STACK-NUMBER IS NOT BOUNDED BY QUEUE-NUMBER

TBD

October 29, 2020

Abstract. We describe a family of graphs with queue-number at most 4 but unbounded stack-number. This resolves open problems of Heath, Leighton and Rosenberg (1992) and Blankenship and Oporwoski (1999).

1 Introduction

Stacks and queues are fundamental data structures in computer science, but which is more powerful? In 1992, Heath, Leighton and Rosenberg [12, 13] introduced an approach for answering this question by defining the graph parameters *stack-number* and *queue-number* (defined below), which respectively measure the power of stacks and queues for representing graphs. The following fundamental problems, implicit in [12, 13], were made explicit by Dujmović and Wood [8][1]:

- Is stack-number bounded by queue-number?
- Is queue-number bounded by stack-number?

If stack-number is bounded by queue-number but queue-number is not bounded by stack-number, then stacks would be considered to be more powerful than queues. Similarly, if the converse holds, then queues would be considered to be more powerful than stacks. Despite extensive research on stack- and queue-numbers, these fundamental questions have remained unsolved.

We now formally define stack- and queue-number. Let G be a graph and let $\prec$ be a total order on $V(G)$. Two disjoint edges $vw, xy \in E(G)$ with $v \prec w$ and $x \prec y$ *cross* with respect to $\prec$ if $v \prec x \prec w \prec y$ or $x \prec v \prec y \prec w$, and *nest* with respect to $\prec$ if $v \prec x \prec y \prec w$ or $x \prec v \prec w \prec y$. Let $\varphi : E(G) \to \{1,\dots,k\}$ for some integer $k \geqslant 1$. Then $(\prec, \varphi)$ is a *k-stack layout* of G if, for every pair of edges $vw, xy \in E(G)$, if $\varphi(vw) = \varphi(xy)$ then vw and xy do not cross. Similarly, the pair $(\prec, \varphi)$ is a *k-queue layout* of G if, for every pair of edges $vw, xy \in E(G)$, if $\varphi(vw) = \varphi(xy)$ then vw and xy do not nest. The smallest integer s for which G has an s-stack layout is called the *stack-number* of G, denoted $\mathrm{sn}(G)$. The smallest integer q for which G has a q-queue layout is called the *queue-number* of G, denoted $\mathrm{qn}(G)$. Note that stack layouts are equivalent to book embeddings (first defined by Ollmann [15]), and stack-number is also known as *page-number*, *book-thickness* or *fixed outer-thickness*. See [1, 2, 5–7, 9, 14, 18, 19] and the references therein for work on stack- and queue-layouts.

PM: Suggestion: Replace second if then with $\varphi(vw) \neq \varphi(xy)$ or vw and xy do not cross.

[1] A *graph parameter* is a function α such that $\alpha(G) \in \mathbb{R}$ for every graph G and such that $\alpha(G_1) = \alpha(G_2)$ for all isomorphic graphs G_1 and G_2. A graph parameter α is *bounded* by a graph parameter β if there exists a function f such that $\alpha(G) \leqslant f(\beta(G))$ for every graph G.

Given a k-stack layout $(\prec, \varphi)$ of a graph G, for each $i \in \{1,\dots,k\}$, the set $\varphi^{-1}(i)$ behaves like a stack, in the sense that each edge $vw \in \varphi^{-1}(i)$ with $v \prec w$ corresponds to an element in a sequence of stack operations, such that if we traverse the vertices in the order of $\prec$, then vw is pushed onto the stack at v and popped off the stack at w. Similarly, each set $\varphi^{-1}(i)$ in a queue layout behaves like a queue. In this way, the stack-number and queue-number respectively measure the power of stacks and queues to represent graphs.

Is Stack-Number Bounded by Queue-number?

This paper considers the first of the above questions. In a positive direction, Heath et al. [12] showed that every 1-queue graph has a 2-stack layout. On the other hand, they described graphs that need exponentially more stacks than queues. In particular, n-vertex ternary hypercubes have queue-number $O(\log n)$ and stack-number $\Omega(n^{1/9-\epsilon})$ for any $\epsilon > 0$.

Our key contribution is the following theorem, which shows that stack-number is not bounded by queue-number. This demonstrates that stacks are not more powerful than queues for representing graphs.

