2$  be distinct faces, and let  $P_1 \in \text{supp}(x^{F_1}), P_2 \in \text{supp}(x^{F_2})$ . Suppose for the sake of contradiction that  $C(P_1)$  and  $C(P_2)$  cross. Cycles that cross must cross at least twice. However, since  $C(P_1), C(P_2)$  do not share their leaf edges or demand edges, these crossings must happen on subpaths of the paths  $P_1, P_2$ . But then this contradicts that  $P_1, P_2$  cross at most once.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.6.* We again augment the instance by adding leaves, as in the proof of Theorem A.2. Let  $x$  be a flow as resulting from Theorem A.2. First, we can assume without loss of generality that for each face  $F$ ,  $E(F) \subseteq \text{supp}(x^F)$  (and in particular,  $F$  is a face of  $G[\text{supp}(x^F)]$ ). If this is not the case for some face  $F$ , we can add new demands parallel to each edge of  $E(F)$  of demand weight  $\epsilon > 0$ , and increasing the capacity of each edge in  $E(F)$  by  $\epsilon$ , and extend  $x$  by routing along these single-edge paths. This does not introduce any new crossings. Now, it suffices to show the nested supports property holds for  $x$ .

By using parallelizations, we may assume all paths are edge-disjoint. Consider two distinct faces  $F_1, F_2$ . To simplify the notation, for  $i = 1, 2$  let  $x^i = x^{F_i}$  and let  $G_i = G[\text{supp}(x^i)] = G[\text{supp}(x^i) \cup E(F_i)]$ . For  $i = 1, 2$ , we will use the notation  $\bar{i}$  to mean the number in  $\{1, 2\} \setminus \{i\}$ . First, we prove that for each  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ ,  $G_i$  is contained in a single face of  $G_{\bar{i}}$ . We will deal with the stellated supports at the end.

Observe that for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  and any  $P \in \text{supp}(x^i)$ , the other face  $F_{\bar{i}}$  is contained in either  $\text{Ext}(C(P))$  or  $\text{Int}(C(P))$ .

**Claim A.3.** *Let  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ .*

- *If the face  $F_i$  is contained in  $\text{Int}(C(P))$  for  $P \in \text{supp}(x^{\bar{i}})$ , then every path  $Q \in \text{supp}(x^i)$  is contained in  $\text{Int}(C(P))$ , and hence  $G_i$  is contained in  $\text{Int}(C(P))$ .*
- *If the face  $F_i$  is contained in  $\text{Ext}(C(P))$  for  $P \in \text{supp}(x^{\bar{i}})$ , then every path  $Q \in \text{supp}(x^i)$  is contained in  $\text{Ext}(C(P))$ , and hence  $G_i$  is contained in  $\text{Ext}(C(P))$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $F_i$  is contained in  $\text{Int}(C(P))$  for  $P \in \text{supp}(x^{\bar{i}})$ . The cycle  $C(Q)$  has an edge (namely, its demand edge) that lies in  $\text{int}(C(P))$ . If it leaves  $\text{Int}(C(P))$ , it must cross the cycle  $C(P)$ , which means it must cross the path  $P$ . This contradicts the earlier claim. The case for  $\text{Ext}(C(P))$  is similar.  $\square$

We say  $F_i$  is *universally exterior* if  $F_i$  is contained in  $\text{Ext}(C(P))$  for all  $P \in \text{supp}(x^{\bar{i}})$ . Note that if  $F_i$  is universally exterior, then by Theorem A.3,  $G_i$  is contained in  $\text{Ext}(C(P))$  for all  $P \in \text{supp}(x^{\bar{i}})$ .

**Claim A.4.** *Either  $F_1$  is universally exterior or  $F_2$  is universally exterior.*

*Proof.* There are two cases.

Case 1: there exists  $P_1 \in \text{supp}(x^1)$  such that  $F_2$  is contained in  $\text{Int}(C(P_1))$ . Now, consider  $P_2 \in \text{supp}(x^2)$ . Then by Theorem A.3, we have that  $P_2$  is contained in  $\text{Int}(C(P_1))$ , and consequently  $P_1$  is contained in  $\text{Ext}(C(P_2))$ . Furthermore, this implies that  $F_1$  is contained in  $\text{Ext}(C(P_2))$ , since if  $F_1$  were contained in  $\text{Int}(C(P_2))$ , then Theorem A.3 would imply that  $P_1$  is contained in  $\text{Int}(C(P_2))$ . Hence  $F_1$  is universally exterior.

