

COUNTEREXAMPLES REGARDING LINKED AND LEAN TREE-DECOMPOSITIONS OF INFINITE GRAPHS

SANDRA ALBRECHTSEN, RAPHAEL W. JACOBS, PAUL KNAPPE, AND MAX PITZ

ABSTRACT. Kříž and Thomas showed that every (finite or infinite) graph of tree-width $k \in \mathbb{N}$ admits a lean tree-decomposition of width k . We discuss a number of counterexamples demonstrating the limits of possible generalisations of their result to arbitrary infinite tree-width.

In particular, we construct a locally finite, planar, connected graph that has no lean tree-decomposition.

§1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Lean tree-decompositions. A cornerstone in both Robertson and Seymour's work [13] on well-quasi-ordering finite graphs, and in Thomas's result [16] that the class of infinite graphs of tree-width $< k$ is well-quasi-ordered under the minor relation for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, is Kříž and Thomas's result on lean tree-decompositions. Recall that a tree-decomposition $(T, (V_t)_{t \in T})$ is *lean* if for every two (not necessarily distinct) nodes $s, t \in T$ and sets of vertices $Z_s \subseteq V_s$ and $Z_t \subseteq V_t$ with $|Z_s| = |Z_t| =: \ell \in \mathbb{N}$, either G contains ℓ pairwise disjoint Z_s – Z_t paths or there exists an edge $e \in sTt$ whose corresponding adhesion set V_e has size less than ℓ .

Theorem 1.1 (Thomas 1990 [17], Kříž and Thomas 1991 [12]). *For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, every (finite or infinite) graph of tree-width $< k$ has a lean tree-decomposition of width $< k$.*

Is it possible to generalise **Theorem 1.1** from finite k to arbitrary infinite cardinalities? In the following let κ be an infinite cardinal. A graph G has *tree-width $< \kappa$* if it admits a tree-decomposition of width $< \kappa$, i.e. one into parts of size $< \kappa$. A graph G of tree-width $< \aleph_0$, i.e. with a tree-decomposition into finite parts, is said to have *finite tree-width*. The following questions arise naturally:

- (i) Does every graph of tree-width $< \kappa$ admit a lean tree-decomposition of width $< \kappa$? In particular, does every graph of finite tree-width admit a lean tree-decomposition into finite parts?
- (ii) If not, does every infinite graph at least admit a lean tree-decomposition?

Note that even without the width restriction, Question (ii) remains non-trivial as the leanness-property has to be satisfied within each bag, which means that we cannot take the trivial

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05C63, 05C05, 05C83, 05C40.

Key words and phrases. Tree-decomposition, linked, lean, infinite graph, counterexample.

tree-decomposition into a single part, unless the graph is infinitely connected. Still, our main example shows that the answers to these questions are in the negative:

Example 1. *There is a planar, locally finite, connected graph that admits no lean tree-decomposition.*

Every locally finite, connected graph is countable, and thus has tree-width $< \aleph_0$: given an arbitrary enumeration $\{v_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of a countable graph G , assigning to each vertex r_i of a ray $R = r_0 r_1 \dots$ the bag $V_{r_i} := \{v_0, \dots, v_i\}$ yields a ray- and thus also tree-decomposition $(R, \mathcal{V})$ of G into finite parts. Hence, the graph from [Example 1](#) witnesses that the answers to both questions (i) and (ii) are in the negative.

On the positive side, we provide in [[3](#), Theorem 3] a sufficient criterion that guarantees the existence of a lean tree-decomposition into finite parts:

Theorem 1.2. *Every graph without half-grid minor admits a lean tree-decomposition into finite parts.*

Note that excluding the half-grid as a minor is sufficient but not necessary for the existence of lean tree-decompositions into finite parts: The countably infinite clique $K^{\aleph_0}$ contains the half-grid even as a subgraph but also the above described ray-decomposition of any given countable graph G into finite parts is lean for $G = K^{\aleph_0}$.

As the graph from [Example 1](#) is planar, it has no K^5 minor, and thus no $K^{\aleph_0}$ minor. Hence, in terms of excluded minors, the gap between our positive result [Theorem 1.2](#) and our negative result [Example 1](#) is quite narrow. Nevertheless, it remains open to exactly characterise the graphs which admit a lean tree-decomposition (into finite parts, or more generally, of width $< \kappa$).

1.2. Linked tree-decompositions. Since the answers to questions (i) and (ii) are in the negative, it is natural to ask what happens if we weaken the condition that the tree-decomposition be lean. One possible such weakening is suggested by the ‘linkedness’-property, which was extensively studied in [[4, 8](#)]: We say a tree-decomposition $(T, \mathcal{V})$ of a graph G is

- ◊ *strongly linked* if for every two nodes $s \neq t$ of T there are $\min\{|V_e| : e \in E(st)\}$ pairwise disjoint V_s – V_t paths in G .

One may further weaken ‘strongly linked’ by requiring the existence of disjoint V_s – V_t paths only between nodes $s, t \in T$ that are ‘comparable’. For this, recall that given a tree T rooted at a node r , its *tree-order* is given by $s \leq t$ for nodes s, t of T if s lies on the (unique) path rTt from r to t . Thomas [[16](#)] defined a rooted tree-decomposition $(T, \mathcal{V})$ of a graph G to be

- ◊ *linked* if for every two comparable nodes $s < t$ of the rooted tree T there are $\min\{|V_e| : e \in E(st)\}$ pairwise disjoint V_s – V_t paths in G .

These weakenings of the ‘leanness’-property are motivated by the fact that for the aforementioned applications of [Theorem 1.1](#) by Robertson and Seymour [13] and by Thomas [16] it is only important that the rooted tree-decomposition is linked.

So what happens if we replace the condition *lean* in (i) and (ii) by *strongly linked* or *linked*? As the trivial tree-decomposition into a single part is always strongly linked, and thus every graph has a strongly linked tree-decomposition, only the weakened version of (i), but not of (ii), is interesting:

- (iv) Does every graph of tree-width $< \kappa$ admit a strongly linked tree-decomposition of width $< \kappa$?

However, question (iv) is trivially true: By definition, every graph G of tree-width $< \kappa$ admits a tree-decomposition $(T, \mathcal{V})$ of width $< \kappa$. Choose an arbitrary root r of T . By assigning to each of the nodes t of T the bag $V'_t := \bigcup_{s \in rTt} V_s$ we obtain a (rooted) tree-decomposition $(T, \mathcal{V}')$ of width $< \kappa$ that is strongly linked; albeit for the trivial reason that $s \neq t \in T$ implies $V'_s \cap V'_t = V'_u$ where u is the $\leq$ -minimal node in sTt .

