

# Breaking the degeneracy barrier for coloring graphs with no $K_t$ minor

Sergey Norin\*

Luke Postle†

Zi-Xia Song‡

December 3, 2021

*Dedicated to the memory of Robin Thomas***Abstract**

In 1943, Hadwiger conjectured that every graph with no  $K_t$  minor is  $(t-1)$ -colorable for every  $t \geq 1$ . In the 1980s, Kostochka and Thomason independently proved that every graph with no  $K_t$  minor has average degree  $O(t\sqrt{\log t})$  and hence is  $O(t\sqrt{\log t})$ -colorable. We show that every graph with no  $K_t$  minor is  $O(t(\log t)^\beta)$ -colorable for every  $\beta > 1/4$ , making the first improvement on the order of magnitude of the Kostochka-Thomason bound.

## 1 Introduction

All graphs in this paper are finite and simple. Given graphs  $H$  and  $G$ , we say that  $G$  has an  $H$  minor if a graph isomorphic to  $H$  can be obtained from a subgraph of  $G$  by contracting edges. We denote the complete graph on  $t$  vertices by  $K_t$ .

In 1943 Hadwiger made the following famous conjecture.

**Conjecture 1.1** (Hadwiger’s conjecture [Had43]). *For every integer  $t \geq 1$ , every graph with no  $K_t$  minor is  $(t-1)$ -colorable.*

Hadwiger’s conjecture is widely considered among the most important problems in graph theory and has motivated numerous developments in graph coloring and graph minor theory. We briefly overview major progress towards the conjecture below, and refer the reader to a recent survey by Seymour [Sey16] for further background.

---

\*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, McGill University. Email: [sergey.norin@mcgill.ca](mailto:sergey.norin@mcgill.ca). Supported by an NSERC Discovery grant.

†Department of Combinatorics and Optimization, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada. Email: [lpostle@uwaterloo.ca](mailto:lpostle@uwaterloo.ca). Canada Research Chair in Graph Theory. Partially supported by NSERC under Discovery Grant No. 2019-04304, the Ontario Early Researcher Awards program and the Canada Research Chairs program.

‡Department of Mathematics, University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL 32816, USA. Email: [Zixia.Song@ucf.edu](mailto:Zixia.Song@ucf.edu). Supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. DMS-1854903.

Hadwiger [Had43] and Dirac [Dir52] independently showed that Conjecture 1.1 holds for  $t \leq 4$ . Wagner [Wag37] proved that for  $t = 5$  the conjecture is equivalent to the Four Color Theorem, which was subsequently proved by Appel and Haken [AH77, AHK77] using extensive computer assistance.

Robertson, Seymour and Thomas [RST93] went one step further and proved Hadwiger’s conjecture for  $t = 6$ , also by reducing it to the Four Color Theorem. Settling the conjecture for  $t \geq 7$  appears to be extremely challenging, perhaps in part due to the absence of a transparent proof of the Four Color Theorem.

Another notable challenging case of Hadwiger’s conjecture is the case of graphs with no independent set of size three. If  $G$  is such a graph on  $n$  vertices then properly coloring  $G$  requires at least  $n/2$  colors, and so Hadwiger’s conjecture implies that  $G$  has a  $K_{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$  minor. This is still open. In fact, as mentioned in [Sey16], it is not known whether there exists any  $c > 1/3$  such that every graph  $G$  as above has a  $K_t$  minor for some  $t \geq cn$ .

The following natural weakening of Hadwiger’s conjecture, which has been considered by several researchers, sidesteps the above challenges.

**Conjecture 1.2** (Linear Hadwiger’s conjecture [RS98, Kaw07, KM07b]). *There exists  $C > 0$  such that for every integer  $t \geq 1$ , every graph with no  $K_t$  minor is  $Ct$ -colorable.*

In this paper we take a step towards Conjecture 1.2 by improving for large  $t$  the upper bound on the number of colors needed to color graphs with no  $K_t$  minor. Prior to our work, the best bound was  $O(t\sqrt{\log t})$ , which was obtained independently by Kostochka [Kos82, Kos84] and Thomason [Tho84] in the 1980s. The only improvement [Tho01, Woo13, KP20] since then has been in the constant factor.

The results of [Kos82, Kos84, Tho84] bound the “degeneracy” of graphs with no  $K_t$  minor. Recall that a graph  $G$  is  $d$ -degenerate if every non-null subgraph of  $G$  contains a vertex of degree at most  $d$ . A standard inductive argument shows that every  $d$ -degenerate graph is  $(d + 1)$ -colorable. Thus the following bound on the degeneracy of graphs with no  $K_t$  minor gives a corresponding bound on their chromatic number.

**Theorem 1.3** ([Kos82, Kos84, Tho84]). *Every graph with no  $K_t$  minor is  $O(t\sqrt{\log t})$ -degenerate.*

Kostochka [Kos82, Kos84] and de la Vega [FdlV83] have shown that there exist graphs with no  $K_t$  minor and minimum degree  $\Omega(t\sqrt{\log t})$ . Thus the bound in Theorem 1.3 is tight, and it is natural to consider the possibility that coloring graphs with no  $K_t$  minor requires  $\Omega(t\sqrt{\log t})$  colors. In fact, Reed and Seymour [RS98] refer to this assertion as “a commonly expressed counter-conjecture” to Conjecture 1.1.

We disprove the above “counter-conjecture” by proving the following main result.

**Theorem 1.4.** *For every  $\beta > \frac{1}{4}$ , every graph with no  $K_t$  minor is  $O(t(\log t)^\beta)$ -colorable.*

The proof of Theorem 1.4 occupies most of the paper. In Section 2, we outline the proof, and derive Theorem 1.4 from our two main technical results:

- Theorem 2.4, which shows that any sufficiently dense graph with no  $K_t$  minor contains a relatively small subgraph, which is still dense, and

- Theorem 2.6, which adapts an argument of Thomason [Tho01] to show that every sufficiently well-connected graph containing a large number of vertex-disjoint dense subgraphs has a  $K_t$  minor.

We prove Theorem 2.6 in Section 3. We prove Theorem 2.4 in Section 4 using a density increment argument. In Section 5 we give an application of Theorem 2.4 beyond the proof of Theorem 1.4, extending results of Kühn and Osthus [KO03, KO05], and Krivelevich and Sudakov [KS09] on the density of minors in graphs with a forbidden complete bipartite subgraph or an even cycle to general bipartite graphs. In Section 6 we conclude the paper with a few remarks.

## Notation

We use largely standard graph-theoretical notation. We denote by  $v(G)$  and  $e(G)$  the number of vertices and edges of a graph  $G$ , respectively, and denote by  $d(G) = e(G)/v(G)$  the *density* of a non-null graph  $G$ . We use  $\chi(G)$  to denote the chromatic number of  $G$ , and  $\kappa(G)$  to denote the (vertex) connectivity of  $G$ . The degree of a vertex  $v$  in a graph  $G$  is denoted by  $\deg_G(v)$  or simply by  $\deg(v)$  if there is no danger of confusion. We denote by  $G[X]$  the subgraph of  $G$  induced by a set  $X \subseteq V(G)$ .

For a positive integer  $n$ , let  $[n]$  denote  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . The logarithms in the paper are natural unless specified otherwise.

We say that vertex-disjoint subgraphs  $H$  and  $H'$  of a graph  $G$  are *adjacent* if there exists an edge of  $G$  with one end in  $V(H)$  and the other in  $V(H')$ , and  $H$  and  $H'$  are *non-adjacent*, otherwise.

A collection  $\mathcal{X} = \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_h\}$  of pairwise disjoint subsets of  $V(G)$  is a *model of a graph  $H$  in a graph  $G$*  if  $G[X_i]$  is connected for every  $i \in [h]$ , and there exists a bijection  $\phi : V(H) \rightarrow [h]$  such that  $G[X_{\phi(u)}]$  and  $G[X_{\phi(v)}]$  are adjacent for every  $uv \in E(H)$ . It is well-known and not hard to see that  $G$  has an  $H$  minor if and only if there exists a model of  $H$  in  $G$ . We say that a model  $\mathcal{X}$  as above is *rooted at  $S$*  for  $S \subseteq V(G)$  if  $|S| = h$  and  $|X_i \cap S| = 1$  for every  $i \in [h]$ .

## 2 Outline of the proof

### Small graphs.

The proof of Theorem 1.4 uses different methods depending on the magnitude of  $v(G)$ . In the case when  $v(G)$  is small our argument is based on the following classical bound due to Duchet and Meyniel [DM82] on the independence number of graphs with no  $K_t$  minor.

**Theorem 2.1** ([DM82]). *For every  $t \geq 2$ , every graph  $G$  with no  $K_t$  minor has an independent set of size at least  $\frac{v(G)}{2^{(t-1)}}$ .*

Theorem 2.1 implies that every graph with no  $K_t$  minor contains a  $t$ -colorable subgraph on a constant proportion of vertices. Woodall [Woo87] proved the following stronger result, which as observed by Seymour [Sey16] also follows from the proof of Theorem 2.1 in [DM82].

**Theorem 2.2** ([Woo87]). *Let  $G$  be a graph with no  $K_t$  minor. Then there exists  $X \subseteq V(G)$  with  $|X| \geq \frac{\mathbf{v}(G)}{2}$  such that  $\chi(G[X]) \leq t - 1$ .*

Theorem 2.2 straightforwardly implies the following bound on the chromatic number of graphs with no  $K_t$  minor.

