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Abstract

We consider the problem of designing succinct navigational oracles, i.e., succinct data structures supporting basic navigational queries such as degree, adjacency and neighborhood efficiently for intersection graphs on a circle, which include graph classes such as circle graphs, $k$-polygon-circle graphs, circle-trapezoid graphs, trapezoid graphs. The degree query reports the number of incident edges to a given vertex, the adjacency query asks if there is an edge between two given vertices, and the neighborhood query enumerates all the neighbors of a given vertex. We first prove a general lower bound for these intersection graph classes, and then present a uniform approach that lets us obtain matching lower and upper bounds for representing each of these graph classes. More specifically, our lower bound proofs use a unified technique to produce tight bounds for all these classes, and this is followed by our data structures which are also obtained from a unified representation method to achieve succinctness for each class. In addition, we prove a lower bound of space for representing trapezoid graphs, and give a succinct navigational oracle for this class of graphs.
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1. Introduction

Intersection graphs of geometric objects are fascinating combinatorial objects from the point of view of algorithmic graph theory as many hard (\textsc{NP-complete} in general) optimization problems become easy, i.e., polynomially solvable when restricted to various classes of intersection graphs. Thus, they provide us with clues with respect to the line of demarcation between P
and NP, if there exists such a line. Furthermore, they also have a broad range of practical applications [1, Chapter 16]. Perhaps the simplest and most widely studied such objects are the interval graphs, intersection graphs of intervals on a line [2, 3, 4]. Several characterizations of interval graphs [4] including their linear time recognition algorithms are already known in the literature [5]. There exist many generalizations of interval graphs, and we focus particularly in this work on some of these generalizations involving intersection of geometric objects bound to a circle.

More specifically, we study circle graphs, $k$-polygon-circle graphs, circle-trapezoid graphs, and trapezoid graphs in this article. A circle graph is defined as the intersection graph of chords in a circle [6, 7]. Polygon-circle graphs [8] are the intersection graphs of convex polygons inscribed into a circle, and the special case, when all the convex polygons have exactly $k$ corners, we call the intersection graph $k$-polygon-circle [9]. Circle-trapezoid graphs are the intersection graphs of circle trapezoids on a common circle, where a circle trapezoid is defined as the convex hull of two disjoint arcs on the circle [10]. Finally, trapezoid graphs are the intersection graphs of trapezoids between two parallel lines which can be regarded as a circle with a sufficiently large radius. These graphs are not only theoretically interesting to study but they also show up in important practical application domains, e.g., in VLSI physical layout [1, 4]. In spite of having such importance and being such basic geometric graphs, we are not aware of any study of these aforementioned objects using the lens of succinct data structures [11] where we need to achieve the following twofold tasks. The first goal is to bound from below the cardinality of a set $T$ consisting of combinatorial objects with certain property, and this is followed by storing any arbitrary member $x \in T$ using the information theoretic minimum of $\log(|T|) + o(\log(|T|))$ bits (throughout this paper, log denotes the logarithm to the base 2) while still being able to support the relevant set of queries efficiently on $x$, both the tasks we focus on here. We assume the usual model of computation, namely a $\Theta(\log n)$-bit word RAM model where $n$ is the size of the input. This is a standard assumption that implies a vertex can be distinguished, in constant time, with a label that fits within a word of the RAM. Finally all the graphs we deal with in this paper are simple, undirected, unlabeled and unweighted.

### 1.1. Related Work

**Succinct navigational oracles.** There already exists a huge body of work on representing several classes of graphs succinctly along with supporting basic navigational queries efficiently. A partial list of such special graph classes would be arbitrary graphs [12], trees [13], planar graphs [14], chordal graphs [15], graphs with bounded tree-width $k$ (partial $k$-trees) [16], etc. Specially, one can consider (i) circular-arc graphs (intersection graphs on the arcs on a circle), (ii) interval graphs (a sub-class of circular-arc graphs), and (iii) permutation graphs (intersection graphs of line segments between two parallel lines) as the special case of the intersection graphs on a circle. For interval graphs and circular-arc graphs, Gavoille and Paul [17] (and independently, Acan et al. [18]) showed that $n \log n - O(n \log \log n)$ bits are necessary for representing an interval or a
circular-arc graph with \( n \) vertices. In [18], the authors also presented succinct navigation oracles for both graph classes. Also for permutation graphs, a lower bound of \((n \log n - O(n \log \log))\) bits is known [19, 20].

**Algorithmic graph-theoretic results.** All the intersection graphs that we focus in this paper are very well studied in the algorithmic graph theory literature. Circle graphs (which are essentially the same as overlap graphs\(^1\)) can be recognized in polynomial time along with admitting polynomial time algorithms for various optimization problems like feedback vertex set and independent set (see [1] and references therein for more details). These graphs were first introduced in the early 1970s, under the name alternance graphs, as a tool used for sorting permutations using stacks [7]. The introduction of polygon-circle graphs (which are same as spider graphs [8]) was motivated by the fact that this class of graphs is closed under taking induced minors. Even though the problem of recognising polygon-circle and \( k \)-polygon-circle graphs is \textsc{NP-complete} [21, 22], many optimization problems that are otherwise \textsc{NP-Complete} on general graphs can be solved in polynomial time given a polygon-circle representation of a graph (see [1] for more details). Felsner et al. [10] introduced circle-trapezoid graphs as an extension of trapezoid graphs and devised polynomial time algorithms for maximum weighted clique and maximum weighted independent set problems. We refer the reader to [3, 4, 1, 23] for more details on these graph classes and other related problems.

1.2. Our Results

In this paper, we consider a graph class defined as the intersection graphs of objects on a circle, where objects are generalized polygons, polygons whose corners are on the circle and edges are either chords or arcs of the circle. This contains many graph classes including (1) circular-arc graphs, (2) \( k \)-polygon-circle graphs, which are intersection graphs of polygons on a circle, where every polygon has \( k \) chords, and (3) circle graphs (4) circle-trapezoid graphs.

Note that these example classes correspond to \( k \)-polygon circle graphs with a fixed \( k \), while our upper and lower bounds in fact apply to a more general case when the graph contains polygons with different number of corners.

We first show a space lower bound for representing the above graph classes (Theorem 3.1). For circle graphs, we show that the lower bound from Section 3.1 can be improved to \( n \log n - O(n) \) bits. Furthermore using a similar idea to prove Theorem 3.1, we also obtain a space lower bound for representing trapezoid graphs. These lower bound results are summarized in Table 1.

Next, we consider data structures for representing families of intersection graphs on a circle which support three basic navigation queries efficiently, which are defined as follows. Given a graph \( G = (V, E) \) such that \(|V| = n\) and two vertices \( u, v \in V \), (i) \texttt{degree}(v) query returns the number of vertices that are adjacent to \( v \) in \( G \), (ii) \texttt{adjacent}(u, v) query returns true if \( u \) and \( v \) are

\(^1\)https://www.graphclasses.org/classes/gc’913.html
Table 1: Lower bounds of families of intersection graphs.

| Graph class              | Space lower bound (in bits)                  | Reference (this paper) |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| circle                  | \(n \log n - O(n)\)                         | Theorem 4.2             |
| \(k\)-polygon-circle    | \((k - 1)n \log n - O(kn \log \log n)\)     | Theorem 3.1, \(k = \text{polylog}(n)\) |
| circle-trapezoid        | \(3n \log n - 4 \log \log n - O(n)\)        | Corollary 3.2           |
| trapezoid               | \(3n \log n - 4 \log \log n - O(n)\)        | Lemma 5.1               |

adjacent in \(G\), and false otherwise, and finally (iii) \text{neighborhood}(v) query returns all the vertices that are adjacent to \(v\) in \(G\).