Theorem 1. *For every $s \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a graph G with $\operatorname{qn}(G) \leqslant 4$ and $\operatorname{sn}(G) > s$.*

As illustrated in Figure 1, the graph G in Theorem 1 is the cartesian product[2] $S_b \square H_n$, where S_b is the star graph with root r and b leaves, and H_n is the dual of the hexagonal grid, defined by

$$V(H_n) := \{1,\dots,n\}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{aligned} E(H_n) := &\{(x,y)(x+1,y) : x \in \{1,\dots,n-1\}, y \in \{1,\dots,n\}\} \\ &\cup \{(x,y)(x,y+1) : x \in \{1,\dots,n\}, y \in \{1,\dots,n-1\}\} \\ &\cup \{(x,y)(x+1,y+1) : x,y \in \{1,\dots,n-1\}\} \ . \end{aligned}$$

In Theorem 1, b and n are chosen to be sufficiently large compared to s. Note that Pupyrev [16] independently suggested using graph products to show that stack-number is not bounded by queue-number.



Figure 1: $S_9 \square H_4$.

[2] For graphs G_1 and G_2, the *cartesian product* $G_1 \square G_2$ is the graph with vertex set $\{(v_1,v_2) : v_1 \in V(G_1), v_2 \in V(G_2)\}$, where $(v_1,v_2)(w_1,w_2) \in E(G_1 \square G_2)$ if $v_1 = w_1$ and $v_2w_2 \in E(G_2)$, or $v_1w_1 \in E(G_1)$ and $v_2 = w_2$.

Subdivisions

A noteworthy consequence of Theorem 1 is that it resolves a conjecture of Blankenship and Oporowski [4]. A graph G' is a *subdivision* of a graph G if G' can be obtained from G by replacing the edges vw of G by internally disjoint paths P_{vw} with endpoints v and w. If each P_{vw} has exactly k internal vertices, then G' is the k-*subdivision* of G. If each P_{vw} has at most k internal vertices, then G' is a $(\leqslant k)$-*subdivision* of G. Blankenship and Oporowski [4] conjectured that the stack-number of $(\leqslant k)$-subdivisions (k fixed) is not much less than the stack-number of the original graph. More precisely:

Conjecture 1 ([4]). *There exists a function f such that for every graph G and integer k, if G' is any $(\leqslant k)$-subdivision of G, then $\mathrm{sn}(G) \leqslant f(\mathrm{sn}(G'), k)$.*

Dujmović and Wood [8] established a connection between this conjecture and the question of whether stack-number is bounded by queue-number. In particular, they showed that if Conjecture 1 is true, then stack-number is bounded by queue-number. Since Theorem 1 shows that stack-number is not bounded by queue-number, Conjecture 1 is false. The proof of Dujmović and Wood [8] is based on the folllowing key lemma: every graph G has a 3-stack subdivision with $1+2\lceil\log_2 \mathrm{qn}(G)\rceil$ division vertices per edge. Applying this result to the graph $G = S_b \square H_n$ in Theorem 1, the 5-subdivision of $S_b \square H_n$ has a 3-stack layout. If Conjecture 1 was true, then $\mathrm{sn}(S_b \square H_n) \leqslant f(3,5)$, contradicting Theorem 1.

Is Queue-number Bounded by Stack-Number?

It remains open whether queues are more powerful than stacks; that is, whether queue-number is bounded by stack-number. Several reults are known about this problem. Heath et al. [12] showed that every 1-stack graph has a 2-queue layout. Dujmović et al. [6] showed that planar graphs have bounded queue-number. (Note that graph products also feature heavily in this proof.) Since 2-stack graphs are planar, this implies that 2-stack graphs have bounded queue-number. It is open whether 3-stack graphs have bounded queue-number. In fact, the case of three stacks is as hard as the general question. Dujmović and Wood [8] proved that queue-number is bounded by stack-number if and only if 3-stack graphs have bounded queue-number. Moreover, if this is true then stack-number is bounded by a polynomial function of queue-number.

2 Stack and Queue Layouts of Cartesian Products

Add discussion of result of Bernhart and Kainen [2]: $\mathrm{sn}(G \square H) \leqslant \mathrm{sn}(G) + \mathrm{dsn}(H)$ for bipartite H. Highlight the key difference between stack and queue layouts is that we need H to be bipartite here.

mention results of Pupyrev [16] about bipartite graphs?