**Corollary 2.3.** *Let  $G$  be a graph with no  $K_t$  minor. Then*

$$\chi(G) \leq \left( \log_2 \left( \frac{\mathbf{v}(G)}{t} \right) + 2 \right) t.$$

*Proof.* By Theorem 2.2 for every integer  $s \geq 0$  there exist disjoint subsets  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_s \subseteq V(G)$  such that  $|V(G) - \cup_{i=1}^s X_i| \leq \mathbf{v}(G)/2^s$  and  $\chi(G[X_i]) \leq t$  for every  $i \in [s]$ . Let  $s = \lceil \log_2(\mathbf{v}(G)/t) \rceil$ . Then  $\mathbf{v}(G)/2^s \leq t$ , and so

$$\chi(G \setminus \cup_{i=1}^s X_i) \leq \mathbf{v}(G \setminus \cup_{i=1}^s X_i) \leq t.$$

It follows that  $\chi(G) \leq t + \sum_{i=1}^s \chi(G[X_i]) \leq (s+1)t$ , implying the corollary.  $\square$

By Corollary 2.3 we may assume that  $\mathbf{v}(G)$  is large. Given a graph  $G$  with  $\chi(G) = \Omega(t(\log t)^\beta)$ , where  $\beta$  is as in Theorem 1.4, we find a  $K_t$  minor in  $G$  by adapting the following strategy employed by Thomason [Tho01]: We first construct a large collection of pairwise vertex-disjoint dense subgraphs  $H_1, \dots, H_r$  of  $G$ , and then find a model of a smaller complete graph in each  $H_i$ , and link these models together to build a model of  $K_t$ .

### Density increment.

The next theorem is the central element of our proof. We precede its statement with a brief motivation.

By Theorem 1.3 there exists  $D = O(t\sqrt{\log t})$  such that every graph  $G$  with density  $\mathbf{d}(G) \geq D$  has a  $K_t$  minor. For a graph  $G$  with smaller density one might still hope to guarantee a  $K_t$  minor by finding a minor  $H$  of  $G$  with  $\mathbf{d}(H) \geq D$ . Thus we are interested for given  $d, D$  in properties of graphs  $G$  of density  $\mathbf{d}(G) = d$  and no minor of density  $D$ , which are the *obstructions* to this approach.

It is possible that such a graph  $G$  simply does not have enough edges. As every graph of density  $D$  has at least  $D^2$  edges, if  $G$  has a minor of density  $D$  we must have  $D^2 \leq \mathbf{e}(G) = d \cdot \mathbf{v}(G)$ . It follows that all the graphs  $G$  with  $\mathbf{v}(G) < D^2/d$  are among the obstructions. One can obtain further obstructions by taking disjoint union of such graphs, and, more generally, by gluing smaller obstructions along small sets in a “tree-like fashion”. Note that all graphs obtained in this way contain a subgraph with at most  $D^2/d$  vertices and density close to  $d$ .

Our result shows that all the obstructions have a similar property, i.e. they contain a subgraph of density  $d/K$  on at most  $KD^2/d$  vertices, where the error factor  $K$  is subpolynomial in the density gap  $D/d$ .

**Theorem 2.4.** *For every  $\delta > 0$  there exists  $C = C_{2.4}(\delta) > 0$  such that for every  $D > 0$  the following holds. Let  $G$  be a graph with  $\mathbf{d}(G) \geq C$ , and let  $s = D/\mathbf{d}(G)$ . Then  $G$  contains at least one of the following:*

- (i) a minor  $J$  with  $\mathbf{d}(J) \geq D$ , or
- (ii) a subgraph  $H$  with  $\mathbf{v}(H) \leq Cs^\delta D^2/\mathbf{d}(G)$  and  $\mathbf{d}(H) \geq s^{-\delta}\mathbf{d}(G)/C$ .

Theorem 2.4 has applications beyond the proof of Theorem 1.4, one of which is given in Section 5. As for the proof of Theorem 1.4, Theorem 2.4 allows us to extract subgraphs one by one to construct the collection  $H_1, \dots, H_r$  mentioned at the end of the last subsection as otherwise we can partition our graph into two subgraphs, a small subgraph and a sparse subgraph, both of which are colorable with few colors: the small subgraph by Corollary 2.3 and the sparse subgraph by the standard degeneracy argument.

Theorem 2.4 is derived from the following ‘‘density increment’’ result. Its statement requires one additional definition. We say that a graph  $H$  is a  $k$ -bounded minor of a graph  $G$  if there exists a model  $\mathcal{X}$  of  $H$  in  $G$  such that  $|X| \leq k$  for every  $X \in \mathcal{X}$ . That is,  $H$  can be obtained from a subgraph of  $G$  by contracting connected subgraphs on at most  $k$  vertices.

**Theorem 2.5.** *Let  $k \geq \ell \geq 2$  be integers. Let  $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{6k})$  and let  $G$  be a graph with  $d = \mathbf{d}(G) \geq 1/\varepsilon$ . Then  $G$  contains at least one of the following:*

- (i) a subgraph  $H$  with  $\mathbf{v}(H) \leq 3k^3d$  and  $\mathbf{e}(H) \geq \varepsilon^2 d^2/2$ , or
- (ii) an  $(\ell + 1)$ -bounded minor  $G'$  with  $\mathbf{d}(G') \geq \frac{\ell}{2}(1 - 6k\varepsilon)d$ , or
- (iii) a  $k$ -bounded minor  $G'$  with  $\mathbf{d}(G') \geq \frac{k}{8\ell}(1 - 2k\varepsilon)d$ .

The proof of Theorem 2.5 is the most challenging part of our argument and occupies Section 4. Meanwhile, let us derive Theorem 2.4 from Theorem 2.5.

*Proof of Theorem 2.4.* For  $\delta > 0$ , let integers  $k \geq \ell \geq 2$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$  be chosen so that

$$(1 - 6k\varepsilon) \frac{\ell}{2} \geq (\ell + 1)^{1/(\delta+1)}, \quad \text{and} \quad (1)$$

$$(1 - 2k\varepsilon) \frac{k}{8\ell} \geq k^{1/(\delta+1)}. \quad (2)$$

It is easy to see that such a choice is possible. We show that  $C = C_{2.4}(\delta) = 6k^3/\varepsilon^2$  satisfies the theorem.

**Claim 2.5.1.** *Every graph  $G$  with  $\mathbf{d}(G) \geq C$  contains at least one of the following:*

- (a) a subgraph  $H$  with  $\mathbf{v}(H) \leq Cd$  and  $\mathbf{d}(H) \geq \mathbf{d}(G)/C$ , or
- (b) an  $r$ -bounded minor  $G'$  with  $\mathbf{d}(G') \geq r^{1/(\delta+1)}\mathbf{d}(G)$  for some  $r > 1$ .

*Proof.* We apply Theorem 2.5 to  $G$ . If Theorem 2.5(i) holds then (a) holds by the choice of  $C$ . If Theorem 2.5(ii) or (iii) holds then (b) holds by (1) and (2), respectively.  $\square$

Suppose now for a contradiction, that there exists a graph  $G$  with  $\mathbf{d}(G) \geq C$  that does not satisfy the conclusion of Theorem 2.4, while every proper minor  $H$  with  $\mathbf{d}(H) \geq C$  of  $G$  satisfies it. Thus  $G$  has no minor  $J$  with  $\mathbf{d}(J) \geq D$ . In particular  $\mathbf{d}(G) < D$ , and  $s = D/\mathbf{d}(G) > 1$ . If there exists a subgraph  $H$  of  $G$  as in Claim 2.5.1(a), then Theorem 2.4(ii) holds, contrary to the choice of  $G$ .

Thus by Claim 2.5.1(b),  $G$  has an  $r$ -bounded minor  $G'$  with  $\mathbf{d}(G') \geq r^{1/(\delta+1)}\mathbf{d}(G)$  for some  $r > 1$ . By the choice of  $G$ ,  $G'$  has a subgraph  $H'$  with

$$\mathbf{v}(H') \leq (s')^{1+\delta}CD \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{d}(H') \geq \frac{(s')^{-\delta}\mathbf{d}(G')}{C},$$

where  $s' = D/\mathbf{d}(G') \leq sr^{-1/(\delta+1)}$ . Then  $H'$  is an  $r$ -bounded minor of  $G$ , corresponding to a subgraph  $H$  of  $G$  with  $\mathbf{v}(H) \leq r\mathbf{v}(H')$  and  $\mathbf{d}(H) \geq \mathbf{d}(H')/r$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}(H) &\leq r(s')^{1+\delta}CD \leq s^{1+\delta}CD, \quad \text{and} \\ \mathbf{d}(H) &\geq \frac{(s')^{-\delta}\mathbf{d}(G')}{Cr} \geq (sr^{-1/(\delta+1)})^{-\delta} r^{1/(\delta+1)}r^{-1}\mathbf{d}(G)/C = s^{-\delta}\mathbf{d}(G)/C, \end{aligned}$$

and so Theorem 2.4(ii) holds, contradicting the choice of  $G$ .  $\square$

### Building a $K_t$ minor.

Once appropriate  $H_1, \dots, H_r$  are found via the repeated use of Theorem 2.4, the following theorem ensures the existence of a  $K_t$  minor.

**Theorem 2.6.** *There exists  $C = C_{2.6} > 1$  satisfying the following. Let  $G$  be a graph with  $\kappa(G) \geq Ct(\log t)^{1/4}$ , and let  $r \geq \sqrt{\log t}/2$  be an integer. If there exist pairwise vertex-disjoint subgraphs  $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_r$  of  $G$  such that  $\mathbf{d}(H_i) \geq Ct(\log t)^{1/4}$  for every  $i \in [r]$  then  $G$  has a  $K_t$  minor.*

Theorem 2.6 is proved in Section 3. To apply it in the proof of Theorem 1.4, we need a bound on the connectivity of  $G$ . We say that a graph  $G$  is *contraction-critical* if  $\chi(H) < \chi(G)$  for every proper minor  $H$  of  $G$ . Clearly, a minimum counterexample to Theorem 1.4 is contraction-critical. This allows us to use the connectivity bound established by Kawarabayshi [Kaw07].

**Theorem 2.7** ([Kaw07]). *Let  $G$  be a contraction-critical graph with  $\chi(G) \geq k$ . Then  $\kappa(G) \geq 2k/27$ .*

In the remainder of this section we deduce Theorem 1.4 from Theorems 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, Corollary 2.3 and the following explicit form of Theorem 1.3 from [Kos82].