We give a unified representation of families of intersection graphs of generalized polygons on a circle where generalized polygon is define as a shape where every pair of consecutive corners are connected by either an arc or a chord on a circle. From these results, we can obtain succinct data structures which can support adjacent, degree, and neighborhood queries efficiently, for all the graphs classes in Table 1, including interval and permutation graphs. Note that for the graph classes in Table 1, these are the first succinct data structures.

Finally, for circle graphs and trapezoid graphs, we present alternative succinct data structures which support faster degree queries (for vertices whose degree is \(\Omega(\log n/\log \log n)\)).

1.3. Paper Organization

After listing preliminary data structures that will be used throughout our paper in Section 2, we move on to present the central contributions of our work. In Section 3, we prove the lower bound of space to represent intersection graphs of generalized polygons on a circle, from which the lower bound results in Table 1 for \(k\)-polygon-circle and circle-trapezoid graphs follow, and present our general upper bound result (see Theorem 3.3) that provides succinct data structures for all these graphs in a unified manner. In Section 4, we give a space lower bound for representing circle graphs which improves the lower bound obtained from Theorem 3.1, and also give an alternative succinct representation for circle graphs. In Section 5, we give a space lower bound for representing trapezoid graphs, and augment it with an alternative succinct representation for trapezoid graphs. Finally, we conclude in Section 6 with some open problems.

2. Preliminaries

In this section, we introduce some data structures that will be used in the rest of the paper.

**Rank, Select and Access queries.** Let \(A[1 \ldots n]\) be an array of size \(n\) over an alphabet \(\Sigma = \{0, 1, \ldots, \sigma - 1\}\) of size \(\sigma\). Then for \(1 \leq i \leq n\) and \(\alpha \in \Sigma\), we define the rank, select and access queries on \(A\) as follows.

- \(\text{rank}_\alpha(i, A)\) returns the number of occurrences of \(\alpha\) in \(A[1 \ldots i]\).
• \( \text{select}_\alpha(i, A) \) returns the position \( j \) where \( A[j] \) is the \( i \)-th \( \alpha \) in \( A \).

• \( \text{access}(i, A) \) returns \( A[i] \).

Then, the following data structures are known for supporting the above queries.

**Lemma 1** ([24]). Given a bit array \( B[1 \ldots n] \) of size \( n \), there exists an \( n + o(n) \)-bit data structure which answers \( \text{rank}_\alpha \), \( \text{select}_\alpha \) for \( \alpha = [0, 1] \), and \( \text{access} \) queries on \( B \) in \( O(1) \) time.

**Lemma 2** ([25]). Given an array \( A[1 \ldots n] \) over \( \Sigma = \{0, 1, \ldots, \sigma - 1\} \) for any \( \sigma > 1 \), there exists an \( n H_0 + o(n) \cdot O(H_0 + 1) \)-bit data structure that answers \( \text{rank}_\alpha \) and \( \text{access} \) queries in \( O(1 + \log \log \sigma) \) time and \( \text{select}_\alpha \) queries in \( O(1) \) time on \( S \), for any \( \alpha \in \Sigma \), where \( H_0 \leq \log \sigma \) is the order-0 entropy of \( A \).

**Range minimum and maximum queries.** Let \( A[1 \ldots n] \) be an array of size \( n \) over a totally ordered set. Then for \( 1 \leq i \leq j \leq n \), we define the \( \text{rmq}, \text{rMq} \) queries on \( A \) as follows.

• \( \text{rmq}(A, i, j) \): returns the index \( m \) of \( A \) that attains the minimum value \( A[m] \) in \( A[i \ldots j] \). If there is a tie, returns the leftmost one.

• \( \text{rMq}(A, i, j) \): returns the index \( m \) of \( A \) that attains the maximum value \( A[m] \) in \( A[i \ldots j] \). If there is a tie, returns the leftmost one.

**Lemma 3** ([26]). Given an array \( A[1 \ldots n] \) of size \( n \) over a totally ordered set, there exists a \( 2n + o(n) \)-bit data structure which answers \( \text{rmq}(A, i, j) \) queries in \( O(1) \) time.

Note that the above structure does not access \( A \) at query time. Similarly, one can also obtain a \( 2n + o(n) \)-bit data structure supporting range maximum queries in \( O(1) \) time.

### 3. Unified Lower and Upper Bounds

In this section, we give a unified representation of families of intersection graphs of generalized polygons on a circle. Here, we define a generalized polygon as a shape where every pair of consecutive corners are connected by either an arc or a chord on the circle. We assume that two arcs not adjacent, otherwise we can merge them into a single arc. Note that we define a single chord (or an arc) as a polygon with two corners. Since there is no restriction on the number of corners for each polygon, this graph is a generalization of circle, \( k \)-polygon-circle and circle-trapezoid graphs. We note that a circular-arc graph can be represented by an intersection graph of generalized polygons with one arc and one chord on a circle, because if a shape on a circle intersects the chord, it always intersects the arc.
3.1. General Lower Bounds

In this section, we prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.1.** Consider a class of intersection graphs on a circle consisting of \( n \) polygons, each of which has at most \( k \) chords. Let \( n_i \) be the number of polygons on the circle with \( i \) corners, \( \bar{n} = (n_2, n_3, \ldots, n_k) \), and \( N = \sum_{i=2}^{k} i \cdot n_i \). Let \( P_{n,k,h} \) denote the total number of such graphs. Then, the following holds:

\[
\log P_{n,k,h} \geq \sum_{i=2}^{k} n_i \cdot \frac{n}{i} - n \log n - O(N \log \log n).
\]

**Proof.** We count the number of graphs in the class of intersection graphs on a circle consisting of \( n \) polygons, each of which has at most \( k \) chords and no arcs. This gives a lower bound of \( P_{n,k,h} \).

Suppose that the circle polygon graph is given as a polygon circle representation with \( n \) polygons on the circle. We will consider partially-colored circle polygon graphs obtained from the following construction. Take \( m \leq n \) (to be determined) non-intersecting polygons \( A_1, \ldots, A_m \) and paint \( A_i \) with color \( i \). Let the set of these \( m \) polygons be \( S \). For each of the remaining \( n - m \) polygons, we will choose a subset of \( S \), and for each such subset \( X \) we will construct a polygon with \( |X| \) corners such that distinct corners lie on distinct polygons from \( X \). Note that each edge of such a polygon intersects with exactly two colored polygons. This construction gives us a polygon-circle graph with \( n \) vertices, where \( m \) of these vertices are colored and they form an independent set. For \( 2 \leq i \leq k \), let \( n_i \) and \( m_i \) (\( \leq n_i \)) be the number of all polygons and colored polygons on the circle with \( i \) corners respectively. Similarly, let \( N \) and \( M \) be the number of total corners on the all polygons and colored polygons, respectively. From the definition, it is clear that \( n = \sum_{i=2}^{k} n_i, m = \sum_{i=2}^{k} m_i, N = \sum_{i=2}^{k} i \cdot n_i, \) and \( M = \sum_{i=2}^{k} i \cdot m_i \). Let \( \bar{n} = (n_2, n_3, \ldots, n_k) \) and \( \bar{m} = (m_2, m_3, \ldots, m_k) \). Let us denote by \( C_{n,k,h} \) the number of such colored polygon-circle graphs, and by \( P_{n,k,h} \) the number of polygon-circle graphs for a given \( k \) and \( \bar{n} \).

