

MINORS OF TWO-CONNECTED GRAPHS OF LARGE PATH-WIDTH¹

Thanh N. Dang

and

Robin Thomas

School of Mathematics
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, Georgia 30332-0160, USA

Abstract

Let P be a graph with a vertex v such that $P \setminus v$ is a forest, and let Q be an outerplanar graph. We prove that there exists a number $p = p(P, Q)$ such that every 2-connected graph of path-width at least p has a minor isomorphic to P or Q . This result answers a question of Seymour and implies a conjecture of Marshall and Wood. The proof is based on a new property of tree-decompositions.

1 Introduction

All *graphs* in this paper are finite and simple; that is, they have no loops or parallel edges. *Paths* and *cycles* have no “repeated” vertices or edges. A graph H is a *minor* of a graph G if we can obtain H by contracting edges of a subgraph of G . An H *minor* is a minor isomorphic to H . A tree-decomposition of a graph G is a pair (T, X) , where T is a tree and X is a family $(X_t : t \in V(T))$ such that:

- (W1) $\bigcup_{t \in V(T)} X_t = V(G)$, and for every edge of G with ends u and v there exists $t \in V(T)$ such that $u, v \in X_t$, and
- (W2) if $t_1, t_2, t_3 \in V(T)$ and t_2 lies on the path in T between t_1 and t_3 , then $X_{t_1} \cap X_{t_3} \subseteq X_{t_2}$.

The *width* of a tree-decomposition (T, X) is $\max\{|X_t| - 1 : t \in V(T)\}$. The *tree-width* of a graph G is the smallest width among all tree-decompositions of G . A *path-decomposition* of G is a tree-decomposition (T, X) of G , where T is a path. We will often denote a path-decomposition as (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n) , rather than having the constituent sets indexed by the vertices of a path. The *path-width* of G is the smallest width among all path-decompositions of G . Robertson and Seymour [12] proved the following:

Theorem 1.1. *For every planar graph H there exists an integer $n = n(H)$ such that every graph of tree-width at least n has an H minor.*

¹Partially supported by NSF under Grants No. DMS-1202640 and DMS-1700157. 11 October 2015, revised 14 April 2018.

Robertson and Seymour [11] also proved an analogous result for path-width:

Theorem 1.2. *For every forest F , there exists an integer $p = p(F)$ such that every graph of path-width at least p has an F minor.*

Bienstock, Robertson, Seymour and the second author [2] gave a simpler proof of Theorem 1.2 and improved the value of p to $|V(F)| - 1$, which is best possible, because K_k has path-width $k - 1$ and does not have any forest minor on $k + 1$ vertices. A yet simpler proof of Theorem 1.2 was found by Diestel [5].

While Geelen, Gerards and Whittle [7] generalized Theorem 1.1 to representable matroids, it is not *a priori* clear what a version of Theorem 1.2 for matroids should be, because excluding a forest in matroid setting is equivalent to imposing a bound on the number of elements and has no relevance to path-width. To overcome this, Seymour [4, Open Problem 2.1] asked if there was a generalization of Theorem 1.2 for 2-connected graphs with forests replaced by the two families of graphs mentioned in the abstract. Our main result answers Seymour’s question in the affirmative:

Theorem 1.3. *Let P be a graph with a vertex v such that $P \setminus v$ is a forest, and let Q be an outerplanar graph. Then there exists a number $p = p(P, Q)$ such that every 2-connected graph of path-width at least p has a P or Q minor.*

Theorem 1.3 is a generalization of Theorem 1.2. To deduce Theorem 1.2 from Theorem 1.3, given a graph G , we may assume that G is connected, because the path-width of a graph is equal to the maximum path-width of its components. We add one vertex and make it adjacent to every vertex of G . Then the new graph is 2-connected, and by Theorem 1.3, it has a P or Q minor. By choosing suitable P and Q , we can get an F minor in G .

Our strategy to prove Theorem 1.3 is as follows. Let G be a 2-connected graph of large path-width. We may assume that the tree-width of G is bounded, for otherwise G has a minor isomorphic to both P and Q by Theorem 1.1. So let (T, X) be a tree-decomposition of G of bounded width. Since the path-width of G is large, it follows by a simple argument (Lemma 6.1 below) that the path-width of T is large, and hence it has a subgraph T' isomorphic to a subdivision of a large binary tree by Theorem 1.2. It now seems plausible that we could use T' and properties (W3) and (W4) of tree-decompositions, introduced below, which we can assume by [10, 13], to show the desired conclusion. But there is a catch: for instance, a long cycle has a tree-decomposition (T, X) satisfying (W3) and (W4) (and, in fact, the minimality condition used in their proof, as well as that of Bellenbaum and Diestel [1]) such that T has a subgraph isomorphic to a large binary tree. And yet it feels that this is the “wrong” tree-decomposition and that the “right” tree-decomposition is one where T is a path. The main result of the first part of this paper, Theorem 3.4 below, deals with converting these “branching” tree-decompositions into “non-branching” ones without increasing their width.

Marshall and Wood [9] define $g(H)$ as the minimum number for which there exists a positive integer $p(H)$ such that every $g(H)$ -connected graph with no H minor has path-width at most $p(H)$. Then Theorem 1.2 implies that $g(H) = 0$ if and only if H is a forest.

There is no graph H with $g(H) = 1$, because path-width of a graph G is the maximum of the path-widths of its connected components. Let A be the graph that consists of a cycle $a_1a_2a_3a_4a_5a_6a_1$ and extra edges a_1a_3, a_3a_5, a_5a_1 . Let $C_{3,2}$ be the graph consisting of two disjoint triangles. In Section 2 we prove a conjecture of Marshall and Wood [9]:

Theorem 1.4. *A graph H has no $K_4, K_{2,3}, C_{3,2}$ or A minor if and only if $g(H) \leq 2$.*

In Section 3 we describe a special tree-decomposition, whose existence we establish in Section 5. Section 4 introduces a quasi-order on trees, our main tool in the proof of Theorem 3.4. In Section 6 we introduce “cascades”, our main tool in the proof of Theorem 1.3, and prove that in any tree-decomposition with no duplicate bags of bounded width of a graph of big path-width there is an “injective” cascade of large height. In Section 7 we prove that every 2-connected graph of big path-width and bounded tree-width admits a tree-decomposition of bounded width and a cascade with linkages that are minimal. In Section 8 we analyze those minimal linkages and prove that there are essentially only two types of minimal linkage. This is where we use the properties of tree-decompositions from Section 3. Finally, in Section 9 we convert the two types of linkage into the two families of graphs from Theorem 1.3.

2 Proof of Theorem 1.4

In this section we prove that Theorem 1.4 is implied by Theorem 1.3.

Definition Let $h \geq 0$ be an integer. By a *binary tree of height h* we mean a tree with a unique vertex r of degree two and all other vertices of degree one or three such that every vertex of degree one is at distance exactly h from r . Such a tree is unique up to isomorphism and so we will speak of the binary tree of height h . We denote the binary tree of height h by CT_h and we call r the *root* of CT_h . Each vertex in CT_h with distance k from r has *height k* . We call the vertices at distance h from r the *leaves* of CT_h . If t belongs to the unique path in CT_h from r to a vertex $t' \in V(T_h)$, then we say that t' is a *descendant* of t and that t is an *ancestor* of t' . If, moreover, t and t' are adjacent, then we say that t is the *parent* of t' and that t' is a *child* of t .

Let \mathcal{P}_k be the graph consisting of CT_k and a separate vertex that is adjacent to every leaf of CT_k .

Lemma 2.1. *If a graph H has no $K_4, C_{3,2}$, or A minor, then H has a vertex v such that $H \setminus v$ is a forest.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on $|V(H)|$. The lemma clearly holds when $|V(H)| = 0$, and so we may assume that H has at least one vertex and that the lemma holds for graphs on fewer than $|V(H)|$ vertices. If H has a vertex of degree at most one, then the lemma follows by induction by deleting such vertex. We may therefore assume that H has minimum degree at least two.

If H has a cutvertex, say v , then v is as desired, for if C is a cycle in $H \setminus v$, then $H \setminus V(C)$ also contains a cycle (because H has minimum degree at least two), and hence H has a $C_{3,2}$ minor, a contradiction. We may therefore assume that H is 2-connected.

We may assume that H is not a cycle, and hence it has an ear-decomposition $H = H_0 \cup H_1 \cup \dots \cup H_k$, where $k \geq 1$, H_0 is a cycle and for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ the graph H_i is a path with ends $u_i, v_i \in V(H_0 \cup H_1 \cup \dots \cup H_{i-1})$ and otherwise disjoint from $H_0 \cup H_1 \cup \dots \cup H_{i-1}$. If $u_1 \in \{u_i, v_i\}$ for all $i \in \{2, 3, \dots, k\}$, then u_1 satisfies the conclusion of the lemma, and similarly for v_1 . We may therefore assume that there exist $i, j \in \{2, 3, \dots, k\}$ such that $u_1 \notin \{u_i, v_i\}$ and $v_1 \notin \{u_j, v_j\}$. It follows that H has a $K_4, C_{3,2}$, or A minor, a contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.2. *If a graph H has a vertex v such that $H \setminus v$ is a forest. then there exists an integer k such that H is isomorphic to a minor of \mathcal{P}_k .*

Proof. Let v be such that $T := H \setminus v$ is a forest. We may assume, by replacing H by a graph with an H minor, that T is isomorphic to CT_t for some t , and that v is adjacent to every vertex of T . It follows that H is isomorphic to a minor of \mathcal{P}_{2t} , as desired. \square

Definition Let \mathcal{Q}_1 be K_3 . An arbitrary edge of \mathcal{Q}_1 will be designated as *base edge*. For $i \geq 2$ the graph \mathcal{Q}_i is constructed as follows: Now assume that \mathcal{Q}_{i-1} has already been defined, and let Q_1 and Q_2 be two disjoint copies of \mathcal{Q}_{i-1} with base edges u_1v_1 and u_2v_2 , respectively. Let T be a copy of K_3 with vertex-set $\{w_1, w_2, w\}$ disjoint from Q_1 and Q_2 . The graph \mathcal{Q}_i is obtained from $Q_1 \cup Q_2 \cup T$ by identifying u_1 with w_1 , u_2 with w_2 , and v_1 and v_2 with w . The edge w_1w_2 will be the *base edge* of \mathcal{Q}_i .

A graph is *outerplanar* if it has a drawing in the plane (without crossings) such that every vertex is incident with the unbounded face. A graph is a *near-triangulation* if it is drawn in the plane in such a way that every face except possibly the unbounded one is bounded by a triangle.

Let H and G be graphs. If G has an H minor, then to every vertex u of H there corresponds a connected subgraph of G , called the *node of u* .

Lemma 2.3. *Let H be a 2-connected outerplanar near-triangulation with k triangles. Then H is isomorphic to a minor of \mathcal{Q}_k . Furthermore, the minor inclusion can be chosen in such a way that for every edge $a_1a_2 \in E(H)$ incident with the unbounded face and for every $i \in \{1, 2\}$, the vertex w_i belongs to the node of a_i , where w_1w_2 is the base edge of \mathcal{Q}_k .*

Proof. We proceed by induction on k . The lemma clearly holds when $k = 1$, and so we may assume that H has at least two triangles and that the lemma holds for graphs with fewer than k triangles. The edge a_1a_2 belongs to a unique triangle, say a_1a_2c . The triangle a_1a_2c divides H into two near-triangulations H_1 and H_2 , where the edge $a_i c$ is incident with the unbounded face of H_i . Let $Q_1, Q_2, u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2, w_1, w_2$ be as in the definition of \mathcal{Q}_k . By the induction hypothesis the graph H_i is isomorphic to a minor of \mathcal{Q}_i in such a way that the vertex u_i belongs to the node of a_i and the vertex v_i belongs to the node of c . It follows that H is isomorphic to \mathcal{Q}_k in such a way that w_i belongs to the node of a_i . \square

Lemma 2.4. *Let H be a graph that has no K_4 or $K_{2,3}$ minor. Then there exists an integer k such that H is isomorphic to a minor of \mathcal{Q}_k .*

Proof. It is well-known [6, Exercise 23] that the hypotheses of the lemma imply that H is outerplanar. We may assume, by replacing H by a graph with an H minor, that H is a 2-connected outerplanar near-triangulation. The lemma now follows from Lemma 2.3. \square

Corollary 2.5. *Let H be a graph that has no K_4 , $K_{2,3}$, $C_{3,2}$, or A minor. Then there exists an integer k such that H is isomorphic to a minor of \mathcal{P}_k and H is isomorphic to a minor of \mathcal{Q}_k .*

Proof. This follows from Lemmas 2.1, 2.2 and 2.4. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.4, assuming Theorem 1.3. To prove the “if” part notice that \mathcal{P}_k and \mathcal{Q}_k are 2-connected and have large path-width when k is large, because \mathcal{Q}_k has a CT_{k-1} minor. There is no vertex v in A such that $A \setminus v$ is acyclic. So, A and $C_{3,2}$ are not minors of \mathcal{P}_k for any k . The graph \mathcal{Q}_k is outerplanar, so K_4 and $K_{2,3}$ are not minors of \mathcal{Q}_k for any positive integer k . This means $g(H) \geq 3$ for $H \in \{K_4, K_{2,3}, C_{3,2}, A\}$. This proves the “if” part.