Case 2: there does not exist  $P_1 \in \text{supp}(x^1)$  such that  $F_2$  is contained in  $\text{Int}(C(P_1))$ . Then  $F_2$  is contained in  $\text{Ext}(C(P_1))$  for all  $P_1 \in \text{supp}(x^{H_{F_1}})$ , and  $F_2$  is universally exterior.  $\square$

**Claim A.5.** *If  $F_i$  is universally exterior, then the other support graph  $G_{\bar{i}}$  is entirely contained within a single face of  $G_i$  (note that this face is possibly bounded or unbounded).*

*Proof.* Let  $F_i^*$  be the face of  $G_i$  that contains  $F_{\bar{i}}$ . We will show that for all  $P \in \text{supp}(x^{\bar{i}})$ , the cycle  $C(P)$  is contained in  $F_i^*$ , which proves the claim.

Let  $h$  be the (embedded) demand edge routed by  $P$ . Certainly the demand  $h$  is contained in the interior of  $F_i^*$  since it is embedded in the interior of  $F_{\bar{i}}$ . Now, if  $C(P)$  ever leaves  $F_i^*$ , then there exists a node  $v$  that is incident with four distinct edges that alternate in clockwise order between  $C(P)$  and  $\text{supp}(x^{\bar{i}})$ . Say listed in clockwise order these are  $e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4$ , where  $e_1, e_3 \in C(P)$  and  $e_2, e_4 \in \text{supp}(x^{\bar{i}})$ . However, since  $C(P)$  is a simple cycle, then at least one of  $e_2, e_4$  must enter  $\text{int}(C(P))$ , which contradicts that  $F_i$  is universally exterior.  $\square$

Now, suppose without loss of generality that  $F_1$  is universally exterior, and thus  $G_2$  is contained in a single face  $F_1^*$  of  $G_1$ . If  $F_2$  is also universally exterior, then we are done. So suppose not. Then there exists  $P_1 \in \text{supp}(x^1)$  such that  $F_2$  is contained in  $\text{Int}(C(P_1))$ , and hence by Theorem A.3 we have that  $G_2$  is contained in  $\text{Int}(C(P_1))$ . Therefore the face  $F_1^*$  of  $G_1$  that contains  $G_2$  must be a bounded face. It then follows that  $G_1$  must be contained within the unbounded face of  $G_2$ .

Thus we have proven that for each  $i$ ,  $G_i$  is contained in a single face of  $G_{\bar{i}}$ . For each  $i$ , let  $S_i$  be the star graph added to  $G_i$  to obtain  $G[x, F_i]$  (so that  $G[x, F_i] = G_i + S_i$ ).

Now fix an  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . Let  $F_i^*$  be the face of  $G_i$  that contains  $G_{\bar{i}}$ . First, observe that  $G[x, F_{\bar{i}}] = G_{\bar{i}} + S_{\bar{i}}$  is still contained in that same face of  $G_i$ , since the star  $S_{\bar{i}}$  is added into the open interior of  $F_{\bar{i}}$  and its embedding is completely disjoint from  $G_{\bar{i}}$ .

So  $G[x, F_{\bar{i}}]$  is contained in a single face  $F_i^*$  of  $G_i$ . The only way that  $G[x, F_{\bar{i}}]$  is not contained in a single face of  $G_i + S_i = G[x, F_i]$  is if adding the star  $S_i$  divides  $F_i^*$  into multiple faces. However, for this to happen we would need that  $F_i^* = F_i$  (recall that  $F_i$  is a face of  $G_i$ , since we assumed that  $E(F_i) \subseteq \text{supp}(x^{F_i})$ ). However, it cannot be the case that  $F_i^* = F_i$ , since the leaves added to  $F_{\bar{i}}$  are not contained in  $F_i$  but are in  $G_{\bar{i}}$ .

Thus  $G[x, F_{\bar{i}}]$  is contained in a single face of  $G[x, F_i]$ . By a symmetric argument we have that  $G[x, F_i]$  is contained in a single face of  $G[x, F_{\bar{i}}]$ . This concludes the proof.  $\square$

## B Randomized Rounding for Maximization

In this section, we prove Theorem 4.4.