First we prove that $\mathrm{qn}(S_b \square H_n) \leqslant 4$, as claimed in Theorem 1. We need the following definition due to Wood [17]. A queue layout $(\varphi, \prec)$ is *strict* if for every vertex $u \in V(G)$ and for all neighbours $v, w \in N_G(u)$, if $u \prec v, w$ or $v, w \prec u$, then $\varphi(uv) \neq \varphi(uw)$. Let $\mathrm{sqn}(G)$ be the minimum integer k such that G has a strict k-queue layout. To see that $\mathrm{sqn}(H_n) \leqslant 3$, order the vertices row-by-row and then left-to-right within a row, with vertical edges in one queue, horizontal edges in one queue, and diagonal edges in another queue. Wood [17] proved that $\mathrm{qn}(G\Box H) \leqslant \mathrm{qn}(G)+\mathrm{sqn}(H)$ for all graphs G and H. Of course, S_b has a 1-queue layout (since no two edges are nested for any vertex-ordering). Thus $\mathrm{qn}(S_b \Box H_n) \leqslant 4$.

3 The Main Proof

We now turn to the proof of our main result, the lower bound on $\mathrm{sn}(G)$, where $G := S_b \Box H_n$. Consider a hypothetical s-stack layout $(\varphi, \prec)$ of G where n and b are chosen sufficiently large compared to s as detailed below. We begin with three lemmata that, for sufficiently large b, provide a large subgraph S_d of S_b for which the induced stack layout of $S_d \Box H_n$ is highly structured.

For each node v of S_b, define π_v as the permutation of $\{1,\dots,n\}^2$ in which (x_1,y_1) appears before (x_2,y_2) if and only if $(v,(x_1,y_1)) \prec (v,(x_2,y_2))$. The following lemma is an immediate consequence of the Pigeonhole Principle:

Lemma 1. *There exists a permutation π of $\{1,\dots,n\}^2$ and a set L_1 of leaves of S_b of size $a \geqslant b/(n^2)!$ such that $\pi_v = \pi$ for each $v \in L_1$.*

For each leaf v in L_1, let φ_v be the edge colouring of H_n defined by $\varphi_v(xy) := \varphi((v,x)(v,y))$ for each $xy \in E(H_n)$. Since H_n has maximum degree 6 and is not 6-regular, it has fewer than $3n^2$ edges. Therefore there are fewer than s^{3n^2} edge colourings of H_n using s colours. Another application of the Pigeonhole Principle proves the following:

Lemma 2. *There exists a subset $L_2 \subseteq L_1$ of size $c \geqslant a/s^{3n^2}$ and an edge colouring $\phi : E(H_n) \to \{1,\dots,s\}$ such that $\varphi_v = \phi$ for each $v \in L_2$.*

Let S_c be the subgraph of S_b induced by $L_2 \cup \{r\}$. The preceding two lemmata ensure that, for distinct leaves v and w of S_c, the stack layouts of the isomorphic graphs $G[\{(v,p) : p \in V(H_n)\}]$ and $G[\{(w,p) : p \in V(H_n)\}]$ are identical. The next lemma is a statement about the relationships between the stack layouts of $G[\{(v,p) : v \in V(S_c)\}]$ and $G[\{(v,q) : v \in V(S_c)\}]$ for distinct $p,q \in V(H_n)$. It does not assert that these two layouts are identical but it does state that they fall into one of two categories.

Lemma 3. *There exists a sequence $L_3 := u_1,\dots,u_d$ with $\{u_1,\dots,u_d\} \subseteq L_2$ of length $d \geqslant c^{1/2^{n^2-1}}$ such that, for each $p \in V(H_n)$, either $(u_1,p) \prec (u_2,p) \prec \cdots \prec (u_d,p)$ or $(u_1,p) \succ (u_2,p) \succ \cdots \succ (u_d,p)$.*