But this tree-decomposition is not useful in practice, and so one would like to have some additional properties making the tree-decomposition less redundant. Especially linked rooted tree-decompositions into finite parts which are additionally ‘tight’ and ‘componental’ turned out to be a powerful tool (cf. [3, §1.2-1.4] and [2]; see paragraph after [Theorem 1.3](#) below for more details). Given a rooted tree-decomposition $(T, \mathcal{V})$ of a graph G and an edge e of T , we call the subgraph $G \upharpoonright^\circ e$ of G induced on $\bigcup_{t \in T_e} V_t \setminus V_e$ the *part strictly above e* , where T_e is the unique component of $T - e$ that does not contain the root of T . Then $(T, \mathcal{V})$ is

- ◊ *componental* if all the parts $G \upharpoonright^\circ e$ strictly above edges $e \in E(T)$ are connected, and
- ◊ *tight* if for every edge $e \in E(T)$ there is some component C of $G \upharpoonright^\circ e$ such that $N_G(C) = V_e$.

We remark that the above strongly linked (rooted) tree-decomposition $(T, \mathcal{V}')$ is componental if $(T, \mathcal{V})$ was componental; but even if $(T, \mathcal{V})$ was tight, $(T, \mathcal{V}')$ may no longer be tight.

The property *tight* ensures that the adhesion sets contain no ‘unnecessary’ vertices. Any given componental rooted tree-decomposition can easily be transformed into a tight and componental rooted tree-decomposition by deleting for every edge e of T the non-neighbours of $G \upharpoonright^\circ e$ in V_e from every V_t with $t \in T_e$. While this construction obviously does not increase the width, it does not necessarily maintain the property *(strongly) linked*. So it is natural to strengthen (iv) to ask whether there exists a tree-decomposition which has all three properties:

- (v) Does every graph of tree-width $< \kappa$ admit a tight and componental rooted tree-decomposition of width $< \kappa$ that is strongly linked?
- (vi) If not, does every graph of tree-width $< \kappa$ admit a tight and componental rooted tree-decomposition of width $< \kappa$ that is at least linked?

The answer to Question (v) is in the negative already for $\kappa = \aleph_0$, as witnessed by the same graph that we constructed for [Example 1](#):

Example 2. *There is a planar, locally finite, connected graph which admits no tight componental rooted tree-decomposition into finite parts that is strongly linked.*

Question (vi), however, has an affirmative answer for $\kappa = \aleph_0$ [[3](#), Theorem 1]:

Theorem 1.3. *Every graph of finite tree-width admits a rooted tree-decomposition into finite parts that is linked, tight and componental.*

We remark that (vi) remains open for uncountable cardinalities $\kappa > \aleph_0$. If the answer is positive, one might, as a next step, also strengthen the notion of *linked* from just considering sizes to a structural notion that encapsulates the typical desired behaviour of infinite path families between two sets, as it is given by Menger’s theorem for infinite graphs [[1](#), Theorem 1.6] proven by Aharoni and Berger.

It turns out that linked rooted tree-decompositions into finite parts which are additionally tight and componental, as given by [Theorem 1.3](#), are particularly useful (cf. [[3](#), §1.2-1.4] and [[2](#)]): In [[3](#), §3], we show that rooted tree-decompositions into finite parts which are linked, tight and componental display the end structure of the underlying graph. This not only resolves a question of Halin [[10](#), §6] but also allows us to deduce from [Theorem 1.3](#), by means of short and unified proofs, the characterisations due to Robertson, Seymour and Thomas of graphs without half-grid minor [[14](#), Theorem 2.6], and of graphs without binary tree subdivision [[15](#), (1.5)]. Also the proof of [Theorem 1.2](#) in [[3](#), §8] heavily relies on post-processing the tree-decomposition from [Theorem 1.3](#). Beside these, there are more applications of rooted tree-decomposition into finite parts which are linked, tight and componental in [[3](#), §1.4] and [[2](#)].

In fact, we show in [[3](#), Theorem 1’] a more detailed version of [Theorem 1.3](#) which, among others, yields that the adhesion sets of the tree-decomposition intersect ‘not more than necessary’. We also give an example which proves that this property is best possible even for locally finite graphs (see [Section 5](#) for details).

In the light of Question (vi) being true for $\kappa = \aleph_0$, one may ask whether a similar modification could rescue (i) for $\kappa = \aleph_0$: What happens if we relax the condition *lean* in (i) to a corresponding ‘rooted’ version?

- (vii) Does every graph of finite tree-width admit a rooted tree-decomposition into finite parts that satisfies the property of being lean for all *comparable* nodes $s \leq t$ of T ?

However, the answer to this question is again in the negative, as there is a graph of finite tree-width such that all its tree-decompositions into finite parts violate the ‘leanness’-property within a single bag:

Example 3. *There is a countable graph G such that every tree-decomposition of G into finite parts has a bag V_t which violates the property of being lean for $s = t$.*

We remark that we do not know whether every tree-decomposition which satisfies the ‘leanness’-property for every two comparable nodes must already be lean.

1.3. How this paper is organised. In [Section 2](#) we recall some important definitions and facts about ends and their interplay with tree-decompositions. In [Section 3](#) we prove [Examples 1](#) and [2](#), and in [Section 4](#) we prove [Example 3](#). Finally, in [Section 5](#), we discuss whether it is possible to strengthen [Theorem 1.3](#) so that the adhesion sets of the tree-decomposition are ‘upwards’ disjoint.

§2. PRELIMINARIES

We refer the reader to [\[3, §2\]](#) for all the relevant definitions. For convenience of the reader we recall the ones which are most important in this paper:

An *end* ε of a graph G is an equivalence class of rays in G where two rays are equivalent if for every finite set X they have a tail in the same component of $G - X$. We refer to this component of $G - X$ as $C_G(X, \varepsilon)$. Write $\Omega(G)$ for the *set of all ends* of G . Note that for every end ε of G and every set of vertices of G which meets every ε -ray at most finitely often, there is a unique component of $G - X$ that contains a tail of every ε -ray. We refer to this component as $C_G(X, \varepsilon)$, which coincides with above definition for finite X .

