arXiv:2007.06455v3 [math.CO] 18 Aug 2022

ASYMPTOTICALLY OPTIMAL VERTEX RANKING OF PLANAR GRAPHS[♀]

Prosenjit Bose[♂] *Vida Dujmović*[♂] *Mehrnoosh Javarsineh*[♂] *Pat Morin*[♂]

August 19, 2022

Abstract. A (vertex) ℓ-ranking is a colouring $\varphi : V(G) \to \mathbb{N}$ of the vertices of a graph G with integer colours so that for any path $u_0,\ldots,u_p$ of length at most ℓ, $\varphi(u_0) \neq \varphi(u_p)$ or $\varphi(u_0) < \max\{\varphi(u_0),\ldots,\varphi(u_p)\}$. We show that, for any fixed integer $\ell \geq 2$, every n-vertex planar graph has an ℓ-ranking using $O(\log n/\log\log\log n)$ colours and this is tight even when $\ell = 2$; for infinitely many values of n, there are n-vertex planar graphs, for which any 2-ranking requires $\Omega(\log n/\log\log\log n)$ colours. This result also extends to bounded genus graphs.

In developing this proof we obtain optimal bounds on the number of colours needed for ℓ-ranking graphs of treewidth t and graphs of simple treewidth t. These upper bounds are constructive and give $O(n)$-time algorithms. Additional results that come from our techniques include new sublogarithmic upper bounds on the number of colours needed for ℓ-rankings of apex minor-free graphs and k-planar graphs.

[♀]This research was partly funded by NSERC.

[♂]School of Computer Science, Carleton University

[♂]Department of Computer Science and Electrical Engineering, University of Ottawa

1 Introduction

A *colouring* $\varphi : V(G) \to \mathbb{N}$ of a graph G is a *(vertex) ℓ-ranking* of G if, for every connected non-empty subgraph $X \subseteq G$ of diameter[1] at most ℓ, there exists exactly one vertex $v \in V(X)$ such that $\varphi(v) = \max\{\varphi(w) : w \in V(X)\}$. The *$\ell$-ranking number* $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(G)$ of G is the minimum integer k such that G has an ℓ-ranking $\varphi : V(G) \to \{1,\dots,k\}$. Note that, for any $\ell \geq 1$ any ℓ-ranking of G is a proper colouring[2] of G, so $\chi(G) \leq \chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(G)$, and any proper colouring of G is a 1-ranking of G, so $\chi(G) = \chi_{1\text{-vr}}(G)$.

Besides the case $\ell = 1$, two cases have received special attention: An ∞-ranking is called a *vertex ranking* or *ordered colouring*. The parameter $\chi_{\infty\text{-vr}}(G)$ is called the *vertex ranking number* of G and is equal to the *treedepth* of G which is equal to the *centered chromatic number* of G [28]. The parameter $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(G)$ for finite $\ell \geq 2$ appears implicitly in a dynamic programming algorithm of Deogun, Kloks, Kratsch, and Müller [8] for computing $\chi_{\infty\text{-vr}}(G)$ when G is a d-trapezoid graph. The case $\ell = 2$ has also received special attention [1, 19, 36]. A 2-ranking is called a *unique-superior colouring* by Karpas et al. [19] who prove the following result:

Theorem T ([19]). *For every n-vertex tree T, $\chi_{2\text{-vr}}(T) \in O(\log n/\log\log n)$ and this is asymptotically optimal: for infinitely many values of n, there exists an n-vertex tree T with $\chi_{2\text{-vr}}(T) \in \Omega(\log n/\log\log n)$.*

The same authors prove the following result for planar graphs:

Theorem P ([19]). *For every integer ℓ and every n-vertex planar graph G, $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(G) \in O(\ell \log n)$.*

Since every tree is a planar graph and no better lower bound is known for planar graphs, this leaves an obvious question: Which is the correct bound for 2-ranking n-vertex planar graphs, $\log n$ or $\log n/\log\log n$? As it turns out, the strange truth is somewhere in between. Let $\log x := \ln x$ denote the natural logarithm of x and define $\log^{(0)} x := x$ and, for any integer $i > 0$, let $\log^{(i)} x := \log(\log^{(i-1)} x)$. We prove:[3]

Theorem 1. *For any fixed integer $\ell \geq 2$, every n-vertex planar graph G has $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(G) \in O(\log n/\log^{(3)} n)$ and this is asymptotically optimal: for infinitely many values of n, there exists an n-vertex planar graph G with $\chi_{2\text{-vr}}(G) \in \Omega(\log n/\log^{(3)} n)$*

Our proof of the upper bound in Theorem 1 makes use of a recent *product structure theorem* of Dujmović, Joret, Micek, Morin, Ueckerdt, and Wood [14] which states that every planar graph G is a subgraph of $H \boxtimes K_3 \boxtimes P$ where H is a planar graph of treewidth at most

[1] The *length* of a path $u_0,\dots,u_p$ is the number, p, of edges in the path. A path is *trivial* if its length is 0 and non-trivial otherwise. The *distance* between two vertices v and w in a graph is the length of a shortest path that contains v and w, or ∞ if v and w are in different components of G. The *diameter* of a graph G is the maximum distance between any pair of vertices in G.

[2] A colouring $\varphi : V(G) \to \mathbb{N}$ is *proper* if, for each edge $vw \in E(G)$, $\varphi(v) \neq \varphi(w)$ and the *chromatic number*, $\chi(G)$, of G is the minimum integer k such that there exists a proper colouring $\varphi : V(G) \to \{1,\dots,k\}$ of G.

[3] Refined versions of Theorem 1 and of the upcoming Theorem 2 to 5 that describes the dependence of $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(G)$ on ℓ are presented in Section 4.4.

3, K_3 is a 3-cycle, P is a path, and $\boxtimes$ denotes the strong graph product.[4] To apply this theorem, we prove the following result:

Theorem 2. *For any fixed integers $\ell \geq 2$ and $t \geq 1$, every n-vertex graph H of simple treewidth at most t has $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(H) \in O(\log n / \log^{(t)} n)$ and this is asymptotically optimal: for any fixed integer $t \geq 1$ and infinitely many values of n, there exists an n-vertex graph H of simple treewidth t that has $\chi_{2\text{-vr}}(H) \in \Omega(\log n / \log^{(t)} n)$.*

The lower bound in Theorem 2 immediately implies the lower bound in Theorem 1 because a graph has simple treewidth at most 3 if and only if it is planar and has treewidth at most 3. Therefore, the lower bound in Theorem 2 shows the existence of n-vertex planar graphs H with $\chi_{2\text{-vr}}(H) \in \Omega(\log n / \log^{(3)} n)$.

To obtain the upper bound in Theorem 1, we apply the upper bound in Theorem 2 to the graph H that appears in the product structure theorem along with a simple lemma which shows that, for any two graphs G_1 and G_2, $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(G_1 \boxtimes G_2) \leq \chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(G_1) \cdot \bar{\chi}_\ell(G_2)$ where $\bar{\chi}_\ell(G_2)$ is the *distance-ℓ colouring number* of G_2; the minimum number of colours needed to colour G_2 so that the endpoints of each non-trivial path of length at most ℓ have different colours. It is easy to see that $\bar{\chi}_\ell(K_3 \times P) \leq 3(\ell+1)$, so $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(H \boxtimes K_3 \boxtimes P) \leq 3(\ell+1) \cdot \chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(H)$.

Every graph of treewidth at most t has simple treewidth at most $t+1$. Therefore, the upper bound in Theorem 2 implies the (upper bound in the) following generalization of Theorem T:

Theorem 3. *For any fixed integers $\ell \geq 2$, $t \geq 0$, every n-vertex graph H of treewidth at most t has $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(H) \in O(\log n / \log^{(t+1)} n)$ and this is asymptotically optimal: for any fixed integer $t \geq 0$ and infinitely many values of n, there exists an n-vertex graph H of treewidth t with $\chi_{2\text{-vr}}(H) \in \Omega(\log n / \log^{(t+1)} n)$.*

The lower bound in Theorem 3 is through a construction of a treewidth-t graph H with $\chi_{2\text{-vr}}(H) \in \Omega(\log n / \log^{(t+1)} n)$. Again, since any graph of treewidth at most $t-1$ has simple treewidth at most t, the lower bound in Theorem 3 implies the lower bound in Theorem 2.

In addition to planar graphs, there are product structure theorems for a number of other graph classes, including bounded genus graphs, apex minor-free graphs, and k-planar graphs. Using product structure theorems for these graph classes along with Theorem 2 and 3, we obtain the following two results:

Theorem 4. *For any fixed integer $\ell \geq 2$ and any integer $g \geq 0$, every n-vertex graph G of Euler genus at most g has $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(G) \in O(g \log n / \log^{(3)} n)$.*

Theorem 5. *For each of the following graph classes $\mathcal{G}$:*

1. *the class of graphs excluding a particular apex graph A as a minor; and*
2. *the class of graphs that can be drawn in a surface of genus g with at most k crossings per edge,*

[4] Definitions of t-trees, simple t-trees, treewidth, simple treewidth, and strong graph product appear later, in Section 2.

there exists an integer $c = c(\mathcal{G})$ such that, for any fixed integer $\ell \geq 2$, every n-vertex graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$ has $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(G) \in O(\log n / \log^{(c)} n)$.

1.1 Related Work and Relation to Other Colouring Numbers

Here we survey previous work on ℓ-ranking as well as its relations to other graph colouring numbers.

1.1.1 Vertex Ranking

For a graph G, an ∞-ranking is known as a *vertex ranking* [4] or *ordered colouring* of G [20]. For any graph G, $\chi_{\infty\text{-vr}}(G)$ is equal to the *treedepth* $\mathrm{td}(G)$ of G, defined by Nešetřil and Ossona de Mendez [28] and which plays a central role in the theory of sparsity [30, 31]. Both of these notions are equal to the minimum clique number of a trivially perfect supergraph of G [28].

Finding a vertex ranking φ that uses exactly $\chi_{\infty\text{-vr}}(G)$ colours is equivalent to finding a minimum-height elimination tree of G [6, 8]. This measure has applications to parallel Cholesky factorization of matrices [3, 9, 13, 24] and in VLSI layout [23, 35]. More recently, Even and Smorodinsky [16] showed that $\chi_{\infty\text{-vr}}(G)$ determines the competitive ratio of the best algorithm for the online hitting set problem in G.

The *vertex ranking problem* of determining $\chi_{\infty\text{-vr}}(G)$ for an arbitrary graph G is known to be NP-hard, even on some restricted classes of graphs [4, 10, 25, 26]. Polynomial-time algorithms for the vertex ranking problem have been found for several families of graphs: Iyer, Ratliff, and Vijayan [18], Schäffer [34] showed this for trees and Deogun et al. [8] showed this for permutation graphs.

A straightforward application of divide-and-conquer using planar separators shows that, for any n-vertex planar graph G, $\chi_{\infty\text{-vr}}(G) \in O(\sqrt{n})$ [20, 25], and this bound is optimal: For the $\sqrt{n} \times \sqrt{n}$ grid, $\chi_{\infty\text{-vr}}(G) \in \Omega(\sqrt{n})$ [20]. A lower bound of Katchalski et al. [20] shows that upper bounds like this, using divide-and-conquer with separators, are essentially tight: If, for every r-element set $S \subseteq V(G)$, the graph $G - S$ has a component of size at least αn, then $\chi_{\infty\text{-vr}}(G) \in \Omega(\alpha r)$. In a similar vein, Bodlaender et al. [3], Kloks [21] show that $\chi_{\infty\text{-vr}}(G)$ is lower bounded by 1 plus the pathwidth of G.

It is not hard to see that, even for an n-vertex path P, $\chi_{\infty\text{-vr}}(P) \in \Omega(\log n)$ and, in fact $\chi_{\infty\text{-vr}}(P) = \lceil \log_2(n+1) \rceil$ [28]. The same separator argument, applied carefully to treewidth-t graphs shows that every n-vertex treewidth-t graph G has $\chi_{\infty\text{-vr}}(G) \leq (t+1)\log_2 n$ [28]. This shows that, even for graphs with constant-size separators, (worst-case asymptotically) optimal bounds are obtained by divide-and-conquer using separators. More references on vertex ranking are available in Section 7.19 of the dynamic survey by Gallian [17].

1.1.2 2-Ranking

At least three works have considered $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}$ for finite ℓ with a focus on the case $\ell = 2$. These results are summarized in Table 1.

Karpas et al. [19] proved Theorem T—a tight bound of $\chi_{2\text{-vr}}(T) \in O(\log n / \log\log n)$ for every n-vertex tree T—and Theorem P—the upper bound $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(G) \in O(\ell \log n)$ for every n-

Graph class	Upper Bound	Lower Bound	Ref.
Trees	$O(\log n/\log\log n)$	$\Omega(\log n/\log\log n)$	[19]
Planar graphs	$O(\ell \log n)$	$\Omega(\log n/\log\log n)$	[19]
Proper minor closed	$O(\ell \log n)$	$\Omega(\log n/\log\log n)$	[19]
d-cubes	$d+1$	$d+1$	[1]
Max-degree 3	7		[1]
Max-degree Δ	$O(\min\{\Delta^2, \Delta\sqrt{n}\})$	$\Omega(\Delta^2/\log\Delta)$	[1, 19]
d-degenerate	$O(d\sqrt{n})$	$\Omega(n^{1/3} + d^2/\log d)$	[1, 19]

Simple treewidth $\leq t$	$O(\log n/\log^{(t)} n)$	$\Omega(\log n/\log^{(t)} n)$	Theorem 2
Treewidth $\leq t$	$O(\log n/\log^{(t+1)} n)$	$\Omega(\log n/\log^{(t+1)} n)$	Theorem 3
Planar graphs	$O(\log n/\log^{(3)} n)$	$\Omega(\log n/\log^{(3)} n)$	Theorem 1 and 3
Outerplanar graphs	$O(\log n/\log^{(2)} n)$	$\Omega(\log n/\log^{(2)} n)$	Theorem 3, [19]
Genus-g graphs	$O(g\log n/\log^{(3)} n)$	$\Omega(\log n/\log^{(3)} n)$	Theorem 3 and 4
A-minor-free (apex A)	$O(\log n/\log^{(c(A))} n)$	$\Uparrow$	Theorem 5
(g,k)-planar	$O(\log n/\log^{(c(g,k))} n)$	$\Uparrow$	Theorem 5

Table 1: Summary of previous and new results on $\chi_{2\text{-vr}}$. All new upper bounds hold for any constant ℓ. An up-arrow ($\Uparrow$) indicates a lower bound that is implied by the lower bound in the cell directly above. All new lower bounds hold for $\ell = 2$. Prior upper bounds hold only for $\ell = 2$, with the exception of the $O(\ell \log n)$ upper bound for planar graphs.

vertex planar graph G and every integer $\ell \geq 2$. More generally, the same authors show that, for any fixed proper minor-closed family $\mathcal{G}$ of graphs $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(G) \in O(\ell \log n)$ for every positive integer ℓ and every n-vertex $G \in \mathcal{G}$. They also show that, for fixed d, every n-vertex d-degenerate graph G has $\chi_{2\text{-vr}}(G) \in O(\sqrt{n})$ and there exists examples with $\chi_{2\text{-vr}}(G) \in \Omega(n^{1/3})$.