Proof. Let $p_1,\dots,p_{n^2}$ denote the vertices of H_n in any order. Begin with the sequence $S_1 := v_{1,1},\dots,v_{1,c}$ that contains all c elements of L_2 ordered so that $(v_{1,1},p_1) \prec \cdots \prec (v_{1,c},p_1)$. For each $i \in \{2,\dots,n^2\}$, the Erdős-Szekeres Theorem [10] implies that S_{i-1} contains a subsequence $S_i := v_{i,1},\dots,v_{i,|S_i|}$ of length $|S_i| \geqslant \sqrt{|S_{i-1}|}$ such that $(v_{i,1},p_i) \prec \cdots \prec (v_{i,|S_i|},p_i)$ or $(v_{i,1},p_i) \succ \cdots \succ (v_{i,|S_i|},p_i)$. It is straightforward to verify by induction on i that $|S_i| \geqslant c^{1/2^{i-1}}$ resulting in a final sequence $S_{n^2} =: L_3$ of length at least $c^{1/2^{n^2-1}}$. □

For the rest of the proof we will work with the star S_d whose leaves are $u_1,\dots,u_d$ described in Lemma 3. Consider the (improper) vertex colouring of H_n obtained by colouring each vertex $p \in V(H_n)$ *red* if $(u_1,p) \prec \cdots \prec (u_d,p)$ and colouring p *blue* if $(u_1,p) \succ \cdots \succ (u_d,p)$. We need the following famous Hex Lemma [11].



Figure 2: The sets $Z_{n,v_1}, \dots, Z_{n,v_{d'}}$ ($n = 4$, $d' = 5$).

Lemma 4 ([11])**.** *Every red–blue vertex colouring of the graph H_n contains an n-vertex path R consisting entirely of red vertices or entirely of blue vertices.*

Without loss of generality, assume that the path $R := p_1, \dots, p_n$ defined by Lemma 4 (with the above-defined colouring) consists entirely of red vertices, so that $(u_1, p_j) \prec \cdots \prec (u_d, p_j)$ for each $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Recall that $(\varphi, \prec)$ is a hypothetical s-stack layout of G and therefore it is also an s-stack layout of the subgraph $X := S_d \square R$. In particular, there is no set of greater than s pairwise crossing edges in X. The following result finishes the proof by showing that such a set exists when $n > 2s$ and $d \geqslant (s+1)2^n$ (which is implied if $n = 2s+1$ and $b \geqslant (n^2)!\, s^{3n^2} ((s+1)2^n)^{2^{n^2-1}}$).

Lemma 5. *The graph X contains a set of edges of size at least* $\min\{\lfloor d/2^n \rfloor, \lceil n/2 \rceil\}$ *that are pairwise crossing with respect to $\prec$.*

Proof. Extend the total order $\prec$ onto a partial order over subsets of $V(G)$ so that $V \prec W$ if and only if $v \prec w$ for each $v \in V$, and $w \in W$. We abuse notation slightly by using $\prec$ to compare elements of $V(G)$ and subsets of $V(G)$ so that, for $v \in V(G)$ and $V \subseteq V(G)$, $v \prec V$ denotes $\{v\} \prec V$. We will define sets $A_1 \supseteq \cdots \supseteq A_n$ of leaves of S_d so that each A_i satisifies the following conditions:

(C1) A_i contains $d_i \geqslant d/2^{i-1}$ leaves of S_d.

(C2) Each leaf $v \in A_i$ defines an i-element vertex set $Z_{i,v} := \{(v, p_j) : j \in \{1, \dots, i\}\}$. For any distinct $v, w \in A_i$, the sets $Z_{i,v}$ and $Z_{i,w}$ are *separated* with respect to $\prec$; that is, $Z_{i,v} \prec Z_{i,w}$ or $Z_{i,v} \succ Z_{i,w}$.

Before defining $A_1, \dots, A_n$ we first show how the existence of the set A_n implies the lemma. To avoid triple-subscripts, let $d' := d_n \geqslant d/2^{n-1}$. The set A_n defines vertex sets $Z_{n,v_1} \prec \cdots \prec Z_{n,v_{d'}}$. Refer to Figure 2. Recall that r is the root of S_b so it is adjacent to each of $v_1, \dots, v_{d'}$ in S_d. Therefore, for each $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and each $i \in \{1, \dots, d'\}$, the edge $(r, p_j)(v_i, p_j)$ is in X. Therefore, (r, p_j) is adjacent to an element of each of $Z_{n,v_1}, \dots, Z_{n,v_{d'}}$.