A vertex v of G *dominates* an end ε of G if it lies in $C_G(X, \varepsilon)$ for every finite set X of vertices other than v . We denote the set of all vertices of G which dominate an end ε by $\text{Dom}(\varepsilon)$. The *degree* $\deg(\varepsilon)$ of an end ε of G is the supremum over all cardinals κ such that there exists a set of κ pairwise disjoint rays in ε , and its *combined degree* is $\Delta(\varepsilon) := \deg(\varepsilon) + |\text{Dom}(\varepsilon)|$.

Given a rooted tree-decomposition $(T, \mathcal{V})$ of G , an end ε of G *gives rise* to a rooted ray R in T if every ε -ray meets every bag V_t with $t \in R$ at most finitely often, and for every $e = st \in T$ with $s < t$ we have $C_G(V_s, \varepsilon) \subseteq G \upharpoonright e^{\circ 1}$. Note that if such a ray exists, then it is unique, and we denote it by R_ε . Moreover, if every ray in an end ε of G meets every bag of a tree-decomposition $(T, \mathcal{V})$ at most finitely often, then ε gives rise to a ray in T . If the bags of a rooted tree-decomposition $(T, \mathcal{V})$ meet all rays in G at most finitely often, the above yields a map $\varphi: \Omega(G) \rightarrow \Omega(T)$, $\varepsilon \mapsto R_\varepsilon$. Such a rooted tree-decomposition $(T, \mathcal{V})$

- ◊ *displays* the ends of G if φ is a bijection [\[5\]](#),
- ◊ *displays all dominating vertices* if $\liminf_{e \in E(R_\varepsilon)} V_e = \text{Dom}(\varepsilon)^2$ for all $\varepsilon \in \Omega(G)$, and
- ◊ *displays all combined degrees* if $\liminf_{e \in E(R_\varepsilon)} |V_e| = \Delta(\varepsilon)$ for all $\varepsilon \in \Omega(G)$.

Moreover, we recall the following lemma [\[3, Lemma 3.3\]](#):

¹We remark that this definition extends the one given in [\[3, §2.2\]](#) to a larger class of tree-decompositions which do not necessarily have finite adhesion.

²The set-theoretic $\liminf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n$ consists of all points that are contained in all but finitely many A_n . For a ray $R = v_0 e_0 v_1 e_1 v_2 \dots$ in T , one gets $\liminf_{e \in E(R_\varepsilon)} V_e = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcap_{i \geq n} V_{e_i}$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $(T, \mathcal{V})$ be a linked rooted tree-decomposition of a graph G which has finite adhesion. Suppose that an end ε of G gives rise to a ray in T which arises from no other end of G and that $\liminf_{e \in R} V_e = \text{Dom}(\varepsilon)$. Then $\liminf_{e \in R} |V_e| = \Delta(\varepsilon)$.*

The following lemma follows immediately from [3, Lemmas 3.1, 3.2 & 3.3]:

Lemma 2.2. *Let $(T, \mathcal{V})$ be a rooted tree-decomposition of a graph G which has finite adhesion and which is linked, tight and componental. Then $(T, \mathcal{V})$ displays all ends of G , their dominating vertices and their combined degrees.* $\square$

§3. EXAMPLES 1 AND 2 – NEGATIVE ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS (i),(ii) AND (v)

In this section we explain Examples 1 and 2, which we restate here for convenience:

Example 1. *There is a planar, locally finite, connected graph that admits no lean tree-decomposition.*

Example 2. *There is a planar, locally finite, connected graph which admits not tight componental rooted tree-decomposition into finite parts that is strongly linked.*




FIGURE 1. Depicted is the graph G from Construction 3.1. The subgraph induced by the orange edges is G_2 together with the extensions of its horizontal rays.

For our proofs of [Examples 1](#) and [2](#) we construct a graph G in [Construction 3.1](#) below, and then show that G is already as desired for both [Examples 1](#) and [2](#). The graph in this construction is inspired by [\[6, Example 7.4\]](#)³.

Construction 3.1. Let G be the graph depicted in [Figure 1](#). Formally, let G' be the graph on the vertex set $V(G') := \{(i/2^j, j) \mid j \in \mathbb{N}, 0 \leq i \leq 2^{j+1}\}$ and with edges between $(i/2^j, j)$ and $((i+1)/2^j, j)$, between $(i/2^j, j)$ and $(i/2^j, j+1)$, and also between $(i/2^j, j)$ and $((2i-1)/2^{j+1}, j+1)$ for $i \leq 2^j$ (this is the black subgraph in [Figure 1](#)). Note that G' has a unique end, which we denote by ε .

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$, let $G_n := \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1} \square P_{2^{n+1}+2^n+1}$ be a grid with $2^{n+1} + 2^n + 2$ rows and infinitely many columns. Then G_n is one-ended and its end ε_n has degree $2^{n+1} + 2^n + 2$. Now the graph G is obtained from $G' \sqcup \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} G_n$ by deleting for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the edge $\{(2, n), (2, n+1)\}$, identifying the vertices $(2, n), (2, n+1)$ with the respective vertices $(1, 1)$ and $(1, 2^{n+1} + 2^n + 2)$ of G_n , and by extending the horizontal rays in G_n as indicated in [Figure 1](#). In particular, the extended horizontal rays of each G_n are still disjoint and their initial vertices are precisely $U_n := \{(i/2^j, j) \mid j \in \{n, n+1\}, 2^j \leq i \leq 2^{j+1}\}$. To get a graph which is not only locally finite but also planar, we subdivide the edges between $(i/2^n, n)$ and $(i/2^n, n+1)$ with $i > 2^n$ in G' to obtain the extended rays. This completes the construction.

In the remainder of this section we prove that the graph G from [Construction 3.1](#) is as desired for [Examples 1](#) and [2](#). For this, we first show two auxiliary lemmas. The first says that G does not admit a tree-decomposition which ‘efficiently distinguishes’ all ends of G . Recall that in a tree-decomposition $(T, \mathcal{V})$ of G every edge $e = t_0 t_1$ of T induces a separation as follows: For $i = 0, 1$ write T_i for the component of $T - e$ that contains t_i . Then $\{\bigcup_{s \in T_0} V_s, \bigcup_{s \in T_1} V_s\}$ is a separation of G [\[7, Lemma 12.3.1\]](#). A separation $\{A, B\}$ of G *efficiently distinguishes* two ends $\varepsilon, \varepsilon'$ of G if ε and ε' live in components of $G - (A \cap B)$ on different sides of $\{A, B\}$, and there is no separation $\{C, D\}$ of G of smaller order $|C \cap D|$ with this property. A tree-decomposition $(T, \mathcal{V})$ *distinguishes* two ends $\varepsilon, \varepsilon'$ of G *efficiently* if some edge e of T induces a separation which efficiently distinguishes ε and ε' .