Shalu and Antony [36] show that determining the minimum number of colours required by a 2-ranking of a given graph is NP-hard, even when restricted to planar bipartite graphs. Almeter et al. [1] determine the exact value of $\chi_{2\text{-vr}}(Q_d) = d+1$ where Q_d is the d-cube. They also show that, for graphs G of maximum degree 3, $\chi_{2\text{-vr}}(G) \leq 7$ and show the existence of a graph with maximum degree k such that $\chi_{2\text{-vr}}(G) \in \Omega(k^2/\log k)$.

1.1.3 Star Colouring and Distance-2 colouring

Note that 2-rankings fall between two very well-studied graph colouring problems:

- *star colourings*, which ensure that the graph induced by any 2 colour classes is a forest of stars and
- *distance-2 colourings* which ensure that the endpoints of each non-trivial path of length at most 2 receive distinct colours.

Every 2-ranking is a star colouring and every distance-2 colouring is a 2-ranking so, letting $\chi_\star(G)$ and $\bar{\chi}_2(G)$ denote the star colouring number of G and distance-2 colouring number of G, respectively, we have $\chi_\star(G) \leq \chi_{2\text{-vr}}(G) \leq \bar{\chi}_2(G)$.

1.1.4 Centered Colouring

A colouring $\varphi : V(G) \to \mathbb{N}$ is *p-centered* if each connected subgraph $X \subseteq G$ that is coloured with at most p distinct colours has a colour that occurs exactly once [28, 29, 38]. This implies that in a p-centered colouring, every connected subgraph with at most $2p$ vertices must have a colour that occurs exactly once. In particular, every path of length at most $2p-1$ must have a colour that occurs exactly once. On the other hand Observation 6 in Section 2 shows that φ is a $(2p-1)$-ranking if and only if every path of length at most $(2p-1)$ has a unique maximum colour.

This example shows how the difference between "unique" and "unique maximum" can be surprisingly profound. Planar graphs (and, indeed, all graph families having similar product structure theorems) have $2p-1$-centered colourings using a number of colours that depends only (polynomially) on p [7, 29, 32]. This contrasts starkly with the lower bounds in Theorem T and Theorem 1, which show that ℓ-rankings of n-vertex trees and planar graphs, respectively, require a number of colours that depends nearly-logarithmically on n, for any $\ell \geq 2$.

1.2 Outline

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 reviews some basic tools used in the following sections. Section 3 proves the lower bound in Theorem 3, which immediately implies the lower bounds in Theorem 1 and 2. Section 4 proves the upper bound in Theorem 2, from which the upper bounds in Theorem 1 and 3 to 5 follow easily. Section 5 gives a brief summary and discusses directions for further work.

2 Preliminaries

In this paper we use standard graph theory terminology as used in the book by Diestel [11]. Every graph G we consider is finite, simple, and undirected with vertex set denoted by $V(G)$ and edge set denoted by $E(G)$. We use the shorthand $|G| := |V(G)|$ to denote the number of vertices in G. We use $N_G(v) := \{w \in V(G) : vw \in E(G)\}$ to denote the *open neighbourhood* of v in G. For any $S \subseteq V(G)$, $N_G(S) := \bigcup_{v \in S} N_G(v) \setminus S$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, K_n denotes the complete graph on n vertices. The *length* of a path $u_0, \ldots, u_p$ in G is equal to the number, p, of edges in the path. A path is *trivial* if it has length 0 and *non-trivial* otherwise.

For any set S, $G[S]$ is the graph with vertex set $V(G[S]) := V(G) \cap S$ and edge set $E(G[S]) := \{vw \in E(G) : \{v, w\} \subseteq S\}$, and $G - S := G[V(G) \setminus S]$. We say that a subgraph G' of G is an *induced* subgraph of G if $G[V(G')] = G'$. Although ℓ-ranking is defined in terms of subgraphs of diameter at most ℓ, it is more convenient to use an equivalent definition based on (induced) paths:[5]

Observation 6. *For any graph G, any vertex colouring $\varphi : V(G) \to \mathbb{N}$, and any $\ell \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ the following statements are equivalent:*

(a) φ is an ℓ-ranking of G.

[5] Definition (c) is, in fact, the definition used by Karpas et al. [19]. We only provide a proof of equivalence here for the sake of completeness.

(b) *For every non-trivial path $u_0,\dots,u_p$ in G of length at most ℓ, there is exactly one $i \in \{0,\dots,p\}$ such that $\varphi(u_i) = \max\{\varphi(u_j) : j \in \{0,\dots,p\}\}$.*
(c) *For every non-trivial path $u_0,\dots,u_p$ in G of length at most ℓ, (i) $\varphi(u_0) \neq \varphi(u_p)$; or (ii) $\varphi(u_0) < \max\{\varphi(u_0),\dots,\varphi(u_p)\}$.*

Proof. That $(a) \Rightarrow (b)$ follows immediately from the fact that every path in G of length at most ℓ is a connected subgraph of G of diameter at most ℓ. To see that $(b) \Rightarrow (c)$ observe that, if $\varphi(u_0) = \varphi(u_p)$ then $\varphi(u_0) \neq \max\{\varphi(u_j) : j \in \{0,\dots,p\}\}$, so $\varphi(u_0) < \max\{\varphi(u_j) : j \in \{0,\dots,p\}\}$.

To see that $(c) \Rightarrow (a)$ we prove the contrapositive $\neg(a) \Rightarrow \neg(c)$. Suppose that φ is not an ℓ-ranking of G. Then G contains a subgraph X with $\operatorname{diam}(X) \leq \ell$ that has two vertices $v, w \in V(X)$ such that $\varphi(v) = \varphi(w) = \max\{\varphi(u) : u \in V(X)\}$. Then let $u_0,\dots,u_p$ be a shortest path in X from $u_0 := v$ to $u_p := w$. This path has length $p \leq \operatorname{diam}(X) \leq \ell$, $\varphi(u_0) = \varphi(u_p)$ and $\varphi(u_0) \not< \max\{\varphi(u_j) : j \in \{0,\dots,p\}\}$. □

Observation 7. *A colouring $\varphi : V(G) \to \mathbb{N}$ of a graph G is an ℓ-ranking of G if and only if, for every induced path $u_0,\dots,u_p$ in G of length at most ℓ, (i) $\varphi(u_0) \neq \varphi(u_p)$; or (ii) $\varphi(u_0) < \max\{\varphi(u_0),\dots,\varphi(u_p)\}$.*

Proof. By Observation 6(c) any ℓ-ranking φ of G satisfies (i) or (ii) for every path of length at most ℓ, including every induced path of length at most ℓ, so this direction is trivial.

For the other direction, suppose G contains a (not necessarily induced) path $u_0,\dots,u_p$ of length $p \leq \ell$ with $\varphi(u_0) = \varphi(u_p)$ and $\varphi(u_0) = \max\{\varphi(u_0),\dots,\varphi(u_p)\}$. Let $w_0,\dots,w_s$ be the shortest path from $w_0 := u_0$ to $w_s := u_p$ in the graph $G[\{u_0,\dots,u_p\}]$. Then $w_0,\dots,w_s$ is an induced path in G with $\varphi(w_0) = \varphi(u_0) = \varphi(u_p) = \varphi(w_s)$ and, since $\{w_0,\dots,w_s\} \subseteq \{u_0,\dots,u_r\}$, $\max\{\varphi(w_0),\dots,\varphi(w_s)\} \leq \max\{u_0,\dots,u_r\}$, so $\varphi(w_0) = \varphi(u_0) = \max\{\varphi(w_0),\dots,\varphi(w_s)\}$, as required. □

From this point on, we will use the characterization in Observation 7 as our definition of ℓ-ranking. Specifically, in order to prove that some colouring $\varphi : V(G) \to \mathbb{N}$ is an ℓ-ranking of G we need only show that for any induced path $u_0,\dots,u_p$, $\varphi(u_0) = \varphi(u_p)$ and $p \leq \ell$ implies that $\varphi(u_0) < \max\{\varphi(u_i) : i \in \{0,\dots,p\}\}$.

Let T be a tree rooted at some node $r \in V(T)$. For any node $x \in V(T)$, $P_T(x)$ denotes the path, in T, from r to x. The *T-depth* of $x \in V(T)$, denoted by $d_T(x)$, is the length of $P_T(x)$. The *height* of T is $\max\{d_T(x) : x \in v(T)\}$. A node $a \in V(T)$ is a *T-ancestor* of $x \in V(T)$ if $a \in V(P_T(x))$. If a is a T-ancestor of x then x is a *T-descendant* of a. Note that every node of T is both a T-ancestor and T-descendant of itself. If a is a T-ancestor of x and $x \neq a$ then a is a *strict* T-ancestor of x and x is a *strict* T-descendant of a. The strict ancestor relation induces a partial order $\prec_T$ on $V(T)$ in which $x \prec_T y$ if and only if x is a strict T-ancestor of y.

For any graph G, and any two vertices $v, w \in V(G)$, $d_G(v,w)$ denotes the length of a shortest path, in G, from v to w or $d_G(v,w) := \infty$ if v and w are in different connected components of G. The *diameter* of G is $\operatorname{diam}(G) := \max\{d_G(v,w) : v, w \in V(G)\}$. For any integer $k \geq 1$, the *k-th power* of G, denoted by G^k, is the graph with vertex set $V(G^k) :=$

$V(G)$ and edge set $E(G^k) := \{vw : v,w \in V(G), 1 \leq d_G(v,w) \leq k\}$. Note that any distance-ℓ colouring of G is a proper colouring of G^ℓ and vice-versa, i.e., $\bar{\chi}_\ell(G) = \chi(G^\ell)$.

For any $v \in V(G)$ and any $W \subseteq V(G)$, let $d_G(v,W) = \min\{d_G(v,w) : w \in W\}$. A *(generalized) BFS layering* of a connected graph G is a partition of $V(G)$ into a sequence $\mathcal{L} := (L_0,\ldots,L_m)$ of sets such that, for each $i \in \{1,\ldots,m\}$ and each $v \in L_i$, $d_G(v,L_0) = i$. Any BFS layering $\mathcal{L} := (L_0,\ldots,L_m)$ defines a partial order $\prec_{\mathcal{L}}$ on $V(G)$ in which $v \prec_{\mathcal{L}} w$ if and only if $v \in L_i$, $w \in L_j$ and $i < j$.

2.1 Graph Decompositions, Treewidth, and Pathwidth

For two graphs H and X, an *X-decomposition* of H is a sequence $\mathcal{X} := (B_x : x \in V(X))$ of subsets of $V(H)$ called *bags* indexed by the nodes of X and such that (i) for each $v \in V(H)$, $X[\{x \in V(X) : v \in B_x\}]$ is connected; and (ii) for each $vw \in E(H)$, there exists some $x \in V(X)$ such that $\{v,w\} \subseteq B_x$. The *width* of $\mathcal{X}$ is $\max\{|B_x| : x \in V(X)\} - 1$. We say that H is *edge-maximal* with respect to $\mathcal{X}$ if, for each $x \in V(X)$, the vertices in B_x form a clique in H.

In the special case where X is a tree (or a forest), $\mathcal{X}$ is called a *tree decomposition* of H. In the more special case where X is a path (or a collection of disjoint paths), $\mathcal{X}$ is called a *path decomposition* of H. The *treewidth* $\mathrm{tw}(H)$ of H is the minimum width of any tree decomposition of H. The *pathwidth* $\mathrm{pw}(H)$ of H is the minimum width of any path decomposition of H. If a graph G is edge-maximal with respect to a path decomposition (tree decomposition) $\mathcal{X}$ of width t, then G is an interval graph (chordal graph, respectively) whose maximum clique size is $t+1$ [2].

For a graph H, a *rooted tree decomposition* of H is a tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} := (B_x : x \in V(T))$ of H in which T is a rooted tree. Throughout the remainder of the paper, all our tree decompositions are rooted, with the root of T typically denoted by r, in which case we call it an *r-rooted tree decomposition*. We use the notation $x_{\mathcal{T}}(v)$ to denote the minimum T-depth node $x \in V(T)$ such that $v \in B_x$. This induces a partial order $\prec_{\mathcal{T}}$ on $V(H)$ in which $v \prec_{\mathcal{T}} w$ if and only if $x_{\mathcal{T}}(v) \prec_T x_{\mathcal{T}}(w)$. The following observations have straightforward proofs:

Observation 8. *Let H be a graph that is edge-maximal with respect to some rooted tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} := (B_x : x \in V(T))$ of H. Then, for any induced path $u_0,\ldots,u_p$ in H and any $i \in \{1,\ldots,p-1\}$, $u_i \preceq_{\mathcal{T}} u_0$ or $u_i \preceq_{\mathcal{T}} u_p$.*

Observation 9. *Let H be a connected graph that is edge-maximal with respect to an r-rooted tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} := (B_x : x \in V(T))$ of H and let $\mathcal{L} := L_0,\ldots,L_m$ be a BFS layering of H with $L_0 := B_r$. Then, for any $v,w \in V(H)$, $v \prec_{\mathcal{T}} w$ implies $v \preceq_{\mathcal{L}} w$. Equivalently, there is no pair $v,w \in V(H)$ such that $v \prec_{\mathcal{L}} w$ and $w \prec_{\mathcal{T}} v$.*

Observation 10. *Let H be a connected graph that is edge-maximal with respect to a width-t r-rooted tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} := (B_x : x \in V(T))$ of H and let $\mathcal{L} := L_0,\ldots,L_m$ be a BFS layering of H with $L_0 := B_r$. Then, for any $i \in \{1,\ldots,m\}$ and any component X of $H[\bigcup_{j=i}^m L_j]$, $L_{i-1} \cap N_H(V(X))$ is contained in a single bag B_x of $\mathcal{T}$.*

We will make use of the following fairly standard vertex-weighted separator lemma. Similar lemmas with similar proofs appear in Robertson and Seymour [33], but we provide a proof for the sake of completeness.