To prove the “only if” part, if H has no K_4 , $K_{2,3}$, $C_{3,2}$ or A minor, then by Corollary 2.5 H is a minor of both \mathcal{P}_k and \mathcal{Q}_k for some k . Then $g(H) \leq 2$ by Theorem 1.3. \square

3 Linked Tree-decompositions

In this section we review properties of tree-decompositions established in [10, 13], and state our main lemma. The proof of the following easy lemma can be found, for instance, in [13].

Lemma 3.1. *Let (T, Y) be a tree-decomposition of a graph G , and let H be a connected subgraph of G such that $V(H) \cap Y_{t_1} \neq \emptyset \neq V(H) \cap Y_{t_2}$, where $t_1, t_2 \in V(T)$. Then $V(H) \cap Y_t \neq \emptyset$ for every $t \in V(T)$ on the path between t_1 and t_2 in T .*

A tree-decomposition (T, Y) of a graph G is said to be *linked* if

- (W3) for every two vertices t_1, t_2 of T and every positive integer k , either there are k disjoint paths in G between Y_{t_1} and Y_{t_2} , or there is a vertex t of T on the path between t_1 and t_2 such that $|Y_t| < k$.

It is worth noting that, by Lemma 3.1, the two alternatives in (W3) are mutually exclusive. The following is proved in [13].

Lemma 3.2. *If a graph G admits a tree-decomposition of width at most w , where w is some integer, then G admits a linked tree-decomposition of width at most w .*

Let (T, Y) be a tree-decomposition of a graph G , let $t_0 \in V(T)$, and let B be a component of $T \setminus t_0$. We say that a vertex $v \in Y_{t_0}$ is *B-tied* if $v \in Y_t$ for some $t \in V(B)$. We say that a path P in G is *B-confined* if $|V(P)| \geq 3$ and every internal vertex of P belongs to $\bigcup_{t \in V(B)} Y_t - Y_{t_0}$. We wish to consider the following three properties of (T, Y) :

(W4) if t, t' are distinct vertices of T , then $Y_t \neq Y_{t'}$,

(W5) if $t_0 \in V(T)$ and B is a component of $T \setminus t_0$, then $\bigcup_{t \in V(B)} Y_t - Y_{t_0} \neq \emptyset$,

(W6) if $t_0 \in V(T)$, B is a component of $T \setminus t_0$, and u, v are B -tied vertices in Y_{t_0} , then there is a B -confined path in G between u and v .

The following strengthening of Lemma 3.2 is proved in [10].

Lemma 3.3. *If a graph G has a tree-decomposition of width at most w , where w is some integer, then it has a tree-decomposition of width at most w satisfying (W1)–(W6).*

We need one more condition, which we now introduce. Let T be a tree. If $t_1, t_2 \in V(T)$, then by $T[t_1, t_2]$ we denote the vertex-set of the unique path in T with ends t_1 and t_2 . A *triad in T* is a triple t_1, t_2, t_3 of vertices of T such that there exists a vertex t of T , called the *center*, such that t_1, t_2, t_3 belong to different components of $T \setminus t$. Let (T, W) be a tree-decomposition of a graph G , and let t_1, t_2, t_3 be a triad in T with center t_0 . The *torso of (T, W) at t_1, t_2, t_3* is the subgraph of G induced by the set $\bigcup W_t$, the union taken over all vertices $t \in V(T)$ such that either $t \in \{t_1, t_2, t_3\}$, or for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, the vertex t belongs to the component of $T \setminus t_i$ containing t_0 . We say that the triad t_1, t_2, t_3 is *W -separable* if, letting $X = W_{t_1} \cap W_{t_2} \cap W_{t_3}$, the graph obtained from the torso of (T, W) at t_1, t_2, t_3 by deleting X can be partitioned into three disjoint non-null graphs H_1, H_2, H_3 in such a way that for all distinct $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, all $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and all $t \in T[t_j, t_0]$, $|V(H_i) \cap W_t| \geq |V(H_i) \cap W_{t_j}| = |W_{t_k} - X|/2 \geq 1$. (Let us remark that this condition implies that $|W_{t_1}| = |W_{t_2}| = |W_{t_3}|$ and $V(H_i) \cap W_{t_i} = \emptyset$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$.) The last property of a tree-decomposition (T, W) that we wish to consider is

(W7) if t_1, t_2, t_3 is a W -separable triad in T with center t , then there exists an integer $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ with $W_{t_i} \cap W_t - (W_{t_1} \cap W_{t_2} \cap W_{t_3}) \neq \emptyset$.

The following is our main lemma.

Theorem 3.4. *If a graph G has a tree-decomposition of width at most w , where w is some integer, then it has a tree-decomposition of width at most w satisfying (W1)–(W7).*

4 A Quasi-order on Trees

A *quasi-ordered set* is a pair (Q, \leq) , where Q is a set and \leq is a *quasi-order*; that is, a reflexive and transitive relation on Q . If $q, q' \in Q$ we define $q < q'$ to mean that $q \leq q'$ and $q' \not\leq q$. We say that q, q' are *\leq -equivalent* if $q \leq q' \leq q$. We say that (Q, \leq) is a *linear quasi-order* if for every two elements $q, q' \in Q$ either $q \leq q'$ or $q' \leq q$ or both. Let (Q, \leq) be a linear quasi-order. If $A, B \subseteq Q$ we say that B *\leq -dominates* A if the elements of A can be listed as $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \dots \geq a_k$ and the elements of B can be listed as $b_1 \geq b_2 \geq \dots \geq b_l$, and there exists an integer p with $1 \leq p \leq \min\{k, l\}$ such that $a_i \leq b_i \leq a_i$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, p$, and either $p < \min\{k, l\}$ and $a_{p+1} < b_{p+1}$, or $p = k$ and $k \leq l$.

Lemma 4.1. *If (Q, \leq) is a linear quasi-order, then \leq -domination is a linear quasi-order on the set of subsets of Q .*

Proof. It is obvious that \leq -domination is reflexive. Assume that B \leq -dominates A and C \leq -dominates B . Assume that the elements of A can be listed as $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \dots \geq a_k$, the elements of B can be listed as $b_1 \geq b_2 \geq \dots \geq b_l$, and the elements of C can be listed as $c_1 \geq c_2 \geq \dots \geq c_m$. By definition, there exists an integer p_1 with $1 \leq p_1 \leq \min\{k, l\}$ such that $a_i \leq b_i \leq a_i$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, p_1$, and either $p_1 < \min\{k, l\}$ and $a_{p_1+1} < b_{p_1+1}$, or $p_1 = k \leq l$; and there exists an integer p_2 with $1 \leq p_2 \leq \min\{l, m\}$ such that $b_i \leq c_i \leq b_i$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, p_2$, and either $p_2 < \min\{l, m\}$ and $b_{p_2+1} < c_{p_2+1}$, or $p_2 = l \leq m$. Let $p = \min\{p_1, p_2\}$. Then $a_i \leq c_i \leq a_i$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, p$. If either $p_1 < \min\{k, l\}$ and $a_{p_1+1} < b_{p_1+1}$, or $p_2 < \min\{l, m\}$ and $b_{p_2+1} < c_{p_2+1}$, then $p < \min\{k, m\}$ and $a_{p+1} < c_{p+1}$. If $p_1 = k \leq l$ and $p_2 = l \leq m$, then $p = k \leq m$. Therefore, C \leq -dominates A , and so \leq -domination is transitive.

Now let A, B be as above, and let p be the maximum integer such that $p \leq \min\{k, l\}$ and $a_i \leq b_i \leq a_i$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, p$. Then if $p < \min\{k, l\}$, then A \leq -dominates B if $a_{p+1} > b_{p+1}$ and B \leq -dominates A if $a_{p+1} < b_{p+1}$. If $p = \min\{k, l\}$ then A \leq -dominates B if $k \geq l$ and B \leq -dominates A if $k \leq l$. Hence, \leq -domination is linear. \square

We say that B *strictly \leq -dominates* A if B \leq -dominates A in such a way that the numberings and integer p can be chosen in such a way that either $p < \min\{k, l\}$, or $p = k$ and $k < l$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let (Q, \leq) be a linear quasi-order, let $A, B \subseteq Q$, and let B \leq -dominate A . Then B *strictly \leq -dominates* A if and only if A does not \leq -dominate B .*

Proof. Let p be as in the definition of B \leq -dominates A . Then $p < \min\{k, l\}$ and $a_{p+1} < b_{p+1}$, or $p = k \leq l$. Assume B *strictly \leq -dominates* A . If $p < \min\{k, l\}$ then $a_{p+1} < b_{p+1}$, so A does not \leq -dominate B . If $p = k < l$ then A also does not \leq -dominate B . Conversely, if A does not \leq -dominate B , then $p < \min\{k, l\}$ or $k < l$, so B *strictly \leq -dominates* A . \square

Let G be a graph and let P be a subgraph of G . By a P -bridge of G we mean a subgraph J of G such that either

- J is isomorphic to the complete graph on two vertices with $V(J) \subseteq V(P)$ and $E(J) \cap E(P) = \emptyset$, or
- J consists of a component of $G - V(P)$ together with all edges from that component to P .

We now define a linear quasi-order \leq on the class of finite trees as follows. Let $n \geq 1$ be an integer, and suppose that $T \leq T'$ has been defined for all trees T on fewer than n vertices. Let T be a tree on n vertices, and let T' be an arbitrary tree. We define $T \leq T'$ if either $|V(T)| < |V(T')|$, or $|V(T)| = |V(T')|$ and for every maximal path P' of T' there exists a maximal path P of T such that the set of P' -bridges of T' \leq -dominates the set

of P -bridges of T . It follows from Lemma 4.3 below that \leq is indeed a linear quasi-order; in particular, it is well-defined.

If T, T' are trees, P is a path in T and P' is a path in T' we define $(T, P) \preceq (T', P')$ if either $|V(T)| < |V(T')|$, or $|V(T)| = |V(T')|$ and the set of P' -bridges of T' \leq -dominates the set of P -bridges of T .

Lemma 4.3. (i) For every tree T there exists a maximal path $P(T)$ in T such that $(T, P(T)) \preceq (T, P)$ for every maximal path P in T .

(ii) For every two trees T, T' , we have $T \leq T'$ if and only if $(T, P(T)) \preceq (T', P(T'))$.

(iii) The ordering \leq is a linear quasi-order on the class of finite trees.

Proof. We prove all three statements simultaneously by induction. Let $n \geq 1$ be an integer, assume inductively that all three statements have been proven for trees on fewer than n vertices, and let T be a tree on n vertices.

(i) Statement (i) clearly holds for one-vertex trees, and so we may assume that $n \geq 2$. Let \mathcal{B} be the set of all P -bridges of T for all maximal paths P of T . Then every member of \mathcal{B} has fewer than n vertices, and hence \mathcal{B} is a linear quasi-order by \leq by the induction hypothesis applied to (iii). By Lemma 4.1 the set of subsets of \mathcal{B} is linearly quasi-ordered by \leq -domination. It follows that there exists a maximal path $P(T)$ in T such that the set of $P(T)$ -bridges of T is minimal under \leq -domination.

(ii) The statement is obvious when $|V(T)| \neq |V(T')|$, so assume $n = |V(T)| = |V(T')|$, and let \mathcal{B} be the set of all P -bridges of T for all maximal paths P of T and the set of all P' -bridges of T' for all maximal paths P' of T' . Then as in (i) the subsets of \mathcal{B} are linearly quasi-ordered by \leq -domination. If $T \leq T'$, then by definition there exists a maximal path P of T such that $(T, P) \preceq (T', P(T'))$. Hence $(T, P(T)) \preceq (T', P(T'))$ follows from (i). If $(T, P(T)) \preceq (T', P(T'))$, then by (i) $(T, P(T)) \preceq (T', P')$ for every maximal path P' in T' , so $T \leq T'$.