We can first obtain an inequality \((n_2)^{m_2} \cdots (n_k)^{m_k} \cdot m! \cdot P_{n,k,h} \geq C_{n,k,h,\bar{m}} \) since every graph counted in \( C_{n,k,h,\bar{m}} \) can be obtained by choosing and coloring \( m_i \) polygons from \( n_i \) polygons on its polygon circle representation of uncolored one for each \( 2 \leq i \leq k \). Now we will find a lower bound for \( C_{n,k,h,\bar{m}} \), which in turn will give a lower bound for \( P_{n,k,h} \). Let us denote the collection of \( i \)-subsets of \( S \) by \( S_i \). Hence \(|S_i| = \binom{n}{i}\). Also let \( S \) be a set of all possible \((k - 1)\)-tuples \((Y_2, Y_3, \ldots, Y_k)\) where \( Y_i \) is a subset of \( S_i \) with \(|Y_i| = n_i - m_i \). Then, \(|S| = \binom{\bar{n}}{m_2} \binom{\bar{n} - m_{m_2}}{m_3} \cdots \binom{\bar{n} - m_{m_{m_1}}}{m_k} \). Now, the total number of graphs obtained by the above construction is at least \(|S|\) by the following observations:

(i) Each element in \( S \) defines at least one colored graph with \( \sum_{i=2}^{k} (n_i - m_i) = n - m \) uncolored polygons (we might get more as the relative order of the corners of polygons within a colored polygon matters).
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Figure 1: A realization of $G_{T_1}$, where $G_{T_1} = \{123, 235, 345\}$.

(ii) If $T_1$ and $T_2$ are elements of $S$ and $T_1 \neq T_2$, then the graphs corresponding to these two elements will be different. Basically, in the graphs obtained from this construction, uncolored $n - m$ vertices are distinguishable by only looking at their colored neighbors.

Figure 2: Another realization of $G_{T_1}$. Note that the edge between the vertices 123 and 345 is missing in this case

Example. Let $k = 3$, $m = 5$, and $n = 8$. We consider triangle-circle graphs (the special case of generalized 3-polygon circle graph when $n_3 = n$, and $n_2 = 0$) with 8 vertices, of which 5 are colored with 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. Then $S = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ and $S = \{123, 124, 125, 134, 135, 145, 234, 235, 245, 345\}$. Here we simply write $xyz$ to denote the 2-tuple $(\emptyset, \{x, y, z\})$ for $1 \leq x, y, z \leq 5$. Any 3-element subset of $S$ will give us a graph. For instance, let $T_1 = \{123, 235, 345\}$ and $T_2 = \{123, 235, 145\}$. The graphs $G_{T_1}$ and $G_{T_2}$ corresponding to subsets $T_1$ and $T_2$, respectively, are different for the following simple reason: $G_{T_1}$ has an uncolored vertex that has colored neighbors 3, 4, and 5 but $G_{T_2}$ does not have such a vertex. (Compare Figure 2 and 3.) On the other hand, more than one graph might be possible corresponding to only one subset $T_1$ as shown in the Figure 1 and 2. Both of them use the same $T_1 = \{123, 235, 345\}$. The edges between colored vertices and uncolored vertices are the same but the set of edges between the uncolored vertices are different.

Now we obtain the lower bound of $\log P_{n,k,h}$ as follows. From the above arguments, we obtain
Figure 3: Some realization of $G_{T_2}$, where $G_{T_2} = \{123, 235, 145\}$.

$C_{n,k,h,n} \geq \binom{n}{m_1} \binom{n}{m_2} \cdots \binom{n}{m_k}$. Combining with the upper bound of $C_{n,k,h,n}$, we obtain

$$\log P_{n,k,h} \geq \sum_{i=2}^{k} \log \binom{m_i}{n_i} - \sum_{i=2}^{k} \log \frac{n_i}{m_i} - \log m!.$$  

We set $m = \frac{n}{\log n}$. For each term on the right-hand side, the following inequalities hold (using the inequality $\binom{a}{b} \geq \left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^b$).

$$\sum_{i=2}^{k} \log \binom{m_i}{n_i} \geq \sum_{i=2}^{k} \log \frac{n_i - m_i}{n_i - m_i}^{n_i - m_i}$$

$$= \sum_{i=2}^{k} (n_i - m_i) \log \binom{m_i}{n_i} - \sum_{i=2}^{k} (n_i - m_i) \log (n_i - m_i)$$

$$\geq \sum_{i=2}^{k} (n_i - m_i) i \log \frac{m_i}{n_i} - n \log n$$

$$= \sum_{i=2}^{k} (n_i - m_i) i \left( \log \frac{n_i}{m_i} - \log \log n \right) - n \log n$$

$$= \sum_{i=2}^{k} n_i \cdot i \log \frac{n_i}{m_i} - \sum_{i=2}^{k} m_i \cdot i \log \frac{n_i}{m_i} - N \log n - n \log n$$

$$\geq \sum_{i=2}^{k} n_i \cdot i \log \frac{n_i}{m_i} - M \log n - N \log n - n \log n$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{i=2}^{k} \log \binom{m_i}{n_i} \leq \sum_{i=2}^{k} m_i \log n = m \log n \leq n$$

Therefore,

$$\log P_{n,k,h} \geq \sum_{i=2}^{k} n_i \cdot i \log \frac{n_i}{m_i} - M \log n - N(\log k + \log \log n) - n \log n - O(n).$$
To satisfy $M \leq N/\log n$, we choose (and color) $m$ polygons as follows. For $1 \leq j \leq n$, let $d_j$ be the number of corners of $j$-th polygon in the representation. Without loss of generality, we order the polygons to satisfy $d_1 \leq d_2 \leq \cdots \leq d_n$. Now we claim that $M \leq N/\log n$ if we choose first $m$ polygons to be colored. To prove the claim, suppose $d_{m+1} \geq N/n$. Then $\sum_{j=m+1}^n d_j \geq (n-m) \cdot N/n = N(1 - 1/\log n)$, which implies $M = \sum_{j=1}^m d_j \leq N/\log n$. Next, suppose $d_{m+1} < N/n$. In this case, $M \leq N/n \cdot m = N/\log n$, which proves the claim. From the assumption $k = \text{polylog}(n)$, $N(\log k + \log \log n) = O(N \log \log n)$. Thus, $\log P_{n,k,\beta} \geq \sum_{i=2}^k n_i \cdot i \log \frac{n}{i} - n \log n - O(N \log \log n)$. \hfill \square

**Corollary 3.2.** Space lower bounds for circle-trapezoid graphs and circular-arc graphs with $n$ vertices are $3n \log n - O(n \log \log n)$ bits and $n \log n - O(n \log \log n)$ bits, respectively.

**Proof.** For circle-trapezoid graphs, in the proof of Theorem 3.1, we create $m = n/\log n$ colored circle-trapezoids, consisting of two arcs and two chords, and place them on the circle so that they do not overlap each other. Then we place $n - m$ uncolored circle-trapezoids with two arcs and two chords such that each chord intersects with exactly two colored circle-trapezoids. The theorem gives a lower bound for the number of such graphs, which is a lower bound of the number of circle-trapezoid graphs.

For circular-arc graphs, instead of a circle-trapezoid, we consider a 2-polygon with one arc and one chord. Then we obtain the desired bound. \hfill \square

Note that to obtain a space lower bound for trapezoid graphs, we cannot use Theorem 3.1 because we cannot distinguish the upper line and the lower line. Another proof is given in Section 5.1.

### 3.2. A Succinct Representation

Now we provide a succinct representation for generalized circle polygon graph $G$ with $n$ generalized polygons on a circle. Let $N$ be the total number of corners of the polygons.

Note that the recognition algorithm of general $k$-polygon-circle graphs, which is a sub-class of the generalized circle polygon graphs, is NP-complete [22]. Thus we assume that $G$ is given as a polygon-circle representation with $n$ polygons, which is defined (for a graph $G = (V,E)$) as a mapping $\mathcal{P}$ of vertices in $V$ to polygons inscribed into a circle such that $(u,v) \in E$ if and only if $\mathcal{P}(u)$ intersects $\mathcal{P}(v)$.