Lemma 11. *Let H be a graph; let $\mathcal{T} := (B_x : x \in V(T))$ be a tree decomposition of H; and let $\xi : V(H) \to \mathbb{R}$ be a function that is positive on $V(H)$. Then, for any $c \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, there exists $S_T \subseteq V(T)$ of size $|S_T| \leq c-1$ such that, for each component X of $H - (\bigcup_{x \in S_T} B_x)$, $\sum_{v \in V(X)} \xi(v) \leq \frac{1}{c} \cdot \sum_{v \in V(H)} \xi(v)$.*

Proof. Let $\Xi := \sum_{v \in V(H)} \xi(v)$. The proof is by induction c. The base case $c = 1$ is trivial, since $S_T := \emptyset$ satisfies the requirements of the lemma. Now assume $c \geq 2$. Root T at some arbitrary vertex r and for each $x \in V(T)$, let T_x denote the subtree of T induced by x and all its T-descendants. Let $G_x := G[\bigcup_{y \in V(T_x)} B_y]$. Say that a node x of T is *heavy* if $\sum_{v \in V(G_x)} \xi(v) \geq \frac{1}{c} \cdot \Xi$. Since $c \geq 1$, r is heavy, so T contains at least one heavy vertex. Let x be a heavy vertex of T with the property that no child of x is also heavy. Then $G' := G - V(G_x)$ has weight $\sum_{v \in V(G')} \xi(v) \leq (1 - 1/c) \cdot \Xi$. On the other hand, every component C of $G - V(G') - B_x$ has weight $\sum_{v \in V(C)} \xi(v) \leq \frac{1}{c} \cdot \Xi$. Apply induction on the graph G' with tree decomposition $\mathcal{T}' := (B_x \cap V(G') : x \in V(T))$ and $c' := c - 1$ to obtain a set S'_T of size at most $c - 2$ such that each component X of $G' - (\bigcup_{x \in S_T} B_x)$, has weight at most $\sum_{v \in V(X)} \xi(v) \leq \frac{1}{c-1} \cdot (1 - \frac{1}{c}) \cdot \Xi = \frac{1}{c} \cdot \Xi$. The set $S_T := S'_T \cup \{x\}$ satisfies the requirements of the lemma. □

2.2 Simple Treewidth

A tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} := (B_x : x \in V(T))$ of a graph H is *t-simple* if it has width at most t and, for each t-element subset $S \subseteq V(H)$, $|\{x \in V(T) : S \subseteq B_x\}| \leq 2$. The *simple treewidth* $\mathrm{stw}(H)$ of a graph H is the minimum integer t such that H has a t-simple tree decomposition [22]. Knauer and Ueckerdt [22] define simple treewidth and Wulf [37] studies it extensively in his thesis.

We work with simple treewidth because it arises naturally in the graphs we are interested in:

Lemma 12 ([22, 27])**.** *For any graph H,*

(i) $\mathrm{stw}(H) \leq 1$ *if and only if H is a collection of vertex-disjoint paths;*
(ii) $\mathrm{stw}(H) \leq 2$ *if and only if H is outerplanar;*
(iii) $\mathrm{stw}(H) \leq 3$ *if and only if* $\mathrm{tw}(H) \leq 3$ *and H is planar.*

Simple treewidth and treewidth are closely related:

Lemma 13 ([22])**.** *For every graph G,* $\mathrm{tw}(G) \leq \mathrm{stw}(G) \leq \mathrm{tw}(G) + 1$.

The following lemma, whose proof uses minor-monotonicity [37, Theorem 5.2], is due to David R. Wood (personal communication).

Lemma 14. *Let H be a connected graph that is edge-maximal with respect to some r-rooted t-simple tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} := (B_x : x \in V(T))$ of H and let $L_0, \ldots, L_m$ be the BFS ordering of H with $L_0 := B_r$. Then, for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$,* $\mathrm{stw}(H[L_i]) \leq t - 1$.

2.3 Product Structure

For two graphs G_1 and G_2, the *strong graph product* of G_1 and G_2, denoted $G_1 \boxtimes G_2$, is a graph whose vertex set is the Cartesian product $V(G_1) \times V(G_2)$ and that contains an edge between $v = (v_1, v_2)$ and $w = (w_1, w_2)$ if and only if (i) $v_1 = w_1$ and $v_2 w_2 \in E(G_2)$; (ii) $v_2 = w_2$ and $v_1 w_1 \in E(G_1)$; or (iii) $v_1 w_1 \in E(G_1)$ and $v_2 w_2 \in E(G_2)$.

The following result of Dujmović et al. [14], which builds on earlier work of Pilipczuk and Siebertz [32], shows that every planar graph is the subgraph of a strong product of very simple graphs.

Theorem 15 ([14])**.** *For every n-vertex planar graph G, there exists a graph H, $|H| \leq n$, $\operatorname{stw}(H) \leq 3$, and a path P such that G is isomorphic to a subgraph of $H \boxtimes K_3 \boxtimes P$.*

As the following simple lemma shows, product structure is highly relevant to ℓ-ranking:

Lemma 16. *For any two graphs G_1 and G_2, $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(G_1 \boxtimes G_2) \leq \chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(G_1) \cdot \bar{\chi}_\ell(G_2)$.*

Proof. For each $(x, y) \in V(G_1 \boxtimes G_2)$, let $\varphi(x, y) := \bar{\chi}_\ell(G_2) \cdot \rho(x) - \psi(y)$ where $\rho : V(G_1) \to \{1, \dots, \chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(G_1)\}$ is an ℓ-ranking of G_1 and $\psi : V(G_2) \to \{0, \dots, \bar{\chi}_\ell(G_2) - 1\}$ is a distance-ℓ colouring of G_2.

To see that φ is an ℓ-ranking, consider any path $u_0, \dots, u_p$ in $G_1 \boxtimes G_2$ of length $p \leq \ell$ such that $\varphi(u_0) = \varphi(u_p)$. We must show that $\varphi(u_0) < \max\{\varphi(u_0), \dots, \varphi(u_p)\}$.

For each $i \in \{0, \dots, p\}$, let $(u_{i,1}, u_{i,2}) := u_i$, so that $u_{i,1} \in V(G_1)$ and $u_{i,2} \in V(G_2)$. Since $\varphi(u_0) = \varphi(u_p)$, $\psi(u_{0,2}) = \psi(u_{p,2})$. Since ψ is a distance-ℓ colouring of G_2 and $p \leq \ell$, this implies that $u_{0,2} = u_{p,2}$. This implies that $u_{0,1} \neq u_{p,1}$, for otherwise $u_0 = u_p$ and $u_0, \dots, u_p$ is not a path. Therefore, $u_{0,1}, \dots, u_{p,1}$ is a walk in G_1 with distinct endpoints. Let $w_0, \dots, w_q$ be a shortest path from $w_0 := u_{0,1}$ to $w_q := u_{p,1}$ in $G_1[\{u_{0,1}, \dots, u_{p,1}\}]$.

Since $\rho(u_{0,1}) = \rho(u_{p,1})$, ρ is an ℓ-ranking of G_1, and $q \leq p \leq \ell$, $\rho(u_{0,1}) = \rho(w_0) < \max\{\rho(w_0), \dots, \rho(w_q)\} \leq \max\{\rho(u_{0,1}), \dots, \rho(u_{p,1})\}$ and therefore $\varphi(u_0) < \max\{\varphi(u_0), \dots, \varphi(u_p)\}$, as required. □

Note that the graph $K_3 \boxtimes P$, which appears in Theorem 15, has maximum degree 8 so $(K_3 \boxtimes P)^\ell$ has maximum degree at most $8 \cdot 7^{\ell-1}$. Since distance-ℓ colouring any graph G is equivalent to properly colouring G^ℓ, this implies that $\bar{\chi}_\ell(K_3 \boxtimes P) \leq 8 \cdot 7^\ell + 1$. The following observation improves this constant using the fact that $(K_d \boxtimes P)^\ell$ is $(d(\ell+1)-1)$-degenerate (as can be seen by ordering vertices of $(K_d \boxtimes P)$ by the order that their second coordinate appears in P).

Observation 17. *For any $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and any path P, $\bar{\chi}_\ell(K_d \boxtimes P) \leq d(\ell+1)$.*

We remark that Observation 17 is tight since, for any path P of length at least ℓ, $(K_d \boxtimes P)^\ell$ contains cliques of order $d(\ell+1)$.

2.4 Inequalities for Iterated Logarithms

For any $x > 0$ and $a \geq 0$, we have the inequality,

$$\log(x+a) = \log(x(1+a/x)) = \log x + \log(1+a/x) \leq \log x + \frac{a}{x} \ , \tag{1}$$

where the inequality follows from the inequality $1 + z \leq e^z$, valid for all $z \in \mathbb{R}$.

Recall that, for any integer $i \geq 0$,

$$\log^{(i)} x := \begin{cases} x & \text{for } i = 0 \\ \log\left(\log^{(i-1)} x\right) & \text{for } i \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Define the *τower* function $\tau : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ by

$$\tau(i) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } i = 0 \\ e^{\tau(i-1)} & \text{for } i \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Note that, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $\log^{(i)} \tau(i) = 1$.

For any $x > \tau(i-1)$ and any $a \geq 0$, Equation (1) generalizes as follows (by induction on i):

$$\log^{(i)}(x+a) \leq \log^{(i)} x + \frac{a}{\prod_{j=0}^{i-1} \log^{(j)} x} \tag{2}$$

In several places we have ratios involving iterated logarithms, in which case we make use of the following consequence of Equation (2)

$$\frac{\log^{(i)}(x+a)}{\log^{(i)} x} \leq 1 + \frac{a}{\prod_{j=0}^{i} \log^{(j)} x} \ , \tag{3}$$

which is valid for all $x > \tau(i-1)$.

2.5 The $\gamma_{i,k}$ Function

For any $i \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, any real $k > \tau(i-1)$, and any real $n \in [1, (\log^{(i)} k)^k]$, we define $\gamma_{i,k}(n)$ to be the solution $x \in [\tau(i), k]$ to the equation

$$(\log^{(i)} k)^k / (\log^{(i)} x)^x = n \ . \tag{4}$$

The value of $\gamma_{i,k}(n)$ is well defined and $\tau(i) \leq \gamma_{i,k}(n) \leq k$, for the following reasons: For $x \in [\tau(i), k]$, the left hand side of Equation (4) is a continuous strictly decreasing function of x. Setting $x = \tau(i)$, the left hand side becomes $(\log^{(i)} k)^k \geq n$. Setting $x = k$, the left hand side becomes $1 \leq n$. We note (and later make use of) the fact that $\gamma_{i,k}(n)$ is a decreasing function of $n \in [\tau(i), k]$.

3 Lower Bounds

We now prove the lower bound in Theorem 3, which establishes all the other lower bounds. The idea is to construct a graph G that has a BFS layering $L_0,\dots,L_m$ such that, for each $i \in \{0,\dots,m-1\}$ and each vertex $a \in L_i$, $G[N_G(a) \cap L_{i+1}]$ is a collection of treewidth-$(t-1)$ graphs $U_{a,0},\dots,U_{a,k}$, each of which is a copy of a small treewidth-$(t-1)$ graph U that requires at least h colours. This forces the colour of a to exceed, by at least h, the smallest colour used in $U_{a,0},\dots,U_{a,k}$. Proceeding bottom up, this forces the vertex in L_0 to receive a colour larger than hm. The lower bound is then obtained by using induction on t to upper bound the size of the graph U needed to ensure that $\chi_{2\text{-vr}}(U) \geq h$ and choosing the parameters h and m appropriately.

Lemma 18. *Let $h,k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, let U be a graph with $\chi_{2\text{-vr}}(U) \geq h$, and let G be a graph obtained by taking $k+1$ disjoint copies $U_0,\dots,U_k$ of U and adding an apex vertex a adjacent to each $v \in \bigcup_{i=0}^{k} V(U_i)$. Let $\varphi : V(G) \to \{1,\dots,k\}$ be a 2-ranking of G with the property that $\varphi(v) \geq k_0$ for each $v \in \bigcup_{i=0}^{k} V(U_i)$ and some $k_0 \in \{1,\dots,k-h\}$. Then $\varphi(a) \geq k_0 + h$.*

Proof. Since $\chi_{2\text{-vr}}(U_i) \geq h$ and each $v \in V(U_i)$ has $\varphi(v) \geq k_0$, there exists some $v_i \in V(U_i)$ such that $\varphi(v_i) \geq k_0 + h - 1$, for each $i \in \{0,\dots,k\}$. Since $|\{0,\dots,k\}| = k+1 > k-k_0+1 = |\{k_0,\dots,k\}|$ the Pigeonhole Principle implies that there exists distinct $i,j \in \{0,\dots,k\}$ such that $\varphi(v_i) = \varphi(v_j)$. Since $v_i a v_j$ is a path in G, this implies that $\varphi(a) \geq \varphi(v_i) + 1 \geq k_0 + h$. □

For a graph U and integers $h,m \geq 0$, we define the *(h,m)-boost* $U^{(h,m)}$ of U as follows: The vertex set of $U^{(h,m)}$ is the disjoint union of $L_0,\dots,L_m$. The set $L_0 := \{a_0\}$ consists of a single vertex. For each $i \in \{1,\dots,m\}$ and each $a \in L_{i-1}$, $U^{(h,m)}$ contains $hm+1$ disjoint copies $U_{a,0},\dots,U_{a,hm}$ of U and contains the edge av for each $v \in \bigcup_{j=0}^{hm} V(U_{a,j})$. This determines the set $L_i = \bigcup_{a \in L_{i-1}} \bigcup_{j=0}^{hm} V(U_{a,j})$. As a simple example, if U is a 1-vertex graph, then $U^{(h,m)}$ is a complete $(hm+1)$-ary tree of height m.

Lemma 19. *For any non-empty graph U, any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and any integer $h \in \{1,\dots,\chi_{2\text{-vr}}(U)\}$, $\chi_{2\text{-vr}}(U^{(h,m)}) \geq hm+1$.*

Proof. Let $k := \chi_{2\text{-vr}}(U^{(h,m)})$ and let $\varphi : V(U^{(h,m)}) \to \{1,\dots,k\}$ be a 2-ranking of $U^{(h,m)}$. Let $L_0,\dots,L_m$ be the partition of $V(U^{(h,m)})$ used in the definition of $U^{(h,m)}$. We will show by induction on $m-i$ that, for each $a \in L_i$, $\varphi(a) \geq (m-i)h+1$. Since $a_0 \in L_0$, this gives $k \geq \varphi(a_0) \geq mh+1$.

The base case of the induction, $m-i=0$, is trivial; it simply asserts that $\varphi(v) \geq 1$ for each $v \in L_m$. Now assume $m-i>0$. For each $a \in L_i$ and each $v \in N_{U^{(h,m)}}(a) \cap L_{i+1}$, the inductive hypothesis implies that $\varphi(v) \in \{(m-i-1)h+1,\dots,k\}$. The induced graph $G := U^{(h,m)}[\{a\} \cup N_{U^{(h,m)}}(a) \cap L_{i+1}]$ is the graph described by Lemma 18 with the value $k_0 := (m-i-1)h+1$. The conclusion of Lemma 18 therefore implies that $\varphi(a) \geq k_0 + h = (m-i)h+1$, as required. □

Lemma 20. *For any graph U and any $h,m \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, $|U^{(h,m)}| \leq (|U|hm)^m \cdot e^{O(1/h)}$.*

Proof. It is easy to see that, for each $i \in \{0,\dots,m\}$, $|L_i| = (|U|(hm+1))^i$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
|U^{h,m}| &= \sum_{i=0}^{m} |L_i| \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{m} (|U|(hm+1))^i \\
&= (|U|(hm+1))^m \cdot (1 + O(1/(|U|hm))) \\
&\le (|U|hme^{1/hm})^m \cdot e^{O(1/(|U|hm))} \\
&= (|U|hm)^m \cdot e^{1/h + O(1/(|U|hm))} = (|U|hm)^m \cdot e^{O(1/h)} \ .
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 21. *For any graph U and any integers $h, m \ge 1$, $\mathrm{tw}(U^{(h,m)}) \le \mathrm{tw}(U) + 1$.*

Proof. Let $t := \mathrm{tw}(U)$. Create a width-$(t+1)$ tree-decomposition $(B_x : x \in V(T))$ of $U^{(h,m)}$ as follows: Start with T having a single node z_0 with $B_{z_0} = L_0$. For each $i \in \{1,\dots,m\}$, and each $a \in L_{i-1}$, find some bag B_z in the current decomposition that contains a, take $hm+1$ disjoint copies $(A_x : x \in V(T_0)),\dots,(A_x : x \in V(T_h))$ of some width-t tree decomposition $\mathcal{T}$ of U. For each $i \in \{0,\dots,hm\}$, add an edge from z to any node of the tree in T_i and add a to every bag in T_i. It is straightforward to verify that this does, indeed, give a width-$(\mathrm{tw}(U)+1)$ tree-decomposition of $U^{(h,m)}$. □

Lemma 22. *For each $t \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ and every integer $r \ge \tau(t)$, there exists a graph G, with $|G| \le (\log^{(t-1)} r)^{r+o(r)} \cdot e^{(t-1)r+o(r)}$, $\mathrm{tw}(G) \le t$, and $\chi_{2\text{-vr}}(G) \ge r$.*

Proof. The proof is by induction on t. Karpas et al. [19] have shown that the complete $(r+1)$-ary tree T of height $r-1$ has $\chi_{2\text{-vr}}(T) \ge r$. As the tree T has size $\sum_{i=0}^{r-1}(r+1)^i \le r^r = (\log^{(0)} r)^r \cdot e^0$, this establishes the base case $t = 1$.