Lemma 3.2. *Let $(T, \mathcal{V})$ be a tree-decomposition of the graph from [Construction 3.1](#). Then there exist $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(T, \mathcal{V})$ does not efficiently distinguish ε_n and ε .*

Proof. Suppose towards a contradiction that G admits a tree-decomposition $(T, \mathcal{V})$ such that, for every end ε_n of G , there exists an edge f_n such that the separation induced by f_n distinguishes ε_n and ε efficiently. Then V_{f_n} has size at most $2^{n+1} + n + 2$ as witnessed by $S_n := \{(i/2^{n+1}, n+1) \mid 2^{n+1} < i \leq 2^{n+2}\} \cup \{(1, j) \mid 0 \leq j \leq n+1\}$ (indicated in purple in [Figure 2](#)). By the definition of G' , there are in fact $|S_n|$ disjoint ε - ε_n double rays R_i^n in G (indicated in orange in [Figure 2](#)),

³The example is only presented in the arXiv version of [\[6\]](#).




FIGURE 2. Depicted is the situation in the proof of Lemma 3.2 for $n = 2$.

so every sizewise-minimal ε - ε_n separator, and in particular V_{f_n} , has to meet each R_i^n precisely once. In particular, $|V_{f_n}| = |S_n|$ and hence $f_n \neq f_m$ for all $n \neq m \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, V_{f_n} avoids the ε -ray $R = (0,0)(0,1) \dots$ (indicated in blue in Figure 2) and the vertex $(2,0)$, as they are both disjoint from all the ε - ε_n double rays R_i^n . Thus, $G - V_{f_n}$ has a component C_n that contains R , and a component C'_n that contains $(2,0)$. In particular, ε lives in C_n . Since there is an ε_n -ray (indicated in green in Figure 2) which starts in $(2,0)$ and is disjoint from the R_i^n , ε_n lives in C'_n . As V_{f_n} separates ε and ε_n , we have $C_n \neq C'_n$. Thus, $(0,0)$ and $(2,0)$ lie on different sides of the separation induced by f_n .

Let V_t and V_s be some bags of $(T, \mathcal{V})$ which contain $(0,0)$ and $(2,0)$, respectively. Since the separations induced by every f_n separate $(0,0)$ and $(2,0)$, all the infinitely many distinct edges f_n lie on the finite path tTs , which is a contradiction. $\square$

The next lemma essentially says that every tree-decomposition of G that displays all ends of G and their combined degrees cannot be strongly linked.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $(T, \mathcal{V})$ be a tree-decomposition of the graph G from Construction 3.1. Suppose that every end ω of G gives rise to a rooted ray R_ω in T with $\liminf_{e \in R_\omega} V_e = \emptyset$ and $\liminf_{e \in R_\omega} |V_e| = \deg(\omega)$. Then $(T, \mathcal{V})$ is not strongly linked.*

Proof. Suppose towards a contradiction that $(T, \mathcal{V})$ is strongly linked. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary. Then the assumptions on $(T, \mathcal{V})$ guarantee that ε_n gives rise to a rooted ray R_n in T such that

$\liminf_{e \in R} V_e = \emptyset$, $|V_e| \geq \deg(\varepsilon_n)$ for cofinitely many edges e of R_n and $|V_e| = \deg(\varepsilon_n)$ for infinitely many edges e of R_n . Thus, there exists an edge $e_n \in R_n := R_{\varepsilon_n}$ with $|V_{e_n}| = \deg(\varepsilon_n)$ such that $G \uparrow e_n$ avoids the first and second column of G_n and every later edge e on R_n satisfies $|V_e| \geq |V_{e_n}|$. Since $G \uparrow e_n$ avoids the first and second column of G_n , the component D_n of $G \uparrow e_n$ in which ε_n lives is contained in G_n . The strong linkedness of $(T, \mathcal{V})$ ensures that D_n is tight. Hence, $G \uparrow e_n$ is connected and avoids the first column of G_n . Thus, $G \uparrow e_n \subseteq G_n$ as it meets G_n .

Similarly, since ε has infinite (combined) degree, there is an edge e'_n of T such that $|V_{e'_n}| \geq \deg(\varepsilon_n)$ and $G \uparrow e'_n \cap G_n = \emptyset$. Since $V_{e_n} \subseteq V(G_n)$ and $V_{e'_n} \cap V(G_n) = \emptyset$, there are at most $2^{n+1} + n + 2$ pairwise disjoint $V_{e_n} - V_{e'_n}$ paths in G , as witnessed by $S_n := \{(i/2^{n+1}, n+1) \mid 2^{n+1} < i \leq 2^{n+2}\} \cup \{(1, j) \mid 0 \leq j \leq n+1\}$ (indicated in purple in [Figure 2](#)). As $(T, \mathcal{V})$ is strongly linked by assumption, there is an edge f_n on the unique $e_n - e'_n$ path in T such that $|V_{f_n}| \leq |S_n|$. In particular, V_{f_n} separates V_{e_n} and $V_{e'_n}$, and thus also ε_n and ε . By the definition of G' , there are in fact $|S_n|$ disjoint $\varepsilon - \varepsilon_n$ double rays R_i^n in G (indicated in orange in [Figure 2](#)), and hence the separation induced by f_n efficiently distinguishes ε and ε_n . Now [Lemma 3.2](#) yields the desired contradiction. $\square$

Proof of [Example 2](#). The graph G from [Construction 3.1](#) is planar, locally finite and connected. By [Lemma 2.2](#), every linked, tight, componental rooted tree-decomposition of G into finite parts displays all the ends of G , their dominating vertices and their (combined) degrees. Thus, [Lemma 3.3](#) ensures that those tree-decomposition are not strongly linked. $\square$

We now turn to our proof of [Example 1](#), i.e. that the graph G from [Construction 3.1](#) does not admit a lean tree-decomposition. The proof consists of two steps. First, we show in [Lemma 3.6](#) that G does not admit a lean tree-decomposition into finite parts. Then, we show in [Lemma 3.7](#) that G neither admits a lean tree-decomposition that has an infinite part.