**Theorem 2.8** ([Kos82]). *Let  $t \geq 2$  be an integer. Then every graph  $G$  with  $\mathbf{d}(G) \geq 3.2t\sqrt{\log t}$  has a  $K_t$  minor.*

*Proof of Theorem 1.4.* It suffices to show that for every  $\delta > 0$  there exists  $t_0 = t_0(\delta)$  such that for all positive integers  $t \geq t_0$ , every graph  $G$  with no  $K_t$  minor satisfies

$$\chi(G) < t(\log t)^{\frac{1}{4}+\delta}.$$

We assume without loss of generality that  $\delta < 1/4$ .

Let  $C_1 = C_{2.4}(\delta)$ , and let  $C_2 = C_{2.6}$ . We choose  $t_0 \gg C_1, C_2, 1/\delta$  implicitly to satisfy the inequalities appearing throughout the proof.

Let  $t \geq t_0$  be an integer and let  $k = t(\log t)^{\frac{1}{4}+\delta}$ . Suppose for a contradiction that there exists a graph  $G$  with no  $K_t$  minor such that  $\chi(G) \geq k$ . We assume without loss of generality that  $G$  is contraction-critical. Thus  $\kappa(G) \geq 2k/27$  by Theorem 2.7. In particular,  $\kappa(G) \geq C_2 t(\log t)^{1/4}$  for large enough  $t$ .

Choose a maximal collection  $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_r$  of pairwise vertex-disjoint subgraphs of  $G$  such that  $d(H_i) \geq C_2 t(\log t)^{1/4}$  and  $v(H_i) \leq t(\log t)^{3/4}$ . By the choice of  $G$  and Theorem 2.6 we have  $r < \sqrt{\log t}/2$ . Let  $X = \cup_{i \in [r]} V(H_i)$ . Then  $|X| < t(\log t)^{5/4}$ . By Corollary 2.3 for sufficiently large  $t$  we have

$$\chi(H[X]) \leq 2t \log \log t < k/2 - 1.$$

Thus  $\chi(G \setminus X) \geq k/2 + 1$ .

Let  $G'$  be a minimal subgraph of  $G \setminus X$  such that  $\chi(G') \geq k/2 + 1$ . Then every vertex of  $G'$  has degree at least  $k/2$ , and so  $d(G') \geq k/4$ . Let  $D = 3.2t\sqrt{\log t}$ . We apply Theorem 2.4 to  $D$  and  $G'$ . If  $G'$  has a minor  $J$  with  $d(J) \geq D$ , then  $G'$  has a  $K_t$  minor by Theorem 2.8, contradicting the choice of  $G$ . Thus there exists a subgraph  $H$  of  $G'$  such that  $v(H) \leq s^{1+\delta}C_1D$  and  $d(H) \geq s^{-\delta}d(G')/C_1$ , where  $s = D/d(G') \leq 13(\log t)^{1/4-\delta}$ . It is easy to check that for large enough  $t$  the above conditions imply  $d(H) \geq C_2 t(\log t)^{1/4}$  and  $v(H) \leq t(\log t)^{3/4}$ . Thus the collection  $\{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_r, H\}$  contradicts the maximality of  $\{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_r\}$ .  $\square$

### 3 Building a $K_t$ minor

In this section we prove Theorem 2.6. Our proof uses several additional tools from the literature.

First, we will need each subgraph  $H_i$  in the statement of Theorem 2.6 to be not only dense, but highly-connected. This is not hard to guarantee using a classical result of Mader [Mad72] which ensures that every dense graph contains a highly-connected subgraph.

**Lemma 3.1** ([Mad72]). *Every graph  $G$  contains a subgraph  $G'$  such that  $\kappa(G') \geq d(G)/2$ .*

The technical part of the proof of Theorem 2.6 involves linking the models we construct in each  $H_i$ . To accomplish this we employ a toolkit introduced by Bollobás and Thomason [BT96] for finding rooted models in highly connected graphs.

**Lemma 3.2** ([BT96]). *Let  $G$  be a graph with  $d = d(G) \geq 3$ . Then  $G$  has a minor  $H$  such that  $v(H) \leq d + 2$  and  $2\delta(H) \geq v(H) + 0.3d - 2$ .*

**Lemma 3.3** ([BT96]). *Let  $n \geq 0, k \geq 2$  and  $h \geq n + 3k/2$  be integers. Let  $G$  be a graph with  $\kappa(G) \geq k$  containing vertex-disjoint non-empty connected subgraphs  $C_1, \dots, C_h$  such that each of them is non-adjacent to at most  $n$  others. Let  $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_k\} \subseteq V(G)$ . Then  $G$  contains vertex-disjoint non-empty connected subgraphs  $D_1, \dots, D_m$  where  $m = h - \lfloor k/2 \rfloor$ , such that  $s_i \in V(D_i)$  for each  $i \in [k]$  and every element of  $\{D_1, \dots, D_m\}$  is non-adjacent to at most  $n$  subgraphs among  $D_{k+1}, \dots, D_m$ .*

It is worth noting that Lemma 3.3 corresponds to [BT96, Lemma 2], where the last condition is only stated for subgraphs  $D_1, \dots, D_k$ , but the family  $D_1, \dots, D_m$  constructed in the proof has the stronger condition claimed in Lemma 3.3.

In addition to the above lemmas, we also use one of the main results of [BT96].

**Theorem 3.4** ([BT96]). *There exists  $C = C_{3.4} > 0$  satisfying the following. Let  $s$  be a positive integer, let  $G$  be a graph with  $\kappa(G) \geq Cs$ , and let  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k$  be non-empty disjoint subsets of  $V(G)$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^k |S_i| \leq s$ . Then there exist vertex-disjoint connected subgraphs  $C_1, \dots, C_k$  of  $G$  such that  $S_i \subseteq V(C_i)$  for every  $i \in [k]$ .*

The value of  $C_{3.4}$  is not explicitly given in [BT96], but it is not hard to see that  $C_{3.4} = 22$  suffices. Thomas and Wollan [TW05] improve the bounds from [BT96], and the results of [TW05] directly imply that  $C_{3.4} = 10$  satisfies Theorem 3.4. The exact value of  $C_{3.4}$  does not substantially affect our bounds.

The next lemma is used to construct the pieces of our model of  $K_t$ . Let  $l$  be a positive integer. Given a collection  $\mathcal{S} = \{(s_i, t_i)\}_{i \in [l]}$  of pairs of vertices of a graph  $G$  (where  $s_i$  and  $t_i$  are possibly the same) an  $\mathcal{S}$ -linkage  $\mathcal{P}$  is a collection of vertex-disjoint paths  $\{P_1, \dots, P_l\}$  in  $G$  such that  $P_i$  has ends  $s_i$  and  $t_i$  for every  $i \in [l]$ .

**Lemma 3.5.** *There exists  $C = C_{3.5} > 0$  satisfying the following. Let  $G$  be a graph, let  $l \geq s \geq 2$  be positive integers. Let  $s_1, \dots, s_l, t_1, \dots, t_l, r_1, \dots, r_s \in V(G)$  be distinct, except possibly  $s_i = t_i$  for some  $i \in [l]$ . If*

$$\kappa(G) \geq C \cdot \max\{l, s\sqrt{\log s}\},$$

*then there exists a  $K_s$  model  $\mathcal{M}$  in  $G$  rooted at  $\{r_1, \dots, r_s\}$  and an  $\{(s_i, t_i)\}_{i \in [l]}$ -linkage  $\mathcal{P}$  in  $G$  such that  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{P}$  are vertex-disjoint.*

*Proof.* Our choice of  $C$  will be implicit, i.e. we assume that it is chosen to satisfy the inequalities appearing throughout the proof.

Let  $d = \mathbf{d}(G) \geq \kappa(G)/2 \geq Cl/2$ . By Lemma 3.2 there exists a model  $\mathcal{H}$  of a graph  $H$  in  $G$  such that  $\mathbf{v}(H) \leq d + 2$ , and every vertex in  $H$  has at most  $\mathbf{v}(H)/2 - d/10$  non-neighbors.

Let  $h = \mathbf{v}(H)$ ,  $n = h/2 - d/10$ , and let  $k = 2l + s \leq 3l \leq d/150$ . (The last inequality assumes  $C \geq 900$ .) Then  $h \geq n + 3k/2$ . By Lemma 3.3 applied to the elements of  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_l, t_1, \dots, t_l, r_1, \dots, r_s\}$ , there exist a collection  $\mathcal{D} = \{D_1, \dots, D_m\}$  of vertex-disjoint non-empty connected subgraphs  $D_1, \dots, D_m$  of  $G$  where  $m = h - \lfloor k/2 \rfloor$ , such that  $D_1, \dots, D_k$  each contain exactly one vertex from  $S$ , and every element of  $\mathcal{D}$  is non-adjacent to at most  $n$  subgraphs in  $\mathcal{D}' := \{D_{k+1}, \dots, D_m\}$ . We may assume without loss of generality that  $r_i \in V(D_i)$  for every  $i \in [s]$ . As  $|\mathcal{D}'| \geq h - 3k/2$ , every two elements of  $\mathcal{D}$  have at least

$$|\mathcal{D}'| - 2n - 2 \geq d/5 - 3k - 2 \geq d/6$$

common neighbors in  $\mathcal{D}'$ .