Let $h := \lceil \log r \rceil$ and $m := \lceil r/\log r \rceil$ so that $hm \ge r$. For $t > 1$ we can apply the inductive hypothesis to obtain a graph U, with $\mathrm{tw}(U) \le t-1$, $|U| \le (\log^{(t-2)} h)^{(t-1)h+o(h)}$ and $\chi_{2\text{-vr}}(U) \ge h$. Let $G := U^{(h,m)}$. By Lemma 21, $\mathrm{tw}(G) \le \mathrm{tw}(U)+1 \le t$. By Lemma 19, $\chi_{2\text{-vr}}(G) \ge hm+1 > hm \ge r$. By Lemma 20,

$$\begin{aligned}
|G| &\le (|U| \cdot m \cdot h)^m \cdot e^{O(1/h)} \\
&\le \left((\log^{(t-2)} h)^{h+o(h)} \cdot e^{(t-2)h+o(h)} \cdot mh\right)^m \cdot e^{O(1/h)} \\
&= (\log^{(t-2)} h)^{r+o(r)} \cdot e^{(t-2)r+o(r)} \cdot e^{r+o(r)} \cdot e^{O(1/h)} \qquad (\text{since } h = \lceil \log r \rceil \text{ and } m = \lceil r/\log r \rceil) \\
&= (\log^{(t-1)} r)^{r+o(r)} \cdot e^{(t-1)r+o(r)} \ .
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 3 (lower bound). By Lemma 22 there exists an n-vertex graph G with $n \le (\log^{(t-1)} r)^{r+o(r)} \cdot e^{(t-1)r+o(r)}$, $\mathrm{tw}(G) \le t$, and $\chi_{2\text{-vr}}(G) \ge r$. So, for any fixed $t \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\log n \le (r + o(r)) \log^{(t)} r \le (1 + o(1)) \cdot \chi_{2\text{-vr}}(G) \cdot \log^{(t)} \chi_{2\text{-vr}}(G) \ .$$

and attempting to solve for $\chi_{2\text{-vr}}(G)$ shows that $\chi_{2\text{-vr}}(G) \in \Omega(\log n / \log^{(t+1)} n)$. □

The lower bound construction in this section gives some guidance on how to obtain a matching upper bound for $\chi_{2\text{-vr}}(G)$. Specifically, for some node $a \in L_i$, the colouring of the component X of $H[\{a\} \cup \bigcup_{j=i+1}^{m} L_j]$ that contains a can create a lower bound on $\varphi(a)$. Specifically, if two vertices $u, w \in V(X[L_{i+1}])$ receives the same colour ϕ then $\varphi(a) > \phi$. This suggests that one should attempt to minimize the largest colour that is repeated in the colouring of $X[L_{i+1}]$. Indeed, this is a guiding principle in our upper bound proof.

4 Upper Bounds

In this section we prove asymptotically tight bounds for the worst-case number of colours needed for ℓ-ranking simple treewidth-t graphs, treewidth-t graphs, planar graphs, and bounded genus graphs. In order to avoid complicating an already technically demanding proof, for the rest of this section we will treat ℓ and t as fixed constants independent of n and other parameters that are unbounded, so that $f(\ell, t) \in O(1)$ for any function $f : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$. At the end of this section, in Section 4.4 we discuss the dependence of $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}$ on ℓ.

4.1 Simple Treewidth-t Graphs

This section is devoted to proving the upper bound in Theorem 2:

Theorem 2a. *For fixed integers $\ell \geq 2$, $t \geq 1$, every n-vertex graph H with $\operatorname{stw}(H) \leq t$ has $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(H) \in O(\log n / \log^{(t)} n)$.*

Theorem 2a immediately implies the upper bounds in Theorem 1 and 3:

Proof of Theorem 1 (upper bound). By Theorem 15, G is a subgraph of $H \boxtimes K_3 \boxtimes P$ where $|H| \leq n$, $\operatorname{stw}(H) \leq 3$, and P is a path. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(G) &\leq \chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(H \boxtimes K_3 \boxtimes P) && \text{(by Theorem 15)} \\
&\leq \chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(H) \cdot \bar{\chi}_{\ell}(K_3 \boxtimes P) && \text{(by Lemma 16)} \\
&\leq 3(\ell+1) \cdot \chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(H) && \text{(by Observation 17)} \\
&\in O(\log n / \log^{(3)} n) && \text{(by Theorem 2a).}
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 3 (upper bound). By Lemma 13, $\operatorname{stw}(H) \leq \operatorname{tw}(H) + 1 \leq t + 1$ so, by Theorem 2a, $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(H) \in O(\log n / \log^{(t+1)} n)$. □

Theorem 2a also has the following corollary, which strengthens Theorem T:

Corollary 23. *For each fixed integer $\ell \geq 2$, every n-vertex outerplanar graph G has $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(G) \in O(\log n / \log^{(2)} n)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 12(ii), $\operatorname{stw}(G) \leq 2$ so, by Theorem 2a $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(G) \in O(\log n / \log^{(2)} n)$. □

The proof of Theorem 2a is the most technically demanding part of the paper and is the subject of most of this section. Globally, the proof is by induction on the value of t, though it is easy to miss this, since it is spread over several lemmas. The case $t = 1$ is easy:

By Lemma 12(i), any graph of simple treewidth 1 is a contained in a path and therefore has an ℓ-ranking using $\ell+1 \in O(\log n/\log^{(1)} n) = O(1)$ colours.[6] In the proof of Lemma 29, below, we will apply Theorem 2a to graphs of simple treewidth $t-1$. Lemma 29 is then used in the proof of Lemma 31 which is used in the proof of Theorem 2a (a statement about graphs of simple treewidth t), at the end of this section.

4.1.1 The Bread

We begin with a few helper lemmas whose purpose is to show that, for a graph H having a width-t tree-decomposition $\mathcal{T} := (B_x : x \in V(T))$, $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(H)$ can be bounded by a function of t and the number of branching (degree at least 3) nodes in T. We begin with the simplest case: when H has a width-t path decomposition.

Lemma 24. *For any graph G, $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(G) \leq (\ell+1)\,\mathrm{pw}(G)+1$.*

Proof. The proof is by induction on $\mathrm{pw}(G)$. The base case $\mathrm{pw}(G)=0$ is trivial: In this case, G contains no edges and can be ℓ-ranked with $1=(\ell+1)\,\mathrm{pw}(G)+1$ colours. For $\mathrm{pw}(G)\geq 1$, we may assume that G is connected since, otherwise, we can colour each component of G separately. Let $P := x_1,\dots,x_m$ be a path and let $(B_x : x \in V(P))$ be a P-decomposition of G of width $\mathrm{pw}(G)$.

Let $v_1,\dots,v_p$ be a path of minimum length such that $v_1 \in B_{x_0}$ and $v_p \in B_{x_m}$. Since $v_1,\dots,v_m$ is a path in G with $v_1 \in B_{x_0}$ and $v_r \in B_{x_m}$, $|B_x \cap \{v_1,\dots,v_p\}| \geq 1$, for each $x \in V(P)$. Since $(B_x \setminus \{v_1,\dots,v_p\} : x \in V(P))$ is a path decomposition of $G-\{v_1,\dots,v_p\}$, this implies that $\mathrm{pw}(G-\{v_1,\dots,v_p\}) \leq \mathrm{pw}(G)-1$. We inductively colour $G-\{v_1,\dots,v_p\}$ using colours $\{1,\dots,(\ell+1)(\mathrm{pw}(G)-1)+1\}$ and then colour each v_i with colour $((\ell+1)(\mathrm{pw}(G)-1)+2+i) \bmod (\ell+1)$.

A standard property of shortest paths implies that, for each $i,j \in \{1,\dots,p\}$, $|j-i| = d_G(v_i,v_j)$. In this colouring, $\varphi(v_i)=\varphi(v_j)$ implies that $j-i \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell+1}$, for any $i,j \in \{1,\dots,p\}$. In particular, for distinct $i,j \in \{1,\dots,p\}$, $\varphi(v_i)=\varphi(v_j)$ implies that $d_G(v_i,v_j) = |j-i| \geq \ell+1$.

To see that the resulting colouring is an ℓ-ranking, consider any path X in G of length at most ℓ. If $V(X)\cap\{v_1,\dots,v_p\} \neq \emptyset$ then each vertex $V(X)\cap\{v_1,\dots,v_m\}$ has a unique colour, which is larger than any colour used by any vertex in $V(X)\setminus\{v_1,\dots,v_m\}$. If $V(X)\cap\{v_1,\dots,v_p\} = \emptyset$ then $X \subseteq G-\{v_1,\dots,v_p\}$ has a unique maximum colour by the inductive hypothesis. □

Lemma 25. *Let $P = x_1,\dots,x_m$ be a path and let G be a graph that is edge-maximal with respect to a width-t P-decomposition $\mathcal{P} := (B_x : x \in V(P))$ of G. Then there exists a set $U \subseteq V(G)$ such that*

(Z1) $B_{x_1} \cup B_{x_m} \subseteq U$;
(Z2) $|U| \leq 2(\ell+1)^t + t$; and

[6] This is far from tight: Any path has an ℓ-ranking using at most $k := \lfloor \log_2 \ell \rfloor + 2$ colours. Any path of length at most $2^{k-1}-1$ is easily coloured using colours in $\{1,\dots,k-1\}$ using divide-and-conquer [28]. To colour a path $v_0,\dots,v_m$ with $m \geq 2^{k-1}$, set $\varphi(v_i) := k$ for each $i \equiv 0 \pmod{2^{k-1}}$. Then the set of uncoloured vertices induces a collection of paths each of length at most $2^{k-1}-1$ which can be coloured using colours in $\{1,\dots,k-1\}$.

(Z3) for each non-trivial induced path $w_0,\dots,w_q$ in G of length at most ℓ, $\{w_0,w_q\}\subseteq U$ implies that $\{w_1,\dots,w_{q-1}\}\subseteq U$.

Proof. To eliminate a level of subscripts, let $x_i := i$ for each $i \in \{1,\dots,m\}$. The proof is by induction on t. In the base case, $t = 0$, G has no edges and therefore no non-trivial paths, so Z3 is vacuous. The lemma is satisfied by taking $U := B_1 \cup B_m$. This certainly satisfies Z1 and satisfies Z2 since $|U| \le 2 = 2(\ell+1)^0 + 0$.

Now assume that $t \ge 1$. If G is not connected, then B_1 and B_m are in different components of G. In this case we choose $U := B_1 \cup B_m$. This certainly satisfies Z1. This satisfies Z2 since $|U| \le |B_1|+|B_m| \le 2t+2 \le 2(\ell+1)^t+t$ because $2(\ell+1)^t \ge 2^{t+1} > t+2$ for all $t \ge 1$. This also satisfies Z3 because the only paths $w_0,\dots,w_q$ that need consideration have $\{w_0,w_q\}\subseteq B_1$ or $\{w_0,w_q\}\subseteq B_m$. Since we only consider induced paths in G and G is edge-maximal with respect to $\mathcal{P}$, this implies that $q = 1$, so $w_0,\dots,w_q = w_0w_q$ consists of a single edge and $\{w_0,w_q\}\subseteq U$.

We may now assume that G is connected. For each $v \in V(G)$, let $r(v) := \max\{i \in \{1,\dots,m\} : v \in B_i\}$. Let $y_0 := 1$ and $i := 1$. As long as $y_i \ne m$, choose a vertex $u_i \in B_{y_i}$ that maximizes $y_{i+1} := r(u_i)$ and increment i. This produces a path $u_0,\dots,u_p$ in G and a sequence of nodes $y_0,\dots,y_{p+1}$ in $V(P)$. It is easy to verify that $u_0,\dots,u_p$ is a shortest path from B_1 to B_m, i.e., $p = \min\{d_H(w_0,w_q) : w_0 \in B_1, w_q \in B_m\}$. Therefore, if $p > \ell$, the lemma is again trivially satisfied by taking $U := B_1 \cup B_m$.

Now assume that $p \le \ell$. For each $i \in \{1,\dots,p+1\}$, define the path $P_i = y_{i-1},\dots,y_i$, let $\mathcal{P}_i := (B_x \setminus \{u_{i-1}\} : x \in V(P_i))$, and let $G_i := G[B_x \setminus \{u_{i-1}\} : x \in V(P_i)]$. Then G_i is edge-maximal with respect to $\mathcal{P}_i$ and $\mathcal{P}_i$ has width at most $t-1$. For each $i \in \{1,\dots,p\}$, we apply the lemma inductively to G_i and $\mathcal{P}_i$ to obtain a set U_i. Let $U := \{u_0,\dots,u_p\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{p+1} U_i$. Observe that, by induction, $\bigcup_{i=1}^{p+1} U_i \supseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{p+1}(B_{y_{i-1}} \cup B_{y_i} \setminus \{u_{i-1}\})$, so $U \supseteq \bigcup_{i=0}^{p+1} B_{y_i}$.

In particular, U contains $B_{y_0} = B_1$ and $B_{y_{p+1}} = B_m$, so U satisfies (Z1). Now observe that $|U| \le |B_1| + |\{u_1,\dots,u_p\}| + |\bigcup_{i=1}^{p+1} |U_i \setminus B_{y_{i-1}}|$. Since $p \le \ell$, this implies that $|U \setminus B_1|$ satisfies the recurrence

$$|U \setminus B_1| \le f(t) \le \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t = 0 \\ \ell + (\ell+1)\cdot f(t-1) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This recurrence resolves to $f(t) \le 2(\ell+1)^t - 1$. Therefore $|U| \le f(t)+|B_1| \le 2(\ell+1)^t + t$ so this satisfies Z2. All that remains is to show that U satisfies (Z3). Consider some induced path $w_0,\dots,w_q$ in G of length at most ℓ with $\{w_0,w_q\}\subseteq U$. We want to show that $\{w_1,\dots,w_{q-1}\}\subseteq U$.