By definition, every lean tree-decomposition is in particular strongly linked. For the first step, it remains to show that every lean tree-decomposition of G into finite parts satisfies the premise of [Lemma 3.3](#): it displays all ends of G and their combined degrees, up to the fact that maybe some rays of the decomposition tree do not arise from an end of G . In fact, the following [Lemma 3.5](#) together with [Lemma 2.1](#) implies that this holds true for *all* graphs H and lean tree-decompositions of them.

To prove [Lemma 3.5](#), we first show that even though lean tree-decompositions may not be componental, they are not far away from it.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $(T, \mathcal{V})$ be a rooted tree-decomposition of finite adhesion of a graph H . Suppose there is an edge $e = ts \in E(T)$ with $t <_T s$ and a set $Y \subseteq V_e$ such that $(H \uparrow e) - Y$ has at least two components C_1, C_2 . Suppose further that $C_1 \cap V_e \neq \emptyset \neq C_2 \cap V_e$ and $C_2 \cap (V_s \setminus V_e) \neq \emptyset$. Then $(T, \mathcal{V})$ is not lean.*

Proof. Set $U_i := V(C_i) \cap V_e$ for $i = 1, 2$, and note that the U_i are non-empty by assumption. Further, pick some vertex $u \in C_2 \cap (V_s \setminus V_e)$. Set $\ell_1 := |U_1|$ and $\ell_2 := |U_2| + 1$. For $i = 1, 2$, if $\ell_i < \ell_{3-i}$, then let $U'_i \subseteq U_{3-i}$ be a set of $\ell_{3-i} - \ell_i$ vertices; otherwise set $U'_i := \emptyset$. Note that such a set U'_i exists since $\ell_i \geq 1$ as U_i is non-empty, and hence $\ell_{3-i} - \ell_i \leq |U_{3-i}| + 1 - \ell_i \leq |U_{3-i}|$. Set $Z_1 := U_1 \cup U'_1 \cup Y$ and $Z_2 := U_2 \cup U'_2 \cup Y \cup \{u\}$. By construction, $|Z_1| = |Y| + \max\{\ell_1, \ell_2\} = |Z_2| =: k$ as the U_i are disjoint since the C_i are. Since $(T, \mathcal{V})$ is lean and $Z_1, Z_2 \subseteq V_s$, there is a family $\mathcal{P}$ of k disjoint Z_1 – Z_2 paths in H . Note that every path in $\mathcal{P}$ that starts in $Z_1 \cap Z_2$ is a trivial path. Moreover, there is a path $P \in \mathcal{P}$ that ends in $u \in Z_2 \setminus Z_1$. In particular, P is non-trivial. Since all paths that start in $Z_1 \cap Z_2 \supseteq Y \cup U'_2$ are trivial, P starts in $U_1 \supseteq Z_1 \setminus Z_2$. But $U_1 \subseteq C_1$ is separated from $u \in C_2$ by $Y \cup U_2 \subseteq Z_2$. This contradicts that the paths in $\mathcal{P}$ are pairwise disjoint. $\square$

Lemma 3.5. *Let $(T, \mathcal{V})$ be a lean tree-decomposition of a graph H into finite parts. Then every ray in T arises from at most one end of H . Moreover, if a ray R in T arises from an end ε of H , then $\liminf_{e \in R} V_e = \text{Dom}(\varepsilon)$.*

Proof. Let T be rooted in an arbitrary node r . For the first assertion, suppose towards a contradiction that there are two distinct ends $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2$ of H that give rise to the same rooted ray R of T . As $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2$ are distinct, there is a finite set X of vertices of H such that $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2$ live in distinct components C_1, C_2 of $G - X$.

Now pick vertices $v_1 \in C_1$ and $v_2 \in C_2$. Then there is an edge $e = ts$ on R with $t <_T s$ such that $X \cup \{v_1, v_2\} \subseteq H \downarrow e$. Note that $C_2 \cap (V_s \setminus V_e)$ is non-empty, and that also the $V(C_i) \cap V_e$ are non-empty as the C_i are connected and meet both $H \downarrow e$ (in the vertex v_i respectively) and $H \uparrow e$. Set $Y := X \cap V_e$. Then $Y, C_1 \cap (H \uparrow e), C_2 \cap (H \uparrow e)$ are as in Lemma 3.4. It follows that $(T, \mathcal{V})$ is not lean, which is a contradiction.

To show the moreover statement, let ε be an end of H that gives rise to a ray R in T . Now suppose towards a contradiction that there is a vertex $w \in \liminf_{e \in R} V_e$ that does not dominate ε . Then there is a finite set $X \subseteq V(H)$ and distinct components C_1, C_2 of $G - X$ such that $w \in C_1$ and ε lives in C_2 .

Now pick a vertex $v \in C_2$. Again, there is an edge $e = ts$ on R with $t <_T s$ such that $X \cup \{v, w\} \subseteq H \downarrow e$. Note that $C_1 \cap (V_s \setminus V_e)$ is non-empty, and that the $V(C_i) \cap V_e$ are non-empty as the C_i are connected and meet both $H \downarrow e$ (in the vertices v, w , respectively) and $H \uparrow e$. Set $Y := X \cap V_e$. Hence, $Y, C_1 \cap (H \uparrow e), C_2 \cap (H \uparrow e)$ are as in Lemma 3.4. It follows that $(T, \mathcal{V})$ is not lean, which is a contradiction. $\square$

Lemma 3.6. *The graph G from Construction 3.1 admits no lean tree-decomposition into finite parts.*

Proof. Suppose towards a contradiction that G admits a lean tree-decomposition $(T, \mathcal{V})$ into finite parts. It follows from Lemma 3.5 that every end ω of G gives rise to a ray R_ω in T which

arises from no other end of G . Moreover, we have $\liminf_{e \in R_\omega} V_e = \text{Dom}(\omega) = \emptyset$, as locally finite graphs have no dominating vertices. So since $(T, \mathcal{V})$ is lean and hence strongly linked, [Lemma 2.1](#) implies that $\liminf_{e \in R_\omega} |V_e| = \Delta(\omega)$. Thus, by [Lemma 3.3](#), $(T, \mathcal{V})$ is not strongly linked, which is a contradiction. $\square$

For the proof of [Example 1](#) it remains to show that the graph from [Construction 3.1](#) neither admits a lean tree-decomposition with possibly infinite parts.