Let  $\mathcal{D}'' \subseteq \mathcal{D}'$  be chosen by selecting each element of  $\mathcal{D}'$  independently at random with probability  $1/2$ . Then by the Chernoff bound the probability that a given pair of elements of  $\mathcal{D}$  have fewer than  $d/24$  common neighbors in  $\mathcal{D}''$  is at most  $e^{-d/100}$ . For sufficiently large  $C$  we have  $(d+2)^2 e^{-d/100} < 1/2$ , and thus by linearity of expectation there exists  $\mathcal{D}'' \subseteq \mathcal{D}'$  such

that  $|\mathcal{D}''| \leq h/2$  and every pair of elements of  $\mathcal{D}$  has at least  $d/24 \geq k$  common neighbors in  $\mathcal{D}''$ . Let  $\mathcal{M}' = \mathcal{D}' - \mathcal{D}''$ , then  $|\mathcal{M}'| \geq h/2 - 3k/2$ . Note that every element of  $\mathcal{M}'$  is non-adjacent to at most  $n$  other elements of  $\mathcal{M}'$ , and hence is adjacent to at least

$$|\mathcal{M}'| - n \geq \left(h - \frac{3k}{2}\right) - \left(h - \frac{d}{5}\right) - 2 = \frac{d}{10} - \frac{3k}{2} - 2 \geq \frac{d}{12} \geq \frac{C}{24} s \sqrt{\log s}$$

other elements of  $\mathcal{M}'$ . By Theorem 2.8, there exists a model  $\mathcal{M}'' = \{M'_1, \dots, M'_s\}$  of  $K_s$  in  $G$  such that each element of  $\mathcal{M}''$  is a union of vertex sets of elements of  $\mathcal{M}'$ . By the choice of  $\mathcal{D}''$ , there exists  $\{D'_1, \dots, D'_s\} \subseteq \mathcal{D}''$  such that  $D'_i$  is adjacent to  $D_i$  and  $G[M'_i]$  for every  $i \in [s]$ . Let  $\mathcal{M} = \{M'_i \cup V(D_i) \cup V(D'_i)\}_{i \in [s]}$ . Then  $\mathcal{M}$  is a model of  $K_s$  in  $G$ , rooted at  $\{r_1, \dots, r_s\}$ . Similarly, using  $l$  elements of  $\mathcal{D}'' - \{D'_1, \dots, D'_s\}$ , we find an  $\{(s_i, t_i)\}_{i \in [l]}$ -linkage  $\mathcal{P}$  in  $G$ , such that  $\mathcal{P}$  is vertex-disjoint from  $\mathcal{M}$ , as desired.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove Theorem 2.6, which we restate for convenience.

**Theorem 2.6.** *There exists  $C = C_{2.6} > 1$  satisfying the following. Let  $G$  be a graph with  $\kappa(G) \geq Ct(\log t)^{1/4}$ , and let  $r \geq \sqrt{\log t}/2$  be an integer. If there exist pairwise vertex-disjoint subgraphs  $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_r$  of  $G$  such that  $\mathbf{d}(H_i) \geq Ct(\log t)^{1/4}$  for every  $i \in [r]$  then  $G$  has a  $K_t$  minor.*

*Proof.* Again we will choose  $C = C_{2.6}$  implicitly, sufficiently large with respect to  $C_{3.4}$  and  $C_{3.5}$ . By Lemma 3.1, replacing each  $H_i$  by a subgraph as necessary, we may assume that

$$\kappa(H_i) \geq \frac{C}{2} t(\log t)^{1/4},$$

instead of  $\mathbf{d}(H_i) \geq Ct(\log t)^{1/4}$ . Let  $y = \lfloor (\log t)^{1/4} \rfloor$  and  $x = \lceil t/y \rceil$ . Then  $xy \geq t$  and it suffices to show that  $G$  has a  $K_{xy}$  minor. We reindex the graphs  $H_1, \dots, H_{\binom{y}{2}+1}$  to  $H_0$  and  $\{H_{\{i,j\}}\}_{\{i,j\} \subseteq [y]}$ . By choosing  $C$  appropriately large, we may assume that  $\kappa(G) \geq xy(y-1)$ . Then it follows from Theorem 3.4 that there exist vertex-disjoint linkages  $\mathcal{Q}_{(i,j)}$  for all  $i, j \in [y]$  with  $i \neq j$ , such that each  $\mathcal{Q}_{(i,j)}$  consists of  $x$  paths  $Q_{(i,j)}^1, \dots, Q_{(i,j)}^x$  each starting in  $V(H_{\{i,j\}})$ , ending in  $V(H_0)$  and otherwise disjoint from  $V(H_{\{i,j\}}) \cup V(H_0)$ . Let  $\mathcal{Q} = \cup_{i,j \in [y], i \neq j} \mathcal{Q}_{(i,j)}$ .

We now apply Lemma 3.5 consecutively to each of the subgraphs  $H = H_{\{i,j\}}$  with  $s = 2x$ , and  $l \leq xy(y-1) - 2x$  equal to the number of paths in  $\mathcal{Q} - \mathcal{Q}_{(i,j)} - \mathcal{Q}_{(j,i)}$  which intersect  $H$ . The vertices  $\{(s_i, t_i)\}_{i \in [l]}$  are then chosen to be the first and last vertex of these paths in  $H$ , while the vertices  $r_1, r_2, \dots, r_s$  are the ends of the paths  $\mathcal{Q}_{(i,j)} \cup \mathcal{Q}_{(j,i)}$  in  $H$ . By using the linkage  $\mathcal{P}$  given by Lemma 3.5 to reroute the paths in  $\mathcal{Q} - \mathcal{Q}_{(i,j)} - \mathcal{Q}_{(j,i)}$  within  $H$ , we may assume that  $H$  contains a  $K_{2x}$  model  $\mathcal{M}_{\{i,j\}}$  rooted at  $\{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_s\} \subseteq V(\mathcal{Q}_{(i,j)}) \cup V(\mathcal{Q}_{(j,i)})$ , which is otherwise disjoint from  $V(\mathcal{Q})$ .

Finally we need to join the ends of paths in  $\mathcal{Q}$  in  $H_0$ . By Theorem 3.4 there exist vertex-disjoint connected subgraphs  $\{C_i^a\}_{i \in [y], a \in [x]}$  of  $H_0$  such that  $V(C_i^a)$  contains the ends of paths  $Q_{(i,j)}^a$  for all  $j \in [y] - \{i\}$ , and is otherwise disjoint from  $V(\mathcal{Q})$ . These  $xy$  connected subgraphs together with the paths of  $\mathcal{Q}$  ending in them, and the elements of the  $K_{2x}$  models containing the second ends of these paths now form the elements of a  $K_{xy}$  model in  $G$ , as desired.  $\square$

## 4 Finding a small dense subgraph

In this section we prove Theorem 2.5. The proof is based on two theorems, Theorem 4.2 about unbalanced bipartite graphs and Theorem 4.4 about general graphs. We prove Theorem 4.2 in Subsection 4.1 and Theorem 4.4 in Subsection 4.2. Finally in Subsection 4.3, we prove Theorem 2.5 by combining these two theorems. However, first we will need some preliminaries.

An important concept to the proofs of Theorems 4.2 and 4.4 is that of a mate, defined as follows.

Let  $G$  be a graph, and let  $K, d \geq 1, \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  be real. We say that two vertices of  $G$  are  $(\varepsilon, d)$ -mates if they have at least  $\varepsilon d$  common neighbors. We say that  $G$  is  $(K, \varepsilon, d)$ -unmated if every vertex of degree at most  $Kd$  in  $G$  has strictly fewer than  $\varepsilon d$   $(\varepsilon, d)$ -mates.

We need the following useful proposition which shows that if a graph does not contain a small dense subgraph, then every  $k$ -bounded minor of it is unmated (for the appropriate choice of constants).

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $k, d \geq 1, \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ . If there does not exist a subgraph  $H$  of a graph  $G$  with  $\mathbf{v}(H) \leq 3k^3d$  and  $\mathbf{e}(H) \geq \varepsilon^2d^2/2$ , then every  $k$ -bounded minor of  $G$  is  $(k^2, \varepsilon, d)$ -unmated.*

*Proof.* Assume for a contradiction that there exists a  $k$ -bounded minor  $G'$  of  $G$  that is not  $(k^2, \varepsilon, d)$ -unmated. Then there exists  $v \in V(G')$  with  $\deg_{G'}(v) \leq k^2d$  such that  $v$  has at least  $\varepsilon d$   $(\varepsilon, d)$ -mates in  $G'$ . Let  $v_1, \dots, v_{\lceil \varepsilon d \rceil}$  be distinct  $(\varepsilon, d)$ -mates of  $v$  in  $G'$ . Let  $H' = G'[N(v) \cup \{v, v_1, \dots, v_{\lceil \varepsilon d \rceil}\}]$ . Then  $\mathbf{v}(H') \leq 1 + k^2d + \lceil \varepsilon d \rceil \leq 3k^2d$  and  $\mathbf{e}(H') \geq \varepsilon^2d^2/2$ . Since  $H'$  is a  $k$ -bounded minor of  $G$ , it corresponds to a subgraph  $H$  of  $G$  with  $\mathbf{v}(H) \leq k \cdot \mathbf{v}(H') \leq 3k^3d$  and  $\mathbf{e}(H) \geq \mathbf{e}(H') \geq \varepsilon^2d^2/2$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

We also need a few definitions involving forests in a graph as follows. Let  $F$  be a forest in a graph  $G$ . For any real number  $k \geq 1$ , we say  $F$  is  $k$ -bounded if  $\mathbf{v}(T) \leq k$  for every component  $T$  of  $F$ . For any real numbers  $d \geq 1$  and  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ , we say  $F$  is  $(\varepsilon, d)$ -mate-free (in  $G$ ) if no two distinct vertices in any component of  $F$  are  $(\varepsilon, d)$ -mates in  $G$ . If  $G = (A, B)$  is bipartite, then we say  $F$  is a *star forest from  $B$  to  $A$*  if every component of  $F$  is a star with a center in  $B$ .

### 4.1 Dense minors in unbalanced bipartite graphs

In this subsection, we prove the following theorem about unbalanced bipartite graphs using an alternating path argument.

**Theorem 4.2.** *Let  $\ell \geq 2$  be an integer, and let  $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, \frac{1}{2\ell})$  and  $d_0 \geq 1/\varepsilon_0$  be real. Let  $G = (A, B)$  be a bipartite graph such that  $|A| > \ell|B|$  and every vertex in  $A$  has at least  $d_0$  neighbors in  $B$ . Then  $G$  contains at least one of the following:*

- (i) a subgraph  $H$  with  $\mathbf{v}(H) \leq 3d_0$  and  $\mathbf{e}(H) \geq \varepsilon_0^2d_0^2/2$ , or
- (ii) an  $(\ell + 1)$ -bounded minor  $G'$  with  $\mathbf{d}(G') \geq \frac{\ell}{2}(1 - 2\ell\varepsilon_0)d_0$ .