Since $Z_{n,v_1}, \dots, Z_{n,v_{d'}}$ are separated with respect to $\prec$, when viewed from afar, this situation looks like a complete bipartite graph $K_{n,d'}$ with the root vertices $L := \{(r, p_j) : j \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}$



Figure 3: The two cases in the proof of Lemma 5.

in one part and the groups $R := Z_{n,v_1} \cup \cdots \cup Z_{n,v_{d'}}$ in the other part. Any linear ordering of $K_{n,d'}$ has a large set of pairwise crossing edges so, intuitively, the induced subgraph $X[L \cup R]$ should also have a large set of pairwise crossing edges. We can formalize this as follows: Label the vertices in L as $r_1,\ldots,r_n$ so that $r_1 \prec \cdots \prec r_n$. Then at least one of the following two cases applies (see Figure 3):

1. $Z_{n,\lfloor d'/2\rfloor} \prec r_{\lceil n/2\rceil}$ in which case the graph between $r_{\lceil n/2\rceil},\ldots,r_n$ and $Z_{n,1},\ldots,Z_{n,\lfloor d'/2\rfloor}$ has a set of at least $\min\{\lfloor d'/2\rfloor, \lceil n/2\rceil\}$ pairwise-crossing edges.

2. $r_{\lceil n/2\rceil} \prec Z_{\lceil d'/2\rceil+1}$ in which case the graph between $r_1,\ldots,r_{\lceil n/2\rceil}$ and $Z_{\lceil d'/2\rceil+1},\ldots,Z_{d'}$ has a set of $\min\{\lfloor d'/2\rfloor, \lceil n/2\rceil\}$ pairwise-crossing edges.

Since, by (C1), $d' \geqslant d/2^{n-1}$, either case results in a set of pairwise-crossing edges of size at least $\min\{\lfloor d/2^n\rfloor, \lceil n/2\rceil\}$, as claimed.

All that remains is to define the sets $A_1 \supseteq \cdots \supseteq A_n$ that satisfy (C1) and (C2). Let A_1 be the set of all the leaves of S_d. For each $i \in \{2,\ldots,n\}$, the set A_i is defined as follows: Let $Z_1,\ldots,Z_{|A_{i-1}|}$ denote the sets $Z_{i-1,v}$ for each $v \in A_{i-1}$ ordered so that $Z_1 \prec \cdots \prec Z_{|A_{i-1}|}$. By Property (C2), this is always possible. Label the vertices of A_{i-1} as $v_1,\ldots,v_{|A_{i-1}|}$ so that $(v_1,p_{i-1}) \prec \cdots \prec (v_r,p_{i-1})$. (This is equivalent to naming them so that $(v_j,p_{i-1}) \in Z_j$ for each $j \in \{1,\ldots,|A_{i-1}|\}$.) Define the set $A_i := \{v_{2k+1} : k \in \{0,\ldots,\lfloor(|A_{i-1}|-1)/2\rfloor\}\} = \{v_j \in A_{i-1} : j \text{ is odd}\}$. This completes the definition of $A_1,\ldots,A_n$.

All that remains is to verify that A_i satisfies (C1) and (C2) for each $i \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$. We do this by induction on i. The base case $i = 1$ is trivial so we assume from this point on that $i \in \{2,\ldots,n\}$. To see that A_i satisfies (C1) just observe that $|A_i| = \lceil |A_{i-1}|/2\rceil \geqslant |A_{i-1}|/2 \geqslant d/2^{i-1}$, where the final inequality follows by applying the inductive hypothesis $|A_{i-1}| \geqslant d/2^{i-2}$. Now all that remains is to show that A_i satisfies (C2).

Recall that, for each $v \in A_{i-1}$, the edge $e_v := (v,p_{i-1})(v,p_i)$ is in X. We have the following properties:

(P1) By Lemma 2, $\varphi(e_v) = \phi(p_{i-1}p_i)$ for each $v \in A_{i-1}$.

(P2) Since p_{i-1} and p_i are both red, $(v, p_{i-1}) \prec (w, p_{i-1})$ if and only if $(v, p_i) \prec (w, p_i)$ for each $v, w \in A_{i-1}$.
(P3) By Lemma 1, $(v, p_{i-1}) \prec (v, p_i)$ for every $v \in A_{i-1}$ or $(v, p_{i-1}) \succ (v, p_i)$ for every $v \in A_{i-1}$.