We say that a vertex w_i is *pinched* if $w_i \in B_{y_j}$ for some $j \in \{0,\dots,p+1\}$. (Note that each of $u_0,\dots,u_p$ is pinched.) The edges of $w_0,\dots,w_q$ can be partitioned into subpaths of the form $w_a,\dots,w_b$ where (i) w_a is pinched; (ii) w_b is pinched; and (iii) none of $w_{a+1},\dots,w_{b-1}$ are pinched. First note that, for any such subpath $w_a,\dots,w_b$, $\{w_a,w_b\}\subseteq U$, so we need only show that $\{w_{a+1},\dots,w_{b-1}\}\subseteq U$. There are three cases to consider:

1. $\{w_a,w_b\}\subseteq B_{y_j}$ for some $j \in \{0,\dots,p+1\}$. Since G is edge-maximal with respect to $\mathcal{P}$, this implies that $w_aw_b \in E(G)$. Since $w_a,\dots,w_b$ is an induced path in G, $b = a+1$ and

there is nothing to prove.
2. $\{w_a, w_b\} \subseteq V(G_j)$ for some $j \in \{1,\dots,p\}$ (and not the preceding case). Since none of $w_{a+1},\dots,w_{b-1}$ are pinched, this implies that $\{w_a,\dots,w_b\} \subseteq V(G_j)$. Therefore, $w_a,\dots,w_b$ is an induced path in G_j so, by the inductive hypothesis, $\{w_{a+1},\dots,w_{b-1}\} \subseteq U_j \subseteq U$.
3. $w_a = u_{j-1}$ for some $j \in \{1,\dots,p+1\}$ and $w_b \in V(G_j)$. In this case, $w_a = u_{j-1} \in B_k$ for each $k \in \{y_{j-1},\dots,y_j\}$ and $w_b \in B_k$ for at least one $k \in \{y_{j-1},\dots,y_j\}$. By edge maximality, $w_a w_b \in E(G)$, so $b = a+1$ and there is nothing to prove. □

A node x in a rooted tree T is a *branching node* if x has at least two children. Let $\Lambda(T)$ denote the set of branching nodes in a tree T. Let H be a graph that is edge-maximal with respect to some tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} := (B_x : x \in V(T))$ of width at most t. We define the *$(\mathcal{T},\ell)$-skeleton* $\hat{H}$ of H as the induced subgraph of H whose vertex set is defined as follows:

1. $V(\hat{H})$ contains $\bigcup_{x\in\Lambda(T)} B_x$.
2. For each pair of nodes $x, y \in \Lambda(T)$ such that the path $P_T(x,y)$ from x to y in T has no branching node in its interior, $V(\hat{H})$ contains the set $U_{xy} \subseteq V(H)$ obtained by applying Lemma 25 to the graph $G_{xy} := H[\bigcup_{z\in V(P_T(x,y))} B_z]$ with the path decomposition $\mathcal{P}_{xy} := (B_z : z \in P_T(x,y))$. (Note that G_{xy} and $\mathcal{P}_{xy}$ satisfy the edge-maximality required for Lemma 25 since H is edge-maximal with respect to $\mathcal{T}$.)

Lemma 26. *Let $w_0,\dots,w_q$ be an induced path in H of length at most ℓ and with endpoints $\{w_0, w_q\} \subseteq V(\hat{H})$. Then $\{w_1,\dots,w_{q-1}\} \subseteq V(\hat{H})$.*

Proof. Partition the edges of $w_0,\dots,w_q$ into paths of the form $w_a,\dots,w_b$ such that (i) $a = 0$ or $w_a \in \bigcup_{x\in\Lambda(T)} B_x$; (ii) $b = q$ or $w_b \in \bigcup_{x\in\Lambda(T)} B_x$; and (iii) none of $w_{a+1},\dots,w_{b-1}$ are contained $\bigcup_{x\in\Lambda(T)} B_x$. This means that $w_a,\dots,w_b$ is an induced path in G_{xy} for some $x, y \in \Lambda(H)$ and $\{w_a, w_b\} \subseteq U_{xy}$. Therefore, by Lemma 25 $\{w_{a+1},\dots,w_{b-1}\} \subseteq U_{xy} \subseteq U$, as required. □

Lemma 27. $|V(\hat{H})| \leq (|\Lambda(T)|-1)\cdot(2(\ell+1)^t + t)$.

Proof. This follows from Lemma 25 (Z2) and the fact that there are $|\Lambda(T)|-1$ distinct pairs $x, y \in \Lambda(T)$ such that $P_T(x,y)$ has no internal nodes in $\Lambda(T)$. □

Lemma 28. *Let H be a graph that is edge-maximal with respect to some width-t tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} := (B_x : x \in V(T))$ of H that defines a $(\mathcal{T},\ell)$-skeleton $\hat{H}$, of H. Then $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(H) \leq \chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(\hat{H}) + (\ell+1)t + 1$.*

Proof. Let $\varphi : V(\hat{H}) \to \{(\ell+1)t+2,\dots,\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(\hat{H})+(\ell+1)t+1\}$ be an ℓ-ranking of $\hat{H}$. The graph $P := T - \Lambda(T)$ consists of disjoint paths and, for any edge $vw \in E(H - V(\hat{H})))$ there is a node $x \in V(P)$ such that $\{v, w\} \subseteq B_x$. Therefore $(B_x : x \in V(P))$ is a width-t path decomposition of $H - V(\hat{H})$, so $\mathrm{pw}(H - V(\hat{H})) \leq t$. Therefore, by Lemma 24, $H - V(\hat{H})$ has an ℓ-ranking $\varphi : V(H - V(\hat{H})) \to \{1,\dots,(\ell+1)t+1\}$. This gives a colouring $\varphi : V(H) \to \{1,\dots,\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(\hat{H}) + (\ell+1)t+1\}$.

We claim that φ is an ℓ-ranking of $\hat{H}$. To see this, consider some induced path $u_0,\dots,u_p$ in H with $\varphi(u_0) = \varphi(u_p)$. We must show that $\varphi(u_i) > \varphi(u_0)$ for some $i \in \{1,\dots,p-1\}$. Since

$\rho(u_0) = \rho(u_p)$ and the colours used to colour $\hat{H}$ are distinct from those used to colour $H - V(\hat{H})$, there are only two cases to consider:

1. $\{u_0, u_p\} \subseteq V(H - V(\hat{H}))$. There are two subcases:
   (a) $\{u_1, \ldots, u_{r-1}\} \subseteq V(H - V(\hat{H}))$. In this case, $u_0, \ldots, u_p$ is a path in $H - V(\hat{H})$, so $\varphi(u_0) < \varphi(u_i)$ for some $i \in \{1, \ldots, p-1\}$ since Lemma 24 ensures that φ is an ℓ-ranking of $H - V(\hat{H})$.
   (b) $u_i \in V(\hat{H})$ for some $i \in \{1, \ldots, p-1\}$. In this case, $\varphi(u_0) \leq (\ell+1)t + 1 < (\ell+1)t + 2 \leq \varphi(u_i)$.
2. $\{u_0, u_p\} \subseteq V(\hat{H})$. By Lemma 26 $\{u_0, \ldots, u_p\} \subseteq V(\hat{H})$, so $\varphi(u_0) < \varphi(u_i)$ for some $i \in \{1, \ldots, p-1\}$ since φ is an ℓ-ranking of $\hat{H}$. □

4.1.2 The Meat

Now we arrive at the combinatorial core of the proof. The main idea is to cover H with a sequence of overlapping blocks, each of which consists of $\ell + 2$ consecutive BFS layers. Each pair of consecutive blocks overlaps in a single BFS layer. To convey some intuition about the proof, we first present it for trees.

The Proof for Trees. We will now show that, for any $\ell \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, any $k \geq 3$, and any tree T with $n \leq k^k$ vertices has a ℓ-ranking $\varphi : V(T) \to \{0, \ldots, \lfloor ak \rfloor\}$, for some value of a that depends only on ℓ. Observe that a value of $k \in O(\log n / \log\log n)$ is sufficient to satisfy the condition $n \leq k^k$, so this already proves that $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(T) \in O(\log n / \log\log n)$, which extends the result of Karpas et al. [19] that $\chi_{2\text{-vr}}(T) \in O(\log n / \log\log n)$.

Let r be the root of T, let h be the height of T and, for each $i \in \{0, \ldots, h\}$, let L_i denote the set of vertices in T that have depth i. For each vertex v in T, let T_v be the subtree of T that contains v and all its descendants, let $n_v := |T_v|$ be the number of vertices in T_v, and let c_v be the solution to the equation $k^k / c_v^{c_v} = n_v$. In other words, $c_v := \gamma_{0,k}(n_v)$. Let $c := c_r$, so $n = k^k / c^c$. We will prove the following stronger result (see Figure 1):

> T has an ℓ-ranking $\varphi : V(T) \to \{1, \ldots, \lfloor ak \rfloor\}$ such that $\varphi(r) = \lfloor a(k-c) \rfloor + 1$ and $\varphi(v) \leq \lfloor a(k-c) \rfloor$ for each vertex $v \in \bigcup_{i=1}^{\ell} L_i$.

We proceed by induction on n. In the base case, $n = 1$, so $c = k$. We set $\varphi(r) := \lfloor a(k-c) \rfloor + 1 = 1$ and we are done. Now suppose $n \geq 2$. For each $v \in L_{\ell+1}$, apply the inductive hypothesis on the subtree T_v to obtain an ℓ-ranking φ of the forest $F := T[\bigcup_{i=\ell+1}^{h} L_i]$.

We say that a vertex $v \in L_{\ell+1}$ is *dangerous* if T_v has size $n_v > k^k / (c+1)^{c+1}$ and *harmless* otherwise. Observe that the number x of dangerous vertices must satisfy $x k^k / (c+1)^{c+1} < n = k^k / c^c$, so

$$x \leq \frac{(c+1)^{c+1}}{c^c} = \left(\frac{c+1}{c}\right)^c \cdot (c+1) = (1 + 1/c)^c \cdot (c+1) < e \cdot (c+1) \ .$$

We modify φ by assigning a unique colour $\varphi(v) \in \{\lfloor a(k-c) + 2, \ldots, \lfloor ak \rfloor\rfloor$ to each dangerous vertex. The number of colours available for dangerous vertices is at least $ac - 2$ and the number of dangerous vertices is at most $e(c+1)$, so this is always possible, provided that




Figure 1: Finding an ℓ-ranking of a tree of size $n = k^k/c^c$. The root gets colour $\lfloor a(k-c)\rfloor+1$. Vertices in $L_1,\dots,L_\ell$ get colours in $[a(k-c-1),a(k-c)]$. Dangerous vertices in $L_{\ell+1}$ get unique colours in $[\lfloor a(k-c)\rfloor+2,ak]$. Harmless vertices get colours in $[1,a(k-c)]$.

$a \geq 8 > e+(e+2)/c$. Observe that this modification can only increase the value of $\varphi(v)$, since $c_v \geq c$ and the inductive hypothesis ensures that, prior to this modification $\varphi(v) = \lfloor a(k-c_v)\rfloor+1 < \lfloor a(k-c)\rfloor+2$. This implies that the modified colouring is still a 2-ranking of F since, by the inductive hypothesis, $\varphi(v)$ is the unique largest colour in $\bigcup_{j=\ell+1}^{2\ell+1}(V(T_v)\cap L_j)$.

Next observe that each harmless vertex $w \in L_{\ell+1}$ has $c_w \geq c+1$, so $\varphi(w) = \lfloor a(k-c_w)\rfloor + 1 \leq \lfloor a(k-c-1)\rfloor+1 < \lfloor a(k-c)\rfloor-\ell$ for any $a \geq \ell+2$. Extending φ to the vertices in $L_0,\dots,L_\ell$ is now straightforward: For each $i \in \{0,\dots,\ell\}$ and each $v \in L_i$, set $\varphi(v) := \lfloor a(k-c)\rfloor+1-i$.

It is straightforward to check that the resulting colouring $\varphi : V(T) \to \{1,\dots,\lfloor ak\rfloor\}$ satisfies the stronger conditions of the inductive hypothesis. To see why φ is an ℓ-ranking of T, consider any path P of length at most ℓ.

- If P is entirely contained in T_v for some $v \in L_{\ell+1}$, then P has a unique maximum colour by the inductive hypothesis.
- Otherwise, if P contains no dangerous vertices then the unique maximum colour in P occurs at the unique vertex of P that has minimum T-depth.
- Otherwise, P contains one or two dangerous vertices that have distinct colours and the largest of these is larger than any other colour that appears in P.

This completes the proof for trees. With some small changes, the proof given above also works for simple 2-trees, i.e., maximal outerplanar graphs. The differences are as follows:

- For a simple 2-tree H we use a BFS layering $L_0,\dots,L_h$ where L_0 may contain a single vertex or both endpoints of an edge of H, and the vertices in L_0 will receive colours in $\{\lfloor a(k-c)\rfloor+1, \lfloor a(k-c)\rfloor+2\}$.
- For each $i \in \{1,\dots,\ell\}$, the induced graph $H[L_i]$ is a collection of paths, so it is coloured using $\ell+1$ distinct colours in $\{\lfloor a(k-c)\rfloor+1-i(\ell+1),\dots,\lfloor a(k-c)\rfloor+1-(i-1)(\ell+1)\}$. This works, provided that $a \geq \ell(\ell+1)+2$.




Figure 2: Finding an ℓ-ranking of a simple t-tree of size $n = (\log^{(t-2)})^k/(\log^{(t-2)} c)^c$. Vertices in S get colours in $[a(k-c-s), a(k-c)]$. Dangerous vertices in $L_{\ell+1}$ get unique colours in $[\lfloor a(k-c)\rfloor, ak]$. Harmless vertices and vertices in $H[\bigcup_{i=0}^{\ell+1} L_i] - S$ get colours in $[1, a(k-c-s)]$.

Note that, for the second point to work, it is crucial that H be a *simple* 2-tree. If H is a (not necessarily simple) 2-tree then $H[L_i]$ can be an arbitrary forest, for which an ℓ-ranking may require $\log|L_i|/\log\log|L_i|$ colours.

The Proof for Simple t-Trees. Our proof for simple t-trees has some elements in common with the proof presented above:

- It follows the same general outline of first inductively colouring components of $H[\bigcup_{i=\ell+1}^{h} L_i]$ and then increasing the colours of dangerous vertices in layer $L_{\ell+1}$ so that they are all unique.
- In the final colouring vertices in $L_1, \ldots, L_\ell$ receive colours not larger than $a(k-c)$, and the vertices in L_0 have colours that are larger than all vertices in $L_1, \ldots, L_\ell$.

Unfortunately, this is where the similarities end, and for $t \geq 3$ considerable complications appear that are not present when $t = 2$. In short, this happens because, for $t \geq 3$, the graph $H[L_i]$ within each layer may require a number of colours that is not bounded by any function of ℓ. We now give a high-level overview of how to deal with this. See Figure 2

We (mostly) give up on the idea of using distinct colours for each of $L_0, \ldots, L_\ell$. As above, we are inductively colouring a graph H with $n \leq (\log^{(t-2)} k)^k$ vertices and $c := \gamma_{t-2,k}(n)$, and we want to show that H has an ℓ-ranking that uses at most $\lfloor ak \rfloor$ colours in which the vertices in $L_1, \ldots, L_\ell$ receive colours less than $a(k-c)$.