*Proof.* We may assume without loss of generality that every vertex in  $A$  has exactly  $d_0$  neighbors in  $B$ . Now first suppose that  $G$  is not  $(1, \varepsilon_0, d_0)$ -unmated. By Proposition 4.1 with  $k = 1$ , there exists a subgraph  $H$  of  $G$  with  $\mathbf{v}(H) \leq 3d_0$  and  $\mathbf{e}(H) \geq \varepsilon_0^2 d_0^2 / 2$ . Hence (i) holds, as desired. So we may assume that  $G$  is  $(1, \varepsilon_0, d_0)$ -unmated.

Let  $F_0$  be an  $(\varepsilon_0, d_0)$ -mate-free  $(\ell + 1)$ -bounded star forest from  $B$  to  $A$  such that  $\mathbf{v}(F_0)$  is maximized. Note that  $B \subseteq V(F_0)$  since  $\mathbf{v}(F_0)$  is maximized. Yet  $|A \cap V(F_0)| \leq \ell|B| < |A|$ . Hence  $A \setminus V(F_0) \neq \emptyset$ .

Choose  $u \in A \setminus V(F_0)$ . For each  $v \in V(G)$  with  $v \neq u$ , we say that a path  $P$  in  $G$  from  $u$  to  $v$  is a  $(u, v)$ - $F_0$ -alternating path if

- every internal vertex of  $P$  has degree exactly one in  $F_0 \cap P$  (that is - informally - every other edge of  $P$  is in  $F_0$ ), and
- there does not exist  $u'v' \in E(P) \setminus E(F_0)$  with  $u' \in A$ ,  $v' \in B$  and a vertex  $w$  in the component of  $F_0$  containing  $v'$  such that  $u'$  and  $w$  are  $(\varepsilon_0, d_0)$ -mates.

Let  $F$  be the subgraph of  $F_0$  consisting of all the components  $T$  of  $F_0$  such that there exists a  $(u, v)$ - $F_0$ -alternating path, where  $\{v\} = V(T) \cap B$ .

Note that  $F$  is non-empty as  $u$  has at least  $\varepsilon_0 d_0 + 1$  neighbors in  $B$  (since  $\varepsilon < 1$ ) but at most  $\varepsilon_0 d_0$   $(\varepsilon_0, d_0)$ -mates in  $A$  as  $G$  is  $(1, \varepsilon_0, d_0)$ -unmated and  $\deg_G(u) = d_0$ .

**Claim 4.2.1.** *Every component of  $F$  has exactly  $\ell$  edges.*

*Proof.* Suppose not. That is, there exists a component  $T$  of  $F$  with  $e(T) < \ell$ . Let  $\{v\} = V(T) \cap B$ . By the definition of  $F$ , there exists a  $(u, v)$ - $F_0$ -alternating path  $P$ . Let  $F'_0 = F_0 \Delta P$ . It follows that  $F'_0$  is an  $(\varepsilon_0, d_0)$ -mate-free  $(\ell + 1)$ -bounded star forest from  $B$  to  $A$ . Yet  $\mathbf{v}(F'_0) > \mathbf{v}(F_0)$ , contradicting the choice of  $F_0$ .  $\square$

**Claim 4.2.2.** *Every vertex in  $V(F) \cap A$  has at most  $\varepsilon_0 d_0$  neighbors in  $B \setminus V(F)$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose not. That is, there exists  $w \in V(F) \cap A$  such that  $w$  has strictly more than  $\varepsilon_0 d_0$  neighbors in  $B \setminus V(F)$ . Since  $G$  is  $(1, \varepsilon_0, d_0)$ -unmated, it follows that there exists  $v \in N(w) \cap B \setminus V(F)$  such that the component of  $F_0$  containing  $v$  does not contain a  $(\varepsilon_0, d_0)$ -mate of  $w$ .

Let  $x \in B$  such that  $wx \in E(F)$ . By definition of  $F$ , there exists a  $(u, x)$ - $F_0$ -alternating path  $P_0$ . If  $w \notin V(P_0)$ , define  $P := P_0 + wx$ ; otherwise, define  $P := P_0 - wx$ . Now  $P$  is a  $(u, w)$ - $F_0$ -alternating path. But then  $P' = P + wv$  is a  $(u, v)$ - $F_0$ -alternating path and hence  $v \in V(F)$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

Let  $G_1$  be obtained from  $G[V(F)]$  by identifying  $A \cap V(C)$  for each component  $C$  of  $F$ . Note that  $G_1$  is bipartite. Let  $M$  be the perfect matching in  $G_1$  corresponding to  $F$ . Let  $G' := G_1 / M = G / E(F)$ . Then  $\mathbf{v}(G_1) = 2 \cdot \mathbf{v}(G')$ .

By Claim 4.2.1, we have that  $\mathbf{v}(G[F]) = (\ell + 1) \cdot \mathbf{v}(G')$ . By Claim 4.2.2 and the fact that every vertex in  $A$  has  $d_0$  neighbors in  $G$ , we have that every vertex in  $A \cap V(F)$  has degree at least  $(1 - \varepsilon_0)d_0$  in  $G[V(F)]$ . Since  $F$  is  $(\varepsilon_0, d_0)$ -mate-free, it follows that every vertex in  $V(G_1) \cap A$  has degree at least

$$\ell(1 - \varepsilon_0)d_0 - \binom{\ell}{2} \varepsilon_0 d_0 \geq \ell(1 - \ell\varepsilon_0)d_0$$

in  $G_1$ , where the last inequality follows since  $\ell \geq 1$ . Since  $|V(G_1) \cap A| = |M| = \mathbf{v}(G')$ , we have that

$$\mathbf{e}(G_1) \geq \ell(1 - \ell\varepsilon_0)d_0 \cdot \mathbf{v}(G').$$

Since  $G_1$  is bipartite, each edge in  $G'$  corresponds to at most two edges in  $G_1 - M$ . It follows that

$$\mathbf{e}(G') \geq \frac{\mathbf{e}(G_1)}{2} - |M| \geq \left( \frac{\ell}{2}(1 - \ell\varepsilon_0)d_0 - 1 \right) \cdot \mathbf{v}(G'),$$

and hence

$$\mathbf{d}(G') \geq \frac{\ell}{2}(1 - \ell\varepsilon_0)d_0 - 1 \geq \frac{\ell}{2}(1 - 2\ell\varepsilon_0)d_0,$$

where the last inequality follows since  $\varepsilon_0 \leq \frac{1}{2\ell}$ . Since  $G'$  is an  $(\ell + 1)$ -bounded minor of  $G$ , (ii) holds, as desired.  $\square$

## 4.2 Dense minors in general graphs

The main result of this subsection is Theorem 4.4.

First, we need the following definition and proposition. Let  $T$  be a tree. We say a vertex  $v$  of  $T$  is a *centroid* of  $T$  if for every edge  $e \in E(T)$  incident with  $v$ , the component of  $T - e$  containing  $v$  has at least  $\mathbf{v}(T)/2$  vertices. Let  $v$  be a vertex of  $T$  that is not a centroid of  $T$ . If  $e \in E(T)$  is an edge incident with  $v$  such that the component  $H$  of  $T - e$  containing  $v$  has at most  $\frac{\mathbf{v}(T)-1}{2}$  vertices, then we say  $e$  is the *central edge for  $v$*  in  $T$  and that  $H$  is the *peripheral piece for  $v$* . We need the following theorem of Jordan [Jor69] from 1869 (see [BLW86] for an English translation and history). We include a proof for completeness.

**Proposition 4.3.** *The number of centroids in a non-empty tree is either one or two.*

*Proof.* Let  $T$  be a non-empty tree. If  $\mathbf{v}(T) = 1$ , then  $T$  has exactly one centroid as desired. So we may assume that  $\mathbf{v}(T) \geq 2$ . Now choose  $e \in E(T)$  and  $T'$  a component of  $T - e$  such that  $\mathbf{v}(T') \geq \frac{\mathbf{v}(T)}{2}$  and subject to those conditions  $\mathbf{v}(T')$  is minimized. Such a choice exists since  $\mathbf{v}(T) \geq 2$ . If  $\mathbf{v}(T') = \frac{\mathbf{v}(T)}{2}$ , then the ends of  $e$  are precisely the centroids of  $T$  as desired. Otherwise  $\mathbf{v}(T') > \frac{\mathbf{v}(T)}{2}$  and the end of  $e$  in  $T'$  is precisely the only centroid of  $T$  as desired.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.4.** *Let  $k \geq \ell \geq 2$  be integers. Let  $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{4k})$ . Let  $G$  be a graph with  $d = \mathbf{d}(G) \geq 1/\varepsilon$ . Then  $G$  contains at least one of the following:*

- (i) *a subgraph  $H$  with  $\mathbf{v}(H) \leq 3k^3d$  and  $\mathbf{e}(H) \geq \varepsilon^2d^2/2$ , or*
- (ii) *a bipartite subgraph  $H = (X, Y)$  with  $|X| > \ell|Y|$  such that every vertex in  $X$  has at least  $(1 - 2k\varepsilon)d$  neighbors in  $Y$ , or*
- (iii) *a  $k$ -bounded minor  $G'$  with  $\mathbf{d}(G') \geq \frac{k}{8\ell}(1 - 2k\varepsilon)d$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose not. We may assume without loss of generality that  $d(H) < d(G)$  for every proper subgraph  $H$  of  $G$ , and hence  $\delta(G) > d$ .

Let  $A = \{v \in V(G) : \deg(v) \leq kd\}$  and  $B = V(G) \setminus A$ . Then  $kd|B| \leq 2e(G) = 2d \cdot v(G)$ . Hence  $|B| \leq \frac{2}{k} \cdot v(G)$ .

For a forest  $F$  in  $G$  define the  $k$ -smallness of  $F$  as

$$\text{small}_k(F) := \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}(F)} \max\{k - 3 \cdot v(C), 0\},$$

where  $\mathcal{C}(F)$  is the set of components of  $F$ .

Let  $F$  be a  $k$ -bounded forest with  $V(F) = A$  such that

$$e(G) - e(G/E(F)) \leq 2\varepsilon d(k \cdot v(G) - \text{small}_k(F)), \quad (3)$$

and subject to that  $\text{small}_k(F)$  is minimized. Note that such an  $F$  exists as the edgeless graph with  $V(F) = A$  is 1-bounded and satisfies (3).