(iii) Let T and T' be two trees. We may assume that $n = |V(T)| = |V(T')|$. Let \mathcal{B} be as in (ii); then subsets of \mathcal{B} are linearly quasi-ordered by \leq -domination. Then either $(T, P(T)) \preceq (T', P(T'))$ or $(T', P(T')) \preceq (T, P(T))$, and so by (ii) \leq is linear. \square

For a tree T , the path $P(T)$ from Lemma 4.3(i) will be called a *spine* of T . For later application we need the following lemma.

Lemma 4.4. Let T, T' be trees on the same number of vertices, let P' be a spine of T' , and let P be a path in T . If the set of P' -bridges of T' strictly \leq -dominates the set of P -bridges of T , then $T < T'$.

Proof. We have $(T, P) \preceq (T', P')$ and $(T', P') \not\preceq (T, P)$ by Lemma 4.2. Let P_1 be a maximal path that contains P ; then $(T, P_1) \preceq (T, P)$. Therefore, $(T, P_1) \preceq (T', P')$ and $(T', P') \not\preceq (T, P_1)$. By Lemma 4.3(i), $(T, P(T)) \preceq (T, P_1) \preceq (T', P')$ and $(T', P') \not\preceq (T, P(T))$. By Lemma 4.3(ii), $T \leq T'$ and $T' \not\leq T$. Therefore, $T < T'$. \square

By a *rank* we mean a class of \leq -equivalent trees. If r is a rank we say that T has rank r or that the rank of T is r if $T \in r$. The class of all ranks will be denoted by \mathcal{R} .

Let T be a tree, and let t be a vertex of T . By a spine-decomposition of T relative to t we mean a sequence $(T_0, P_0, T_1, P_1, \dots, T_l, P_l)$ such that

- (i) $T_0 = T$,
- (ii) for $i = 0, 1, \dots, l$, P_i is a spine of T_i , and
- (iii) for $i = 1, 2, \dots, l$, $t \notin V(P_{i-1})$ and T_i is the P_{i-1} -bridge of T_{i-1} containing t .

Lemma 4.5. *Let T be a tree, let t be a vertex of T of degree three with neighbors t'_1, t'_2, t'_3 , and let $(T_0, P_0, T_1, P_1, \dots, T_l, P_l)$ be a spine-decomposition of T relative to t with $t \in V(P_l)$. Then exactly two of t'_1, t'_2, t'_3 belong to $V(P_l)$, say t'_1 and t'_2 . Let r_3, r'_3 be adjacent vertices of T such that r_3, r'_3, t'_3, t occur on a path of T in the order listed. Thus possibly $t'_3 = r'_3$, but $t'_3 \neq r_3$. Let T' be obtained from T by subdividing the edge $r_3 r'_3$ twice (let r''_3, r'''_3 be the new vertices so that r'_3, r''_3, r'''_3, r_3 occur on a path of T' in the order listed), deleting the edge tt'_1 , contracting the edges tt'_2 and tt'_3 and adding an edge joining t'_1 and r'''_3 . Then T' has strictly smaller rank than T .*

Proof. Let $T'_0 = T'$ and for $i = 1, 2, \dots, l$, let T'_i be the P_{i-1} -bridge of T'_{i-1} containing r'''_3 . Let P' be the unique maximal path in T' with $V(P_l) - \{t, t'_2\} \cup \{r'_3\} \subseteq V(P')$. From the definition of a spine-decomposition and the fact that $t'_3 \notin V(P_l)$ we deduce that $r_3 \in V(T_i)$ for all $i = 0, 1, \dots, l$. It follows that $r_3 \in V(T'_i)$ and $|V(T_i)| = |V(T'_i)|$ for all $i = 0, 1, \dots, l$. The P_l -bridge of T_l that contains r_3 is replaced by P' -bridges of T'_l with smaller cardinalities. Other P_l -bridges of T_l are unchanged in T' . Therefore, the set of P_l -bridges of T_l strictly \leq -dominates the set of P' -bridges of T'_l , and hence $T'_l < T_l$ by Lemma 4.4. This implies, by induction on $l - i$ using Lemma 4.4, that $T'_i < T_i$ for all $i = 0, 1, \dots, l$; that is, T' has smaller rank than T . \square

5 A Theorem about Tree-decompositions

Let (T, Y) be a tree-decomposition of a graph G , let n be an integer, and let r be a rank. By an (n, r) -cell in (T, Y) we mean any component of the restriction of T to $\{t \in V(T) : |Y_t| \geq n\}$ that has rank at least r . Let us remark that if K is an (n, r) -cell in (T, Y) and $r \geq r'$, then K is an (n, r') -cell as well. The *size* of a tree-decomposition (T, Y) is the family of numbers

$$(1) \quad (a_{n,r} : n \geq 0, r \in \mathcal{R}),$$

where $a_{n,r}$ is the number of (n, r) -cells in (T, Y) . Sizes are ordered lexicographically; that is, if

$$(2) \quad (b_{n,r} : n \geq 0, r \in \mathcal{R})$$

is the size of another tree-decomposition (R, Z) of the graph G , we say that (2) is *smaller than* (1) if there are an integer $n \geq 0$ and a rank $r \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $a_{n,r} > b_{n,r}$ and $a_{n',r'} = b_{n',r'}$ whenever either $n' > n$, or $n' = n$ and $r' > r$.

Lemma 5.1. *The relation “to be smaller than” is a well-ordering on the set of sizes of tree-decompositions of G .*

Proof. Since this ordering is clearly linear, it is enough to show that it is well-founded. Suppose for a contradiction that $\{(a_{n,r}^{(i)} : n \geq 0, r \in \mathcal{R})\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is a strictly decreasing sequence of sizes, and for $i = 1, 2, \dots$, let n_i, r_i be such that $a_{n_i, r_i}^{(i)} > a_{n_i, r_i}^{(i+1)}$ and $a_{n,r}^{(i)} = a_{n,r}^{(i+1)}$ for (n, r) such that either $n > n_i$, or $n = n_i$ and $r > r_i$. Since $a_{n,r}^{(1)} = 0$ for all $r \in \mathcal{R}$ and all $n > |V(G)|$, we may assume (by taking a suitable subsequence) that $n_1 = n_2 = \dots$, and that $r_1 \leq r_2 \leq r_3 \leq \dots$. Since clearly $a_{n,r}^{(i)} \geq a_{n,r'}^{(i)}$ for all $n \geq 0$, all $r \leq r'$ and all $i = 1, 2, \dots$, we have

$$a_{n_1, r_1}^{(1)} > a_{n_1, r_1}^{(2)} \geq a_{n_2, r_2}^{(2)} > a_{n_2, r_2}^{(3)} \geq a_{n_3, r_3}^{(3)} > \dots,$$

a contradiction. \square

We say that a tree-decomposition (T, W) of a graph G is *minimal* if there is no tree-decomposition of G of smaller size.

Lemma 5.2. *Let w be an integer, and let G be a graph of tree-width at most w . Then a minimal tree-decomposition of G exists, and every minimal tree-decomposition of G has width at most w .*

Proof. The existence of a minimal tree-decomposition follows from Lemma 5.1. If G has a tree-decomposition of width at most w , then every minimal tree-decomposition has width at most w , as desired. \square

Theorem 5.3. *Let (T, W) be a minimal tree-decomposition of a graph G . Then (T, W) satisfies (W1)–(W6).*

Proof. That (T, W) satisfies (W3) is shown in [13], and that it satisfies (W4), (W5) and (W6) is shown in [10]. Let us remark that [10] and [13] use a slightly different definition of minimality, but the proofs are adequate, because a minimal tree-decomposition in our sense is minimal in the sense of [10] and [13] as well. \square

Lemma 5.4. *Let (T, W) be a minimal tree-decomposition of a graph G . Then for every edge $tt' \in E(T)$ either $W_t \subseteq W_{t'}$ or $W_{t'} \subseteq W_t$.*

Proof. Assume for a contradiction that there exists an edge $tt' \in E(T)$ such that $W_t \not\subseteq W_{t'}$ and $W_{t'} \not\subseteq W_t$. Let R be obtained from T by subdividing the edge tt' and let t'' be the new vertex. Let $Y_{t''} = W_t \cap W_{t'}$ and $Y_r = W_r$ for all $r \in V(T)$, and let $Y = (Y_r : r \in V(R))$. Then (R, Y) is a tree-decomposition of G of smaller size than (T, W) , contrary to the minimality of (T, W) . \square

Lemma 5.5. *Let (T, W) be a minimal tree-decomposition of a graph G , let $t \in V(T)$, let $X \subseteq W_t$, let B be a component of $T \setminus t$, let t' be the neighbor of t in B , let $Y = W_t \cup \bigcup_{r \in V(B)} W_r$, and let H be the subgraph of G induced by Y . If $H \setminus X = H_1 \cup H_2$, where $V(H_1) \cap V(H_2) = \emptyset$ and both of $V(H_1), V(H_2)$ intersect W_t , then either $W_{t'} - X \subseteq W_t \cap V(H_1)$ or $W_{t'} - X \subseteq W_t \cap V(H_2)$.*

Proof. We first prove the following claim.

Claim 5.5.1. *Either $W_t \cap W_{t'} - X \subseteq V(H_1)$ or $W_t \cap W_{t'} - X \subseteq V(H_2)$.*

To prove the claim suppose for a contradiction that there exist vertices $v_1 \in W_t \cap W_{t'} \cap V(H_1)$ and $v_2 \in W_t \cap W_{t'} \cap V(H_2)$. Thus both v_1 and v_2 are B -tied, and so by (W6), which (T, W) satisfies by Theorem 5.3, there exists a B -confined path Q with ends v_1 and v_2 . Since Q is B -confined, it is a subgraph of $H \setminus X$, contrary to the fact that $V(H_1) \cap V(H_2) = \emptyset$ and $H_1 \cup H_2 = H \setminus X$. This proves Claim 5.5.1.

Since both of $V(H_1), V(H_2)$ intersect W_t , Claim 5.5.1 implies that $W_t \not\subseteq W_{t'}$, and hence $W_{t'} \subseteq W_t$ by Lemma 5.4. By another application of Claim 5.5.1 we deduce that either $W_{t'} - X \subseteq W_t \cap V(H_1)$ or $W_{t'} - X \subseteq W_t \cap V(H_2)$, as desired. \square

Lemma 5.6. *Let $k \geq 1$ be an integer, let (T, W) be a minimal tree-decomposition of a graph G , let $t_1, t_2 \in V(T)$, let $X = W_{t_1} \cap W_{t_2}$, let H be the subgraph of G induced by $\bigcup W_t$, the union taken over all vertices $t \in V(T)$ such that either $t \in \{t_1, t_2\}$, or for $i = 1, 2$ the vertex t belongs to the component of $T \setminus t_i$ containing t_{3-i} , let $H \setminus X = H_1 \cup H_2$, where $V(H_1) \cap V(H_2) = \emptyset$, and assume that $|W_{t_i} \cap V(H_j)| = k$ and $|W_t \cap V(H_i)| \geq k$ for all $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$ and all $t \in T[t_1, t_2]$. Let t, t' be two adjacent vertices on the path of T between t_1 and t_2 . Then there exists an integer $i \in \{1, 2\}$ such that $W_t \cap V(H_i) = W_{t'} \cap V(H_i)$ and this set has cardinality k .*

Proof. We begin with the following claim.

Claim 5.6.1. *For every $t \in T[t_1, t_2]$ either $|W_t \cap V(H_1)| = k$ or $|W_t \cap V(H_2)| = k$.*

To prove the claim let R be the subtree of T induced by vertices $r \in V(T)$ such that either $r \in \{t_1, t_2\}$ or r belongs to the component of $T \setminus \{t_1, t_2\}$ that contains neighbors of both t_1 and t_2 , let R_1, R_2 be two isomorphic copies of R , and for $r \in V(R)$ let r_1 and r_2 denote the copies of r in R_1 and R_2 , respectively. Assume for a contradiction that there is $t_0 \in T[t_1, t_2]$ such that $|W_{t_0} \cap V(H_i)| > k$ for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$, and choose such a vertex with $t_0 \in V(R)$ and $|W_{t_0}|$ maximum. We construct a new tree-decomposition (T', W') as follows. The tree T' is obtained from the disjoint union of $T \setminus (V(R) - \{t_1, t_2\})$, R_1 and R_2 by identifying t_1 with $(t_1)_1$, $(t_2)_1$ with $(t_1)_2$ and $(t_2)_2$ with t_2 (here $(t_1)_2$ denotes the copy of t_1 in R_2 and similarly for the other three quantities). The family $W' = (W'_t : t \in V(T'))$ is defined as follows:

$$W'_t = \begin{cases} W_t & \text{if } t \in V(T) - V(R) \\ (W_r \cap V(H_1)) \cup (W_{t_1} \cap V(H_2)) \cup X & \text{if } t = r_1 \text{ for } r \in T[t_1, t_2] \\ (W_r \cap V(H_2)) \cup (W_{t_2} \cap V(H_1)) \cup X & \text{if } t = r_2 \text{ for } r \in T[t_1, t_2] \\ W_r \cap V(H_1) & \text{if } t = r_1 \text{ for } r \in V(R) - T[t_1, t_2] \\ W_r \cap V(H_2) & \text{if } t = r_2 \text{ for } r \in V(R) - T[t_1, t_2] \end{cases}$$

Please note that the value of W'_t is the same for $t = (t_2)_1$ and $t = (t_1)_2$, and hence W' is well-defined. Since no edge of G has one end in $V(H_1)$ and the other end in $V(H_2)$, it follows that (T', W') is a tree-decomposition of G .