To achieve this we use a separator $S \subseteq \bigcup_{i=0}^{\ell} L_i$ that guarantees that the size of each component of $H - S$ is sufficiently small that it has an ℓ-ranking in which the vertices in $L_0, \ldots, L_\ell$ have colours smaller than $a(k-c-s)$ for some appropriately chosen s. For this to work, we need that each component have size at most $(\log^{(t-2)} k)^k/(\log^{(t-2)}(c+s))^{c+s}$. The situation is complicated further by the fact that the harmless vertices in $L_{\ell+1}$ create lower

bounds on the colours of their neighbours in L_ℓ. Without these lower bounds, two vertices in distinct components of $H[L_{\ell+1}]$ might receive the same colour which is smaller than the colour of their common neighbour in L_ℓ. This requires us to solve a weighted generalization of the problem on $H[\bigcup_{i=0}^{\ell} L_i]$. This weighted problem on a graph of diameter $d \in O(\ell)$ is the subject of Lemma 29, below.

Assuming this weighted generalization can be solved, this still leaves the problem of colouring the vertices in S. For a carefully chosen value of s, the separator S is the union of $O(c^4)$ bags in a t-simple tree-decomposition of H, where $\log c/\log^{(t-1)}(c) = O(s)$. We can then augment S into a superset $S' \supseteq S \cup L_0$ in such a way that $H[S']$ has a width-t tree decomposition whose underlying tree has $O(c^4)$ branching nodes. For each $i \in \{0,\dots,\ell\}$, the graph $H_i' := H[L_i \cap S']$ has simple treewidth $t-1$ (by Lemma 14) and has a tree decomposition of width at most $t-1$ whose underlying tree has $O(c^4)$ branching nodes. Therefore, by Lemma 28 and induction on t, H_i' has an ℓ-ranking using $O(\log c^4/\log^{(t-1)} c^4) = O(s)$ colours. This leaves enough room to colour all of H' using colours in the interval $[\lfloor a(k-c-s)\rfloor+1, \lfloor a(k-c)\rfloor]$, using a colouring in which all vertices of H_i' have larger colours than those of H_{i+1}', for each $i \in \{0,\dots,\ell-1\}$.

In order for all of this to work, we must strike a balance between the size of the separator S and the sizes of the components that remain after removing S. As it turns out, setting $s := \log c/\log^{(t-1)} c$ achieves what we need. This choice of s appears in the following lemma, which is what we eventually use to colour the vertices in $L_0,\dots,L_\ell$. The purpose of the weighting $(n_v : v \in V(H))$ that appears in this lemma is to deal with the fact, discussed above, that harmless vertices in $L_{\ell+1}$ that are coloured inductively will place lower bounds on the colours of vertices in L_ℓ.

Lemma 29. *Let $t, d, \ell \in \mathbb{N}\setminus\{0\}$ be fixed values, let $k \geq 3$; let H be a graph with $\operatorname{diam}(H) \leq d$ and $\operatorname{stw}(H) \leq t$ in which each vertex $v \in V(H)$ is assigned a real-valued weight $n_v \geq 1$. Then there exists a constant $a := a(t,\ell,d)$ such that, if*

$$\sum_{v\in V(H)} n_v \leq \frac{(\log^{(t-2)} k)^k}{(\log^{(t-2)} c)^c} \ , \tag{5}$$

for some $c \geq 1$ and

$$\max\{n_v : v \in V(H)\} \leq \frac{(\log^{(t-2)} k)^k}{(\log^{(t-2)}(c+s))^{c+s}} \ , \tag{6}$$

where $s := \log c/\log^{(t-1)} c$, then H has an ℓ-ranking $\varphi : V(H) \to \{1,\dots,\lfloor a(k-c\rfloor\}$ such that $\varphi(v) > a(k-\gamma_{t-2,k}(n_v))$ for each $v \in V(H)$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that H is edge-maximal with respect to some r-rooted t-simple tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} := (B_x : x \in V(T))$. Let $L_0,\dots,L_h$ be the BFS layering of H with $L_0 := B_r$. Note that $h \leq \operatorname{diam}(H) \leq d$.

The proof is by induction on $|H|$. In the base case, $|H| = 0$ and there is nothing to prove. Now assume $|H| \geq 1$. For each subgraph X of H, define $n_X := \sum_{v\in V(X)} n_v$ so that Equation (5) implies that $n_H \leq (\log^{(t-2)} k)^k/(\log^{(t-2)} c)^c$.

Let

$$n_0 := \frac{(\log^{(t-2)} k)^k}{\left(\log^{(t-2)}\left(c+s+\frac{\log(c+s)}{\log^{(t-1)}(c+s)}\right)\right)^{c+s+\frac{\log(c+s)}{\log^{(t-1)}(c+s)}}} \quad . \tag{7}$$

We say that a subgraph X of H is *heavy* if $n_X > n_0$ and X is *light* otherwise. For a heavy subgraph X,

$$\frac{n_H}{n_X} < \frac{n_H}{n_0} \leq \frac{\left(\log^{(t-2)}\left(c+s+\frac{\log(c+s)}{\log^{(t-1)}(c+s)}\right)\right)^{c+s+\frac{\log(c+s)}{\log^{(t-1)}(c+s)}}}{(\log^{(t-2)} c)^c} \in O\left(c^4\right) \ , \tag{8}$$

where the upper bound of $O(c^4)$ is justified by a calculation in Appendix A.1.

By Lemma 11 with the weight function $\xi(v) := n_v$, there exists $S_T \subseteq V(T)$ of size $O(c^4)$ that defines $S := \bigcup_{x \in S_T} B_x$ such that each component X of $H - S$ is light. Let T' be the subtree of T induced by S_T and every T-ancestor of every node in S_T, i.e., $T' := T[\bigcup_{x \in S_T} V(P_T(x))]$. Let $H' := H[\bigcup_{x \in V(T')} B_x]$.

For each $i \in \{0, \ldots, h\}$, let $H_i' := H'[L_i]$. Then $\mathcal{T}_i' := (B_x \cap L_i : x \in V(T'))$ is a tree decomposition of H_i' and H_i' is edge-maximal with respect to $\mathcal{T}_i'$. Each leaf x of T' is an element of S_T, therefore T' has at most $|S_T| \in O(c^4)$ leaves. Since T' has $O(c^4)$ leaves, it has $O(c^4)$ branching nodes. Therefore, by Lemma 27, the $(\mathcal{T}_i', \ell)$-skeleton $\hat{H}_i'$ of H_i' has size $|\hat{H}_i'| \in O(c^4)$. Since $\hat{H}_i'$ is a subgraph of H_i', $\mathrm{stw}(\hat{H}_i') \leq \mathrm{stw}(H_i') \leq \mathrm{stw}(H[L_i]) \leq t-1$, where the last inequality follows from Lemma 14.

By Theorem 2a applied to the graph $\hat{H}_i'$ (which has simple treewidth at most $t-1$),[7]

$$\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(\hat{H}_i') \in O\left(\frac{\log|\hat{H}_i'|}{\log^{(t-1)}|\hat{H}_i'|}\right) \subseteq O\left(\frac{\log c^4}{\log^{(t-1)} c^4}\right) = O\left(\frac{\log c}{\log^{(t-1)} c}\right) = O(s) \ .$$

Therefore, by Lemma 28 $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(H_i') \in O(s)$, so H_i' has an ℓ-ranking $\varphi : V(H_i') \to \{\lfloor a(k-c)\rfloor - (i+1)q + 1, \ldots, \lfloor a(k-c)\rfloor - iq\}$ for some $q \in O(s)$.

In the preceding paragraphs, we have defined a colouring $\varphi : V(H') \to \{\lfloor a(k-c)\rfloor - (h+1)q, \ldots, \lfloor a(k-c)\rfloor\rfloor\}$. For a sufficiently large constant $a := a(t, \ell, d)$, $(h+1)q < as$, so $\lfloor a(k-c)\rfloor - (h+1)q + 1 > a(k-c-s)$. Therefore, each vertex in H' receives a colour larger than $\lfloor a(k-c-s)\rfloor$. By Equation (6), $\gamma_{t-2,k}(n_v) \geq c+s$ for each $v \in V(H)$, so $\varphi(v) > a(k-c-s) \geq a(k - \gamma_{t-2,k}(n_v))$ for each $v \in V(H')$, as required.

Since $S' := V(H') \supseteq S$, each component X of $H - V(H')$ is light, so

$$n_X \leq \frac{(\log^{(t-2)} k)^k}{\left(\log^{(t-2)}\left(c+s+\frac{\log(c+s)}{\log^{(t-1)}(c+s)}\right)\right)^{\left(c+s+\frac{\log(c+s)}{\log^{(t-1)}(c+s)}\right)}}$$

[7] The case $i = 0$ is an exception here, since $H[L_0] = H[B_r]$ is a clique of size at most $t+1$, which certainly has an ℓ-ranking using at most $t+1 \in O(1)$ colours.

Let $c' := c + s$ and let $s' := \log(c+s)/\log^{(t-1)}(c+s)$. Since each component X of $H - S'$ is light, n_X satisfies Equation (5) with the value $c' + s' \geq c'$ and satisfies Equation (6) with the value s'.[8] Therefore, we can apply Lemma 29 inductively on X to obtain an ℓ-ranking $\varphi : V(X) \to \{1, \ldots, \lfloor a(k-c') \rfloor\}$ in which $\varphi(v) > a(k - \gamma_{t-2,k}(n_v))$ for each $v \in V(X)$, as required. Doing this for each component X of $H - S'$ completes the colouring φ to a total colouring of H.

All that remains is to verify that φ is an ℓ-ranking of H. To do this, consider any induced path $u_0, \ldots, u_p$ in H with $p \leq \ell$ and $\varphi(u_0) = \varphi(u_p)$. We must show that $\varphi(u_0) < \varphi(u_j)$ for some $j \in \{1, \ldots, p-1\}$. There are a few cases to consider:

1. If $\varphi(u_0) = \varphi(u_p) > a(k-c')$ then $\{u_0, u_p\} \subseteq V(H')$. By Observation 8, $x_{\mathcal{T}}(u_i)$ is a $\mathcal{T}$-ancestor of at least one of $x_{\mathcal{T}}(u_0)$ or $x_{\mathcal{T}}(u_p)$ for each $i \in \{0, \ldots, p\}$. By construction, T' contains every T-ancestor of $x_{\mathcal{T}}(u_0)$ and T' contains every T-ancestor of $x_{\mathcal{T}}(u_p)$. Therefore $\{u_0, \ldots, u_p\} \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in V(T')} B_x = V(H')$.
   For distinct i and j vertices in H'_i and H'_j receive colours from disjoint sets. Therefore, since $\varphi(u_0) = \varphi(u_p)$, $\{u_0, u_p\} \subseteq V(H'_i)$ for some $i \in \{0, \ldots, h\}$. By Observation 8 and 9, $\{u_0, \ldots, u_p\} \subseteq \bigcup_{j=0}^{i} V(H'_j)$. There are two cases to consider:
   (a) $\{u_0, \ldots, u_p\} \subseteq V(H'_i)$ in which case $\varphi(u_j) > \varphi(u_0)$ for some $j \in \{1, \ldots, p-1\}$ since φ is an ℓ-ranking of H'_i (by the application of Lemma 28 to H'_i); or
   (b) $u_j \in V(H'_{i-1})$ for some $j \in \{1, \ldots, p-1\}$. In this case $\varphi(u_j) \geq \lfloor a(k-c) \rfloor - iq + 1 > \lfloor a(k-c) \rfloor - iq \geq \varphi(u_0)$.
2. If $\varphi(u_0) = \varphi(u_p) \leq a(k-c')$ then $u_0 \in V(X)$ and $u_p \in V(Y)$ for some components X and Y of $H - S'$. Either
   (a) $u_j \in S' = V(H')$ for some $j \in \{1, \ldots, p-1\}$ in which case $\varphi(u_j) > a(k-c') \geq \varphi(u_0)$; or
   (b) $X = Y$ and $\{u_0, \ldots, u_p\} \subseteq V(X)$, in which case $\varphi(u_j) > \varphi(u_0)$ for some $j \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ (by the application of Lemma 29, inductively, on X). □

Since our strategy is to use Lemma 29 on the first $\ell+1$ BFS layers of H and then recurse on the subgraphs attached to layer $\ell + 1$, we need to define vertex weights n_v that allow us to capture the sizes of the subgraphs attached to vertices in layer $\ell + 1$. The following lemma shows that the obvious approach to this does not overcount by more than a factor of t.

Lemma 30. *Let H be a graph that is edge-maximal with respect to an r-rooted tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} := (B_x : x \in V(T))$ of width at most t and let $\mathcal{L} := L_0, \ldots, L_m$ be the BFS layering of H with $L_0 = B_r$. For each $i \in \{0, \ldots, m\}$ and each $v \in L_i$, let H_v be the component of $H[\{v\} \bigcup_{j=i+1}^{m} L_j]$ that contains v and let $\kappa_v := t + |H_v|$. Then $\sum_{v \in L_i} \kappa_v \leq t \cdot |\bigcup_{j=i}^{m} L_j|$.*

Proof. For each component X of $H[\bigcup_{j=i+1}^{m} L_j]$, let $C_X := L_i \cap N_H(V(X))$. By Observation 10, $|C_X| \leq t$. A vertex $w \in V(X)$ appears in H_v if and only if $v \in C_X$. Therefore,

$$\sum_{v \in L_i} \kappa_v \leq t \cdot |L_i| + \sum_X |C_X| \cdot |X| \leq t \cdot |L_i| + \sum_X t \cdot |X| = t \cdot \left| \bigcup_{j=i}^{m} L_j \right| . \qquad \square$$

[8] Indeed, $\sum_{v \in V(X)} n_x \leq n_0$, so $\max\{n_v : v \in V(X)\} \leq n_0 = (\log^{(t-2)} k)^k / (\log^{(t-2)}(c' + s'))^{c'+s'}$.

Finally, we can prove the technical lemma that implies Theorem 2a.

Lemma 31. *Let $n, t, \ell \in \mathbb{N}\setminus\{0\}$ and $k, c \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $tn \leq (\log^{(t-2)} k)^k/(\log^{(t-2)} c)^c$;let H be an n-vertex graph that is edge-maximal with respect to some r-rooted t-simple tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} := (B_x : x \in V(T))$ of H; let $L_0 := \{v_1, \ldots, v_{t'}\} \subseteq B_r$; and let $L_0, \ldots, L_m$ be the BFS layering of H.*

Then, there exists an integer $a := a(t,\ell)$ such that, for any distinct $\phi_0, \ldots, \phi_{t'} \in \{\lfloor a(k-c)\rfloor + 1, \ldots, \lfloor ak\rfloor\}$ there exists an ℓ-ranking $\varphi : V(G) \to \{1, \ldots, \lfloor ak\rfloor\}$ such that

(R1) $\varphi(v_i) = \phi_i$ for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, t'\}$; and
(R2) $\varphi(v) < a(k-c)$ for each $v \in \bigcup_{j=1}^{\ell} L_i$.

Proof. The proof is by induction on n. If $n = 0$, then there is nothing to prove.

Let $n_0 := (\log^{(t-2)} k)^k/(\log^{(t-2)}(c+s))^{c+s}$ and, for each $v \in V(H)$, let κ_v be defined as in Lemma 30. We say that a vertex $v \in L_{\ell+1}$ is *dangerous* if $\kappa_v > n_0$ and v is *harmless* otherwise.