Lemma 3.7. *The graph G from [Construction 3.1](#) admits no lean tree-decomposition.*

Proof. Suppose for a contradiction that G has a lean tree-decomposition $(T, \mathcal{V})$. Let T be rooted in an arbitrary node. We first show that every end ε_n gives rise to a ray R_n in T , that is every bag of $(T, \mathcal{V})$ meets every ε_n -ray at most finitely often. For this it suffices to show that every bag meets G_n at most finitely often. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be given, and suppose there is a bag V_t that contains infinitely many vertices of G_n . Then let $Z_1 \subseteq V_t$ be a set of $2^{n+1} + 2^n + 3$ vertices of G_n , and let $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that Z_1 is contained in the first i columns of G_n . Now let $Z_2 \subseteq V_t$ be a set of $2^{n+1} + 2^n + 3$ vertices of G_n that avoids the first i columns of G_n . Since the i -th column of G_n has size $2^{n+1} + 2^n + 2$ and separates Z_1 and Z_2 , this contradicts that $(T, \mathcal{V})$ is lean.

Hence, each ε_n -ray meets every bag of $(T, \mathcal{V})$ at most finitely often, which implies that ε_n gives rise to a ray R_n in T . In particular, then, there exists a node t of R_n such that V_t meets every row of G_n : If not, then every bag V_t of R_n avoids some row of G_n . In fact, since ε_n gives rise to R_n and thus every V_t meets every row that meets V_s for some node $s <_T t$ of R_n , all V_t with $t \in R_n$ avoid the same row of G_n . Since ε_n gives rise to R_n , it follows that this row is contained in $G_n^{\uparrow}e$ for all edges e of R_n , which contradicts that $(T, \mathcal{V})$ is a tree-decomposition. Hence, there is a node t_n of R_n such that V_{t_n} meets every row of G_n . In particular, there is a set $X_n \subseteq V_{t_n}$ of $2^{n+1} + 2^n + 2$ vertices of G_n .

Since G admits no lean tree-decomposition into finite parts by [Lemma 3.6](#), $(T, \mathcal{V})$ contains an infinite bag V_s . As shown above, V_s contains at most finitely many vertices of each G_n . Hence, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the bag V_s contains infinitely many vertices of $G'_n := G'[\{(i, j) \in V(G') : j > n\}] \cup \bigcup_{m > n} G_m$. Let $Y_n \subseteq V_s$ consist of $2^{n+1} + 2^n + 2$ vertices of G'_n . Since G is locally finite and connected, it follows from the Star-Comb Lemma [[7](#), Lemma 8.2.2] that there is a comb C in G with teeth in V_s . Recall that the comb C is the union of a ray R , its spine, and infinitely many disjoint (possibly trivial) paths with precisely their first vertex in R and their last vertex in V_s . As $V_s \cap V(G_n)$ is finite for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the spine R of C is an ε -ray.

Since $X_n \subseteq V(G_n)$ and $Y_n \subseteq V(G'_n)$, there are at most $2^{n+1} + n + 2$ pairwise disjoint X_n - Y_n paths in G , as witnessed by $S_n = \{(i/2^{n+1}, n+1) \mid 2^{n+1} < i \leq 2^{n+2}\} \cup \{(1, j) \mid 0 \leq j \leq n+1\}$ (indicated in purple in [Figure 2](#)). As $(T, \mathcal{V})$ is lean by assumption, there is an edge f_n on the unique t_n - s path in T such that $|V_{f_n}| \leq |S_n|$. In particular, V_{f_n} separates V_{t_n} and V_s , and thus also the ends ε_n and ε . Indeed, since C has teeth in V_s , the end ε lives in the component K of $G - V_{f_n}$ that contains $V_s \setminus V_{f_n}$. Since V_{f_n} separates X_n and V_s , and because X_n is linked to ε_n

and $|V_{f_n}| < |X_n|$, the end ε_n lives in the component of $G - V_{f_n}$ that contains $V_{t_n} \setminus V_{f_n}$, and thus does not live in K . By the definition of G , there are $|S_n|$ disjoint ε - ε_n double rays R_i^n in G , and hence the separation induced by f_n distinguishes ε and ε_n efficiently. Now [Lemma 3.2](#) yields the desired contradiction. $\square$

Proof of [Example 1](#). The graph G from [Construction 3.1](#) is planar, locally finite and connected. The assertion thus follows from [Lemma 3.7](#). $\square$

§4. [EXAMPLE 3](#) – NEGATIVE ANSWER TO QUESTION (vii)

In this section we construct [Example 3](#), which we restate here for convenience:

Example 3. *There is a countable graph G such that every tree-decomposition of G into finite parts has a bag V_t which violates the property of being lean for $s = t$.*

The graph in this example is essentially the same as [[5](#), Example 3.7].

Proof. Let G' be the $\mathbb{N} \times \{0, 1, 2\}$ grid, that is, $V(G') = \{(i, j) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}, j \in \{0, 1, 2\}\}$, and there is an edge in G' between (i, j) and (i', j') whenever $|i - i'| + |j - j'| = 1$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$, let $U_n := \{(i, 1) \mid i \leq n\} \cup \{(n-1, 0), (n, 0)\}$ (see [Figure 3](#)). Now the graph G is obtained from G' by making the sets U_n complete. We claim that G is as desired.




FIGURE 3. Depicted is the graph G' and the set U_4 in purple from [Example 3](#). Indicated in blue is the ray $(0, 2)(1, 2) \dots$ that contains the vertex w and indicated in green is the path $(0, 0)(1, 0)(2, 0)(3, 0)$ that contains the vertex u in the case $m = 4$.

Let $(T, \mathcal{V})$ be a rooted tree-decomposition of G into finite parts. Let $R \subseteq T$ be the rooted ray arising from the unique end ε of G . Since $\bigcap_{e \in R} V(G \upharpoonright e) = \emptyset$, there is an edge e of R such that $(0, 0), (0, 1), (0, 2) \in V(G \downarrow e)$. As ε gives rise to R , the ray $(0, 0)(1, 0)(2, 0) \dots$ through the bottom row has a tail in $G \upharpoonright e$; i.e. there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(n', 0) \in V(G \upharpoonright e)$ for all $n' \geq n$. Since $G[U_{n'}]$ is complete, it follows that $U_{n'} \subseteq V(G \upharpoonright e)$ for all $n' \geq n$.