*Proof.* Let  $\nu, \gamma \in (0, 1)$  be constants, sufficiently small so that  $\frac{1-\gamma}{1+\nu} \geq 1 - \epsilon$  (for example,  $\nu = \gamma = \epsilon^2$  suffices).

Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be the set of support paths of  $f$ . We first proceed with some assumptions about the input data. By scaling  $w$ , we may assume  $w(h) \leq 1$  for each  $h \in E(H)$  and  $w_{\max} = 1$ . Finally, observe that we may assume  $f(P) < \frac{1}{\log^2 n}$  for each  $P \in \mathcal{P}$ . Otherwise we can decompose  $f = f_1 + f_2$  where  $f_2(P)$  is some multiple of  $\frac{1}{\log^2 n}$  and  $f_1(P) < \frac{1}{\log^2 n}$  (for each  $P$ , let  $k_P$  be the maximum positive integer such that  $f(P) - \frac{k_P}{\log^2 n} \geq 0$  and define  $f_2(P) = \frac{k_P}{\log^2 n}$ ). Then we can apply the lemma to  $f_1$  to obtain  $\hat{f}_1$ , and  $\hat{f} = \hat{f}_1 + f_2$  satisfies the desired properties for the original flow  $f$ .

Proceeding under the above assumptions, define an integral flow  $\bar{f}$  by independently assigning each  $\hat{f}(P)$  to 1 with probability  $\log^2 n \cdot \hat{f}(P) \in [0, 1)$  and otherwise assigning it 0. We use the following Chernoff bounds.

**Lemma B.1** (Chernoff Bounds). *Let  $X_1, \dots, X_k$  be mutually independent random variables where  $X_i \in [0, 1]$ . Let  $X = \sum_i X_i$  and let  $\mu_{\max} \geq \mathbb{E}[X] \geq \mu_{\min}$ . The following inequalities hold:*

1. For any  $\delta \geq 1$  we have

$$\Pr[X \geq (1 + \delta)\mu_{\max}] \leq \exp(-\delta\mu_{\max}/3).$$

2. For any  $\delta \leq 1$  we have

$$\Pr[X \leq (1 - \delta)\mu_{\min}] \leq \exp(-\delta^2\mu_{\min}/2).$$

How much does  $\bar{f}$  congest an edge  $e$ ? We have that  $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{P \ni e} \bar{f}(P)] = \log^2 n \cdot \sum_{P \ni v} f(P) \leq \log^2 n$  since  $f$  is feasible. Let  $\mathcal{B}_e$  be the (bad) event that  $\sum_{P \ni e} f(P) \geq (1 + \nu) \log^2 n$ . Setting  $\mu_{\max} = \log^2 n$  and  $\delta = \nu$  in Theorem B.1, we obtain:

$$\Pr[\mathcal{B}_v] \leq \exp(-\nu \log^2 n) = n^{-\nu \log n}.$$

What value does  $\bar{f}$  achieve? We have that  $\mathbb{E}[w(f)] = \sum_h \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_h} w(P) \mathbb{E}[\bar{f}(P)] = \log^2 n \cdot \sum_h \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_h} w(h) f(P) = \log^2 n \cdot w(f)$ . Let  $\mathcal{B}_w$  be the (bad) event that  $w(f') \leq (1 - \gamma) \log^2 n \cdot w(f)$ . Setting  $\mu_{\min} = \log^2 n \cdot w(f)$  and  $\delta = \epsilon$  in Theorem B.1, we obtain:

$$\Pr[w(f') \leq (1 - \gamma) \log^2 n \cdot w(f)] \leq \exp(-\gamma^2 \log^2 n \cdot w(f)/2) = n^{-\gamma^2 w(f)/2} \leq n^{-\gamma^2/2}$$

where the last inequality follows from  $w(f) \geq w_{\max} = 1$ .

Thus by the union bound, the probability that one of the events  $(\mathcal{B}_v : v \in E(G))$  or  $\mathcal{B}_w$  occurs is at most  $\frac{n^2}{n^{\nu \log n}} + \frac{1}{n^{\gamma^2/2}}$ , which converges to 0. So with high probability, we obtain an outcome  $f'$  that avoids all of these bad events.