Then, a corner-string of a polygon-circle representation is a string produced by starting at any arbitrary location on the circle, and proceeding around the circle in clockwise order, adding a label denoting the vertex represented by a polygon each time a corner of a polygon encountered (denoted by the array $S$ in Figure 4). Note that a single polygon-circle representation has many possible corner-strings, depending on the starting point. As the naive encoding of $S$ uses $N[\log n]$ bits, it is not succinct, and does not support efficient queries. Therefore we convert $S$ into another representation and add auxiliary data structures for efficient queries. First, we
convert $S$ into a bit array $F$ of length $N$ and another integer array $S'$ of length $N - n$. The entry $F[i]$ is 1 if $S[i]$ is the first occurrence of the value in $S$, and 0 otherwise. The array $S'$ stores all entries of $S$ except for the first occurrence of each value in the same order as in $S$. We store $F$ using the data structure of Lemma 1, and $S'$ using the data structure of Lemma 2. Then the space becomes $(N - n) \log n + O(N \log n / \log \log n)$ bits, which is succinct. Using $F$ and $S'$, we show how to support access$(i, S)$ and rank$_a(i, S)$ in $O(\log \log n)$ time and select$_a(i, S)$ in $O(1)$ time.

- **access$(i, S)$**
  \[
  \begin{cases} 
  \text{rank}_a(i, F) & (\text{access}(i, F) = 1) \\
  \text{access}(\text{rank}_0(i, F), S') & (\text{otherwise}) 
  \end{cases}
  \]

- **rank$_a(i, S)$**
  \[
  \text{rank}_a(\text{rank}_0(i, F), S') + \begin{cases} 
  1 & (\text{rank}_1(i, F) \geq S[i]) \\
  0 & (\text{otherwise}) 
  \end{cases}
  \]

- **select$_a(i, S)$**
  \[
  \begin{cases} 
  \text{select}_a(\alpha, F) & (i = 1) \\
  \text{select}_a(\text{select}_a(i - 1, S'), F) & (\text{otherwise}) 
  \end{cases}
  \]

We can regard as if the array $S$ were stored and access to $S$ were done in $O(\log \log n)$ time.

Now we show the space bound of the representation. We compress the corner-string $S$, in which a character $2 \leq i \leq k$ appears $n_i$ times in $S$. The length of $S$ is $N = \sum_{i=2}^{k} n_i \cdot i$. For each character $i$, its first occurrence in $S$ is encoded in a bit-vector of length $N$. Other characters are stored in a string $S'$ of length $N - n$. Each character $i$ appears $n_i - 1$ times in $S'$. We compress $S'$ into its order-0 entropy. Then the total space is

\[
\sum_{i=2}^{k} n_i (i - 1) \log \frac{N - n}{i - 1} + O(N) \leq \sum_{i=2}^{k} n_i (i - 1) \log \frac{nk}{i/2} + O(N) \\
\leq \sum_{i=2}^{k} n_i \cdot i \log \frac{n}{i} - n \log n + O(N \log k).
\]

If $k = o(\log n / \log \log n)$, the lower bound of Theorem 3.1 is

\[
\log P_{n,k,h} \geq \sum_{i=2}^{k} n_i \cdot i \log \frac{n}{i} - n \log n - O(N \log \log n)
\]

\[
\geq \sum_{i=2}^{k} n_i \cdot i \log \frac{n}{i} - n \log n - o(n \log n).
\]

On the other hand, the upper bound is

\[
\sum_{i=2}^{k} n_i \cdot i \log \frac{n}{i} - n \log n + O(N \log k) \leq \sum_{i=2}^{k} n_i \cdot i \log \frac{n}{i} - n \log n + o(n \log n).
\]

Therefore this upper bound matches the lower bound, up to lower order terms.
### 3.3. Query Algorithms

We now describe how to support navigation queries using the data structure of Section 3.2. Consider a vertex \( u \) in \( G \). Assume the vertex \( u \) corresponds to a \( k \)-polygon, which is represented by \( k \) many integers \( u \) in \( S \). The polygon has \( k \) edges, for \( i \)-th edge \((1 \leq i \leq k - 1)\), we consider an interval of \( S \) between \( i \)-th occurrence of \( u \) and \((i + 1)\)-st occurrence of \( u \), that is, \([\text{select}_u(i, S), \text{select}_u(i + 1, S)]\). Let \( I(u, i) \) denote this interval. For \( k \)-th edge, the interval becomes the union of \([\text{select}_u(k, S), N]\) and \([1, \text{select}_u(1, S)]\).

Consider two polygons \( u \) and \( v \). We check for each side \( e \) of \( u \) if \( e \) intersects with a side \( f \) of \( v \). Let \( I(u, i) = [\ell, r] \) be the interval of \( e \) and \( I(v, j) = [s, t] \) be the interval of \( f \). There are four cases. (1) \( e \) is a chord and \( f \) is a chord. Then \( e \) and \( f \) intersect iff \([\ell, r] \cap [s, t] \neq \emptyset \), \([s, t] \not\subseteq [\ell, r] \), and \([\ell, r] \not\subseteq [s, t] \). (2) \( e \) is an arc and \( f \) is a chord. This case is the same as (1) in addition to the case when \([s, t] \subset [\ell, r] \). (3) \( e \) is a chord and \( f \) is an arc. This case is the same as (1) in addition to the case when \([\ell, r] \subset [s, t] \). (4) \( e \) is an arc and \( f \) is an arc. Then \( e \) and \( f \) intersect iff \([\ell, r] \cap [s, t] \neq \emptyset \).

We add new data structures \( N, N_a, P_a, N_c, P_c \), and \( A \) defined as follows. Let \( I(u, i) = [\ell, r] \) denote the \( i \)-th interval of \( S \), defined above, and \( d_u \) be the number of corners of \( u \). Then \( A \) is a bit array of length \( N \) where \( A[[i]] = 1 \) if and only if \([\ell, r] \) corresponds to an arc of \( u \). The arrays \( N, N_a, P_a, N_c, \) and \( P_c \) are defined as follows where \( u = S[i] \).

\[
N[i] = \begin{cases} 
\text{select}_u(\text{rank}_u(i, S) + 1, S) & \text{if } \text{rank}_u(i, S) < d_u \\
\infty & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

\[
N_a[i] = \begin{cases} 
\text{select}_u(\text{rank}_u(i, S) + 1, S) & \text{if } A[i] = 1 \text{ and } \text{rank}_u(i, S) < d_u \\
\infty & \text{if } A[i] = 1 \text{ and } \text{rank}_u(i, S) = d_u \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

\[
P_a[i] = \begin{cases} 
\text{select}_u(\text{rank}_u(i, S) - 1, S) & \text{if the side ending at } S[i] \text{ is an arc and } \text{rank}_u(i, S) > 1 \\
\infty & \text{if the side ending at } S[i] \text{ is an arc and } \text{rank}_u(i, S) = 1 \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

\[
N_c[i] = \begin{cases} 
\text{select}_u(\text{rank}_u(i, S) + 1, S) & \text{if } A[i] = 0 \text{ and } \text{rank}_u(i, S) < d_u \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

\[
P_c[i] = \begin{cases} 
\text{select}_u(\text{rank}_u(i, S) - 1, S) & \text{if the side ending at } S[i] \text{ is a chord and } \text{rank}_u(i, S) > 1 \\
\infty & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

The array \( N_a[i] (N_c[i]) \) stores the other endpoint of an arc (a chord) starting from \( S[i] \). Similarly, the array \( P_a[i] (P_c[i]) \) stores the other endpoint of an arc (a chord) ending with \( S[i] \). Finally, the array \( N[i] \) stores the other endpoint of an arc or a chord starting from \( S[i] \). The difference between \( N_a \) and \( N_c \) is that in \( N_c \), we do not store the last side of a polygon. We do not store these arrays explicitly; we store only the range maximum data structures for \( N, N_a \) and \( N_c \), and
the range minimum data structures for $P_a$ and $P_c$. We can obtain any entry of these arrays in $O(\log \log n)$ time using the above formula.