Let  $G' = G/E(F)$ . Since  $F$  is  $k$ -bounded,  $G'$  is a  $k$ -bounded minor of  $G$ . Thus, since (i) does not hold, we have by Proposition 4.1 that  $G'$  is  $(k^2, \varepsilon, d)$ -unmated.

Let  $C$  be the set of centroids of components  $T$  of  $F$  with  $v(T) > \frac{2k}{3}$ . By Proposition 4.3, every component of  $F$  has either one or two centroids. Hence  $|C| \leq 2 \left(\frac{3}{2k} \cdot v(G)\right) = \frac{3}{k} \cdot v(G)$ . Let  $Y = B \cup C$ . Then  $|Y| \leq \frac{5}{k} \cdot v(G)$ . Finally let  $X$  denote the set of vertices in components  $T$  of  $F$  with  $v(T) < \frac{k}{3}$ .

**Claim 4.4.1.** *Every vertex in  $X$  has at least  $(1 - 2k\varepsilon)d$  neighbors in  $Y$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose not. That is, there exists a vertex  $v \in X$  with fewer than  $(1 - 2k\varepsilon)d$  neighbors in  $Y$ . Since  $\delta(G) \geq d$ , this implies that  $X$  has at least  $2k\varepsilon d$  neighbors in  $V(G) \setminus Y$ . Let  $T$  be the component of  $F$  containing  $v$  and let  $x_T$  denote the vertex of  $G'$  corresponding to  $T$ . Since  $G'$  is  $(k^2, \varepsilon, d)$ -unmated and  $\deg_{G'}(x_T) \leq \sum_{u \in V(T)} \deg(u) \leq k^2 d$ , we have by definition that  $x_T$  has at most  $\varepsilon d$   $(\varepsilon, d)$ -mates in  $G'$ .

Since  $2k\varepsilon d > k\varepsilon d + k - 1$ , as  $d \geq 1/\varepsilon$ , it follows that  $v$  has a neighbor  $u \in V(G) \setminus Y$  in a component  $T'$  of  $F$  such that  $T' \neq T$  and the vertex  $x_{T'}$  corresponding to  $T'$  in  $G'$  is not an  $(\varepsilon, d)$ -mate of  $x_T$  in  $G'$ .

First suppose that  $v(T') \leq \frac{2k}{3}$ . Let  $F_1 = F + uv$ . Thus  $T'' := (T \cup T') + uv$  is a component of  $F_1$ . Since

$$v(T'') = v(T) + v(T') \leq \frac{k}{3} + \frac{2k}{3} \leq k.$$

and  $F$  is  $k$ -bounded, we have that  $F_1$  is  $k$ -bounded. Since  $x_{T'}$  is not an  $(\varepsilon, d)$ -mate of  $x_T$  in  $G'$ , we have that

$$e(G') - e(G/E(F_1)) \leq \varepsilon d + 1 \leq 2\varepsilon d,$$

where the last inequality follows since  $d \geq 1/\varepsilon$ . Yet

$$\text{small}_k(F_1) = \text{small}_k(F) - \text{small}_k(T) - \text{small}_k(T') + \text{small}_k(T'').$$

Since  $\text{small}_k(T) > \text{small}_k(T'')$  and  $\text{small}_k(T') \geq 0$ , we have that

$$\text{small}_k(F_1) \leq \text{small}_k(F) - 1,$$

where the  $-1$  follows since  $\text{small}_k$  is integral. It now follows that  $F_1$  also satisfies (3). Since  $F_1$  is a  $k$ -bounded forest with  $V(F_1) = A$  satisfying (3) and  $\text{small}_k(F_1) < \text{small}_k(F)$ , we have that  $F_1$  contradicts the choice of  $F$ .

So we may assume that  $\mathbf{v}(T') > \frac{2k}{3}$ . Since  $u \notin Y$ , we have by definition that  $u$  is not a centroid of  $T'$ . Let  $P$  be the peripheral piece of  $T'$  containing  $u$  and let  $e$  be the central edge of  $u$  in  $T'$ . Since  $P$  is a peripheral piece, we have that  $\mathbf{v}(P) \leq \frac{\mathbf{v}(T')}{2} \leq \frac{k}{2}$ .

Let  $F_2 = F + uv - e$ . Thus  $T_1 := (T \cup P) + uv$  and  $T_2 := T' - V(P)$  are components of  $F_2$ . Now  $F_2$  is  $k$ -bounded since  $\mathbf{v}(T_2) < \mathbf{v}(T') \leq k$  and

$$\mathbf{v}(T_1) = \mathbf{v}(T) + \mathbf{v}(P) \leq \frac{k}{3} + \frac{k}{2} \leq k.$$

Since  $x_{T'}$  is not an  $(\varepsilon, d)$ -mate of  $x_T$  in  $G'$ , we have that  $\mathbf{e}(G') - \mathbf{e}(G/E(F_2)) \leq 2\varepsilon d$ , as above. Note that  $\mathbf{v}(T_1) = \mathbf{v}(T) + \mathbf{v}(P) > \mathbf{v}(T)$  and  $\mathbf{v}(T_2) = \mathbf{v}(T) - \mathbf{v}(P) > \frac{\mathbf{v}(T')}{2} \geq \frac{k}{3}$ . Yet

$$\text{small}_k(F_2) = \text{small}_k(F) - \text{small}_k(T) - \text{small}_k(T') + \text{small}_k(T_1) + \text{small}_k(T_2).$$

Since  $\text{small}_k(T) > \text{small}_k(T_1)$  and  $\text{small}_k(T') = \text{small}_k(T_2) = 0$ , we have that

$$\text{small}_k(F_2) \leq \text{small}_k(F) - 1,$$

where the  $-1$  follows since  $\text{small}_k$  is integral. But then  $F_2$  also satisfies (3). Since  $F_2$  is a  $k$ -bounded forest with  $V(F_2) = A$  satisfying (3) and  $\text{small}_k(F_2) < \text{small}_k(F)$ , we have that  $F_2$  contradicts the choice of  $F$ .  $\square$

We now return to the main proof. First suppose that  $|X| > \ell|Y|$ . Let  $H$  be the bipartite graph with  $V(H) = X \cup Y$  and  $E(H) = \{xy \in E(G) : x \in X, y \in Y\}$ . Then (ii) holds by Claim 4.4.1, a contradiction.

So we may assume that  $|X| \leq \ell|Y| \leq \frac{5\ell}{k} \cdot \mathbf{v}(G)$ . Note that  $F$  has at most  $\frac{3}{k} \cdot \mathbf{v}(G)$  components  $T$  with  $\mathbf{v}(T) \geq \frac{k}{3}$ . Thus

$$\mathbf{v}(G') \leq |X| + \frac{3}{k} \cdot \mathbf{v}(G) + |B| \leq \frac{5(\ell+1)}{k} \cdot \mathbf{v}(G) \leq \frac{8\ell}{k} \cdot \mathbf{v}(G),$$

where the last inequality follows since  $\ell \geq 2$ . Recall that by construction,

$$\mathbf{e}(G) - \mathbf{e}(G') \leq 2\varepsilon d(k \cdot \mathbf{v}(G) - \text{small}_k(F)) \leq 2\varepsilon dk \cdot \mathbf{v}(G),$$

where the last inequality follows since  $\text{small}_k(F) \geq 0$ . Since  $\mathbf{e}(G) = d \cdot \mathbf{v}(G)$ , it follows from the inequality above that

$$\mathbf{e}(G') \geq (1 - 2k\varepsilon)d \cdot \mathbf{v}(G).$$

Since  $\mathbf{v}(G') \leq \frac{8\ell}{k} \cdot \mathbf{v}(G)$ , we have that

$$\mathbf{d}(G') \geq \frac{k}{8\ell}(1 - 2k\varepsilon)d,$$

and (iii) holds, a contradiction.  $\square$

### 4.3 Combining the cases

We now derive Theorem 2.5, which we restate for convenience, from Theorems 4.2 and 4.4.

**Theorem 2.5.** *Let  $k \geq \ell \geq 2$  be integers. Let  $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{6k})$  and let  $G$  be a graph with  $d = d(G) \geq 1/\varepsilon$ . Then  $G$  contains at least one of the following:*

- (i) *a subgraph  $H$  with  $v(H) \leq 3k^3d$  and  $e(H) \geq \varepsilon^2d^2/2$ , or*
- (ii) *an  $(\ell + 1)$ -bounded minor  $G'$  with  $d(G') \geq \frac{\ell}{2}(1 - 6k\varepsilon)d$ , or*
- (iii) *a  $k$ -bounded minor  $G'$  with  $d(G') \geq \frac{k}{8\ell}(1 - 2k\varepsilon)d$ .*

*Proof.* We apply Theorem 4.4 to  $G$ . If Theorem 4.4(i) holds, then (i) holds as desired. Similarly if Theorem 4.4(iii) holds, then (iii) holds as desired.

So we may assume that Theorem 4.4(ii) holds, that is there exists a bipartite subgraph  $H = (X, Y)$  with  $|X| > \ell|Y|$  such that every vertex in  $X$  has at least  $(1 - 2k\varepsilon)d$  neighbors in  $Y$ . We next apply Theorem 4.2 with  $d_0 = (1 - 2k\varepsilon)d$  and  $\varepsilon_0 = 2\varepsilon$  to  $H$ .

First assume Theorem 4.2(i) holds. That is, there exists a subgraph  $H_0$  of  $H$  with  $v(H_0) \leq 3d_0 \leq 3k^3d$  and  $e(H_0) \geq \varepsilon_0^2d_0^2/2 = 4\varepsilon^2(1 - 2k\varepsilon)^2d^2/2$ . Since  $2k\varepsilon \leq 1/2$  as  $\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{4k}$ , we find that  $e(H_0) \geq \varepsilon^2d^2/2$  and (i) holds as desired.