Now let  $\hat{f} = \frac{1}{(1+\nu) \log^2 n} f'$ . Since  $f'$  avoids  $\mathcal{B}_e$  for each edge  $e$ ,  $\hat{f}$  is feasible. Additionally, since  $f'$  avoids  $\mathcal{B}_w$ , we have that  $w(\hat{f}) = \frac{1}{(1+\nu)} w(f') \geq \frac{(1-\gamma)}{(1+\nu)} w(f) \geq (1 + \epsilon) w(f)$ .

This procedure can be de-randomized to obtain a deterministic algorithm using pessimistic estimators [21].  $\square$

## C NP-Completeness of Fractional Uncrossed Multiflow

In this section we prove the NP-completeness of deciding the existence of a fractional uncrossed flow satisfying all demands. The proof is reminiscent of a reduction by Middendorf and Pfeiffer [18], for the node-disjoint paths problem when  $G + H$  is planar. We remark that this shows NP-completeness even for leaf instances of multiflows. We refer to a fractional uncrossed flow which satisfies all demands as a *solution*.

In the first subsection, we show the problem is in NP (which is not necessarily obvious, given that uncrossed fractional multiflow is not a linear program). In the next subsection, we introduce the key gadgets which are used in the proof of NP-hardness, and in the subsection after we present the main proof of NP-hardness.

### C.1 Polynomial-Sized Solutions

Adding uncrossed-ness to the constraints of a multiflow problem means it is no longer a linear program, and it is not necessarily obvious that we should expect uncrossed solutions that are polynomial in the size of the input (i.e. in terms of  $|V|, |E(G)|, |E(H)|$ , and the bit-size of  $u, d$ ).

We give a brief argument for why polynomial-sized solutions exist. Let  $f$  be a feasible uncrossed (fractional) multiflow for a maximization or congestion instance. Consider a single commodity  $h = (s, t) \in E(H)$ , and consider the single-commodity uncrossed multiflow  $f^h$ , obtained by restricting  $f$  to  $h$ . Let  $P_1, \dots, P_k$  be the clockwise ordering of the support paths about  $s$ . Each sector (i.e. the region bounded between consecutive paths in this ordering) contains some face  $F$  of  $G$  that is not contained in any other sector. Hence there are at most  $O(|V|)$  sectors, and thus  $O(|V|)$  paths. Thus over all commodities the set of support paths  $\mathcal{P}^*$  is at most  $O(|V||E(H)|)$ . To obtain values of  $f(P)$  that have polynomial bit-size, we can set up restricted versions of the maximization/congestion linear programs that only have variables for  $P \in \mathcal{P}^*$ . By standard linear programming theory there exists a solution for these problems that has polynomial bit-size, and any solution for these LPs is uncrossed as they draw support paths only from  $\mathcal{P}^*$ .

A consequence of this argument is that the problem of determine whether  $(G, H, u, d)$  has a feasible (fractional) solution that is uncrossed is in NP, as promised by Theorem 1.5. Given a polynomial-sized candidate solution, it is straightforward to check that each pair of support paths is uncrossed and that the solution is feasible in polynomial time.

## C.2 Gadgets

Many of the ideas build on the structure of solutions for the instance in Figure 9 which we call Double Diamond.

**Lemma C.1** (Double Diamond Instance). *Let  $G, H$  be the instance of fractional uncrossed flow from Figure 9. This instance has only two possible path-solutions, and both are integral.*




Figure 9: *Double Diamond Instance*. An instance for the fractional uncrossed flow problem that has only integral solutions (one of these solutions is given by the two colored paths with value 1).

*Proof.* Suppose there is a support path  $P$  in a fractional solution starting with  $s_1u_1, u_1h_1, h_1u_2, u_2l_1$ . Then, because the support paths are uncrossed, there is no support path starting by  $s_2u_2, u_2h_1$ , as such a flow path  $Q$  would cross  $P$  at either the subpath  $Z = u_2, h_1$  or  $Z = u_2, h_1, u_1$ . Then all support paths for the demand  $s_2t_2$  uses  $u_2l_1$ , which, considering also  $P$ , implies that the total value of flow paths on that edge is more than 1, contradiction.