Next, observe that there is an edge $e' > e$ of R such that $U_n \subseteq V(G \downarrow e')$. Now let $f = ts$ with $t \leq_T s$ be the $\leq_T$ -minimal edge of R such that there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq n}$ with $U_m \subseteq V(G \downarrow f)$. Note that e' is a candidate for f , and observe that $e < f$. Let m be maximal such that $U_m \subseteq V(G \downarrow f)$; in particular, $m \geq n$. To see that this maximum exists, note that the ray $(0,0)(1,0)(2,0) \dots$ has a tail in $G \uparrow f$, and hence there is $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(j,0) \in V(G \uparrow f)$ for all $j \geq i$. Thus, $m \leq i$.

By the choice of f and m , we have $U_{m+1} \subseteq V(G \uparrow f)$, as U_{m+1} is complete. Hence, as V_f separates $G \uparrow f$ and $G \downarrow f$, it follows that $U_m \cap U_{m+1} \subseteq V_f \subseteq V_t$. Moreover, as $(0,2) \in V(G \downarrow e) \subseteq V(G \downarrow f)$ by the choice of e , and because ε gives rise to R , the ray $(0,2)(1,2)(2,2) \dots$ meets $V_f \subseteq V_t$ in a vertex w . Similarly, the path $(0,0)(1,0) \dots (m-1,0)$ meets $V_{f'} \subseteq V_t$ in a vertex u where f' is the unique down-edge at t . Indeed, we have $(0,0) \in G \downarrow f'$ by the choice of $e < f$ and $(m-1,0) \in G \uparrow f'$: if $(m-1,0)$ was contained in $G \downarrow f'$, then $U_m \subseteq V(G \downarrow f')$ since U_m is complete in G , which contradicts the $\leq_T$ -minimal choice of f .

We now define $Z_1 := (U_m \cap U_{m+1}) \cup \{w\}$ and $Z_2 := (U_m \cap U_{m+1}) \cup \{u\}$. By construction, we have $|Z_1| = |Z_2| = m + 3$ and $Z_1, Z_2 \subseteq V_t$. Hence, $(T, \mathcal{V})$ violates the property of being lean for $t_1 = t_2 = t$ since $U_m \cap U_{m+1}$ separates w and u and hence witnesses that G contains at most $m + 2$ disjoint Z_1 – Z_2 paths. $\square$

§5. UPWARDS DISJOINTNESS OF ADHESION SETS

As mentioned in the introduction, we show in [3, Theorem 1'] a more detailed version of **Theorem 1.3** which, among others, yields that the adhesion sets of the tree-decomposition intersect ‘not more than necessary’:

Theorem 5.1. *Every graph G of finite tree-width admits a rooted tree-decomposition $(T, \mathcal{V})$ into finite parts that is linked, tight and componental. Moreover, we may assume that*

- (1) *for every $e <_T e' \in E(T)$ with $|V_e| \leq |V_{e'}|$, each vertex of $V_e \cap V_{e'}$ either dominates some end of G that lives in $G \uparrow e'$, or is contained in a critical vertex⁴ set of G that is included in $G \uparrow e'$.*

Halin [9, Theorem 2] showed that every locally finite, connected graph has a linked ray-decomposition⁵ into finite parts with disjoint adhesion sets. He used this result in [10, Satz 10] to establish **Theorem 5.1** for locally finite graphs with at most two ends, replacing (1) by the stronger condition of having disjoint adhesion sets. In light of this, we discuss here that (1) describes how close one may come to having ‘disjoint adhesion sets’ in the general case.

If G is not locally finite, we generally cannot require the tree-decomposition $(T, \mathcal{V})$ in **Theorem 1.3** to have disjoint adhesion sets while having finite parts, as every dominating vertex of an end ε will be eventually contained in all adhesion sets along the ray of T which arises from ε . Moreover, as every critical vertex set has to lie in an adhesion set of any tree-decomposition into

⁴A set X of vertices of G is *critical* if infinitely many components of $G - X$ have neighbourhood X in G .

⁵A *ray-decomposition* is a tree-decomposition whose decomposition tree is a ray.

finite parts, and since the tree-decomposition is linked, one can easily check that the adhesion sets also intersect in critical vertex sets. Thus one might hope to obtain a tree-decomposition as in [Theorem 1.3](#) that satisfies the following condition:

- (1') for every $e <_T e' \in E(T)$ each vertex of $V_e \cap V_{e'}$ either dominates some end of G that lives in $G \uparrow e'$, or is contained in a critical vertex set of G that is included in $G \uparrow e'$.

But (1) allows for more than (1'): If $e <_T e' \in T$ and $|V_e| > |V_{e'}|$, then V_e and $V_{e'}$ are allowed to intersect also in vertices that do not dominate an end and that are not contained in a critical vertex set. The following example shows that allowing this is in fact necessary. It presents a locally finite graph that does not admit a tree-decomposition $(T, \mathcal{V})$ as in [Theorem 1.3](#) with (1'), the stronger version of (1). As locally finite graphs do not have any dominating vertices and critical vertex sets, (1') boils down to the property that the tree-decomposition $(T, \mathcal{V})$ has *upwards disjoint adhesion sets*, that is $V_e \cap V_{e'} = \emptyset$ for every $e <_T e' \in E(T)$.

Example 5.2. *There is a locally finite connected graph G which does not admit a linked, tight, componental rooted tree-decomposition $(T, \mathcal{V})$ into finite parts with upwards disjoint adhesion sets, i.e. one which satisfies (1').*

Proof. Let $c_{00}(\mathbb{N})$ denote the set of all sequences with values in $\mathbb{N}$ that are eventually zero. Let G be the graph depicted in [Figure 4](#), that is the graph on the vertex set

$$V(G) := \{((s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, i, j) \in c_{00}(\mathbb{N}) \times \mathbb{N} \times \{1, 2, 3\}\}$$

and with edges between $(\mathcal{S}, i, j)$ and $(\mathcal{S}', i', j')$ whenever $|i - i'| + |j - j'| = 1$ and, for $\mathcal{S} = (s_0, \dots, s_{n-1}, 0, \dots)$ and $\mathcal{S}' = (s'_0, \dots, s'_{n-1}, s'_n, 0, \dots)$, with edges between $(\mathcal{S}, i-1, 3)$ and $(\mathcal{S}', 0, j')$ and between $(\mathcal{S}, i, 3)$ and $(\mathcal{S}', 0, j')$ whenever $s'_n = i \geq 1$ and $s_k = s'_k$ for all $k < n$. Note that G is locally finite.