So we may assume that Theorem 4.2(ii) holds. That is,  $H$  contains an  $(\ell + 1)$ -bounded minor  $H_0$  with

$$d(H_0) \geq \frac{\ell}{2}(1 - 2\ell\varepsilon_0)d_0 \geq \frac{\ell}{2}(1 - 4k\varepsilon)(1 - 2k\varepsilon)d \geq \frac{\ell}{2}(1 - 6k\varepsilon)d,$$

where the middle inequality uses the fact that  $\ell \leq k$ . Hence (ii) holds with  $G' = H_0$ , as desired.  $\square$

## 5 An application of Theorem 2.4

For a pair of graphs  $G$  and  $H$ , we say that  $G$  is  $H$ -free if no subgraph of  $G$  is isomorphic to  $H$ . The next theorem due to Kühn and Osthus [KO05] shows that  $H$ -free graphs have exceptionally dense minors for every complete bipartite graph  $H$ .

**Theorem 5.1** ([KO05]). *For every integer  $s \geq 2$ , every  $K_{s,s}$ -free graph  $G$  has a minor  $J$  with*

$$d(J) \geq (d(G))^{1 + \frac{1}{2(s-1)} - o_{d(G)}(1)}. \quad (4)$$

Krivelevich and Sudakov [KS09] tightened (4) to  $d(J) \geq c_s(d(G))^{1 + \frac{1}{s-1}}$  for some  $c_s > 0$  independent of  $d(G)$ . They also proved the following, strengthening a result of Kühn and Osthus [KO03].

**Theorem 5.2** ([KS09]). *For every integer  $k \geq 2$  there exists  $c_k > 0$  such that every  $C_{2k}$ -free  $G$  has a minor  $J$  with*

$$d(J) \geq c_k(d(G))^{\frac{k+1}{2}}.$$

The exponents appearing in Theorems 5.1 and 5.2 can not be improved, subject to well known conjectures on the Turán numbers of  $K_{s,s}$  and  $C_{2k}$ , which we mention below.

In this section we use Theorem 2.4 to extend Theorems 5.1 and 5.2 to general bipartite graphs. Stating our result requires a couple of definitions. The *Turán number*  $\text{ex}(n, H)$  of a graph  $H$  with  $\mathbf{e}(H) \neq 0$  is the maximum number of edges in an  $H$ -free graph  $G$  with  $\mathbf{v}(G) = n$ . The *Turán exponent*  $\gamma(H)$  of a graph  $H$  with  $\mathbf{e}(H) \geq 2$  is defined as

$$\gamma(H) := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \text{ex}(n, H)}{\log n}.$$

Many fundamental questions about Turán exponents of bipartite graphs remain open. In particular, a famous conjecture of Erdős and Simonovits (see [FS13, Conjecture 1.6]) states that  $\gamma(H)$  is rational for every graph  $H$ , and that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{ex}(n, H)/n^{\gamma(H)}$  exists and is positive. We refer the reader to a comprehensive survey by Füredi and Simonovits [FS13] for further background.

The main result of this section is an essentially tight analogue of Theorems 5.1 and 5.2 for  $H$ -free graphs  $G$  for general bipartite  $H$ .

**Theorem 5.3.** *For every bipartite graph  $H$  with  $\gamma(H) > 1$ , every  $H$ -free graph  $G$  has a minor  $J$  with*

$$\mathbf{d}(J) \geq (\mathbf{d}(G))^{\frac{\gamma(H)}{2(\gamma(H)-1)} - o_{\mathbf{d}(G)}(1)}.$$

*Proof.* The theorem follows from Theorem 2.4 via a routine, if not exceptionally short, calculation. Let  $H$  be as in the theorem statement, and let  $\gamma = \gamma(H)$ . We need to show that for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $d_0 = d_0(\varepsilon, H) > 0$  such that every  $H$ -free graph  $G$  with  $\mathbf{d}(G) \geq d_0$  has a minor  $J$  with

$$\mathbf{d}(J) \geq (\mathbf{d}(G))^{\frac{\gamma}{2(\gamma-1)} - \varepsilon}.$$

Let  $\delta$  be chosen so that  $\left(\frac{\gamma}{2(\gamma-1)} - \varepsilon\right) \delta \leq \frac{1}{2}$  and

$$\frac{\gamma + \delta}{(2 + \delta)(\gamma - 1 + \delta) + \delta} > \frac{\gamma}{2(\gamma - 1)} - \varepsilon, \quad (5)$$

and let  $C = C_{2.4}(\delta)$  be as in Theorem 2.4. Let  $d_0 \geq C^{1/\delta}$  be chosen so that every  $H$ -free graph  $G'$  with  $\mathbf{v}(G') \geq (d_0)^{1/2}$  satisfies  $\mathbf{e}(G') \leq (\mathbf{v}(G'))^{\gamma+\delta}$ . Such a choice is possible by definition of the Turán exponent  $\gamma(H)$ .

Let  $G$  be an  $H$ -free graph with  $\mathbf{d} := \mathbf{d}(G) \geq d_0$ , and let  $D := \mathbf{d}^{\frac{\gamma}{2(\gamma-1)} - \varepsilon}$ . We assume for a contradiction that the density of every minor of  $G$  is less than  $D$ . Then by Theorem 2.4 there exists a subgraph  $G'$  with

$$\mathbf{v}(G') \leq (D/\mathbf{d})^\delta C D^2 / \mathbf{d} \leq D^{2+\delta} / \mathbf{d}, \quad (6)$$

and

$$\mathbf{d}(G') \geq (D/\mathbf{d})^{-\delta} \mathbf{d} / C \geq \mathbf{d} / D^\delta. \quad (7)$$

By the choice of  $d_0$ , we have that

$$\mathbf{v}(G') \geq \mathbf{d}(G') \geq \mathbf{d}^{1-\delta(\frac{\gamma}{2(\gamma-1)} - \varepsilon)} \geq (d_0)^{1/2}.$$

It follows from the choice of  $d_0$  and the fact that  $G'$  is  $H$ -free that

$$d(G') = \frac{e(G')}{v(G')} \leq (v(G'))^{\gamma-1+\delta}.$$

Substituting (6) and (7) in the above we obtain

$$\frac{d}{D^\delta} \leq \left( \frac{D^{2+\delta}}{d} \right)^{\gamma-1+\delta},$$

implying

$$D \geq d^{\frac{\gamma+\delta}{(2+\delta)(\gamma-1+\delta)+\delta}} \stackrel{(5)}{>} d^{\frac{\gamma}{2(\gamma-1)}-\varepsilon} = D,$$

the desired contradiction.  $\square$

By definition of the Turán exponent, for every graph  $H$  there exists a family of  $H$ -free graphs  $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  with  $v(G_n) \rightarrow \infty$  and  $d(G_n) \geq v(G_n)^{\gamma(H)-1-o(1)}$ . For every minor  $J$  of a graph  $G_n$  we have

$$d^2(J) \leq e(J) \leq e(G_n) = v(G_n)d(G_n) \leq d(G_n)^{\frac{\gamma(H)}{\gamma(H)-1}+o(1)},$$

assuming  $\gamma(H) > 1$ . Thus Theorem 5.3 is tight up to the  $o_{d(G)}(1)$  term, as claimed above.

It has been shown by Kővari, Sós and Turán [KST54] that  $\gamma(K_{s,s}) \leq 2 - \frac{1}{s}$ , and by Erdős (see [FS13, Theorem 4.6]), and Bondy and Simonovits [BS74] that  $\gamma(C_{2k}) \leq (k+1)/k$ . Thus Theorem 5.3 extends Theorems 5.1 and 5.2, although the error term in Theorem 5.2 is better controlled. Note that the tightness of Theorems 5.1 and 5.2, unlike that of Theorem 5.3, hinges on tightness of the above inequalities on  $\gamma(K_{s,s})$  and  $\gamma(C_{2k})$ , which is widely believed, but is in general open.

Theorem 5.3 does not apply to bipartite graphs  $H$  with  $\gamma(H) \leq 1$ . However, if  $\gamma(H) \leq 1$  then  $H$  is a forest (see [FS13, Corollary 2.28]). It is not hard to show that for every forest  $H$  with  $v(H) \geq 2$  and every  $H$ -free graph  $G$ , we have  $d(G) \leq v(H) - 2$ , and so the density of  $H$ -free graphs is bounded for such  $H$ . (The exact bound is the subject of the famous Erdős-Sós conjecture [Erd64], see also [FS13, Conjecture 6.1].) Thus there are no meaningful extensions of asymptotic results such as Theorem 5.3 to this case.

## 6 Concluding remarks

### Further improvements.

Further improving the bounds obtained in this paper would require improving or replacing Theorem 2.6, which encapsulates our current procedure for obtaining a  $K_t$  minor by linking several smaller pieces.

Answering the following question would help determine the limits of the current approach.

**Question 6.1.** *Does there exist  $C > 0$  such that for every integer  $t \geq 1$  the following holds?*

*If  $G$  is a graph and  $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_r$  are vertex-disjoint subgraphs of  $V(G)$  for some  $r \geq (\log t)^C$ ,  $\kappa(G) \geq Ct$  and  $\kappa(H_i) \geq Ct$  for every  $i \in [r]$ , then  $G$  has a  $K_t$  minor.*

Note that Böhme et al. [BKMM09] have shown that for every integer  $t \geq 1$  there exists  $N(t)$  such that every graph  $G$  with  $\kappa(G) \geq 31(t+1)/2$  and  $v(G) \geq N(t)$  has a  $K_t$  minor. Their result implies that if we replace the requirement  $r \geq (\log t)^C$  in Question 6.1 by  $r \geq N(t)$ , then the modified question has a positive answer.

### Odd minors.

Given graphs  $G$  and  $H$  we say that  $G$  has an *odd  $H$  minor* if a graph isomorphic to  $H$  can be obtained from a subgraph  $G'$  of  $G$  by contracting a set of edges forming a cut in  $G'$ . Gerards and Seymour (see [JT95, p. 115]) conjectured the following strengthening of Hadwiger's conjecture.

**Conjecture 6.2** (Odd Hadwiger's Conjecture). *For every integer  $t \geq 1$ , every graph with no odd  $K_t$  minor is  $(t-1)$ -colorable.*

Geelen, Gerards, Reed, Seymour and Vetta [GGR<sup>+</sup>09] used Theorem 1.3 to show that every graph with no odd  $K_t$  minor is  $O(t\sqrt{\log t})$ -colorable. In [NS19b] two of us strengthen Theorem 1.4 to show the following.