We claim that these three conditions imply that the vertex sets $\{(v, p_{i-1}) : v \in A_{i-1}\}$ and $\{(v, p_i) : v \in A_{i-1}\}$ interleave perfectly with respect to $\prec$. More precisely:

Claim 1. *$(v_1, p_{i-1+t}) \prec (v_1, p_{i-t}) \prec (v_2, p_{i-1+t}) \prec (v_2, p_{i-t}) \cdots \prec (v_r, p_{i-1+t}) \prec (v_r, p_{i-t})$ for some $t \in \{0, 1\}$.*

Proof of Claim 1. By (P3) we may assume, without loss of generality, that $(v, p_{i-1}) \prec (v, p_i)$ for each $v \in A_{i-1}$, in which case we are trying to prove the claim for $t = 0$. Therefore, it is sufficient to show that $(v_j, p_i) \prec (v_{j+1}, p_{i-1})$ for each $j \in \{1, \dots, r-1\}$. For the sake of contradiction, suppose $(v_j, p_i) \succ (v_{j+1}, p_{i-1})$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, r-1\}$. By the labelling of A_{i-1}, $(v_j, p_{i-1}) \prec (v_{j+1}, p_{i-1})$ so, by (P2), $(v_j, p_i) \prec (v_{j+1}, p_i)$. Therefore

$$(v_j, p_{i-1}) \prec (v_{j+1}, p_{i-1}) \prec (v_j, p_i) \prec (v_{j+1}, p_i) \ .$$

Therefore the edges $e_{v_j} = (v_j, p_{i-1})(v_j, p_i)$ and $e_{v_{j+1}} = (v_{j+1}, p_{i-1})(v_{j+1}, p_i)$ cross with respect to $\prec$. But this is a contradiction since, by (P1), $\varphi(e_{v_j}) = \varphi(e_{v_{j+1}}) = \phi(p_{i-1}p_i)$. This contradiction completes the proof of Claim 1. □

We now complete the proof that A_i satisfies (C2). Apply Claim 1 and assume without loss of generality that $t = 0$, so that

$$(v_1, p_{i-1}) \prec (v_1, p_i) \prec (v_2, p_{i-1}) \prec (v_2, p_i) \cdots \prec (v_r, p_{i-1}) \prec (v_r, p_i) \ .$$

For each $j \in \{1, \dots, r-2\}$, we have $(v_{j+1}, p_{i-1}) \in Z_{j+1} \prec Z_{j+2}$, so $(v_j, p_i) \prec (v_{j+1}, p_{i-1}) \prec Z_{j+2}$. Therefore $Z_j \cup \{(v_j, p_i)\} \prec Z_{j+2}$. By a symmetric argument, $Z_j \cup \{(v_j, p_i)\} \succ Z_{j-2}$ for each $j \in \{3, \dots, r\}$. Finally, since $(v_j, p_i) \prec (v_{j+2}, p_i)$ for each odd $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, we have $Z_j \cup \{(v_j, p_i)\} \prec Z_{j+2} \cup \{(v_{j+2}, p_i)\}$ for each odd $j \in \{1, \dots, r-2\}$. Thus A_i satisifies (C2) since the sets $Z_1 \cup \{(v_1, p_i)\}, Z_3 \cup \{(v_3, p_i)\}, \dots, Z_{2\lfloor (r-1)/2 \rfloor + 1} \cup (v_{2\lfloor (r-1)/2 \rfloor + 1}, p_i)$ are precisely the sets $Z_{i,1}, \dots, Z_{i,d_i}$ determined by our choice of A_i. □

4 Open Problems

Recall that every 1-queue graph has a 2-stack layout [12] and we proved that there are 4-queue graphs with unbounded stack-number. The following questions remain open: Do 2-queue graphs have bounded stack-number? Do 3-queue graphs have bounded stack-number?