By similar arguments, one can show that the support paths use only one of the two highlighted paths from Figure 9  $P_1$  (in blue) and  $P_2$  (in red) and their symmetric paths by a flip along an horizontal axis  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$ . To conclude, notice that  $P_1$  crosses  $Q_2$  and  $Q_1$  crosses  $P_2$ , implying that the only two solutions are  $P_1 + P_2$  and  $Q_1 + Q_2$ .  $\square$

We next discuss the Terminal Gadget, which is a modification of the Double Diamond Instance.

**Lemma C.2** (Terminal Gadget, Figure 10). *Let  $G, H$  be an instance of fractional uncrossed flow, with at least two demands  $s_1t_1, s_2t_2$  as described in Figure 10 (modified from Figure 9). Let  $G_1$  be the subgraph induced by the nodes outside the circle. Then, for any fractional solution  $z$  to  $G, H$ ,*

- (i)  $s_1t_1$  is routed integrally inside  $G_1$ ;
- (ii) either all the support paths for  $s_2t_2$  use  $c_1x$  or they all use  $d_1y$ ;
- (iii) no support path for any other demand uses an edge of  $G_1$  (aside from  $s_1t_1, s_2t_2$ ).

*Proof.* By considering the cut  $\{c_1x, d_1y\}$ , which is crossed by the demand  $s_2t_2$ , at most half a unit of  $s_1t_1$ -flow can be routed on these edges. This implies that there exists a support  $s_1t_1$ -path contained in  $G_1$ . There are 4 possible such paths, two of length 5 and two of length 7. Let  $P = s_1u_1a_1u_2b_1d_1, v_1t_1$  and suppose that  $z(P) > 0$ . Since less than 1 unit of capacity is now available on  $u_2b_1$  for  $s_2t_2$ , there must be an support  $s_2t_2$ -path  $Q$  starting with  $s_2u_2a_1$ . Hence  $Q$  must continue to  $u_1$  and  $b_1$ , but this crosses  $P$ . Therefore  $z(P) = 0$ , and there must be a support  $s_1t_1$ -path  $P_1$  of length 5. We may assume  $P_1 = s_1u_1a_1c_1v_1t_1$ .

Suppose that there is a support  $s_2t_2$ -flow path  $P_2$ , containing  $c_1x$ . Then as  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  do not cross,  $P_2$  must contain a subpath  $b_1u_1a_1c_1x$ . Because  $\{a_1c_1, b_1d_1\}$  is a tight cut and  $a_1c_1 \in P_2$ ,  $P_2$  does not contain  $b_1d_1$ . Hence  $P_2$  starts with  $s_2u_2b_1u_1 \dots$ . Because  $z(P_2) > 0$  and  $u_1a_1 \in P_2$ , there is a support  $s_1t_1$ -path  $Q_1$  starting with  $s_1u_1b_1$ . As  $P_2$  and  $Q_1$  do not cross,  $Q_1$  continues with  $b_1u_2$ , but then it must cross  $P_2$






Figure 12: The Clause Gadget for a clause  $C$ . The two edges marked with a double blue line should be replaced by the gadget from Figure 11, allowing only one of these two edges to be used by the flow.

For any  $r \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , if  $s_r t_r$  is coherent (routing up, say), then any support  $s_r t_r$ -path is either exactly  $P_r$  or it starts with  $s_r x_r y_{r-1} \dots y_0$  and ends with  $x_4 y_3 \dots y_r t_r$ . In the latter case we say the path *escapes*. If any coherent  $s_r t_r$  does not have any escaping support paths (i.e., it routes entirely on  $P_r$ ), then it is impossible for any external demand to route using  $P_{xy}$  if  $s_r t_r$  routes up, and impossible to use  $P_{wz}$  if  $s_r t_r$  routes down. In these cases, the lemma holds with  $Q = P_{wz}$  in the former case and  $Q = P_{xy}$  in the latter. So we may assume each coherent  $s_r t_r$  has an escaping support path.

For any incoherent pair, all the support paths leave and re-enter the gadget, and therefore use up 2 units of capacity on the cut  $\{y_0 x_1, z_0 w_1, y_3 x_4, z_3 w_4\}$ . Hence if there are 2 incoherent pairs, then no external demand may cross through the gadget, in which case the lemma holds. We may thus assume that there are  $i < j$  such that  $s_i t_i$  and  $s_j t_j$  are coherent. Let  $k \in \{1, 2, 3\} \setminus \{i, j\}$ .