We claim that the size of (T', W') is smaller than the size of (T, W) . Indeed, let $n_0 = |W_{t_0}|$, and let $Z = \{t \in V(T') : |W'_t| \geq n_0\}$. Then $n_0 > 2k + |X|$. We define a

mapping $f : Z \rightarrow V(T)$ by $f(t) = t$ for $t \in Z - V(R_1) - V(R_2)$, $f(r_1) = r$ for $r \in V(R)$ such that $r_1 \in Z$ and $f(r_2) = r$ for $r \in V(R)$ such that $r_2 \in Z$. We remark that the vertex obtained by identifying $(t_2)_1$ with $(t_1)_2$ does not belong to Z , and hence there is no ambiguity. Then Z and f have the following properties:

- $|W_{f(t)}| \geq |W'_t|$ for every $t \in Z$,
- for $r \in V(R)$, at most one of r_1, r_2 belongs to Z , and
- $(t_0)_1, (t_0)_2 \notin Z$

These properties follow from the assumptions that $|W_{t_i} \cap V(H_j)| = k$ and $|W_t \cap V(H_i)| \geq k$ for all $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$ and all $t \in T[t_1, t_2]$. (To see the second property assume for a contradiction that for some $r \in V(R)$ both r_1 and r_2 belong to Z . Then $n_0 = |W_{t_0}| \geq |W_{f(r_i)}| \geq |W_{r_i}| \geq n_0$, by the maximality of $|W_{t_0}|$ and the first property, and so equality holds throughout, contrary to the construction.) It follows from the first two properties that f maps injectively (n, r) -cells in (T', W') to (n, r) -cells in (T, W) for all $n \geq n_0$ and all ranks r . On the other hand, the third property implies that, letting r_1 denote the rank of one-vertex trees, no (n_0, r_1) -cell in (T', W') is mapped onto the (n_0, r_1) -cell in (T, W) with vertex-set $\{t_0\}$. Thus the size of (T', W') is smaller than the size of (T, W) , contrary to the minimality of (T, W) . This proves Claim 5.6.1.

Now let $t, t' \in T[t_1, t_2]$ be adjacent. By Lemma 5.4 we may assume that $W_t \subseteq W_{t'}$. Then $W_t \cap V(H_1) \subseteq W_{t'} \cap V(H_1)$ and $W_t \cap V(H_2) \subseteq W_{t'} \cap V(H_2)$. By Claim 5.6.1 we may assume that $|W_{t'} \cap V(H_1)| = k$. Given that $|W_t \cap V(H_1)| \geq k$ we have $W_t \cap V(H_1) = W_{t'} \cap V(H_1)$ and this set has cardinality k , as desired. \square

Lemma 5.7. *Let (T, W) be a minimal tree-decomposition of a graph G , let t_1, t_2, t_3 be a W -separable triad in T with center t_0 , and let X, H, H_1, H_2 and H_3 be as in the definition of W -separable triad. Let $k = |W_{t_1} - X|/2$ and for $i = 1, 2, 3$ let t'_i denote the neighbor of t_0 in the component of $T \setminus t_0$ containing t_i . Then for all distinct $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, $V(H_i) \cap W_{t'_i} = \emptyset$, $V(H_i) \cap W_{t'_j} = V(H_i) \cap W_{t_0}$, and this set has cardinality k .*

Proof. Let $X_3 = \bigcup W_t$, the union taken over all $t \in V(T)$ that do not belong to the component of $T \setminus t_3$ containing t_0 . By Lemma 5.5 applied to the vertex t_0 , the component of $T \setminus t_0$ containing t_3 and the subgraphs of G induced by $(V(H_1) \cup V(H_2) \cup X_3) \cap Y$ and $V(H_3) \cap Y$, where Y is as in the statement of Lemma 5.5 we deduce that $V(H_3) \cap W_{t'_3} = \emptyset$. The other two statements of the first assertion follow by symmetry.

To prove the remaining assertions, since $|W_{t_0} \cap V(H_1)| \geq k$ and $|W_{t_0} \cap V(H_2)| \geq k$ by the definition of W -separable triad, by Lemma 5.6 applied to t_1, t_2, H_3 and the subgraph of G induced by $V(H_1) \cup V(H_2) \cup X_3$ we deduce that $V(H_3) \cap W_{t_0} = V(H_3) \cap W_{t'_1} = V(H_3) \cap W_{t'_2}$, and this set has cardinality k . Similarly we deduce that $V(H_2) \cap W_{t_0} = V(H_2) \cap W_{t'_1} = V(H_2) \cap W_{t'_3}$ and $V(H_1) \cap W_{t_0} = V(H_1) \cap W_{t'_2} = V(H_1) \cap W_{t'_3}$, and that the latter two sets also have cardinality k . \square

We are finally ready to prove Theorem 3.4, which, by Lemma 5.2 is implied by the following theorem.

Theorem 5.8. *Let (T, W) be a minimal tree-decomposition of a graph G . Then (T, W) satisfies (W1)–(W7).*

Proof. That (T, W) satisfies (W1)–(W6) follows from Theorem 5.3. Thus it remains to show that (T, W) satisfies (W7). Suppose for a contradiction that (T, W) does not satisfy (W7), and let t_1, t_2, t_3 be a W -separable triad in T with center t_0 such that $W_{t_i} \cap W_{t_0} \subseteq X$ for every $i = 1, 2, 3$, where $X = W_{t_1} \cap W_{t_2} \cap W_{t_3}$. Let H, H_1, H_2 and H_3 be as in the definition of W -separable triad, and for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ let t'_i denote the neighbor of t_0 in the component of $T \setminus t_0$ containing t_i .

Let $n := |W_{t_1}|$, let $k := |W_{t_1} - X|/2$, let r_1 denote the rank of 1-vertex trees, and let T_0 denote the (n, r_1) -cell containing t_0 . By the definition of W -separable triad we have $|W_{t'_i}| \geq n$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, and hence the degree of t_0 in T_0 is at least three and by Lemmas 5.7 and 5.5 it is at most three.

Let $(T_0, P_0, T_1, P_1, \dots, T_l, P_l)$ be a spine-decomposition of T_0 relative to t_0 with $t_0 \in V(P_l)$. Since P_l is a maximal path in T_l we may assume that $t'_1, t'_2 \in V(P_l)$ and $t'_3 \notin V(P_l)$.

It follows from Lemma 5.7 that $W_{t_3} \cap W_{t'_3} = X$. By Lemma 5.6 applied to t_3 and t'_3 and t'_3 and its neighbor in $T[t_3, t'_3]$ we deduce that there exists a vertex $r_3 \in T[t_3, t'_3] - \{t'_3\}$ such that either $V(H_1) \cap W_{t'_3} = V(H_1) \cap W_r$ for every $r \in T[r_3, t'_3]$, or $V(H_2) \cap W_{t'_3} = V(H_2) \cap W_r$ for every $r \in T[r_3, t'_3]$. Without loss of generality we may assume the latter. We may choose r_3 to be as close to t_3 as possible. The fact that $W_{t_3} \cap W_{t'_3} = X$ implies that $r_3 \neq t_3$. By another application of Lemma 5.6, this time to t_3, t'_3, r_3 and the neighbor of r_3 in $T[r_3, t_3]$, we deduce that $|V(H_1) \cap W_{r_3}| = |V(H_2) \cap W_{r_3}| = k$.

Let r'_3 be the neighbor of r_3 in $T[r_3, t_0]$ and let the tree T'' be defined as follows: for every component B of $T \setminus T[t_0, r'_3]$ not containing t_1, t_2 or t_3 let $r(B)r'(B)$ denote the edge connecting B to $T[t_0, r'_3]$, where $r(B) \in V(B)$ and $r'(B) \in T[t_0, r'_3]$. By Lemma 5.5 there exists an integer $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ such that $W_{r(B)} \subseteq W_{r'(B)} \cap V(H_i)$. Let us mention in passing that this, the choice of r_3 and Lemma 5.7 imply that for every such component B , every (n, r_1) -cell is either a subgraph of B or is disjoint from B . The tree T'' is obtained from T by, for every such component B for which either $i = 2$, or $i = 3$ and $r'(B) = t_0$, deleting the edge $r(B)r'(B)$ and adding the edge $t'_1 r(B)$; and for every such component B for which $i = 1$ and $r'(B) = t_0$ deleting the edge $r(B)r'(B)$ and adding the edge $t'_2 r(B)$. Since $W_{r'(B)} \cap (V(H_2) \cup V(H_3)) \subseteq W_{t'_1}$ by the choice of r_3 and Lemma 5.7; and $W_{r'(B)} \cap V(H_1) \subseteq W_{t'_2}$ by Lemma 5.7 it follows that (T'', W) is a tree-decomposition of G .

Let T' be defined as in Lemma 4.5, starting from the tree T'' , let t'_0 be the vertex that resulted from contracting the edges $t_0 t'_2$ and $t_0 t'_3$, and let $W' = (W'_t \mid t \in V(T'))$ be defined by

$$W'_t = \begin{cases} W_t & \text{if } t \in V(T') - T'[r''_3, t'_0] \\ W_{r_3} \cup (V(H_3) \cap W_{t_0}) & \text{if } t = r'''_3 \\ (W_{r_3} - V(H_2)) \cup (V(H_3) \cap W_{t_0}) & \text{if } t = r''_3 \\ W_{t'_2} & \text{if } t = t'_0 \\ (W_t - V(H_2)) \cup (V(H_3) \cap W_{t_0}) & \text{if } t \in T'[r'_3, t'_0] - \{t'_0\} \end{cases}$$

We claim that (T', W') is a tree decomposition of G . Indeed, since $V(H_2) \cap W_r \subseteq W_{t_0}$ for all $r \in T[r'_3, t_0]$ it follows that (T', W') satisfies (W1).

To show that (T', W') satisfies (W2) let $v \in V(G)$, let $Z = \{t \in V(T) : v \in W_t\}$. and let $Z' = \{t \in V(T') : v \in W'_t\}$. It suffices to show that Z' induces a connected subset of T' , for this is easily seen to be equivalent to (W2). To that end assume first that $v \notin W'_{t'_1} = W_{t'_1} = W_{t_0} \cap (V(H_2) \cup V(H_3) \cup X)$, where the second equality follows from Lemma 5.7. It follows that, since Z induces a subtree of T , that Z' induces a subtree of T' . We assume next that $v \in W_{t_0} \cap V(H_2)$. The choice of T'' and the definition of W' imply that no vertex in the component of $T' \setminus r'''_3$ containing t'_0 belongs to Z' . Again, it follows that Z' induces a subtree of T' . Finally, let $v \in W_{t_0} \cap (V(H_3) \cup X)$. Then $T[t'_1, t'_0] \subseteq Z'$, and it again follows that Z' induces a subtree of T' . This proves our claim that (T', W') is a tree-decomposition.

We claim that the size of (T', W') is smaller than the size of (T, W) . Let r denote the rank of T_0 , and let T'_0 denote the (n, r_1) -cell in (T', W') containing t'_0 . First, by the passing remark made a few paragraphs ago, for every integer $m \geq n$ and every rank s , to every (m, s) -cell in (T', W') other than T'_0 there corresponds a unique (m, s) -cell in (T, W) . (To the $(n+1, r_1)$ -cell in (T', W') with vertex-set $\{r'''_3\}$ there corresponds the $(n+1, r_1)$ -cell in (T, W) with vertex-set $\{t_0\}$.) Second, by Lemma 4.5 the rank of T_0 is strictly larger than the rank of T'_0 . Thus no (n, r) -cell in (T', W') corresponds to T_0 . It follows that (T', W') is a tree-decomposition of G of smaller size, contrary to the minimality of (T, W) . \square

6 Cascades

In this section we introduce ‘‘cascades’’, our main tool. The main result of this section, Lemma 6.6, states that in any tree-decomposition with no duplicate bags of bounded width of a graph of big path-width there is an ‘‘injective’’ cascade of large height

Lemma 6.1. *Let p, w be two positive integers and let G be a graph of tree-width strictly less than w and path-width at least p . Then for every tree-decomposition (T, X) of G of width strictly less than w , the path-width of T is at least $\lfloor p/w \rfloor$.*

Proof. We will prove the contrapositive. Assume there exists a tree-decomposition (T, X) of G of width $< w$ such that the path-width of T is less than $\lfloor p/w \rfloor$. Because the path-width of T is less than $\lfloor p/w \rfloor$, there exists a path-decomposition (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_s) of T with $|Y_i| \leq \lfloor p/w \rfloor$ for all i . We will construct a path-decomposition (Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_s) for G of width less than p . Set $Z_i = \bigcup_{y \in Y_i} X_y$ for every $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$. For every vertex $v \in V(G)$, v belongs to at least one set X_t for some $t \in V(T)$. The vertex t of the tree T must be in Y_l for some $l \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$, so $v \in X_t \subseteq Z_l$. Therefore, $\bigcup Z_i = V(G)$. Similarly, for every edge $uv \in E(G)$, there exists $t \in V(T)$ such that $u, v \in X_t$. Therefore, $u, v \in Z_l$ for some $l \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$.