**Theorem 6.3** ([NS19b]). *For every  $\beta > \frac{1}{4}$ , every graph with no odd  $K_t$  minor is  $O(t(\log t)^\beta)$ -colorable.*

The proof of Theorem 6.3 follows the same strategy as the proof of Theorem 1.4. Theorem 2.4 can be used as is, while Corollary 2.3 and Theorems 2.6 and 2.8 are replaced with more technical versions.

### List coloring.

A graph  $G$  is said to be  *$k$ -list colorable* if for every assignment of lists  $\{L(v)\}_{v \in V(G)}$  to vertices of  $G$  such that  $|L(v)| \geq k$  for every  $v \in V(G)$ , there is a choice of colors  $\{c(v)\}_{v \in V(G)}$  such that  $c(v) \in L(v)$ , and  $c(v) \neq c(u)$  for every  $uv \in E(G)$ . Clearly every  $k$ -list colorable graph is  $k$ -colorable, but the converse implication does not hold. Voigt [Voi93] has shown that there exist planar graphs which are not 4-list colorable. Generalizing the result of [Voi93], Barát, Joret and Wood [BJW11] constructed graphs with no  $K_{3t+2}$  minor which are not  $4t$ -list colorable for every  $t \geq 1$ . These results leave open the possibility that the Linear Hadwiger's Conjecture holds for list coloring, as conjectured by Kawarabayashi and Mohar [KM07a].

**Conjecture 6.4** ([KM07a]). *There exists  $C > 0$  such that for every integer  $t \geq 1$ , every graph with no  $K_t$  minor is  $Ct$ -list colorable.*

In [NP20] two of us extended Theorem 1.4 to list coloring.

**Theorem 6.5** ([NP20]). *For every  $\beta > \frac{1}{4}$ , every graph with no  $K_t$  minor is  $O(t(\log t)^\beta)$ -list-colorable.*

The key new ingredient in the proof of Theorem 6.5 is the following bound on the size of sufficiently highly connected graphs with no  $K_t$  minor.

**Theorem 6.6** ([NP20]). *For every  $\beta > 1/4$  and every integer  $t \geq 1$  there exists  $C > 0$  such that every graph  $G$  with  $\kappa(G) \geq Ct(\log t)^\beta$  and no  $K_t$  minor satisfies  $\nu(G) \leq t(\log t)^{7/4}$ .*

The proof of Theorem 6.6 relies on Theorems 2.4 and 2.6 and a new essentially tight bound on the density of unbalanced bipartite graphs with no  $K_t$  minor. Note that combining Theorem 6.6 with Theorems 2.2 and 2.7 immediately yields Theorem 1.4. In the proof of Theorem 6.6 the last two ingredients are replaced by new technical variants, which are applicable to list coloring.

## Acknowledgements.

This paper combines the content of two preprints [NS19a, Pos]. In [NS19a] the first and third author have shown that every graph with no  $K_t$  minor is  $O(t(\log t)^{0.354})$ -colorable. Subsequently, in [Pos] the second author proved Theorem 2.5, strengthening a similar result used in [NS19a], which yields the current bound.

The research presented in this paper was in part completed during the visit of the third author to McGill University. Z-X. Song thanks the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, McGill University for its hospitality.

L. Postle thanks Michelle Delcourt for helpful comments.

## References

- [AH77] K. Appel and W. Haken. Every planar map is four colorable. I. Discharging. *Illinois J. Math.*, 21(3):429–490, 1977.
- [AHK77] K. Appel, W. Haken, and J. Koch. Every planar map is four colorable. II. Reducibility. *Illinois J. Math.*, 21(3):491–567, 1977.
- [BJW11] János Barát, Gwenaél Joret, and David R. Wood. Disproof of the list Hadwiger conjecture. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 18(1):Paper 232, 7, 2011.
- [BKMM09] Thomas Böhme, Ken-ichi Kawarabayashi, John Maharry, and Bojan Mohar. Linear connectivity forces large complete bipartite minors. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 99(3):557–582, 2009.
- [BLW86] N. Biggs, E. K. Lloyd, and R. J. Wilson. *Graph Theory, 1736-1936*. Clarendon Press, USA, 1986.
- [BS74] J. A. Bondy and M. Simonovits. Cycles of even length in graphs. *J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. B*, 16:97–105, 1974.
- [BT96] Béla Bollobás and Andrew Thomason. Highly linked graphs. *Combinatorica*, 16(3):313–320, 1996.
- [Dir52] G. A. Dirac. A property of 4-chromatic graphs and some remarks on critical graphs. *J. London Math. Soc.*, 27:85–92, 1952.

- [DM82] Pierre Duchet and Henri Meyniel. On hadwiger’s number and the stability number. In *North-Holland Mathematics Studies*, volume 62, pages 71–73. Elsevier, 1982.
- [Erd64] P. Erdős. Extremal problems in graph theory. In *Theory of Graphs and its Applications (Proc. Sympos. Smolenice, 1963)*, pages 29–36. Publ. House Czechoslovak Acad. Sci., Prague, 1964.
- [FdIV83] W. Fernandez de la Vega. On the maximum density of graphs which have no subcontraction to  $K^s$ . *Discrete Math.*, 46(1):109–110, 1983.
- [FS13] Zoltán Füredi and Miklós Simonovits. The history of degenerate (bipartite) extremal graph problems. In *Erdős centennial*, volume 25 of *Bolyai Soc. Math. Stud.*, pages 169–264. János Bolyai Math. Soc., Budapest, 2013.
- [GGR<sup>+</sup>09] Jim Geelen, Bert Gerards, Bruce Reed, Paul Seymour, and Adrian Vetta. On the odd-minor variant of Hadwiger’s conjecture. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 99(1):20–29, 2009.
- [Had43] Hugo Hadwiger. Über eine Klassifikation der Streckenkomplexe. *Vierteljschr. Naturforsch. Ges. Zürich*, 88:133–142, 1943.
- [Jor69] Camille Jordan. Sur les assemblages de lignes. *Journal fr die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, 70:185–190, 1869.
- [JT95] Tommy R. Jensen and Bjarne Toft. *Graph coloring problems*. Wiley-Interscience Series in Discrete Mathematics and Optimization. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1995. A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- [Kaw07] Ken-ichi Kawarabayashi. On the connectivity of minimum and minimal counterexamples to Hadwiger’s Conjecture. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 97(1):144–150, 2007.
- [KM07a] Ken-ichi Kawarabayashi and Bojan Mohar. A relaxed Hadwiger’s conjecture for list colorings. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 97(4):647–651, 2007.
- [KM07b] Ken-ichi Kawarabayashi and Bojan Mohar. Some recent progress and applications in graph minor theory. *Graphs Combin.*, 23(1):1–46, 2007.
- [KO03] Daniela Kühn and Deryk Osthus. Minors in graphs of large girth. *Random Structures Algorithms*, 22(2):213–225, 2003.
- [KO05] Daniela Kühn and Deryk Osthus. Complete minors in  $K_{s,s}$ -free graphs. *Combinatorica*, 25(1):49–64, 2005.
- [Kos82] A. V. Kostochka. The minimum Hadwiger number for graphs with a given mean degree of vertices. *Metody Diskret. Analiz.*, (38):37–58, 1982.
- [Kos84] A. V. Kostochka. Lower bound of the Hadwiger number of graphs by their average degree. *Combinatorica*, 4(4):307–316, 1984.

- [KP20] Tom Kelly and Luke Postle. A local epsilon version of reed’s conjecture. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 141:181–222, 2020.
- [KS09] Michael Krivelevich and Benjamin Sudakov. Minors in expanding graphs. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 19(1):294–331, 2009.
- [KST54] T. Kövari, V. T. Sós, and P. Turán. On a problem of K. Zarankiewicz. *Colloq. Math.*, 3:50–57, 1954.
- [Mad72] W. Mader. Existenz  $n$ -fach zusammenhängender Teilgraphen in Graphen genügend grosser Kantendichte. volume 37, pages 86–97, 1972.
- [NP20] Sergey Norin and Luke Postle. Connectivity and choosability of graphs with no  $K_t$  minor. 2020. arXiv:2004.10367.
- [NS19a] Sergey Norin and Zi-Xia Song. Breaking the degeneracy barrier for coloring graphs with no  $K_t$  minor. 2019. arXiv:1910.09378v1.
- [NS19b] Sergey Norin and Zi-Xia Song. A new upper bound on the chromatic number of graphs with no odd  $K_t$  minor. 2019. arXiv:1912.07647.
- [Pos] Luke Postle. Halfway to Hadwiger’s Conjecture. arXiv:1911.01491.
- [RS98] Bruce Reed and Paul Seymour. Fractional colouring and Hadwiger’s conjecture. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 74(2):147–152, 1998.
- [RST93] Neil Robertson, Paul Seymour, and Robin Thomas. Hadwiger’s conjecture for  $K_6$ -free graphs. *Combinatorica*, 13(3):279–361, 1993.
- [Sey16] Paul Seymour. Hadwiger’s conjecture. In *Open problems in mathematics*, pages 417–437. Springer, 2016.
- [Tho84] Andrew Thomason. An extremal function for contractions of graphs. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 95(2):261–265, 1984.
- [Tho01] Andrew Thomason. The extremal function for complete minors. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 81(2):318–338, 2001.
- [TW05] Robin Thomas and Paul Wollan. An improved linear edge bound for graph linkages. *European J. Combin.*, 26(3-4):309–324, 2005.
- [Voi93] Margit Voigt. List colourings of planar graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 120(1-3):215–219, 1993.
- [Wag37] K. Wagner. Über eine Eigenschaft der ebenen Komplexe. *Mathematische Annalen*, 114:570–590, 1937.
- [Woo87] D. R. Woodall. Subcontraction-equivalence and Hadwiger’s conjecture. *J. Graph Theory*, 11(2):197–204, 1987.
- [Woo13] David R Wood. A note on Hadwiger’s conjecture. manuscript, arXiv:1304.6510, 2013.