**Case 1:** Suppose both  $s_i t_i$  and  $s_j t_j$  are routed in the same direction, say up. Since both  $s_i t_i$  and  $s_j t_j$  have a support path that escapes, these paths cross, a contradiction.

**Case 2:** The remaining case is when both  $s_i t_i$  and  $s_j t_j$  are routed in distinct directions, and  $s_k t_k$  is not coherent (otherwise it would be in the same direction as  $s_i t_i$  or  $s_j t_j$  and the previous case applies). Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $s_i t_i$  is routed up and  $i < k$ . To avoid crossing the escaping path for  $s_i t_i$  at  $y_i$ , every support path for  $s_k t_k$  must use  $y_3 x_4$ . However, this does not leave enough capacity for the escaping path for  $s_i t_i$  that also uses this edge, a contradiction.  $\square$

By routing each demand up, or each demand down, one of the two paths  $P_{xy}$ ,  $P_{wz}$  is free to be used by support paths from external demands.

Thus, the gadget from Figure 11 can be used to replace two edges  $e'$  and  $e''$ , with the effect of forbidding the use of both edges in the fractional uncrossed flow: it adds the constraint that either  $x(e') = 0$  or  $x(e'') = 0$ .

**Lemma C.4** (Clause Gadget, Figure 12). *The clause gadget (Figure 12) has a solution even if we remove two of the three edges  $e'$ ,  $e''$ ,  $e'''$ . It has no solution if we remove all three edges  $e'$ ,  $e''$ ,  $e'''$ .*

*Proof.* It easily follows from Theorem C.3 by a simple case analysis, as only one of the two edges crossed by the double blue line can be used in routing the demand edge.  $\square$

### C.3 Hardness of Finding Uncrossed Fractional Flows

**Theorem C.5.** *The problem FRACTIONAL UNCROSSED FLOW is NP-complete.*

*Proof.* We reduce from PLANAR 3-SATISFIABILITY, in which the given 3-Sat instance has a planar variable-clause incidence graph. We may assume that each variable appears at most three times, and furthermore that it is not the same polarity in all of its incident clauses. From the variable-clause incidence graph  $G$ , we construct an uncrossed multiflow instance  $(G', H')$  as follows.

For each variable  $x$ , we replace the node for  $x$  in  $G$  with a 3-cycle, where the edges are labelled with the clauses incident with  $x$  as  $e_{x,C}$ . The clockwise order of the labels corresponds to the clockwise ordering of

the clauses about  $x$  in  $G$ . Now, we place a demand  $s_x t_x$  between two nodes of the 3-cycle, so that the two  $s_x t_x$  paths on the cycle correspond to the clauses where  $x$  appears positively and negatively. Call these two paths  $P_x$  and  $N_x$  respectively.

Now for each clause  $C$ , we replace the node for  $C$  in  $G$  with a clause gadget from Figure 12, where the edges  $e'$ ,  $e''$  and  $e'''$  of the figure are labelled by the three variables occurring in  $C$  as  $e_{C,x}$ . The clockwise order of the labels corresponds to the clockwise ordering of the variables about  $C$  in  $G$ .

Now, consider each incident variable-clause pair  $(x, C)$ . We replace the edges  $e_{x,C}$  (from the 3-cycle of  $x$ ) and  $e_{C,x}$  (from the clause gadget of  $C$ ) with a copy of the Coupled Arcs Gadget (Figure 11). By installing the Coupled Arcs Gadget in close proximity to the edges of the original graph  $G$  (recalling that the edge-labellings also mirror the original graph), we obtain a planar embedding of  $G'$ . We will abuse notation and still use  $e_{x,C}$  and  $e_{C,x}$  for the subdivided paths in the Coupled Arcs Gadget. By the properties of the Coupled Arcs Gadget, this has the effect that flow for demands outside of the Coupled Arcs Gadget can only use one of the edges  $e_{x,C}$  or  $e_{C,x}$ . Additionally, support paths cannot “hop between” the two coupled edges, so the only two possible support paths for  $s_x t_x$  are  $P_x$  and  $N_x$ . Similarly, any support path for the demand  $s_C t_C$  of a clause gadget stays entirely inside the clause gadget.