Now, if a vertex $v \in V(G)$ belongs to both Z_a and Z_b for some $a, b \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$, $a < b$, we will show that $v \in Z_c$ for all c such that $a < c < b$. Let c be an arbitrary integer satisfying $a < c < b$. The fact that $v \in Z_a$ implies $v \in X_{y_1}$ for some $y_1 \in Y_a$. Similarly, $v \in X_{y_2}$ for some $y_2 \in Y_b$. Let H be the set of vertices of T on the path from y_1 to y_2 .

Since $y_1 \in Y_a$ and $y_2 \in Y_b$, $H \cap Y_a \neq \emptyset \neq H \cap Y_b$. Hence, by Lemma 3.1 with $H = T$ and (T, Y) the path-decomposition (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_s) , we have $H \cap Y_c \neq \emptyset$. Let $t \in H \cap Y_c$, then $v \in X_t \subseteq Z_c$. So (Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_s) is a path-decomposition of G . Since the width of (T, X) is less than w , we have $|X_y| \leq w$ for every $y \in Y_i$, where $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$. Therefore, $|Z_i| \leq w \cdot \lfloor p/w \rfloor \leq p$ for every $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$. Therefore, the width of (Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_s) is less than p , so the path-width of G is less than p , as desired. \square

Let T, T' be trees. A *homeomorphic embedding of T into T'* is a mapping $\eta : V(T) \rightarrow V(T')$ such that

- η is an injection, and
- if tt_1, tt_2 are edges of T with a common end, and P_i is the unique path in T' with ends $\eta(t)$ and $\eta(t_i)$, then P_1 and P_2 are edge-disjoint.

We will write $\eta : T \hookrightarrow T'$ to denote that η is a homeomorphic embedding of T into T' . Since CT_a has maximum degree at most three, the following lemma follows from [9, Lemma 6].

Lemma 6.2. *Let T be a forest of path-width at least $a \geq 1$. Then there exists a homeomorphic embedding $CT_{a-1} \hookrightarrow T$.*

For every integer $h \geq 1$ we will need a specific type of tree, which we will denote by T_h . The tree T_h is obtained from CT_h by subdividing every edge not incident with a vertex of degree one exactly once, and adding a new vertex r' of degree one adjacent to the root r of CT_h . The vertices of T_h of degree three will be called *major*, and all the other vertices will be called *minor*. We say that r is the *major root* of T_h and that r' is the *minor root* of T_h . Each major vertex at distance $2k$ from r has *height* k , and each minor vertex at distance $2k$ from r' has *height* k .

If t belongs to the unique path in T_h from r' to a vertex $t' \in V(T_h)$, then we say that t' is a *descendant* of t and that t is an *ancestor* of t' . If, moreover, t and t' are adjacent, then we say that t is the *parent* of t' and that t' is a *child* of t . Thus every major vertex t has exactly three minor neighbors. Exactly one of those neighbors is an ancestor of t . The other two neighbors are descendants of t . We will assume that one of the two descendant neighbors is designated as the *left neighbor* and the other as the *right neighbor*. Let t_0, t_1, t_2 be the parent, left neighbor and right neighbor of t , respectively. We say that the ordered triple (t_0, t_1, t_2) is the *trinity at t* . In case we want to emphasize that the trinity is at t , we use the notation $(t_0(t), t_1(t), t_2(t))$.

Let $\eta : T \hookrightarrow T'$. We define *span of η* , to be the set of vertices $t \in V(T')$ that lie on the path from $\eta(t_1)$ to $\eta(t_2)$ for some vertices $t_1, t_2 \in V(T)$.

Let $s > 0$ be an integer and let (T, X) be a tree-decomposition of a graph G . By a *cascade of height h and size s in (T, X)* we mean a homeomorphic embedding $\eta : T_h \hookrightarrow T$ such that $|X_{\eta(t)}| = s$ for every minor vertex $t \in V(T_h)$ and $|X_t| \geq s$ for every t in the span of η .

Lemma 6.3. *For any positive integer h and nonnegative integers a, k , the following holds. Let $m = (a + 2)h + a$. Let (T, X) be a tree-decomposition of a graph G and let $\phi : CT_m \hookrightarrow$*

T be a homeomorphic embedding such that $|X_t| \geq k$ for all $t \in sp(\phi)$. If for every $t \in V(CT_m)$ at height $l \leq m - a$ there exist a descendant t' of t at height $l + a$ and a vertex $r \in T[\phi(t), \phi(t')]$ such that $|X_r| = k$, then there exists a cascade η of height h and size k in (T, X) .

Proof. By hypothesis there exist a vertex $x_0 \in V(CT_m)$ at height a and a vertex $u_0 \in V(T)$ on the path from the image under ϕ of the root of CT_m to $\phi(x_0)$ such that $|X_{u_0}| = k$. Let x be a child of x_0 , and let x_1 and x_2 be the children of x . By hypothesis there exist, for $i = 1, 2$, a vertex $y_i \in V(CT_m)$ at height $2a + 2$ that is a descendant of x_i and a vertex $u_i \in T[\phi(x_i), \phi(y_i)]$ such that $|X_{u_i}| = k$. Let r be the major root of T_1 , and let (t_0, t_1, t_2) be its trinity. We define $\eta_1 : T_1 \hookrightarrow T$ by $\eta_1(t_i) = u_i$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$ and $\eta_1(r) = \phi(x)$. Then η_1 is a cascade of height one and size k in (T, X) . If $h = 1$, then η_1 is as desired, and so we may assume that $h > 1$.

Assume now that for some positive integer $l < h$ we have constructed a cascade $\eta_l : T_l \hookrightarrow T$ of height l and size k in (T, X) such that for every leaf t_0 of T_l other than the minor root there exists a vertex $x_0 \in V(CT_m)$ at height $(a + 2)l + a$ such that the image under η_l of every vertex on the path in T_l from the minor root to t_0 belongs to the path in T from the image under ϕ of the root of CT_m to $\phi(x_0)$. Our objective is to extend η_l to a cascade η_{l+1} of height $l + 1$ and size k in (T, X) with the same property. To that end let $\eta_{l+1}(t) = \eta_l(t)$ for all $t \in V(T_l)$, let t_0 be a leaf of T_l other than the minor root and let x_0 be as earlier in the paragraph. Let x be a child of x_0 , and let x_1 and x_2 be the children of x . By hypothesis there exist, for $i = 1, 2$, a vertex $y_i \in V(CT_m)$ at height $(a + 2)(l + 1) + a$ that is a descendant of x_i and a vertex $u_i \in T[\phi(x_i), \phi(y_i)]$ such that $|X_{u_i}| = k$. Let r be the child of t_0 in T_{l+1} , and let (t_0, t_1, t_2) be its trinity. We define $\eta_{l+1}(t_i) = u_i$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $\eta_{l+1}(r) = \phi(x)$. This completes the definition of η_{l+1} .

Now η_h is as desired. \square

Lemma 6.4. *For any two positive integers h and w , there exists a positive integer $p = p(h, w)$ such that if G is a graph of path-width at least p , then in any tree-decomposition of G of width less than w , there exists a cascade of height h .*

Proof. Let $a_{w+1} = 0$, and for $k = w, w - 1, \dots, 0$ let $a_k = (a_{k+1} + 2)h + a_{k+1}$, and let $p = w(a_0 + 1)$. We claim that p satisfies the conclusion of the lemma. To see that let (T, X) be a tree-decomposition of G of width less than w . Let $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, w + 1\}$ be the maximum integer such that there exists a homeomorphic embedding $\phi : CT_{a_k} \hookrightarrow T$ satisfying $|X_t| \geq k$ for all $t \in sp(\phi)$. Such an integer exists, because $k = 0$ satisfies those requirements by Lemmas 6.1 and 6.2, and it satisfies $k \leq w$, because the width of (T, X) is less than w . The maximality of k implies that for the integers h, k and a_{k+1} the hypothesis of Lemma 6.3 is satisfied. Thus the lemma follows from Lemma 6.3. \square

Let (T, X) be a tree-decomposition of a graph G , and let $\eta : T_h \hookrightarrow T$ be a cascade of height h and size s in (T, X) . We say that η is *injective* if there exists $I \subseteq V(G)$ such that $|I| < s$ and $X_{\eta(t)} \cap X_{\eta(t')} = I$ for every two distinct vertices $t, t' \in V(T_h)$. We call this set I the *common intersection set* of η .

Lemma 6.5. *Let a, b, s, w be positive integers and let k be a nonnegative integer. Let (T, X) be a tree-decomposition of a graph G of width strictly less than w . Let $h = (2(a + 2)w + 2)b$. If there is a cascade η of height h and size $s + k$ in (T, X) such that $|\bigcap_{t \in V(T_h)} X_{\eta(t)}| \geq k$, then either there is a cascade η' of height a and size $s + k$ in (T, X) such that $|\bigcap_{t \in V(T_a)} X_{\eta'(t)}| \geq k + 1$ or there is an injective cascade η' of height b , size $s + k$ and common intersection set of size k in (T, X) .*

Proof. We may assume that

- (*) there does not exist a cascade η' of height a and size $s + k$ in (T, X) such that $|\bigcap_{t \in V(T_a)} X_{\eta'(t)}| \geq k + 1$.

Let $F = \bigcap_{t \in V(T_h)} X_{\eta(t)}$. By (*), $|F| = k$. We claim the following.

Claim 6.5.1. *For every vertex $t \in V(T_h)$ at height $l \leq h - a - 2$ and every $u \in X_{\eta(t)} - F$ there exists a descendant $t' \in V(T_h)$ of t at height at most $l + a + 2$ such that $u \notin X_{\eta(t')}$.*

To prove the claim let $u \in X_{\eta(t)} - F$. By (*) in the subtree of T_h consisting of t and its descendants there is a vertex t' of height at most $l + a + 2$ such that $u \notin X_{\eta(t')}$. This proves the claim.

We use the previous claim to deduce the following generalization.

Claim 6.5.2. *For every vertex $t \in V(T_h)$ at height $l \leq h - (a + 2)w$ there exists a descendant $t' \in V(T)$ of t at height at most $l + (a + 2)w$ such that $X_{\eta(t)} \cap X_{\eta(t')} = F$.*

To prove the claim let $X_{\eta(t)} \setminus F = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_p\}$, where $p \leq w$. By Claim 6.5.1 there exists a descendant $t_1 \in V(T)$ of t at height at most $l + a + 2$ such that $u_1 \notin X_{\eta(t')}$. By another application of Claim 6.5.1 there exists a descendant $t_2 \in V(T)$ of t_1 at height at most $l + 2(a + 2)$ such that $u_2 \notin X_{\eta(t')}$. By (W2) $u_1 \notin X_{\eta(t')}$. By continuing to argue in the same way we finally arrive at a vertex t_p that is a descendant of t at height at most $l + (a + 2)p$ such that $X_{\eta(t)} \cap X_{\eta(t_p)} = F$. Thus t_p is as desired. This proves the claim.

Let $x_0 \in V(T_h)$ be the minor root of T_h . By Claim 6.5.2 and (W2) there exists a major vertex $x \in V(T)$ at height at most $(a + 2)w + 1$ such that $X_{\eta(x_0)} \cap X_{\eta(x)} = F$. Let y_1 and y_2 be the children of x . By Claim 6.5.2 and (W2) there exists, for $i = 1, 2$, a minor vertex $x_i \in V(T_h)$ at height at most $2(a + 2)w + 2$ that is a descendant of y_i and such that $X_{\eta(x_i)} \cap X_{\eta(x)} = F$. Let r be the major root of T_1 , and let (t_0, t_1, t_2) be its trinity. We define $\eta_1 : T_1 \hookrightarrow T$ by $\eta_1(t_i) = \eta(x_i)$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$ and $\eta_1(r) = \eta(x)$. Then η_1 is an injective cascade of height one and size $s + k$ in (T, X) with common intersection set F . If $b = 1$, then η_1 is as desired, and so we may assume that $b > 1$.