**Lemma 4.** If generalized polygons $u$ and $v$ intersect, there exists a side $e$ of $u$ with interval $[\ell, r]$ and a side $f$ of $v$ with interval $[s, t]$ satisfying at least one of the following.

1. Both $e$ and $f$ are chords, neither $e$ or $f$ is the last side, and $(\ell < s < r$ and $r < t (= N_c[s]))$ or $(\ell < t < r$ and $\ell > s (= N_a[t]))$.

2. $e$ is an arc and $f$ is a chord, $f$ is not the last side, and $\ell < t (= N_a[s]) < r$ or $\ell < s (= P_a[t]) < r$.

3. $e$ is a chord and $f$ is an arc, $e$ is not the last side, and $s < r < t (= N_a[s])$ or $s (= P_a[t]) < \ell < t$.

4. Both $e$ and $f$ are arcs, and $s < r$ and $\ell < t (= N_a[s])$.

Note that for an arc $e$ that is the last side of $u$, the interval is divided into two. We regard as if $e$ is divided into two arcs and apply the lemma to each of them.

Figure 4 shows an example of our representation. For a chord of polygon 2 whose interval is $[8, 12]$, polygons 1 and 4 intersect with the chord because $N_c[10] = 14 > 12$ and $P_c[9] = 1 < 8$. For a chord of polygon 3 whose interval is $[5, 6]$, polygon 2 intersects with the chord because $N_a[2] = 8 > 6$. For an arc of polygon 1 whose interval is $[9, 10]$, polygons 4 intersects with the arc because $N_a[7] = 11 > 9.$
Using this idea, we obtain an algorithm for adjacent query. 

**adjacent(\(u, v\)) query:** Consider the intervals \(I(u, 1), I(u, 2), \ldots, I(u, d_u)\) and \(I(v, 1), I(v, 2), \ldots, I(v, d_v)\). We scan these intervals in the clockwise order on the circle, and for each endpoint of an interval, we check the condition of Lemma 4. For each interval, checking this condition takes \(O(\log \log n)\) time, and since we need to check at most \(d_u + d_v\) intervals, the time complexity is \(O(k \log \log n)\).

Next we consider neighborhood(\(u\)) query. For each side (chord or arc) of \(u\), we want to enumerate all generalized polygons \(v\) satisfying the conditions of Lemma 4. For each chord \(e\) of \(u\), we can find all chords which intersect with \(u\) as follows. Let \([\ell, r]\) be the interval of \(e\). First we obtain \(m = rMQ(N_e, \ell, r)\). If \(N_e[m] \leq r\), all entries of \(N_e\) in \([\ell, r]\) are less than \(r\), and there are no polygons intersecting \(e\). Therefore we stop enumeration. If \(N_e[m] > r\), the polygon \(S[m]\) intersects with \(u\). To check if there is another such polygon, we recursively search for \([\ell, m - 1]\) and \([m + 1, r]\). The time complexity is \(O(d \log \log n)\) where \(d\) is the number of entries \(m\) such that \(N_e[m] > r\). We also process \(P_c\) analogously.

For an arc \(e\) of \(u\), we can enumerate all chords of the other generalized polygons which intersects with \(e\) is obtained by finding all \(S[m]\) such that \(\ell < m < r\). Such distinct \(m\) can be obtained by finding all \(m\) such that (i) \(\ell < m < r\), and (ii) \(\ell < N_e[m]\) or \(P_c[m] < r\) using the range maximum data structure.

For a chord \(e\) of \(u\), we can enumerate all arcs of other generalized polygons which intersects with \(e\) is obtained by finding all \(S[m]\) such that \(1 \leq m < r\) and \(N_e[m] > r\), or \(\ell < m \leq N\) and \(P_e[m] < r\).

For an arc \(e\) of \(u\), we can enumerate all arcs of other generalized polygons which intersects with \(e\) is obtained by finding all \(S[m]\) such that \(1 \leq m < r\) and \(N_e[m] > r\), or \(\ell < m \leq N\) and \(P_e[m] < r\).

**neighborhood(\(u\)) query:** For each interval \(I(u, i) = [\ell, r]\), we output all polygons \(S[m]\) satisfying one of the above conditions. However there may exist duplicates. To avoid outputting the same polygon twice, we use a bit array \(D[1 \ldots n]\) to mark which polygon is already output. The bit array is initialized by 0 when we create the data structure. At a query process, before outputting a polygon \(v\), we check if \(D[v] = 1\). If it is, \(v\) is already output and we do not output again. If not, we output \(v\) and set \(D[v] = 1\). After processing all intervals of \(u\), we have to clean \(D\). To do so, we run the same algorithm again. But this time we output nothing and set \(D[v] = 0\) for all \(v\) found by the algorithm. The time complexity is \(O(\text{degree}(v) \cdot k \log \log n)\) where \(k\) is the maximum number of sides in each generalized polygon.

**degree(\(v\)) query:** The degree(\(v\)) can be answered by returning the size of the output of the neighborhood(\(u\)) query, in \(O(\text{degree}(v) \cdot k \log \log n)\) time. Note that by adding an integer array of length \(n\) storing the degree of each vertex explicitly, degree(\(v\)) can be supported in \(O(1)\) time. The whole data structure is still succinct if \(k = \omega(1)\), but it is not if \(k = O(1)\).

Finally, we show how one can represent various classes of intersection graphs by our representation. Generalized polygons in each class are represented as follows.
• $k$-polygon-circle: set all $A[i] = 0$ for all $i$ (all sides are chords).

• circle-trapezoid: the number of sides is 4 and arcs and chords appear alternately.

• trapezoid: we split a circle in half equally (upper and lower part), and both upper and lower part have 2 corners. Now arcs and chords appear alternately, from the arcs on the upper part.

• circle and permutation: the number of sides is 2 and all sides are chords.

• circular-arc and interval: the number of sides is 2 and there are an arc and a chord. Set all the entries of $N_c$ to be 0 and $P_c$ to be $\infty$ so that the query algorithms do not output any chord.

Thus, we obtain the following result.

**Theorem 3.3.** Consider an intersection graph of $n$ (generalized) polygons on a circle. Let $n_i$ be the number of all polygons on the circle with $i$ corners ($2 \leq i \leq k$), where $k$ is the maximum number of corners among the polygons on a circle, and $N$ be the total number of corners of the polygons. There exist an $(\sum_{i=2}^{k} n_i \cdot i \log \frac{n}{i} - n \log n + O(N \log k))$-bit representation of the graph that can support adjacent$(u,v)$ query in $O(k \log \log n)$ time, and neighborhood$(v)$ and degree$(v)$ queries in $O(k|\text{degree}(v)| \cdot \log \log n)$ time. Also, the representation is succinct (i.e., matches the lower bound of Theorem 3.1 to within lower order terms) when $k = o(\log n / \log \log n)$.

**Corollary 3.4.** For an intersection graph of $n$ (generalized) polygons with at most $k$ corners on a circle, let $N$ be the total number of corners of the polygons. There exist an ($(N - n) \log n + O(N \log k))$-bit representation of the graph. For any $k$-polygon-circle graph, there exists a $((k - 1)n \log n + O(nk \log k))$-bit representation.

### 4. Circle graphs

In this section, we first show that for circle graphs, the lower bound of Theorem 3.1 can be improved to $n \log n - O(n)$ bits. Next, we give an alternative succinct representation of circle graphs, which can answer degree$(v)$ queries independent of $|\text{degree}(v)|$, but takes more time for the other two queries compared to the representation of Theorem 3.3.