If the satisfiability instance is satisfied by a truth assignment  $\phi$ , then we can find an uncrossed (integral) routing. First, for each variable  $x$ , if  $\phi(x) = \text{true}$ , we set  $f(N_x) = 1$ , otherwise set  $f(P_x) = 1$ . This clearly satisfies all of the variable demands  $s_x t_x$ . We now extend this routing to satisfy the clause demands and the internal demands of the Coupled Arcs Gadgets.

Now, consider a clause  $C$  and its gadget. Some literal for a variable  $x$  in  $C$  is made true by the assignment. Without loss of generality, assume  $x$  occurs positively in  $C$  and  $\phi(x) = \text{True}$ . In our partial routing,  $e_{x,C}$  is in  $P_x$ , and is not used by the routing for  $s_x t_x$ . Therefore we can route the demands from the Coupled Arcs Gadget using  $e_{x,C}$ . This leaves  $e_{C,x}$  available to route the demand  $s_C t_C$  and still satisfy the Coupled Arcs Gadget strictly inside the clause gadget (as in Lemma C.4). The other two Coupled Arcs Gadgets incident with the clause gadget for  $C$  can be routed inside the clause gadget using the other variable-labelled edges. This satisfies all of the demands that appear in clause gadgets and Coupled Arcs Gadgets. In this way, we find an integral uncrossed routing.

Conversely, suppose there is a fractional uncrossed flow  $f$ . For each variable  $x$ , either  $f(P_x) > 0$  or  $f(N_x) = 1$ . Set  $\phi(x) = \text{false}$  in the former case, and  $\text{true}$  otherwise. We claim that  $\phi$  satisfies all the clauses. Consider a clause  $C$  with variables  $x_1, x_2, x_3$  (with some polarity). One of the edges  $e_{C,x_1}, e_{C,x_2}, e_{C,x_3}$  must be used by a support path for the demand  $s_C t_C$ . Say  $e_{C,x_i}$  is used. By the properties of the Coupled Arcs Gadget, this implies that the corresponding edge  $e_{x_i,C}$  in the 3-cycle for  $x_i$  is saturated by the internal demands of the Coupled Arcs Gadget and is thus not available for routing  $s_x t_x$ . If  $x_i$  occurs positively in  $C$ , this means that  $f(P_{x_i}) = 0$ , and so  $\phi(x_i) = \text{true}$ , satisfying the clause. On the hand, if  $x_i$  occurs negatively in  $C$ , this means that  $f(N_{x_i}) = 0$  and  $f(P_{x_i}) = 1$ , and so  $\phi(x_i) = \text{false}$ , satisfying the clause. As this holds for any clause,  $\phi$  is a satisfying assignment, concluding the proof of reduction.  $\square$

## C.4 Exists-Embedding Uncrossed Multiflow

**Theorem C.6.** *It is NP-hard to determine whether there is an embedding of  $G$  in which  $(G, H)$  has a fractional uncrossed multiflow.*

*Proof.* We reduce from the fixed-embedding version of fractional uncrossed multiflow. Start with a fixed embedding of  $G$ . Consider the following operation: add an edge  $e = (u_1, u_2)$  between two nodes  $u_1, u_2$  on the same face, then subdivide it into a path  $P = u_1, v_1, v_2, u_2$ , and add demand edges  $u_1 v_1, u_2 v_2$ . The new supply and demand edges have unit weight.

**Claim C.7.**  *$(G, H)$  has an uncrossed solution (in the original embedding) if and only if the new instance has an uncrossed solution.*

*Proof.* It is straightforward to verify that if  $(G, H)$  has an uncrossed solution, then so does the new instance. We show the converse, that if the new instance has an uncrossed solution, so too does  $(G, H)$ . Consider an

arbitrary uncrossed solution  $f$  for the new instance. It suffices to show that there is an uncrossed solution where the demand  $u_i v_i$  is routed entirely on the supply edge  $u_i v_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$ .