We now assign weights to the vertices of the graph $H_0 := H[\bigcup_{j=0}^{\ell+1}]$ in such a way that we can apply Lemma 29 to H_0. For each $v \in \bigcup_{j=0}^{\ell} L_j$, we set $n_v := 1$. For each $v \in L_{\ell+1}$, we set $n_v := \min\{n_0, \kappa_v\}$. With this assignment of weights, Lemma 30 implies that $\sum_{v\in V(H_0)} n_v \leq tn \leq (\log^{(t-2)} k)^k/(\log^{(t-2)} c)^c$, which satisfies Equation (5) and, by definition, $\max\{n_v : v \in V(H_0)\} \leq n_0$ which satisfies Equation (6).

In the following, we use the shorthand $\gamma_v := \gamma_{t-2,k}(n_v)$. By Lemma 29, H_0 has an ℓ-ranking $\varphi : V(H_0) \to \{1, \ldots, \lfloor a(k-c)\rfloor\}$ in which $\varphi(v) > a(k-\gamma_v)$ for each $v \in V(H_0)$. By Lemma 30, the number of dangerous vertices in $L_{\ell+1}$ is at most

$$\frac{tn}{n_0} \in O\left(\frac{(\log^{(t-2)}(c+s))^{c+s}}{(\log^{(t-2)} c)^c}\right) \in O(c) \ ,$$

where the $O(c)$ upper bound is justified by a calculation in Appendix A.2. Before continuing, we make the following modifications to φ.

1. We set $\varphi(v_i) := \phi_i$ for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, t'\}$.
2. For each dangerous vertex v, we set $\varphi(v)$ to a distinct value in $\{\lfloor a(k-c)\rfloor + 1, \ldots, ak\} \setminus \{\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_t\}$. (Since the number of dangerous vertices is $O(c)$, this is always possible.)

These modifications ensure that φ satisfies requirements (R1) and (R2) and, since they only introduce new unique colours larger than any existing colour, they preserve the fact that φ is an ℓ-ranking of H_0.

For each component X of $H - V(H_0)$, let $C_X := L_{\ell+1} \cap N_H(V(X))$ and let $H_X := H[C_X \cup V(X)]$. By Observation 10, $|C_X| \leq t$. We apply induction on H_X for each component X of $H - H_0$ using colours $\phi'_1, \ldots, \phi'_{t'}$ already assigned to the vertices in C_X. When we do this, we obtain an ℓ-ranking of H_X in which each vertex w of $X[\bigcup_{j=\ell+2}^{2\ell+1} L_j]$ receives a colour $\varphi(w) \leq a(k - \gamma_{t-2,k}(|H_X|))$.

For each harmless vertex $v \in C_X$, X is a subgraph of H_v, so $n_v \geq t+|X| \geq |C_X|+|X| = |H_X|$, so $\gamma_v \leq \gamma_{t-2,k}(|H_X|)$. Therefore, for each harmless $v \in C_X$, $\varphi(v) > a(k-\gamma_v) \geq \varphi(w)$ for each $w \in V(X) \cap [\bigcup_{j=\ell+2}^{2\ell+1} L_j]$. For each dangerous vertex $v \in C_X$, $\varphi(v) > a(k-c)$. Since $|H_X| \leq |H|$,

$\gamma_{t-2,k}(|H_X|) \geq c$. Therefore each dangerous vertex $v \in C_X$ also receives a colour larger than each vertex w in $X[\bigcup_{j=\ell+2}^{2\ell+1} L_j]$.

All that remains is to verify that the resulting colouring is, indeed, an ℓ-ranking of H. Consider some induced path $u_0, \ldots, u_p$ in H of length $p \leq \ell$ such that $\varphi(u_0) = \varphi(u_p)$. There are some cases to consider:

1. $\{u_0, u_p\} \subseteq V(H_0)$. In this case, Observation 8 and 9 imply that $\{u_0, \ldots, u_p\} \subseteq V(H_0)$. However, we have already established that φ is an ℓ-ranking of H_0 through the application of Lemma 29 and the subsequent recolouring of vertices in L_0 and $L_{\ell+1}$. Therefore, $\varphi(u_0) < \max\{\varphi(u_1), \ldots, \varphi(u_{p-1})\}$.
2. $u_0 \in V(X)$ for some component X of $H - V(H_0)$ and $u_i \in C_X$ for some $i \in \{1, \ldots, p-1\}$. Since $i < p \leq \ell$, this implies that $u_0 \in \bigcup_{j=\ell+2}^{\ell+p+1} L_j \subseteq \bigcup_{j=\ell+2}^{2\ell+1} L_j$. We have already argued above that this implies that $\varphi(u_i) > \varphi(u_0)$.
3. $\{u_0, \ldots, u_p\} \subseteq V(X)$ for some component X of $H - V(H_0)$. In this case, the inductive hypothesis ensures that φ is an ℓ-ranking of X, so $\varphi(u_0) < \max\{\varphi(u_0), \ldots, \varphi(u_p)\}$. □

Rewriting Lemma 31 in terms of n yields Theorem 2a:

Proof of Theorem 2 (upper bound). When $t = 1$, H is a collection of vertex-disjoint paths and $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(H) \in O(\log \ell) = O(1) = O(\log n / \log^{(1)} n)$ (see Footnote 6). Assume now that $t \geq 2$. Fix some $\epsilon > 0$, let $k := (1+\epsilon)\log(tn)/\log^{(t)} n$, and let $c := \tau(t-2)$. By Lemma 31, $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(H) \in O(k)$ provided that k satisfies

$$\frac{(\log^{(t-2)} k)^k}{(\log^{(t-2)} c)^c} \geq tn \Leftrightarrow \frac{k \log^{(t-1)} k}{\log(tn)} \geq 1 \ ,$$

for all sufficiently large n. With our choice of k we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{k \log^{(t-1)} k}{\log(tn)} &= (1+\epsilon) \cdot \frac{\log^{(t-1)}\left((1+\epsilon)\log n / \log^{(t)} n\right)}{\log^{(t)} n} \\
&= (1+\epsilon) \cdot \frac{\log^{(t-2)}\left(\log^{(2)} n + \log(1+\epsilon) - \log^{(t+1)} n\right)}{\log^{(t-2)}\left(\log^{(2)} n\right)} \\
&= (1+\epsilon) \cdot \frac{\log^{(t-2)}\left(\log^{(2)} n - o(\log^{(2)} n)\right)}{\log^{(t-2)}\left(\log^{(2)} n\right)} \\
&\qquad \text{(since } t \geq 2\text{, so } \log^{(t+1)} n \in o(\log^{(2)} n)\text{)} \\
&\to 1 + \epsilon
\end{aligned}$$

as $n \to \infty$.[9] Therefore, $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(H) \in O(k) = O(\log n / \log^{(t)} n)$, as required. □

[9] If there exists some $\epsilon > 0$ and x_0 such that $f(x) - \delta x \leq f(x - \delta x) \leq f(x)$ for all $x \geq x_0$ and all $\delta \in [0, \epsilon]$ then $\lim_{x\to\infty}[f(x - o(x))/f(x)] = 1$. Here we are using this with $f(x) := \log^{(t-2)} x$ and $x := \log^{(2)} n$.

4.2 Bounded Genus Graphs

The upper bound in Theorem 4 for bounded genus graphs follows from Theorem 2, Lemma 16, and Observation 17 and the following recent result of Distel, Hickingbotham, Huynh, and Wood [12]:

Theorem 32 ([12]). *For every n-vertex graph G of Euler genus at most g, there exists some at most n-vertex simple 3-tree H and some path P such that G is isomorphic to a subgraph of $H \boxtimes K_{\max\{2g,3\}} \boxtimes P$*

4.3 Other Graph Families with Product Structure

As noted in the introduction, several other families of graphs are known to have product structure theorems like Theorem 15 and 32. In particular, Dujmović et al. [14] show:

Theorem 33 ([14]). *For any apex graph A, there exists a value t such that any n-vertex A-minor free graph G is isomorphic to a subgraph of $H \boxtimes P$ where $|H| \leq n$, $\mathrm{tw}(H) \leq t$, and P is a path.*

A graph is *(g,k)-planar* if it has an embedding in a surface of Euler genus g in which each edge is involved in at most k crossings with other edges. Dujmović, Morin, and Wood [15] prove analogues of Theorem 33 for some non-minor-closed families of graphs, the most well-known of which are the (g,k)-planar graphs:

Theorem 34 ([15]). *For any integers g and k, there exists a value t such that any n-vertex (g,k)-planar graph G is isomorphic to a subgraph of $H \boxtimes P$, where $|H| \leq n$, $\mathrm{tw}(H) \leq t$, and P is a path.*

Proof of Theorem 5. For any n-vertex member G of these graph families, Theorem 33 and 34 show that G is a subgraph of $H \boxtimes P$ with $\mathrm{tw}(H) \leq t$. Theorem 3, Lemma 16, and Observation 17 then imply Theorem 5. □

4.4 Dependence on ℓ

Throughout this section, we have assumed that ℓ and t were fixed constants, independent of n. We now describe the dependence of our results on ℓ. Since all of our upper bounds are based on Theorem 2a we begin by discussing Theorem 2a and its proof, which is the subject of Section 4.1. We will show that, for fixed constant t, the bound for Theorem 2a is easily shown to be $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(G) \in O(\ell^{t-1} \log^t \ell \log n / \log^{(t)} n)$.

Recall that the overall structure of the proof is by induction on t with the base case $t = 1$. The case $t = 1$ is described in Footnote 6, which explains how a simple 1-tree (a collection of disjoint paths) has an ℓ-ranking using $O(\log \ell)$ colours. This establishes the result for the base case.

The first place in which ℓ is treated as a constant is in Lemma 29, in which the constant $a := a(t,\ell,d)$ appears. The only place Lemma 29 is used is in the proof of Lemma 31, where it is applied with $d \in O(\ell)$. Under these conditions, taking $a \in O(\ell^{t-1} \log^t \ell)$ is sufficient, as we now show. Within the proof of Lemma 29, Theorem 2a is used on the graph $\hat{H}'_i$ for each

$i \in \{0,\dots,h\}$ to show that $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(\hat{H}_i') \in O(s)$. Here $\hat{H}_i'$ is a treewidth $t-1$ graph with $O(\ell^t c^4)$ vertices and $s = \log c/\log^{(t-1)} c$. With the more precise inductive hypothesis, this becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(\hat{H}_i') &\in O\left(\ell^{t-2}\log^{t-1}\ell \cdot \frac{\log(\ell^t c^4))}{\log^{(t-1)}(\ell^t c^4)}\right)\\
&= O\left(\ell^{t-2}\log^{t-1}\ell \cdot \frac{\log c + \log \ell}{\log^{(t-1)} c}\right)\\
&\subseteq O\left(\ell^{t-2}\log^{t-1}\ell \cdot \frac{(\log c)(\log \ell)}{\log^{(t-1)} c}\right)\\
&= O((\ell^{t-2}\log^t \ell)s)
\end{aligned}$$

Doing this for each $i \in \{0,\dots,h\}$ gives a colouring of H' using the colour set $\{\lfloor a(k-c)-(h+1)q+1,\dots,\lfloor a(k-c)\rfloor\}$ for some $q \in O((\ell^{t-2}\log^t \ell)s)$. Here $h \in O(d) = O(\ell)$. By choosing a sufficiently large $a \in O(\ell^{t-1}\log^t \ell)$, so that $as > (h+1)q$, this colouring uses only colours from the set $\{\lfloor a(k-c-s)+1,\dots,\lfloor a(k-c-1)\rfloor$. The rest of the proof applies Lemma 29 inductively on each of the uncoloured components of $H - V(H')$ to complete the colouring using smaller colours in the set $\{1,\dots,\lfloor a(k-c-s)\rfloor\}$ and is unchanged. The remainder of the proof is unchanged and proves the following refinement of Theorem 2:

(2) For any fixed integer $t \geq 1$ and every integer $\ell \geq 1$, every n-vertex graph H of simple treewidth at most t has $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(H) \in O(\ell^{t-1}\log^t \ell \log n/\log^{(t)} n)$.

Using this refinement of Theorem 2 gives the following refined versions of Theorem 1 and 3 to 5.

(1) For every integer $\ell \geq 1$, every n-vertex planar graph G has $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(G) \in O((\ell\log\ell)^3 \log n/\log^{(3)} n)$. (The additional factor of ℓ comes from the application of Lemma 16 on the graph $H \boxtimes P \supseteq G$, where $\mathrm{stw}(H) \leq 3$.)

(3) For any fixed integer $t \geq 0$ and every integer $\ell \geq 1$, every n-vertex graph H of treewidth at most t has $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(H) \in O(\ell^t \log^{t+1}\ell \log n/\log^{(t+1)} n)$.

(4) For any integers $g \geq 0$, $\ell \geq 1$, every n-vertex graph G of Euler genus at most g has $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(G) \in O((\ell\log\ell)^3 g \log n/\log^{(3)} n)$.

(5) For each of the following graph classes $\mathcal{G}$:

1. the class of graphs excluding a particular apex graph A as a minor; and
2. the class of (g,k)-planar graphs,

there exists an integers $c = c(\mathcal{G})$ and $b = b(\mathcal{G})$ such that every n-vertex graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$ has $\chi_{\ell\text{-vr}}(G) \in O(b\ell^{c-1}\log^c \ell \log n/\log^{(c)} n)$.

5 Discussion

We have given asymptotically optimal bounds on the number of colours required by ℓ-rankings of n-vertex graphs of treewidth t, graphs of simple treewidth t, planar 3-trees, outerplanar graphs, and planar graphs. Prior to this work, the best known bounds for planar graphs were $\Omega(\log n/\log\log n)$ (trees) and $O(\log n)$.

Our upper bounds are constructive and lead to straightforward linear time algorithms for finding ℓ-rankings of (simple) treewidth t graphs, including planar 3-trees, and outerplanar graphs. For a planar graph G we can use the recent linear time algorithm of Bose, Morin, and Odak [5] for finding the simple 3-tree H and the path P such that $G \subseteq H \boxtimes K_3 \boxtimes P$ (Theorem 15) to find an ℓ-ranking of G in $O(n)$ time.

For constant d, the lower and upper bounds for 2-ranking d-degenerate graphs are $\Omega(n^{1/3})$ and $O(\sqrt{n})$, respectively. Closing this gap is an intriguing open problem.

Acknowledgement

The authors are grateful to David Wood who, after reading an early draft of this paper, pointed us to the notion of simple treewidth, which greatly simplifies and unifies the exposition of our results.

References

[1] Jordan Almeter, Samet Demircan, Andrew Kallmeyer, Kevin G. Milans, and Robert Winslow. Graph 2-rankings. *Graphs and Combinatorics*, 35(1):91–102, 2019. doi: 10.1007/s00373-018-1979-4. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/s00373-018-1979-4.

[2] Hans L. Bodlaender. A partial k-arboretum of graphs with bounded treewidth. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 209(1-2):1–45, 1998. doi: 10.1016/S0304-3975(97)00228-4. URL https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975(97)00228-4.