#### 4.1. Lower bound

In this section we show that $\log C_n \geq n \log n - O(n)$ as $n \to \infty$, where $C_n$ is the number of unlabeled circle graphs with $n$ vertices. We first take a circle with $2n$ equally spaced points on it, and label the points 1 to $2n$ clockwise such that the first $n$ points lie on the upper semicircle and the rest lie on the lower semicircle. These $2n$ points will be the endpoints of $n$ disjoint chords. First, on each semicircle, we take $k$ chords, each of which determines an arc with $\ell$ points on
it, excluding the endpoints of the chord. So the first chord on the upper semicircle will connect the points 1 and $\ell + 2$, the next chord will connect the points $\ell + 3$ and $2\ell + 4$, and etc. We will call these chords *special* chords. Now color these special chords with the colors 1 through $2k$ in the canonical order, i.e., in the order we see them when we traverse the circle clockwise starting from point 1. So far, we have used $4k$ out of $2n$ points, and the remaining $2n - 4k$ points lie on $2k$ arcs determined by the $2k$ special chords. Let these arcs be $A_1, \ldots, A_k$ (for the upper semicircle) and $A_{k+1}, \ldots, A_{2k}$ (for the lower semicircle) (see Figure 5 for an example). Since we want $\ell$ to satisfy $2k\ell + 4k = 2n$, $\ell$ is defined to $\frac{2n-4k}{2k}$. From now on we will assume $k$ and $\ell$ are integers where $2k\ell + 4k = 2n$. (When they are not integers, we can easily modify the proof by taking appropriate ceilings and/or floors.)

Now what we want is to match the unused $k\ell$ points on the upper semicircle with the $k\ell$ unused points on the lower semicircle. The number of such matchings is $(k\ell)!$. For each pair in the matching, if we draw the chord connecting the points in the pair, we get $n$ chords which gives a colored circle graph. (Each chord corresponds to a vertex.) The $2k$ vertices corresponding to the special $2k$ chords are colored 1 through $2k$ (in the same canonical order), and the other $n - 2k$ vertices are uncolored.

Let $M$ be a matching from $\cup_{i=1}^k A_i$ to $\cup_{j=k+1}^{2k} A_j$. We call $M$ a *bad matching* if it contains a triple of pairs $((x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), (x_3, y_3))$ such that $x_1, x_2, x_3$ lie on $A_i$ for some $i \leq k$ and $y_1, y_2, y_3$ lie on $A_{k+j}$ for some $j \leq k$. Otherwise we call it a *good matching* (denoted by $M$). Then, the following lemma shows that when $n \to \infty$, almost all matchings are good.

**Lemma 4.1.** Let $k = n^{3/4+\varepsilon}$ for some fixed small $\varepsilon > 0$. For a random matching $M$, the expected number of triples of pairs $((x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), (x_3, y_3))$ in bad matching tends to 0 as $n \to \infty$. i.e.
\[ |M| = 1 - o(1) \] as \( n \to \infty \). Consequently, almost all matchings are good.

Proof. Let \( k \) and \( M \) be as above and let \( X \) denote the number of triplets \( ((x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), (x_3, y_3)) \) in \( M \) such that \( x_1, x_2, x_3 \) lie on \( A_i \) for some \( i \leq k \) and \( y_1, y_2, y_3 \) lie on some arc \( A_{k+j} \) for some \( 1 \leq j \leq k \). Let \( X_{i,j} \) denote the number of triplets from \( A_i \) to \( A_{k+j} \) for \( 1 \leq i, j \leq k \). Hence we have \( X = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{k} X_{i,j} \).

Also Letting \( \mu = \mathbb{E}[X] \) and \( \mu_{i,j} = \mathbb{E}[X_{i,j}] \), we have, by the linearity of the expectation, \( \mu = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \mu_{i,j} \).

In order to compute \( \mu_{i,j} \), we take three points from each of \( A_i \) and \( A_{k+j} \) in \( \binom{k}{3} \binom{\ell}{3} \) ways, and multiply this number by the probability that the first set of three points are matched to the second set of three points, which is \( \frac{3!}{(k\ell)(k\ell-1)(k\ell-2)} \). Hence

\[
\mu_{i,j} = \binom{k}{3} \binom{\ell}{3} \frac{(k\ell-3)!3!}{(k\ell)!} = O\left(\frac{\ell^3}{k^3}\right).
\]

Since there are \( k^2 \) summands in the double sum, we get

\[
\mu = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \mu_{i,j} = k^2 O\left(\frac{\ell^3}{k^3}\right) = O(\ell^3/k) = O(n^3/k^4) \to 0.
\]

By Markov’s inequality, we have \( \mathbb{P}(X > 0) = \mathbb{P}(X \geq 1) \leq \mathbb{E}[X] = \mu = o(1) \). Hence \( |M| = \mathbb{P}(X = 0) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(X \geq 1) \geq 1 - o(1) \), as desired.

Now we prove \( \log C_n \geq n \log n - O(n) \), as \( n \to \infty \). Let \( k = n^{3/4+\epsilon} \). By the previous lemma, we have \( |M| = (1 - o(1))(k\ell)! \). The nice thing about a good matching is that it can be recovered from its (colored) circle graph. (In other words, there is a one-to-one matching between the set of good matchings and their corresponding graphs. Figure 6 shows that for bad matchings, this property does not hold.) To see this, we first note that each colored vertex is unique; if we see a color \( i \) on a vertex, that vertex corresponds to the \( i \)-th special chord. Next, each uncolored vertex has exactly two colored neighbors, which gives us the ability to determine the two arcs its endpoints lie on; if these two neighbors are colored \( i \) and \( j \), then the arcs containing the endpoints of the chord are
$A_i$ and $A_j$. Finally, suppose two uncolored vertices $u$ and $v$ have a common neighbor with color $i$. Then one endpoint of each of the chords corresponding to $u$ and $v$ lie on $A_i$, and the relative order of these endpoints is determined by whether the vertices $u$ and $v$ are adjacent or not. Hence

$$C_n\left(\binom{n}{2k}\right)(2k)! \geq \text{number of circle graphs with } 2k \text{ colored vertices}$$  

$$\geq \text{number of circle graphs obtained from the construction above}$$  

$$\geq |\mathcal{M}| = (1 - o(1))(k!)! = (1 - o(1))(n - 2k)!.$$  

where the last inequality follows from the fact that there is a one to one matching between the set of good matchings and their corresponding graphs. Using $(\binom{n}{2k})! \leq n^{2k}$, we can write the above inequality as $C_n2^k \geq (1 - o(1))(n - 2k)!$. Taking the logarithms and using the Stirling’s approximation gives $\log C_n = n \log n - O(n)$.

We summarize the result in the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.2.** For unlabeled circle graph $G$ with $n$ vertices. Then at least $n \log n - O(n)$ bits are necessary to represent $G$.

### 4.2. Alternative succinct representation

In this section, we give alternative succinct representation of circle graphs. Before describing the representation, we first introduce the orthogonal range queries on grids which defined as follows. Given a set $P$ of $n$ points on an $n \times n$ 2-dimensional grid, the orthogonal range queries on grids are consist of the following queries:

- **count($P, R$)** : returns the number of points of $P$ within the rectangular range $R$.
- **report($P, R$)** : reports the points of $P$ within the rectangular range $R$

The following lemma shows that there exists a succinct representation to support these queries efficiently, which we used in our representation.

**Lemma 5 ([27]).** Given a set of $n$ points $P$ on an $n \times n$ grid, there exists an $n \log n + o(n \log n)$-bit data structure, such that for any $(x, y) \in P$ and the rectangular range $R$, one can answer (i) **count($P, R$)** queries in $O(\log n/\log \log n)$ time, and (ii) **report($P, R$)** queries in $O(k \log n/\log \log n)$ time, where $k$ is the size of the output.