Observe that, in  $f$ , all flow for  $u_1 v_1$  that is not routed through  $u_1 v_1$  must be routed through  $u_2 v_2$ . So,  $f^{u_1 v_1}(u_1 v_1) + f^{u_1 v_1}(u_2 v_2) = 1$ . Similarly,  $f^{u_2 v_2}(u_2 v_2) + f^{u_2 v_2}(u_1 v_1) = 1$ . So, between the two new demands, all capacity on the new supply edges  $u_1 v_1, u_2 v_2$  is used. Therefore, the demands of the original demand graph  $H$  are routed (uncrossed) inside the original supply graph  $G$ . So  $(G, H)$  has an uncrossed solution.  $\diamond$

We then repeat this operation until the supply graph is a (subdivision of) a 3-connected graph, which has a unique embedding. The claim implies that the original instance  $(G, H)$  has an uncrossed solution (in its given embedding) if and only if the new instance has an uncrossed solution in its embedding, which by the uniqueness of the embedding is equivalent to the new instance having an uncrossed solution in some embedding.  $\square$

## D Colouring Uncrossed String Graphs

In this section, we prove the following result.

**Theorem D.1.** *Let  $U$  be an uncrossed string graph arising from a realization with at most  $k$  paths on any edge. Then  $\chi(U) = O(k^2 \log |E(U)|)$ .*

The following is the key lemma.

**Lemma D.2.** *Let  $U$  be an uncrossed string graph with a load  $k$  realization  $(G, \mathcal{P})$ . Then  $U$  is the union of  $O(k^2 \log |E(U)|)$  planar graphs.*

*Proof.* We generate a random subgraph  $H = (S, F)$  of  $U$  as follows. First, we select random subset  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}$  by drawing each  $P \in \mathcal{P}$  independently and uniformly at random with probability  $q = \frac{1}{k}$ . Now, for each  $e \in E(G)$  such that  $|S \cap \mathcal{P}_e| = 2$  exactly, we add to  $F$  an edge between the two members of  $S \cap \mathcal{P}_e$ . Note that  $H$  is planar.

Let  $PP' \in E(U)$ , and consider the event that  $PP' \in E(H)$ . This event happens if there exists some  $e$  with  $P, P' \in \mathcal{P}_e$  where  $P \in S, P' \in S$ , and no other path in  $\mathcal{P}_e$  is in  $S$ . Clearly there is at least one  $e$  such that  $P, P' \in \mathcal{P}_e$ , and we lower bound the probability that  $PP'$  is included due to this particular edge. Then,

$$\Pr[PP' \in E(H)] \geq q \cdot q \cdot (1 - q)^{k-2} \geq \frac{1}{k^2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-2} \geq \frac{1}{ek^2},$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that  $(1 - 1/x)^{x-2} \geq 1/e$  for all  $x > 1$ .

We repeat this process  $C = 2ek^2 \log |E(U)|$  times, independently, obtaining random subgraphs  $H_1, \dots, H_C$  of  $U$ . For  $PP' \in E(U)$ , let  $A_{PP'}$  be the event that for all  $i \in [C]$ ,  $PP' \notin E(H_i)$ . Then,

$$\Pr[A_{PP'}] \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{ek^2}\right)^{2ek^2 \log |E(U)|} \leq \left(\frac{1}{e}\right)^{2 \log |E(U)|} = |E(U)|^{-2},$$

where the second inequality follows from the fact that  $(1 - 1/x)^x \leq 1/e$  for  $x > 1$ .

Let  $A$  be the event that there exists  $PP' \in E(U)$  such that for all  $i \in [C]$ ,  $PP' \notin E(H_i)$ . That is, there exists  $PP' \in E(U)$  such that  $A_{PP'}$  holds. By a basic union bound,  $\Pr[A] \leq |E(U)| \cdot |E(U)|^{-2} < 1$ . So there is an outcome in which  $A$  does not hold. In this outcome,  $U$  is covered by the graphs  $H_1, \dots, H_C$ . Hence  $U$  is the sum of  $C$  planar graphs.  $\square$

From this, Theorem D.1 follows easily.

*Proof of Theorem D.1.* We show that  $U$  is  $O(k^2 \log |E(U)|)$ -degenerate, from which the result follows. As the property in the assumption of the theorem is a hereditary graph property, it suffices to show that  $U$  contains a node with at most  $O(k^2 \log |E(U)|)$  neighbours.

By Theorem D.2,  $U$  is the sum of  $O(k^2 \log |E(U)|)$  planar graphs. Each planar graph contributes at most  $3|V(U)|$  parallel edge classes, so it follows that  $E(U)$  contains at most  $O(k^2 |V(U)| \log |E(U)|)$  parallel edge classes. Hence it contains a node with at most  $O(k^2 \log |E(U)|)$  neighbours.  $\square$