Given the role of cartesian products in our proof, it is natural to ask when is $\mathrm{sn}(G_1 \square G_2)$ bounded? Note that H_n is a subgraph of a planar Hamiltonian graph (namely, H_{2n}), so $\mathrm{sn}(H_n) \leqslant 2$. So $\mathrm{sn}(G_1 \square G_2)$ can be unbounded even when G_1 is a star and $\mathrm{sn}(G_2) \leqslant 2$. Since $\mathrm{sn}(G_2) \leqslant 1$ if and only if G_2 is outerplanar, the following question naturally arises: Is $\mathrm{sn}(S \square H)$ bounded for every star S and outerplanar graph H with bounded degree? Is $\mathrm{sn}(T \square H)$ bounded for every tree T and outerplanar graph H with bounded degree? The assumption that H has bounded degree is needed since $S_n \square S_n$ contain the 1-subdivision of $K_{n,n}$, which has unbounded stack-number [3].

Since $H_n \subseteq P \boxtimes P$ where P is the n-vertex path, Theorem 1 implies that $\mathrm{sn}(S \boxtimes P \boxtimes P)$ is unbounded for stars S and paths P. It is easily seen that $\mathrm{sn}(S \boxtimes P)$ is bounded [16]. The following question naturally arises (independently asked by Pupyrev [16]): Is $\mathrm{sn}(T \boxtimes P)$ bounded for every tree T and path P? We conjecture the answer is "no".

$\boxtimes$ is not defined

References

[1] Michael A. Bekos, Henry Förster, Martin Gronemann, Tamara Mchedlidze, Fabrizio Montecchiani, Chrysanthi N. Raftopoulou, and Torsten Ueckerdt. Planar graphs of bounded degree have bounded queue number. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 48(5):1487–1502, 2019.

[2] Frank R. Bernhart and Paul C. Kainen. The book thickness of a graph. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 27(3):320–331, 1979.

[3] Robin Blankenship. Book embeddings of graphs. Ph.D. thesis, Department of Mathematics, Louisiana State University, U.S.A., 2003.

[4] Robin Blankenship and Bogdan Oporowski. Drawing subdivisions of complete and complete bipartite graphs on books. Tech. Rep. 1999-4, Department of Mathematics, Louisiana State University, U.S.A., 1999.

[5] Giuseppe Di Battista, Fabrizio Frati, and János Pach. On the queue number of planar graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 42(6):2243–2285, 2013.

[6] Vida Dujmović, Gwenaël Joret, Piotr Micek, Pat Morin, Torsten Ueckerdt, and David R. Wood. Planar graphs have bounded queue-number. *J. ACM*, 67(4):22, 2020.

[7] Vida Dujmović and David R. Wood. On linear layouts of graphs. *Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 6(2):339–358, 2004.

[8] Vida Dujmović and David R. Wood. Stacks, queues and tracks: Layouts of graph subdivisions. *Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 7:155–202, 2005.

[9] Vida Dujmović and David R. Wood. Graph treewidth and geometric thickness parameters. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 37(4):641–670, 2007.

[10] Paul Erdős and George Szekeres. A combinatorial problem in geometry. *Compositio Math.*, 2:463–470, 1935.

[11] David Gale. The game of Hex and the Brouwer fixed-point theorem. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 86(10):818–827, 1979.

[12] Lenwood S. Heath, F. Thomson Leighton, and Arnold L. Rosenberg. Comparing queues and stacks as mechanisms for laying out graphs. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 5(3):398–412, 1992.

[13] Lenwood S. Heath and Arnold L. Rosenberg. Laying out graphs using queues. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 21(5):927–958, 1992.

[14] Michael Kaufmann, Michael A. Bekos, Fabian Klute, Sergey Pupyrev, Chrysanthi N. Raftopoulou, and Torsten Ueckerdt. Four pages are indeed necessary for planar graphs. *J. Comput. Geom.*, 11(1):332–353, 2020.

[15] L. Taylor Ollmann. On the book thicknesses of various graphs. In Frederick Hoffman, Roy B. Levow, and Robert S. D. Thomas, eds., *Proc. 4th Southeastern Conference on Combinatorics, Graph Theory and Computing*, vol. VIII of *Congr. Numer.*, p. 459.

Utilitas Math., 1973.

[16] Sergey Pupyrev. Book embeddings of graph products. 2020, arXiv:2007.15102.

[17] David R. Wood. Queue layouts of graph products and powers. *Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 7(1):255–268, 2005.

[18] Mihalis Yannakakis. Embedding planar graphs in four pages. *J. Comput. System Sci.*, 38(1):36–67, 1989.

[19] Mihalis Yannakakis. Planar graphs that need four pages. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 145:241–263, 2020.