Assume now that for some positive integer $l < b$ we have constructed an injective cascade $\eta_l : T_l \hookrightarrow T$ of height l and size $s + k$ with common intersection set F in (T, X) such that for every leaf t_0 of T_l other than the minor root there exists a vertex $x_0 \in V(T_h)$ at height $(2(a + 2)w + 2)l$ such that the image under η_l of every vertex on the path in T_l from the minor root to t_0 belongs to the path in T from the image under η of the root of T_h to $\eta(x_0)$. Our objective is to extend η_l to an injective cascade η_{l+1} of height

$l + 1$, size $s + k$, and common intersection set F in (T, X) with the same property. To that end let $\eta_{l+1}(t) = \eta_l(t)$ for all $t \in V(T_l)$, let t_0 be a leaf of T_l other than the minor root, and let x_0 be as earlier in the paragraph. By Claim 6.5.2 and (W2) there exists a descendant x of x_0 at height at most $(2(a+2)w+2)l + (a+2)w + 1$ such that x is major and $X_{\eta_l(t_0)} \cap X_{\eta(x)} = F$. Let y_1 and y_2 be the children of x . By Claim 6.5.2 and (W2) there exists, for $i = 1, 2$, a minor vertex $x_i \in V(T_h)$ at height at most $(2(a+2)w+2)(l+1)$ that is a descendant of y_i and such that $X_{\eta(x_i)} \cap X_{\eta(x)} = F$. Let r be the child of t_0 in T_{l+1} , and let (t_0, t_1, t_2) be its trinity. We define $\eta_{l+1}(t_i) = \eta(x_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $\eta_{l+1}(r) = \eta(x)$. This completes the definition of η_{l+1} .

Now η_h is as desired. \square

Lemma 6.6. *For any two positive integers h and w , there exists a positive integer $p = p(h, w)$ such that if G is a graph of tree-width less than w and path-width at least p , then in any tree-decomposition (T, X) of G that has width less than w and satisfies (W4), there is an injective cascade of height h .*

Proof. Let $a_w = 0$, and for $k = w - 1, \dots, 0$ let $a_k = (2(a_{k+1} + 2)w + 2)h$. Let p be the integer in Lemma 6.4 for input integers a_0 and w . We claim that p satisfies the conclusion of the lemma. To see that let (T, X) be a tree-decomposition of G of width less than w satisfying (W4). By Lemma 6.4, there exists a cascade η of height a_0 in (T, X) . Let $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, w\}$ be the maximum integer such that there exists a cascade $\eta' : T_{a_k} \hookrightarrow T$ satisfying $|\bigcap_{t \in V(T_{a_k})} X_{\eta'(t)}| \geq k$. Such an integer exists, because $k = 0$ satisfies those requirements and $k < w$ because of (W4) and because the width of (T, X) is less than w . The maximality of k implies that there does not exist a cascade $\eta'' : T_{a_{k+1}} \hookrightarrow T$ satisfying $|\bigcap_{t \in V(T_{a_{k+1}})} X_{\eta''(t)}| \geq k + 1$. Thus the lemma follows from Lemma 6.5. \square

7 Ordered Cascades

The main result of this section, Theorem 7.5, states that every 2-connected graph of big path-width and bounded tree-width admits a tree-decomposition of bounded width and a cascade with linkages that are minimal.

Let (T, X) be a tree-decomposition of a graph G , and let η be an injective cascade in (T, X) with common intersection set I . Assume the size of η is $|I| + s$. Then we say η is *ordered* if for every minor vertex $t \in V(T_h)$ there exists a bijection $\xi_t : \{1, 2, \dots, s\} \rightarrow X_{\eta(t)} - I$ such that for every major vertex t_0 with trinity (t_1, t_2, t_3) , there exist s disjoint paths P_1, P_2, \dots, P_s in $G \setminus I$ such that the path P_i has ends $\xi_{t_1}(i)$ and $\xi_{t_2}(i)$, and there exist s disjoint paths Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_s in $G \setminus I$ such that the path Q_i has ends $\xi_{t_1}(i)$ and $\xi_{t_3}(i)$. In that case we say that η is an *ordered cascade with orderings* ξ_t . We say that the set of paths P_1, P_2, \dots, P_s is a *left t_0 -linkage with respect to η* , and that the set of paths Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_s is a *right t_0 -linkage with respect to η* .

We will need to fix a left and a right t_0 -linkage for every major vertex $t_0 \in V(T_h)$; when we do so we will indicate that by saying that η is an *ordered cascade in (T, X) with orderings ξ_t and specified linkages*, and we will refer to the specified linkages as the *left specified t_0 -linkage* and the *right specified t_0 -linkage*. We will denote the left specified t_0 -linkage

by $P_1(t_0), P_2(t_0), \dots, P_s(t_0)$ and the right specified t_0 -linkage by $Q_1(t_0), Q_2(t_0), \dots, Q_s(t_0)$. We say that the specified t_0 -linkages are *minimal* if for every set of disjoint paths P_1, P_2, \dots, P_s in $G \setminus I$ from $X_{\eta(t_1)} - I$ to $X_{\eta(t_2)} - I$ such that $\xi_{t_1}(i)$ is an end of P_i (let the other end be p_i) and every set of disjoint paths Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_s in $G \setminus I$ from $X_{\eta(t_1)} - I$ to $X_{\eta(t_3)} - I$ such that $\xi_{t_1}(i)$ is an end of Q_i (let the other end be q_i) we have

$$\left| E \left(\bigcup (x_i P_i p_i \cup x_i Q_i q_i) \right) \right| \geq \left| E \left(\bigcup (y_i P_i(t_0) \xi_{t_2}(i) \cup y_i Q_i(t_0) \xi_{t_3}(i)) \right) \right|, \quad (1)$$

where the unions are taken over $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$, x_i is the first vertex from $\xi_{t_1}(i)$ that P_i departs from Q_i , and y_i is the first vertex from $\xi_{t_1}(i)$ that $P_i(t_0)$ departs from $Q_i(t_0)$.

Lemma 7.1. *Let h and s be two positive integers, and let $\eta : T_h \hookrightarrow T$ be an injective cascade of height h and size s in a linked tree-decomposition (T, X) of a graph G . Then the cascade η can be turned into an ordered cascade with specified t_0 -linkages that are minimal for every major vertex $t_0 \in V(T_h)$.*

Proof. Let $s' := s - |I|$. To show that η can be made ordered let r be the minor root of T_h , let $\xi_r : \{1, 2, \dots, s'\} \rightarrow X_{\eta(r)} - I$ be arbitrary, assume that for some integer $l \in \{0, 1, \dots, h-1\}$ we have already constructed $\xi_t : \{1, 2, \dots, s'\} \rightarrow X_{\eta(t)} - I$ for all minor vertices $t \in V(T_h)$ at height at most l , let $t \in V(T_h)$ be a minor vertex at height exactly l , let t_0 be its child, and let (t, t_1, t_2) be the trinity at t_0 . By condition (W3) there exist s' disjoint paths $P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{s'}$ in $G \setminus I$ from $X_{\eta(t)} - I$ to $X_{\eta(t_1)} - I$ and s' disjoint paths $Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_{s'}$ in $G \setminus I$ from $X_{\eta(t)} - I$ to $X_{\eta(t_2)} - I$. We may assume that $\xi_t(i)$ is an end of P_i and Q_i and we define $\xi_{t_1}(i)$ and $\xi_{t_2}(i)$ to be their other ends, respectively. We may also assume that these paths satisfy the minimality condition (1). It follows that η is an ordered cascade with orderings ξ_t and specified t_0 -linkages that are minimal for every major vertex $t_0 \in V(T_h)$. \square

Let h, h' be integers. We say that a homeomorphic embedding $\gamma : T_{h'} \hookrightarrow T_h$ is *monotone* if

- t is a major vertex of $T_{h'}$ with trinity (t_1, t_2, t_3) , then $\gamma(t_2)$ is the left neighbor of $\gamma(t)$ and $\gamma(t_3)$ is the right neighbor of $\gamma(t)$, and
- the image under γ of the minor root of $T_{h'}$ is the minor root of T_h .

Lemma 7.2. *For every two integers $a \geq 1$ and $k \geq 1$ there exists an integer $h = h(a, k)$ such that the following holds. Color the major vertices of T_h using k colors. Then there exists a monotone homeomorphic embedding $\eta : T_a \hookrightarrow T_h$ such that the major vertices of T_a map to major vertices of the same color in T_h .*

Proof. Let c be one of the colors. We will prove by induction on k and subject to that by induction on b that there is a function $h = g(a, b, k)$ such that there is either a monotone homeomorphic embedding $\eta : T_a \hookrightarrow T_h$ such that the major vertices of T_a map to major vertices of the same color in T_h , or a monotone homeomorphic embedding $\eta : T_b \hookrightarrow T_h$ such that the major vertices of T_b map to major vertices of color c in T_h . In fact, we will show that $g(a, b, 1) = a$, $g(a, 1, k+1) \leq g(a, a, k)$ and $g(a, b+1, k+1) \leq g(a, b, k+1) + g(a, a, k)$.

The assertion holds for $k = 1$ by letting $h = a$ and letting η be the identity mapping. Assume the statement is true for some $k \geq 1$, let the major vertices of T_h be colored using $k + 1$ colors, and let c be one of the colors. If $b = 1$, then if T_h has a major vertex colored c , then the second alternative holds; otherwise at most k colors are used and the assertion follows by induction on k .

We may therefore assume that the assertion holds for some integer $b \geq 1$ and we must prove it for $b + 1$. To that end we may assume that T_h has a major vertex t_0 colored c at height at most $g(a, a, k)$, for otherwise the assertion follows by induction on k . Let the trinity at t_0 be (t_1, t_2, t_3) . For $i = 2, 3$ let R_i be the subtree of T_h with minor root t_i . If for some $i \in \{2, 3\}$ there exists a monotone homeomorphic embedding $T_a \hookrightarrow R_i$ such that the major vertices of T_a map to major vertices of the same color in T_h , then the statement holds. We may therefore assume that for $i \in \{2, 3\}$ there exists a monotone homeomorphic embedding $\eta_i : T_b^i \hookrightarrow R_i$ such that the major vertices of T_b^i map to major vertices of color c , the major root of T_{b+1} is r_0 , the trinity at r_0 is (r_1, r_2, r_3) and T_b^i is the subtree of $T_{b+1} - \{r_0, r_1\}$ with minor root r_i . Let $\eta : T_{b+1} \hookrightarrow T_h$ be defined by $\eta(t) = \eta_i(t)$ for $t \in V(T_b^i)$, $\eta(r_0) = t_0$ and $\eta(r_1)$ is defined to be the minor root of T_h . Then $\eta : T_{b+1} \hookrightarrow T_h$ is as desired. This proves the existence of the function $g(a, b, k)$.

Now $h(a, k) = g(a, a, k)$ is as desired. \square

Let G be a graph, let $v \in V(G)$ and for $i = 1, 2, 3$ let P_i be a path in G with ends v and v_i such that the paths P_1, P_2, P_3 are pairwise disjoint, except for v . Assume that at least two of the paths P_i have length at least one. We say that $P_1 \cup P_2 \cup P_3$ is a *tripod* with *center* v and *feet* v_1, v_2, v_3 .

Let (T, X) be a tree-decomposition of a graph G , and let $\eta : T_h \hookrightarrow T$ be an injective cascade in (T, X) with common intersection set I . Let $t_0 \in V(T_h)$ be a major vertex, and let (t_1, t_2, t_3) be the trinity at t_0 . We define the η -*torso* at t_0 as the subgraph of G induced by $\bigcup X_t - I$, where the union is taken over all t in $V(T)$ such that the unique path in T from t to $\eta(t_0)$ does not contain $\eta(t_1), \eta(t_2)$, or $\eta(t_3)$ as an internal vertex.

Let $s > 0$ be an integer. Let (T, X) be a tree-decomposition of a graph G , let $\eta : T_h \hookrightarrow T$ be an ordered cascade in (T, X) of size $|I| + s$ and with orderings ξ_t , where I is the common intersection set of η . Let $t_0 \in V(T_h)$ be a major vertex, let (t_1, t_2, t_3) be the trinity at t_0 , let G' be the η -torso at t_0 , and let $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$ be distinct. We say that t_0 *has property* A_{ij} *in* η if there exist disjoint tripods L_i, L_j in G' such that for each $m \in \{i, j\}$ the tripod L_m has feet $\xi_{t_1}(m), \xi_{t_2}(m), \xi_{t_3}(m)$ for some $m_2, m_3 \in \{i, j\}$.