By [Lemma 2.2](#) every linked, tight, componental rooted tree-decomposition of G into finite parts displays all the ends of G and their (combined) degrees. Thus, it suffices to show that G has no rooted tree-decomposition with upwards disjoint adhesion sets which displays all its ends and their (combined) degrees. Let $(T, \mathcal{V})$ be a tree-decomposition of G which displays all ends of G and their (combined) degrees. Consider the rays $R_{\mathcal{S}, j} = \{(\mathcal{S}, i, j) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ for all $\mathcal{S} \in c_{00}(\mathbb{N})$ with $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Then for every fixed $\mathcal{S} \in c_{00}(\mathbb{N})$ the rays $R_{\mathcal{S}, 1}, R_{\mathcal{S}, 2}, R_{\mathcal{S}, 3}$ all belong to the same end $\varepsilon_{\mathcal{S}}$ of G ; and these ends $\varepsilon_{\mathcal{S}}$ are pairwise distinct. Since $(T, \mathcal{V})$ displays all ends of G and their (combined) degrees, there exist for each $\varepsilon_{\mathcal{S}}$ infinitely many edges e of T such that V_e has size three and meets every ray $R_{\mathcal{S}, j}$; we fix for each end $\varepsilon_{\mathcal{S}}$ one such edge $e_{\mathcal{S}}$. Let $v_{\mathcal{S}} = (\mathcal{S}, i_{\mathcal{S}}, 3)$ be the (unique) vertex in $V_{e_{\mathcal{S}}} \cap V(R_{\mathcal{S}, 3})$.

Set $\mathcal{S}_0 := (0, 0, \dots)$ and $\mathcal{S}_n := (s_0, \dots, s_{n-1}, i_{\mathcal{S}_{n-1}} + 1, 0, \dots)$ where $\mathcal{S}_{n-1} = (s_0, \dots, s_{n-1}, 0, \dots)$. Then the $v_{\mathcal{S}_n}$ define a (unique) end ε of G , in that every ray that meets all the $v_{\mathcal{S}_n}$ belongs to the same end ε . This end has degree 2 as witnessed by the sets $S_n := \{(\mathcal{S}_n, i_{\mathcal{S}_n}, 3), (\mathcal{S}_n, i_{\mathcal{S}_n} + 1, 3)\}$ (see [Figure 4](#)).




FIGURE 4. Depicted is the graph G from [Example 5.2](#). The blue subgraph is induced by the vertices $(\mathfrak{S}, i, j)$ of G with $\mathfrak{S} = (0, 0, 0, \dots)$. The green subgraphs are induced by the vertices $(\mathfrak{S}_x, i, j)$ of G with $\mathfrak{S}_x = (1, x, 0, \dots)$ for $x \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$, respectively.

Now since $(T, \mathcal{V})$ displays the (combined) degree of ε , and because the sets S_n are the only separators witnessing that ε has degree 2, there is an edge $e \in T$ with $V_e = S_n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. But since every such S_n meets the set $V_{e_{S_n}}$, the tree-decomposition $(T, \mathcal{V})$ does not have upwards disjoint separators. $\square$

This example might explain why Halin never extended his result [[10](#), Satz 10] mentioned above to graphs with more than two ends: His precursor notion to a tree-decomposition, namely the quasi-trees and pseudo-trees discussed in [[11](#)], required upwards disjoint separators, and hence could not possibly capture the types of locally finite graphs described in [Example 5.2](#).

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Aharoni and E. Berger, *Menger's theorem for infinite graphs*, *Inventiones mathematicae* **176** (2009), no. 1, 1–62, available at [arXiv:0509397](#).
- [2] S. Albrechtsen, *Tangle-tree duality in infinite graphs*, arXiv preprint (2024).
- [3] S. Albrechtsen, R. W. Jacobs, P. Knappe, and M. Pitz, *Linked tree-decompositions into finite parts*, arXiv preprint (2024).




FIGURE 5. A ray in G that meets all the sets $V_{e_{S_n}}$. The end to which it belongs has degree 2.

- [4] P. Bellenbaum and R. Diestel, *Two short proofs concerning tree-decompositions*, Combinatorics, Probability and Computing **11** (2002), no. 6, 541–547.
- [5] J. Carmesin, *All graphs have tree-decompositions displaying their topological ends*, Combinatorica **39** (2019), no. 3, 545–596, available at [arXiv:1409.6640](https://arxiv.org/abs/1409.6640).
- [6] J. Carmesin, M. Hamann, and B. MirafTAB, *Canonical trees of tree-decompositions*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B **152** (2022), 1–26, available at [arXiv:2002.12030](https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.12030).
- [7] R. Diestel, *Graph Theory*, 5th ed., Springer, 2017.
- [8] J. Erde, *A unified treatment of linked and lean tree-decompositions*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B **130** (2018), 114–143, available at [arXiv:1703.03756](https://arxiv.org/abs/1703.03756).
- [9] R. Halin, *Some path problems in graph theory*, Abhandlungen aus dem Mathematischen Seminar der Universität Hamburg **44** (1975), no. 1, 175–186.
- [10] ———, *Systeme disjunkter unendlicher Wege in Graphen*, Numerische Methoden bei Optimierungsaufgaben Band 3: Optimierung bei graphentheoretischen und ganzzahligen Problemen (1977), 55–67.
- [11] ———, *Tree-partitions of infinite graphs*, Discrete Mathematics **97** (1991), no. 1-3, 203–217.
- [12] I. Kříž and R. Thomas, *The menger-like property of the tree-width of infinite graphs*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B **52** (1991), no. 1, 86–91.
- [13] N. Robertson and P. D. Seymour, *Graph minors. IV. Tree-width and well-quasi-ordering*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B **48** (1990), 227–254.
- [14] N. Robertson, P. D. Seymour, and R. Thomas, *Excluding infinite clique minors*, Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society **118** (1995), no. 566, vi+103.

- [15] P. D Seymour and R. Thomas, *Excluding infinite trees*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **335** (1993), no. 2, 597–630.
- [16] R. Thomas, *Well-quasi-ordering infinite graphs with forbidden finite planar minor*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **312** (1989), no. 1, 279–313.
- [17] ———, *A menger-like property of tree-width: The finite case*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B **48** (1990), 67–76.

UNIVERSITÄT HAMBURG, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BUNDESSTRASSE 55 (GEOMATIKUM), 20146 HAMBURG, GERMANY

Email address: {sandra.albrechtsen, raphael.jacobs, paul.knappe, max.pitz}@uni-hamburg.de