[3] Hans L. Bodlaender, John R. Gilbert, Hjálmtyr Hafsteinsson, and Ton Kloks. Approximating treewidth, pathwidth, frontsize, and shortest elimination tree. *J. Algorithms*, 18(2):238–255, 1995. doi: 10.1006/jagm.1995.1009. URL https://doi.org/10.1006/jagm.1995.1009.

[4] Hans L. Bodlaender, Jitender S. Deogun, Klaus Jansen, Ton Kloks, Dieter Kratsch, Haiko Müller, and Zsolt Tuza. Rankings of graphs. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.*, 11(1):168–181, 1998. doi: 10.1137/S0895480195282550. URL https://doi.org/10.1137/S0895480195282550.

[5] Prosenjit Bose, Pat Morin, and Saeed Odak. An optimal algorithm for product structure in planar graphs. In Artur Czumaj and Qin Xin, editors, *18th Scandinavian Symposium and Workshops on Algorithm Theory, SWAT 2022, June 27-29, 2022, Tórshavn, Faroe Islands*, volume 227 of *LIPIcs*, pages 19:1–19:14. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022. doi: 10.4230/LIPIcs.SWAT.2022.19. URL https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.SWAT.2022.19.

[6] Pilar de la Torre, Raymond Greenlaw, and Alejandro A. Schäffer. Optimal edge ranking of trees in polynomial time. *Algorithmica*, 13(6):592–618, 1995. doi: 10.1007/BF01189071. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01189071.

[7] Michal Debski, Stefan Felsner, Piotr Micek, and Felix Schröder. Improved bounds for centered colorings. In Shuchi Chawla, editor, *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2020, Salt Lake City, UT, USA, January 5-8, 2020*, pages 2212–2226. SIAM, 2020. doi: 10.1137/1.9781611975994.136. URL https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611975994.136.

[8] Jitender S. Deogun, Ton Kloks, Dieter Kratsch, and Haiko Müller. On the vertex ranking problem for trapezoid, circular-arc and other graphs. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 98 (1-2):39–63, 1999. doi: 10.1016/S0166-218X(99)00179-1. URL https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-218X(99)00179-1.

[9] Dariusz Dereniowski and Marek Kubale. Cholesky factorization of matrices in parallel and ranking of graphs. In Roman Wyrzykowski, Jack J. Dongarra, Marcin Paprzycki, and Jerzy Wasniewski, editors, *Parallel Processing and Applied Mathematics, 5th International Conference, PPAM 2003, Czestochowa, Poland, September 7-10, 2003. Revised Papers*, volume 3019 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 985–992. Springer, 2003. doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-24669-5_127. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-24669-5_127.

[10] Dariusz Dereniowski and Adam Nadolski. Vertex rankings of chordal graphs and weighted trees. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 98(3):96–100, 2006. doi: 10.1016/j.ipl.2005.12.006. URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipl.2005.12.006.

[11] Reinhard Diestel. *Graph Theory, 4th Edition*, volume 173 of *Graduate texts in mathematics*. Springer, 2012. ISBN 978-3-642-14278-9.

[12] Marc Distel, Robert Hickingbotham, Tony Huynh, and David R. Wood. Improved product structure for graphs on surfaces, 2021.

[13] Iain S. Duff and John K. Reid. The multifrontal solution of indefinite sparse symmetric linear. *ACM Trans. Math. Softw.*, 9(3):302–325, 1983. doi: 10.1145/356044.356047. URL https://doi.org/10.1145/356044.356047.

[14] Vida Dujmović, Gwenaël Joret, Piotr Micek, Pat Morin, Torsten Ueckerdt, and David R. Wood. Planar graphs have bounded queue-number. *J. ACM*, 67(4):22:1–22:38, 2020. URL https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3385731.

[15] Vida Dujmović, Pat Morin, and David R. Wood. The structure of k-planar graphs. *CoRR*, abs/1907.05168, 2019. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/1907.05168.

[16] Guy Even and Shakhar Smorodinsky. Hitting sets online and unique-max coloring. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 178:71–82, 2014. doi: 10.1016/j.dam.2014.06.019. URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2014.06.019.

[17] Joseph A. Gallian. A dynamic survey of graph labeling. *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*. doi: 10.37236/27. Version 22, published December 15, 2019.

[18] Ananth V. Iyer, H. Donald Ratliff, and Gopalakrishnan Vijayan. Optimal node ranking of trees. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 28(5):225–229, 1988. doi: 10.1016/0020-0190(88)90194-9. URL https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0190(88)90194-9.

[19] Ilan Karpas, Ofer Neiman, and Shakhar Smorodinsky. On vertex rankings of graphs and its relatives. *Discret. Math.*, 338(8):1460–1467, 2015. doi: 10.1016/j.disc.2015.03.008. URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.disc.2015.03.008.

[20] Meir Katchalski, William McCuaig, and Suzanne M. Seager. Ordered colourings. *Discret. Math.*, 142(1-3):141–154, 1995. doi: 10.1016/0012-365X(93)E0216-Q. URL https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-365X(93)E0216-Q.

[21] T. Kloks. *Treewidth–Computations and Approximations*, volume 842 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994.

[22] Kolja Knauer and Torsten Ueckerdt. Simple treewidth. In Pavel Rytír, editor, *Midsummer Combinatorial Workshop Prague*, 2012. URL https://kam.mff.cuni.cz/workshops/mcw/work18/mcw2012booklet.pdf.

[23] Charles E. Leiserson. Area-efficient graph layouts (for VLSI). In *21st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, Syracuse, New York, USA, 13-15 October 1980*, pages 270–281. IEEE Computer Society, 1980. doi: 10.1109/SFCS.1980.13. URL https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1980.13.

[24] J. W. H. Liu. The role of elimination trees in sparse factorization. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 11:134–172, 1990.

[25] Donna Crystal Llewellyn, Craig A. Tovey, and Michael A. Trick. Local optimization on graphs. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 23(2):157–178, 1989. doi: 10.1016/0166-218X(89)90025-5. URL https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-218X(89)90025-5.

[26] Donna Crystal Llewellyn, Craig A. Tovey, and Michael A. Trick. Erratum: Local optimization on graphs. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 46(1):93–94, 1993.

[27] Lilian Markenzon, Cláudia Marcela Justel, and N. Paciornik. Subclasses of k-trees: Characterization and recognition. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 154(5):818–825, 2006. doi: 10.1016/j.dam.2005.05.021. URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2005.05.021.

[28] Jaroslav Nešetřil and Patrice Ossona de Mendez. Tree-depth, subgraph coloring and homomorphism bounds. *Eur. J. Comb.*, 27(6):1022–1041, 2006. doi: 10.1016/j.ejc.2005.01.010. URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejc.2005.01.010.

[29] Jaroslav Nešetřil and Patrice Ossona de Mendez. Grad and classes with bounded expansion i. decompositions. *Eur. J. Comb.*, 29(3):760–776, 2008. doi: 10.1016/j.ejc.2006.07.013. URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejc.2006.07.013.

[30] Jaroslav Nešetřil and Patrice Ossona de Mendez. *Sparsity: Graphs, Structures, and Algorithms*, volume 28 of *Algorithms and combinatorics*. Springer, 2012. ISBN 978-3-642-27874-7. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-27875-4. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-27875-4.

[31] Jaroslav Nešetřil and Patrice Ossona de Mendez. On low tree-depth decompositions. *Graphs Comb.*, 31(6):1941–1963, 2015. doi: 10.1007/s00373-015-1569-7. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/s00373-015-1569-7.

[32] Michał Pilipczuk and Sebastian Siebertz. Polynomial bounds for centered colorings on proper minor-closed graph classes. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B*, 151:111–147, 2021. doi: 10.1016/j.jctb.2021.06.002. URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jctb.2021.06.002.

[33] N. Robertson and P.D. Seymour. Graph minors. II. algorithmic aspects of tree-width. *Journal of Algorithms*, 7(3):309–322, 1986.

[34] Alejandro A. Schäffer. Optimal vertex ranking of trees in linear time. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 33:91–99, 1988. doi: 10.1016/0020-0190(89)90161-0.

[35] Arunabha Sen, Haiyong Deng, and Sumanta Guha. On a graph partition problem with application to VLSI layout. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 43(2):87–94, 1992. doi: 10.1016/0020-0190(92)90017-P. URL https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0190(92)90017-P.

[36] M. A. Shalu and Cyriac Antony. Complexity of restricted variant of star colouring. In Manoj Changat and Sandip Das, editors, *Algorithms and Discrete Applied Mathematics - 6th International Conference, CALDAM 2020, Hyderabad, India, February 13-15, 2020, Proceedings*, volume 12016 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 3–14. Springer, 2020. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-39219-2_1. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-39219-2_1.

[37] Lasse Wulf. Stacked treewidth and the Colin de Verdiére number. Bachelorthesis, Department of Informatics, Institute of Theoretical Computer Science, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, 2016. URL https://i11www.iti.kit.edu/_media/teaching/theses/ba-wulf-16.pdf.

[38] Xuding Zhu. Colouring graphs with bounded generalized colouring number. *Discret. Math.*, 309(18):5562–5568, 2009. doi: 10.1016/j.disc.2008.03.024. URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.disc.2008.03.024.

A Calculations

A.1 Calculation in the Proof Lemma 29

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left(\log^{(t-2)}\left(c+s+\frac{\log(c+s)}{\log^{(t-1)}(c+s)}\right)\right)^{c+s+\frac{\log(c+s)}{\log^{(t-1)}(c+s)}} \\
&\quad= \left(\log^{(t-2)} c\right)^{\left(c+s+\frac{\log(c+s)}{\log^{(t-1)}(c+s)}\right)\left(\frac{\log^{(t-1)}(c+s+\log(c+s)/\log^{(t-1)}(c+s))}{\log^{(t-1)} c}\right)} \\
&\qquad\text{(change of base)} \\
&\quad< (\log^{(t-2)} c)^{\left(c+s+\frac{\log(c+s)}{\log^{(t-1)}(c+s)}\right)\left(1+\frac{s+\log(c+s)/\log^{(t-1)}(c+s)}{\prod_{j=0}^{t-1}\log^{(j)} c}\right)} \\
&\qquad\text{(by Equation (3))} \\
&\quad< (\log^{(t-2)} c)^{\left(c+s+\frac{\log(c+s)}{\log^{(t-1)}(c+s)}\right)\left(1+\frac{2\log(c+s)/\log^{(t-1)}(c+s)}{\prod_{j=0}^{t-1}\log^{(j)} c}\right)} \\
&\qquad\text{(since } s=\log c/\log^{(t-1)} c\text{, so } s<\log(c+s)/\log^{(t-1)}(c+s)) \\
&\quad< (\log^{(t-2)} c)^{\left(c+s+\frac{\log(c+s)}{\log^{(t-1)}(c+s)}\right)\left(1+\frac{2\log(c+s)/\log^{(t-1)} c}{\prod_{j=0}^{t-1}\log^{(j)} c}\right)} \\
&\qquad\text{(since } c+s>c\text{)} \\
&\quad= (\log^{(t-2)} c)^{\left(c+s+\frac{\log(c+s)}{\log^{(t-1)}(c+s)}\right)\left(1+\frac{2\log(c+s)}{c\log c\cdot\left(\prod_{j=2}^{t-1}\log^{(j)}(c+s)\right)\log^{(t-1)} c}\right)} \\
&\qquad\text{(since } t\geq 2\text{)} \\
&\quad\leq (\log^{(t-2)} c)^{\left(c+s+\frac{\log(c+s)}{\log^{(t-1)}(c+s)}\right)\left(1+\frac{2\log(c+s)}{c\log c\cdot\log^{(t-1)} c}\right)} \\
&\qquad\text{(since } c\geq\tau(t-1)\text{, so } \textstyle\prod_{j=2}^{t-1}\log^{(j)} c\geq 1\text{)} \\
&\quad\leq (\log^{(t-2)} c)^{\left(c+s+\frac{\log c+s/c}{\log^{(t-1)}(c+s)}\right)\left(1+\frac{2\log c+2s/c}{c\cdot\log^{(t-1)} c}\right)} \\
&\qquad\text{(by Equation (1))} \\
&\quad\leq (\log^{(t-2)} c)^{c+s+\frac{\log c}{\log^{(t-1)} c}+\frac{2\log c}{\log^{(t-1)} c}+o\left(\frac{1}{\log^{(t-1)} c}\right)} \\
&\quad= (\log^{(t-2)} c)^{c+\frac{4\log c}{\log^{(t-1)} c}+o\left(\frac{1}{\log^{(t-1)} c}\right)} \\
&\quad= (1+o_c(1))\cdot c^4\cdot\left(\log^{(t-2)} c\right)^c \\
&\quad= O\left(c^4\cdot\left(\log^{(t-2)} c\right)^c\right)\ .
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore

$$
\frac{\left(\log^{(t-2)}\left(c+s+\frac{\log(c+s)}{\log^{(t-1)}(c+s)}\right)\right)^{c+s+\frac{\log(c+s)}{\log^{(t-1)}(c+s)}}}{(\log^{(t-2)} c)^c}\in O(c^4)\ .
$$

A.2 Calculation in the Proof Lemma 31

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(\log^{(t-2)}(c+s))^{c+s} \\
&\quad= \left(\log^{(t-2)}\left(c+\frac{\log c}{\log^{(t-1)} c}\right)\right)^{c+\frac{\log c}{\log^{(t-1)} c}} \\
&\quad= \left(\log^{(t-2)} c\right)^{\left(c+\frac{\log c}{\log^{(t-1)} c}\right)\left(\frac{\log^{(t-1)}\left(c+\log c/\log^{(t-1)} c\right)}{\log^{(t-1)} c}\right)} && \text{(change of base)} \\
&\quad= \left(\log^{(t-2)} c\right)^{\left(c+\frac{\log c}{\log^{(t-1)} c}\right)\left(1+\frac{\log c/\log^{(t-1)} c}{\prod_{j=0}^{t-1}\log^{(j)} c}\right)} && \text{(by Equation (3))} \\
&\quad= \left(\log^{(t-2)} c\right)^{\left(c+\frac{\log c}{\log^{(t-1)} c}\right)\left(1+\frac{1}{c\cdot\left(\prod_{j=2}^{t-1}\log^{(j)} c\right)\cdot\log^{(t-1)} c}\right)} && \text{(for } t\geq 2\text{)} \\
&\quad\leq \left(\log^{(t-2)} c\right)^{\left(c+\frac{\log c}{\log^{(t-1)} c}\right)\left(1+\frac{1}{c\cdot\log^{(t-1)} c}\right)} && \left(c\geq\tau(t-1)\text{, so }\prod_{j=2}^{t-1}\log^{(j)} c\geq 1\right) \\
&\quad= \left(\log^{(t-2)} c\right)^{c+\frac{\log c}{\log^{(t-1)} c}+\frac{1}{\log^{(t-1)} c}+\frac{\log c}{c\cdot(\log^{(t-1)} c)^2}} \\
&\quad= \left(\log^{(t-2)} c\right)^{c+\frac{\log c}{\log^{(t-1)} c}+O_c\left(\frac{1}{\log^{(t-1)} c}\right)} \\
&\quad\in O\left(c\cdot\left(\log^{(t-2)} c\right)^{c}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore

$$
\frac{(\log^{(t-2)}(c+s))^{c+s}}{(\log^{(t-2)} c)^{c}} \in O(c) \ .
$$