We say that t_0 *has property* B_{ij} *in* η if there exist vertices $v_{x,y}$ for all $x \in \{i, j\}, y \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, and tripods L_i, L_j in G' with centers c_i, c_j such that

- for each $y \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, $\{v_{i,y}, v_{j,y}\} = \{\xi_{t_y}(i), \xi_{t_y}(j)\}$
- for each $m \in \{i, j\}$, L_m has feet $v_{m,1}, v_{m,2}, v_{m,3}$
- $L_i \cap L_j = c_i L_i v_{i,3} \cap c_j L_j v_{j,2}$ and it is a path that does not contain c_i, c_j .

We say that t_0 *has property* C_{ij} *in* η if there exist three pairwise disjoint paths R_i, R_j, R_{ij} and a path R in G' such that the ends of R_i are $\xi_{t_1}(i)$ and $\xi_{t_2}(i)$, the ends of R_j are $\xi_{t_1}(j)$ and $\xi_{t_3}(j)$, the ends of R_{ij} are $\xi_{t_2}(j)$ and $\xi_{t_3}(i)$, and R is internally disjoint

from R_i, R_j, R_{ij} and connects two of these three paths. We will denote these paths as $R_i(t_0), R_j(t_0), R_{ij}(t_0), R(t_0)$ when we want to emphasize they are in the torso at the major vertex t_0 .

We say that the path P_i of a left or right t_0 -linkage is *confined* if it is a subgraph of the η -torso at t_0 .

Now let $\eta : T_h \hookrightarrow T$ be an ordered cascade in (T, X) with orderings ξ_t and specified linkages. Let $t_0 \in V(T_h)$ be a major vertex with trinity (t_1, t_2, t_3) , and let P_1, P_2, \dots, P_s be the left specified t_0 -linkage. We define A_{t_0} to be the set of integers $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$ such that the path P_i is confined, and we define B_{t_0} in the same way but using the right specified t_0 -linkage instead. Define C_{t_0} as the set of all triples (i, l, m) such that $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$, the path P_i is not confined and when following P_i from $\xi_{t_1}(i)$, it exits the η -torso at t_0 for the first time at $\xi_{t_3}(l)$ and re-enters the η -torso at t_0 for the last time at $\xi_{t_3}(m)$. Let D_{t_0} be defined similarly, but using the right t_0 -linkage instead. We call the sets $A_{t_0}, B_{t_0}, C_{t_0}$ and D_{t_0} the *confinement sets for η at t_0 with respect to the specified linkages*.

Let A_{t_0} and B_{t_0} be the confinement sets for η at t_0 . We say that t_0 *has property C* in η if s is even, A_{t_0} and B_{t_0} are disjoint and both have size $s/2$, and there exist disjoint paths $R_1, R_2, \dots, R_{3s/2}$ in G' in such a way that

- each R_i is a subpath of both the left specified t_0 -linkage and the right specified t_0 -linkage,
- for $i \in A_{t_0}$, the path R_i has ends $\xi_{t_1}(i)$ and $\xi_{t_2}(i)$,
- for $i \in B_{t_0}$ the path R_i has ends $\xi_{t_1}(i)$ and $\xi_{t_3}(i)$, and
- for $i = s + 1, s + 2, \dots, 3s/2$ the path R_i has one end $\xi_{t_2}(k)$ and the other and $\xi_{t_3}(l)$ for some $k \in B_{t_0}$ and $l \in A_{t_0}$.

Let (T, X) be a tree-decomposition of a graph G , let $\eta : T_h \hookrightarrow T$ be a cascade in (T, X) and let $\gamma : T_{h'} \hookrightarrow T_h$ be a monotone homeomorphic embedding. Then the composite mapping $\eta' := \eta \circ \gamma : T_{h'} \hookrightarrow T$ is a cascade in (T, X) of height h' , and we will call it a *subcascade of η* .

Lemma 7.3. *Let (T, X) be a tree-decomposition of a graph G , let $\eta : T_h \hookrightarrow T$ be an ordered cascade in (T, X) with orderings ξ_t , specified linkages and common intersection set I , let $\gamma : T_{h'} \hookrightarrow T_h$ be a monotone homeomorphic embedding, and let $\eta' := \eta \circ \gamma : T_{h'} \hookrightarrow T$ be a subcascade of η of height h' . Then for every major vertex $t_0 \in V(T_{h'})$*

- (i) η' is an ordered cascade with orderings $\xi_{\gamma(t)}$ and common intersection set I ,
- (ii) if the vertex $\gamma(t_0)$ has property A_{ij} (B_{ij}, C_{ij} , resp.) in η , then t_0 has property A_{ij} (B_{ij}, C_{ij} , resp.) in η' .

Furthermore, the specified linkages for η' may be chosen in such a way that

- (iii) $(A_{t_0}, B_{t_0}, C_{t_0}, D_{t_0}) = (A_{\gamma(t_0)}, B_{\gamma(t_0)}, C_{\gamma(t_0)}, D_{\gamma(t_0)})$,

- (iv) the vertex t_0 has property C in η' if and only if $\gamma(t_0)$ has property C in η , and
- (v) if the specified linkages for η are minimal, then the specified linkages for η' are minimal.

Proof. For each major vertex $t \in V(T_{h'})$ or $t \in V(T_h)$ we denote its trinity by $(t_1(t), t_2(t), t_3(t))$. Assume t_0 is a major vertex of $T_{h'}$. Let $v_0 = \gamma(t_1(t_0)), v_1, \dots, v_k = t_1(\gamma(t_0))$ be the minor vertices on $T_h[v_0, v_k]$. Let U be the union of the left (or right) linkage from $X_{\eta(v_i)} - I$ to $X_{\eta(v_{i+1})} - I$ for all $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$ depending on whether v_{i+1} is a left (or right) neighbor of its parent. Let P be the left specified $\gamma(t_0)$ -linkage and Q be the right specified $\gamma(t_0)$ -linkage. Then $U \cup P$ is a left t_0 -linkage and $U \cup Q$ is a right t_0 -linkage. We designate $U \cup P$ to be the left specified t_0 -linkage and $U \cup Q$ to be the right specified t_0 -linkage. It is easy to see that this choice satisfies the conclusion of the lemma. \square

Let (T, X) be a tree-decomposition of a graph G , and let η be an ordered cascade with specified linkages in (T, X) of height h and size $|I| + s$, where I is the common intersection set. We say that η is *regular* if there exist sets $A, B \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$, and sets C and D such that the confinement sets $A_{t_0}, B_{t_0}, C_{t_0}$ and D_{t_0} satisfy $A_{t_0} = A, B_{t_0} = B, C_{t_0} = C$ and $D_{t_0} = D$ for every major vertex $t_0 \in V(T_h)$.

Lemma 7.4. *For every two positive integers a and s there exists a positive integer $h = h(a, s)$ such that the following holds. Let (T, X) be a linked tree-decomposition of a graph G . If there exists an injective cascade η of height h in (T, X) , then there exists a regular cascade $\eta' : T_a \hookrightarrow T$ of height a in (T, X) with specified t_0 -linkages that are minimal for every major vertex $t_0 \in V(T_a)$ such that η' has the same size and common intersection set as η .*

Proof. Let η be an injective cascade of size $|I| + s$ and height h in (T, X) , where we will specify h in a moment. By Lemma 7.1 η can be turned into an ordered cascade with specified t_0 -linkages that are minimal for every major vertex $t_0 \in V(T_h)$. For every major vertex $t_0 \in V(T_h)$, the number of possible quadruples $(A_{t_0}, B_{t_0}, C_{t_0}, D_{t_0})$ is a finite number $k = k(s)$ that depends only on s .

Consider each choice of $(A_{t_0}, B_{t_0}, C_{t_0}, D_{t_0})$ as a color; then by Lemma 7.2, there exists a positive integer $h = h(a, k)$ such that there exists a monotone homeomorphic embedding $\gamma : T_a \hookrightarrow T_h$ such that the quadruple $(A_{\gamma(t)}, B_{\gamma(t)}, C_{\gamma(t)}, D_{\gamma(t)})$ for η is the same for every $t \in V(T_a)$. Now, let $\eta' = \eta \circ \gamma : T_a \rightarrow T$. Then η' is as desired by Lemma 7.3. \square

The following is the main result of this section.

Theorem 7.5. *For any two positive integers a and w , there exists a positive integer $p = p(a, w)$ such that the following holds. Let G be a 2-connected graph of tree-width less than w and path-width at least p . Then G has a tree-decomposition (T, X) such that:*

- (T, X) has width less than w ,
- (T, X) satisfies (W1)–(W7), and

- for some s , where $2 \leq s \leq w$, there exists a regular cascade $\eta : T_a \hookrightarrow T$ of height a and size s in (T, X) with specified t_0 -linkages that are minimal for every major vertex $t_0 \in V(T_a)$.

Proof. Given positive integers a and w let h be as in Lemma 7.4, and let $p = p(h, w)$ be as in Lemma 6.6. We claim that p satisfies the conclusion of the theorem. To see that let G be a graph of tree-width less than w and path-width at least p . By Theorem 3.4, G admits a tree-decomposition (T, X) of width less than w satisfying (W1)–(W7). By Lemma 6.6 there is an injective cascade of height h in (T, X) . Let s be the size of this cascade, then $s \leq w$. If G is 2-connected, then $s \geq 2$. The last conclusion of the theorem follows from Lemma 7.4. \square

8 Taming Linkages

Lemma 8.6, the main result of this section, states that there are essentially only two types of linkage.

Let $s > 0$ be an integer. Let (T, X) be a tree-decomposition of a graph G , let $\eta : T_h \hookrightarrow T$ be an ordered cascade in (T, X) of size $|I| + s$ and with orderings ξ_t , where I is the common intersection set of η . Let $t_0 \in V(T_h)$ be a major vertex, let (t_1, t_2, t_3) be the trinity at t_0 , let G' be the η -torso at t_0 , and let $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$ be distinct. We say that t_0 has property AB_{ij} in η if there exist disjoint paths L_i, L_j and disjoint paths R_i, R_j in G' such that the two ends of L_m are $\xi_{t_1}(m)$ and $\xi_{t_2}(m)$ for each $m \in \{i, j\}$ and the two ends of R_m are $\xi_{t_1}(m)$ and $\xi_{t_3}(m)$ for each $m \in \{i, j\}$.

If P is a path and $u, v \in V(P)$, then by uPv we denote the subpath of P with ends u and v .

Lemma 8.1. *Let (T, X) be a tree-decomposition of a graph G . Let $\eta : T_1 \hookrightarrow T$ be an ordered cascade in (T, X) with orderings ξ_t of height one and size $s + |I|$, where I is the common intersection set. Let t_0 be the major vertex in T_1 , and let $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$ be distinct. If t_0 has property AB_{ij} in η , then t_0 has either property A_{ij} or property B_{ij} in η .*

Proof. Let (t_1, t_2, t_3) be the trinity at t_0 . Let G' be the η -torso at t_0 . Since t_0 has property AB_{ij} in η , there exist disjoint paths L_i, L_j and disjoint paths R_i, R_j in G' such that two endpoints of L_m are $\xi_{t_1}(m)$ and $\xi_{t_2}(m)$ for all $m \in \{i, j\}$, and two endpoints of R_m are $\xi_{t_1}(m)$ and $\xi_{t_3}(m)$ for all $m \in \{i, j\}$.

We may choose L_i, L_j, R_i, R_j such that $|E(L_i) \cup E(L_j) \cup E(R_i) \cup E(R_j)|$ is as small as possible.

Let $x_k = \xi_{t_1}(k)$ and $z_k = \xi_{t_3}(k)$ for $k \in \{i, j\}$. Starting from z_i , let a be the first vertex where R_i meets $L_i \cup L_j$, and starting from z_j , let b be the first vertex where R_j meets $L_i \cup L_j$. If a and b are not on the same path (one on L_i and the other on L_j), then by considering L_i, L_j and the parts of R_i and R_j from z_i to a and from z_j to b we see that t_0 has property A_{ij} in η .