**Remark.** When there exists no two points $p_1, p_2 \in P$ where $p_1 = (x_1, y_1)$ and $p_2 = (x_2, y_2)$ with some $1 \leq x \leq n$ and $1 \leq y_1, y_2 \leq n$, we define the query $Y(x, P)$ as **report($P, [x, x] \times [1, n]$). Since the size of **report($P, [x, x] \times [1, n]$) is at most 1 for all $1 \leq x \leq n$ in this case, $Y(x, P)$ returns the value $y$ which satisfies $(x, y) \in P$ if such $(x, y)$ exists in $P$. Also, $Y(x, P)$ query can be answered in $O(\log n/\log \log n)$ time using the data structure of Lemma 5. Similarly, if no two input points have the same $y$-coordinate, then we can define the query $X(y, P) = \text{report($P, [1, n] \times [y, y]$), which can be answered in } O(\log n/\log \log n)$ time.
Now we describe the alternative succinct representation for circle graphs. Suppose $G = (V, E)$ is an intersection graph of the set of chords $C = \{e_1 = (p_1, q_1), e_2 = (p_2, q_2), \ldots, e_n = (p_n, q_n)\}$ of the circle $C$ where all the points in the set $P = \{p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_n\}$ are distinct. Note that when $G$ is given, we can find the corresponding $C$ in $O(n^2)$ time [28]. Next, consider a bijective map $f$ from $P$ to $\{1, 2, \ldots, 2n\}$ where for any $v \in P$, $f(v) = v'$ if and only if $v$ is the $v'$-th point from $p_1$ according to the clockwise direction (we define $f(p_1) = 1$). Then for $1 \leq i \leq n$, $f$ maps the chord $c_i$ to the interval $I_i = [s_i, e_i] \subset [1, 2n]$, where $s_i = \min(f(p_i), f(q_i))$, and $e_i = \max(f(p_i), f(q_i))$. Note that since all the points in $P$ are disjoint, $\{f(p) \mid p \in P\} = \{1, 2, \ldots, 2n\}$.

Now using the set of intervals $I = \{I_1, I_2, \ldots, I_n\}$, we define an overlap graph $G' = (V', E')$ as follows:

- $V' = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, where for $1 \leq i \leq n$, the vertex $i$ corresponds to the interval $I_i$.
- For any vertices $i, j \in G'$, $(i, j) \in E'$ if and only if $I_i$ and $I_j$ are overlap, i.e., $I_i \cap I_j \neq \emptyset, I_i \not\subset I_j$, and $I_j \not\subset I_i$.

It is well-known that $G$ and $G'$ are equal graphs (in general, any graph is a circle graph if and only if it is an overlap graph) [29]. In the rest of this section, we refer to $G$ as the overlap graph $G'$. Now in what follows we describe our data structure for representing $G$.

1. Let $S[1 \ldots 2n]$ be a bit array of size $2n$ where for $1 \leq i \leq 2n$, $S[i] = 0$ (resp. $S[i] = 1$) if $i \in \{s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n\}$ (resp. $i \in \{e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_n\}$). We maintain the data structure of Lemma 1 on $S$ using $2n + o(n)$ bits to support rank and select queries in $O(1)$ time.

2. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, let $e'_i = \text{rank}_i(S, e_i)$. Since $\{e'_1, e'_2, \ldots, e'_n\} = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, we can consider the set of $n$ points $P = \{(1, e'_1), (2, e'_2), \ldots, (n, e'_n)\}$ on the $n \times n$ grid. We maintain $n \log n + o(n \log n)$-bit data structure of Lemma 5, to answer $\text{count}(P, R)$, and $Y(x, P)$ queries in...
\(O(\log n/\log \log n)\) time and \(\text{report}(P,R)\) queries in \(O(k \log n/\log \log n)\) time for any \(1 \leq x \leq n\) and rectangular range \(R\), where \(k\) is the number of points in \(P\) on \(R\).

See Figure 7 for an example. The total space of the above substructures takes \(n \log n + o(n \log n)\) bits, and for vertex \(v \in V\), we can compute the corresponding interval \(I_v = [s_v, e_v]\) in \(O(\log n/\log \log n)\) time by \(s_v = \text{select}_0(v, S)\), and \(e_v = \text{select}_1(Y(v, P), S)\). Now for any two vertices \(u, v \in G\), we show how to support \(\text{degree}(v)\) and \(\text{adjacent}(u,v)\) query in \(O(\log n/\log \log n)\) time and \(\text{neighborhood}\) query in \(O(\text{degree}(v))\log n/\log \log n)\) time using our representation.

\textbf{degree}(v) query: To answer \(\text{degree}(v)\) query, we first compute the corresponding interval \(I_v\) in \(O(\log n/\log \log n)\) time, and count the number of intervals overlap with \(I_v\), which is the sum of (i) the number of intervals \(I_p\) where \(s_p < s_v\) and \(e_v < e_p < e_v\), and (ii) the number of intervals \(I_p\) where \(s_v < s_p < e_v\) and \(e_p > e_v\). By the definition of the set \(P\), the number of intervals in (i) is same as the answer of \(\text{count}(P, R_1)\) which can be computed in \(O(\log n/\log \log n)\) time, where \(R_1 = [1, \text{rank}_0(s_v, S) - 1] \times [\text{rank}_1(s_v, S) + 1, \text{rank}_1(e_v, S)]\). Similarly we can count the number of intervals in (ii) by returning \(\text{count}(P, R_2)\) in \(O(\log n/\log \log n)\) time, where \(R_2 = [v + 1, \text{rank}_0(e_v, S)] \times [\text{rank}_1(e_v, S) + 1, n]\) (note that \(R_1\) and \(R_2\) can be computed in \(O(1)\) time when \(I_v = [s_v, e_v]\) is given). Thus by Lemma 5, we can answer \(\text{degree}(v)\) query in \(O(\log n/\log \log n)\) time in total.

\textbf{adjacent}(u,v) query: To answer \(\text{adjacent}(u,v)\) query, it is enough to check whether the corresponding intervals \(I_u\) and \(I_v\) are overlap or not. Since we can compute \(I_u\) and \(I_v\) in \(O(\log n/\log \log n)\) time, \(\text{adjacent}(u,v)\) query can be answered in \(O(\log n/\log \log n)\) time.

\textbf{neighborhood}(v) query: To answer \(\text{neighborhood}(v)\) query, we simply report all the intervals in (i) and (ii) which are mentioned in the \(\text{degree}(v)\) query. Thus, we can answer \(\text{neighborhood}(v)\) query in \(O(\text{degree}(v))\log n/\log \log n)\) time by returning the first coordinates of the answer of \(\text{report}(P, R_1)\) and \(\text{report}(P, R_2)\) queries, where \(R_1\) and \(R_2\) are rectangular ranges in the grid which are defined same as the above.

We summarize our result in the following theorem

**Theorem 4.3.** Let \(G\) be an unlabeled circle graph with \(n\) vertices. Then there exists an \((n \log n + o(n \log n))\)-bit data structure representing \(G\) that supports \(\text{degree}(v)\) and \(\text{adjacent}(u,v)\) queries in \(O(\log n/\log \log n)\) time, and \(\text{neighborhood}(v)\) queries in \(O(\text{degree}(v))\log n/\log \log n)\) time.

### 5. Trapezoid graphs

In this section, we give the lower bound on space for representing trapezoid graphs, which implies that the representation of Theorem 3.3 gives a succinct representation of trapezoid graphs. Also we give an alternative succinct representation of trapezoid graphs, which uses the similar idea as Theorem 4.3 to answer \(\text{degree}(v)\) queries independent of \(\text{degree}(v)\) (and again, it takes more time for the other two queries compared to the representation of Theorem 3.3).
5.1. Lower bound

We can obtain a lower bound on the number of trapezoid graphs, intersection graphs of trapezoids where their corners are on two parallel lines.

**Theorem 5.1.** Consider a family of intersection graphs made from $n$ trapezoids on two parallel lines. Let $P_n$ denotes the total number of such graphs. Then the following holds:

$$\log P_n \geq 3\log n - 4\log \log n - O(n).$$

**Proof.** Let $m = \frac{n}{\log n}$. We first consider partially-colored trapezoids with $4m$ colored trapezoids and $n - 4m$ uncolored ones. We represent each colored trapezoid with a line, which could be thought as a thin trapezoid. To construct our diagrams, we divide the upper and lower lines into six pieces, $U_1,\ldots,U_6$ and $L_1,\ldots,L_6$, respectively, from left to right. From each of the pairs $(U_1,L_3)$, $(U_2,L_2)$, $(U_5,L_4)$, and $(U_5,L_3)$, we get $m$ colored parallel lines. Then, we draw $n - 4m$ uncolored trapezoids, each of which has exactly one corner from each of the segments $U_2$, $L_3$, $L_4$, and $U_5$. We also make sure that two uncolored trapezoids do not intersect exactly the same set of colored lines. (See Figure 8.) Note that, in the graph corresponding to a diagram, the colored neighbors of an uncolored vertex gives us where the corners of the trapezoid corresponding to that vertex are located. There are $(m + 1)^4$ possible uncolored trapezoids, and hence there are $\binom{m+1}{n-4m}$ different colored intersection graphs coming from this construction. The claim follows from similar arguments used in previous lemmas.

5.2. Alternative succinct representation

Our representation of trapezoid graphs uses the similar idea as the representation of Section 4.2 which uses orthogonal range queries. Suppose $G = (V,E)$ is given as the representation
of \( n \) trapezoids \( T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_n \) on two lines \( L_1 \) and \( L_2 \) in the two-dimensional space which are parallel to the \( x \)-axis as follows. For \( 1 \leq i \leq n \), \( T_i \) is the trapezoid corresponding to the vertex \( i \in G \), which has two points \( a_i \) and \( b_i \) from \( L_1 \) and other two points \( c_i \) and \( d_i \) from \( L_2 \) where \( a_i \) is the \( i \)-th leftmost point on \( L_1 \) among \( \{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n\} \). We interchangeably use names of points and their \( x \)-coordinates. Also without loss of generality, we assume that \( a_i < b_i, c_i < d_i \), and there is no point \( p \in \{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n\} \cup \{b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_n\} \) and \( q \in \{c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_n\} \cup \{d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_n\} \) such that the line \( \overline{pq} \) is not perpendicular to neither \( L_1 \) nor \( L_2 \). Note that one can obtain such representation from \( G \) in \( O(n(n + m)) \) time, where \( m \) is the number of edges in \( G \) [30]. We denote four sets \( V_0, V_1, V_2 \) and \( V_3 \) as \( \{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n\}, \{b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_n\}, \{c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_n\}, \) and \( \{d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_n\} \) respectively. Now the following shows our representation of \( G \).

1. Consider an imaginary line \( L_3 \) parallel to \( L_1 \) and \( L_2 \). We project all the points in \( V_0 \cup V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3 \) orthogonally onto \( L_3 \), and denote the set of these \( 4n \) points as \( P' \). Now we consider an array \( S[1, 2, \ldots, 4n] \) of size \( 4n \) over an alphabet \( \{0, 1, 2, 3\} \) where for \( 1 \leq i \leq 4n \), \( S[i] = j \) if \( i \)-th leftmost point in \( P' \) is the point from \( V_j \). We maintain the data structure of Lemma 2 on \( S \) using \( 4n + o(n) \) bits to support rank and select queries in \( O(1) \) time.

2. for \( 1 \leq i \leq n \), let \( b_i' = \text{rank}_1(S, b_i), c_i' = \text{rank}_2(S, c_i), \) and \( d_i' = \text{rank}_3(S, d_i) \). Then we can consider three sets of \( n \) distinct points \( P_1 = \{(1, b_1'), (2, b_2'), \ldots, (n, b_n')\} \), \( P_2 = \{(1, c_1'), (2, c_2'), \ldots, (n, c_n')\} \), and \( P_3 = \{(1, d_1'), (2, d_2'), \ldots, (n, d_n')\} \) on the \( n \times n \) grid. We maintain \( 3n \log n + o(n \log n) \)-bit data structure of Lemma 5, to answer count, and \( Y \), and report queries on \( P_1, P_2, \) and \( P_3 \) efficiently.

The total space of the above substructures takes \( 3n \log n + o(n \log n) \) bits, which is succinct by Theorem 5.1. Also for vertex \( v \in V \), we can compute the corresponding points \( (v, b_i') \in P_1 \), \( (v, c_i') \in P_2 \), and \( (v, d_i') \in P_3 \) in \( O(\log n / \log \log n) \) time by \( b_i' = Y(v, P_1), c_i' = Y(v, P_2), \) and \( d_i' = Y(v, P_3) \). Now for any two vertices \( u, v \in G \), we show how to support \( \text{degree}(v) \) and \( \text{adjacent}(u, v) \) query in \( O(\log n / \log \log n) \) time and \( \text{neighborhood} \) query in \( O(\text{degree}(v) \log n / \log \log n) \) time using our representation.

**adjacent\((u, v)\) query**: To answer \( \text{adjacent}(u, v) \) query, it is enough to check whether the corresponding Trapezoids \( T_u \) and \( T_v \) are intersect or not, and it is clear that \( T_u \) and \( T_v \) are not intersect if and only if (i) \( \max(b_i', d_i') < \min(c_i', c_i'' ) \), or (ii) \( \min(a_i', c_i') > \max(b_i', d_i') \). Since we can compute all these eight values in \( O(\log n / \log \log n) \) time, \( \text{adjacent}(u, v) \) query can be answered in the same time.

**degree\((v)\) query**: To answer \( \text{degree}(v) \) query, we count the number of vertices in \( G \) which is not adjacent to \( v \), which is a total size of disjoint union of two sets of trapezoids satisfying the above conditions (i) and (ii) respectively. To count the number of trapezoids satisfying the condition (i), let \( p_1 = (p_1', p_1^1) \) where \( p_1^1 = (\text{rank}_0(S, \max(b_i', d_i')) \) and \( p_1^1 = \text{rank}_2(S, \max(b_i', d_i')) \). Then we can count the number of such trapezoids in \( O(\log n / \log \log n) \) time by \( \text{count}(P_2, R_1) \) where \( R_1 = [p_1^1, n] \times [p_1^1, n] \). Similarly, let \( p_2 = (p_2^1, p_2^1) \) where \( p_2^1 = (\text{rank}_1(S, \min(a_i', c_i')) \) and
neighborhood(v) query: To answer neighborhood(v) query, we simply report all the trapezoids not in (i) and (ii) which are mentioned in the neighborhood of the answer of report(v R) queries, where

\[ R_1 = [1, p_1 - 1] \times [1, n], \quad R_2 = [p_1, n] \times [1, p_2 - 1], \quad R_3 = [1, n] \times [p_2 + 1, n], \quad \text{and} \quad R_4 = [p_2, 1, n] \times [1, p_2]. \]

Next, we return all the trapezoids corresponding to these coordinates by simply returning such coordinates (for the case of the queries on \( P_1 \)), or by returning the corresponding answers of \( X \) query on \( P_1 \) (for the case of the queries on \( P_3 \)). Note that we return the same trapezoids at most 2 times, but it does not affect the query time asymptotically.

We summarize our result in the following theorem.

**Theorem 5.2.** Let \( G \) be an unlabeled trapezoid graph with \( n \) vertices. Then there exists a \((3n \log n + o(n \log n))\)-bit data structure representing \( G \) such that \( \text{degree}(v) \) and \( \text{adjacent}(u, v) \) query can be answered in \( O(\log n / \log \log n) \) time, and neighborhood(v) query can be reported in \( O(|\text{degree}(v)| \log n / \log \log n) \) time.

### 6. Conclusion and Final Remarks

In this article we proved a unified space lower bound for several classes of intersection graphs on a circle. Subsequently, we designed succinct navigational oracles for these classes of graphs in a uniform manner, along with efficient support for queries such as degree, adjacency and neighborhood. We conclude with the following open problem: can we improve the query times of our data structures, possibly to constant time?
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