If a and b are on the same path, then we may assume they are on L_i . We may also assume that $a \in L_i[y_i, b]$. Then following R_i from a away from z_i , the paths R_i and L_i

eventually split; let c be the vertex where the split occurs. In other words, c is such that $aL_i c \cap aR_i c$ is a path and its length is maximum. Let d be the first vertex on $cR_i x_i \cap (L_i \cup L_j) - \{c\}$ when traveling on R_i from c to x_i . If $d \in V(L_i)$, then by replacing $cL_i d$ by $cR_i d$ we obtain a contradiction to the choice of L_i, L_j, R_i, R_j . Thus $d \in V(L_j)$. Now L_i, L_j and the paths $z_i R_i d$ and $z_j R_j b$ show that t_0 has property B_{ij} in η . \square

Let (T, X) be a tree-decomposition of a graph G and let $\eta : T_h \hookrightarrow T$ be an injective cascade in (T, X) of height h and size $|I| + s$, where I is the common intersection set. Let v be a vertex of T_h and let Y consist of $\eta(v)$ and the vertex-sets of all components of $T \setminus \eta(v)$ that do not contain the image under η of the minor root of T_h . Let H be the subgraph of G induced by $\bigcup_{t \in Y} X_t - I$. We will call H the *outer graph at v* .

Lemma 8.2. *Let (T, X) be a tree-decomposition satisfying (W6) of a graph G and let $\eta : T_h \hookrightarrow T$ be an ordered cascade in (T, X) of height h and size $|I| + s$, where I is the common intersection set. Let v be a minor vertex of T_h at height at most $h - 1$, let H be the outer graph at v , and let $x, y \in X_{\eta(v)}$. Then there exists a path of length at least two with ends x and y and every internal vertex in $V(H) - X_{\eta(v)}$.*

Proof. Let v_0 be the child of v , let v_1 be a child of v_0 , and let B be the component of $T - \eta(v)$ that contains $\eta(v_1)$. We show that x is B -tied. This is obvious if $x \in I$, and so we may assume that $x \notin I$. Since η is ordered, there exist s disjoint paths from $X_{\eta(v)} - I$ to $X_{\eta(v_1)} - I$ in $G \setminus I$. It follows that each of the paths uses exactly one vertex of $X_{\eta(v)} - I$, and that vertex is its end. Let P be the one of those paths that ends in x , and let x' be the neighbor of x in P . The vertex x' exists, because $X_{\eta(v)} \cap X_{\eta(v_1)} = I$. By (W1) there exists a vertex $t \in V(T)$ such that $x, x' \in X_t$. Since $P - x$ is disjoint from $X_{\eta(v)}$, it follows from Lemma 3.1 applied to the path $P - x$ and vertices t and $\eta(v_1)$ of T that $t \in V(B)$. Thus x is B -tied and the same argument shows that so is y . Hence the lemma follows from (W6). \square

We will refer to a path as in Lemma 8.2 as a *W6-path*.

Let h, h' be integers. We say that a homeomorphic embedding $\gamma : T_{h'} \hookrightarrow T_h$ is *weakly monotone* if for every two vertices $t, t' \in V(T_{h'})$

- if t' is a descendant of t in $T_{h'}$, then the vertex $\gamma(t')$ is a descendant of $\gamma(t)$ in T_h
- if t is a minor vertex of $T_{h'}$, then the vertex $\gamma(t)$ is minor in T_h .

Let (T, X) be a tree-decomposition of a graph G , let $\eta : T_h \hookrightarrow T$ be a cascade in (T, X) and let $\gamma : T_{h'} \hookrightarrow T_h$ be a weakly monotone homeomorphic embedding. Then the composite mapping $\eta' := \eta \circ \gamma : T_{h'} \hookrightarrow T$ is a cascade in (T, X) of height h' , and we will call it a *weak subcascade of η* .

Lemma 8.3. *Let $s \geq 2$ be an integer, let (T, X) be a tree-decomposition of a graph G satisfying (W6), and let $\eta : T_5 \hookrightarrow T$ be a regular cascade in (T, X) of height five and size $|I| + s$ with specified linkages that are minimal, where I is the common intersection set of η . Then either there exists a weak subcascade $\eta' : T_1 \hookrightarrow T$ of η of height one such that the unique major vertex of T_1 has property A_{ij} or B_{ij} in η' for some distinct integers $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$, or the major root of T_5 has property C in η .*

Proof. We will either construct a weakly monotone homeomorphic embedding $\gamma : T_1 \hookrightarrow T_5$ such that in $\eta' = \eta \circ \gamma$ the major root of T_1 will have property AB_{ij} for some distinct $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$, or establish that the major root of T_5 has property C in η . By Lemma 8.1 this will suffice.

Since η is regular, there exist sets A, B, C, D as in the definition of regular cascade. Let t_0 be the unique major vertex of T_1 and let (t_1, t_2, t_3) be its trinity. Let u_0 be the major root of T_5 and let (v_1, v_2, v_3) be its trinity. Let u_1 be the major vertex of T_5 of height one that is adjacent to v_3 and let (v_3, v_4, v_5) be its trinity. Let us recall that for a major vertex u of T_5 we denote the paths in the specified left u -linkage by $P_i(u)$ and the paths in the specified right u -linkage by $Q_i(u)$. If there exist two distinct integers $i, j \in A \cap B$, then the paths $P_i(u_0), P_j(u_0), Q_i(u_0), Q_j(u_0)$ show that u_0 has property AB_{ij} in η . Let $\gamma : T_1 \hookrightarrow T_5$ be the homeomorphic embedding that maps t_0, t_1, t_2, t_3 to u_0, v_1, v_2, v_3 , respectively. Then $\eta' = \eta \circ \gamma$ is as desired. We may therefore assume that $|A \cap B| \leq 1$.

For $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\} - A$ the path $P_i(u_0)$ exits and re-enters the η -torso at u_0 , and it does so through two distinct vertices of $X_{\eta(v_3)}$. But $|X_{\eta(v_3)} - I| = s$, and hence $|A| \geq s/2$. Similarly $|B| \geq s/2$. By symmetry we may assume that $|B| \geq |A|$. It follows that $|A| = \lceil s/2 \rceil$, and hence for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\} - A$ and every major vertex w of T_5 the path $P_i(w)$ exits and re-enters the η -torso at w exactly once. The set C includes an element of the form (i, l, m) , which means that the vertices $\xi_{w_1}(i), \xi_{w_3}(l), \xi_{w_3}(m), \xi_{w_2}(i)$ appear on the path $P_i(w)$ in the order listed. Let $l_i := l, m_i := m, x_i(w) := \xi_{w_3}(l), y_i(w) := \xi_{w_3}(m), X_i(w) := \xi_{w_1}(i)P_i(w)x_i(w)$ and $Y_i(w) := y_i(w)P_i(w)\xi_{w_2}(i)$. Thus $X_i(w)$ and $Y_i(w)$ are subpaths of the η -torso at w . We distinguish two main cases.

Main case 1: $|A \cap B| = 1$. Let j be the unique element of $A \cap B$. We claim that $B - A \neq \emptyset$. To prove the claim suppose for a contradiction that $B \subseteq A$. Thus $|B| = 1$, and since $|B| \geq |A|$ we have $|A| = 1$, and hence $s = 2$. We may assume, for the duration of this paragraph, that $A = B = \{1\}$. The paths $P_1(u_0), X_2(u_0), Y_2(u_0)$ are pairwise disjoint, because they are subgraphs of the specified left u_0 -linkage. The path $Q_2(u_0)$ is unconfined, and hence it has a subpath R joining $\xi_{v_2}(1)$ and $\xi_{v_2}(2)$ in the outer graph at v_2 . It follows that $P_1(u_0) \cup R \cup Y_2(u_0)$ and $X_2(u_0)$ are disjoint paths from $X_{\eta(v_1)}$ to $X_{\eta(v_3)}$, and it follows from the minimality of the specified u_0 -linkage that they form the specified right u_0 -linkage, contrary to $1 \in A$. This proves the claim that $B - A \neq \emptyset$, and so we may select an element $i \in B - A$.




Figure 1: First case of the construction of the path R .

Let us assume as a case that either $l_i \in A$ or $l_i \notin B$. In this case we let γ map t_0, t_1, t_2, t_3 to u_0, v_1, v_2, v_5 , respectively, and we will prove that t_0 has property AB_{ij} in η' . To that end we need to construct two pairs of disjoint paths. The first pair is $Q_i(u_0) \cup Q_i(u_1)$ and $Q_j(u_0) \cup Q_j(u_1)$. The second pair will consist of $P_j(u_0)$ and another path from $\xi_{v_1}(i)$ to $\xi_{v_2}(i)$ which is a subgraph of a walk that we are about to construct. It will consist of $X_i(u_0) \cup Y_i(u_0)$ and a walk R in the outer graph of v_3 with ends $x_i(u_0)$ and $y_i(u_0)$. To construct the walk R we will construct paths R_1, R_2 and a walk R_3 , whose union will contain the desired walk R . If $l_i \in A$, then we let $R_1 := P_{l_i}(u_1)$. If $l_i \notin B$, then the path $Q_{l_i}(u_1)$ is unconfined, and hence includes a subpath R_1 from $x_i(u_0)$ to $X_{\eta(v_4)}$ that is a subgraph of the η -torso at u_1 . We need to distinguish two subcases depending on whether $m_i \in B$. Assume first that $m_i \notin B$ and refer to Figure 1. Then similarly as above the path $Q_{m_i}(u_1)$ is unconfined, and hence includes a subpath R_3 from $y_i(u_0)$ to $X_{\eta(v_4)}$ that is a subgraph of the η -torso at u_1 , and we let R_2 be a W6-path in the outer graph at v_4 joining the ends of R_1 and R_3 in $X_{\eta(v_4)}$. This completes the subcase $m_i \notin B$, and so we may assume that $m_i \in B$. In this subcase we define $R_3 := Y_i(u_1) \cup Q_{m_i}(u_1)$ and we define R_2 as above. See Figure 2. This completes the case that either $l_i \in A$ or $l_i \notin B$.




Figure 2: Second case of the construction of the path R .

Next we consider the case $l_i \in B$ and $m_i \notin A - B$. We proceed similarly as in the previous paragraph, but with these exceptions: the homeomorphic embedding γ will map t_3 to v_4 , rather than v_5 , the first pair of disjoint paths will now be $Q_i(u_0) \cup P_i(u_1)$ and $Q_j(u_0) \cup P_j(u_1)$, and for the second pair we define $R_1 = Q_{l_i}(u_1)$, $R_3 = X_{m_i}(u_1)$ if $m_i \notin A$ and $R_3 = Q_{m_i}(u_1)$ if $m_i \in B$, and R_2 will be a W6-path in the outer graph of v_5 joining the ends of R_1 and R_3 .

Therefore assume that $l_i \in B - A$ and $m_i \in A - B$ for every $i \in B - A$. Let u_2 be the major vertex of T_5 at height two whose trinity includes v_5 and assume its trinity is (v_5, v_6, v_7) . Let u_3 be the major vertex of T_5 at height three whose trinity includes v_7 and assume its trinity is (v_7, v_8, v_9) . Let γ map t_0, t_1, t_2, t_3 to u_0, v_1, v_2, v_8 , respectively. Then t_0 also has property AB_{ij} in η' . To see that the first pair of disjoint paths is $Q_i(u_0) \cup Q_i(u_1) \cup Q_i(u_2) \cup P_i(u_3)$ and $Q_j(u_0) \cup Q_j(u_1) \cup Q_j(u_2) \cup P_j(u_3)$. The first path of the second pair is $P_j(u_0)$. Let $R_1 = Y_i(u_0) \cup Q_{m_i}(u_1) \cup P_{m_i}(u_2)$, $R_2 = P_j(u_2) \cup Q_j(u_2) \cup Q_j(u_3)$, and $R_3 = X_i(u_0) \cup Q_{l_i}(u_1) \cup X_{l_i}(u_2) \cup X_{l_i}(u_3)$. Then the second path of the second pair is a path from $\xi_{v_1}(i)$ to $\xi_{v_2}(i)$ that is a subgraph of $R_1 \cup R_2 \cup R_3 \cup R_4 \cup R_5$, where R_4 is a W6-path in the outer graph of v_6 joining the ends of R_1 and R_2 , and R_5 is a W6-path in

the outer graph of v_9 joining the ends of R_2 and R_3 . See Figure 3. This completes main case 1.




Figure 3: Second pair when $l_i \in B - A$ and $m_i \in A - B$.

Main case 2: $A \cap B = \emptyset$. It follows that s is even and $|A| = |B| = s/2$. Assume as a case that for some integer $i \in B$ either $l_i, m_i \in A$ or $l_i, m_i \in B$. But the integers l_i, m_i are pairwise distinct, and so if $l_i, m_i \in A$, then there exists $j \in B$ such that $l_j, m_j \in B$, and similarly if $l_i, m_i \in B$. We may therefore assume that $l_i, m_i \in A$ and $l_j, m_j \in B$ for some distinct $i, j \in B$. Let us recall that u_2 is the child of v_5 and (v_5, v_6, v_7) is its trinity. We let γ map t_0, t_1, t_2, t_3 to u_0, v_1, v_2, v_6 , respectively, and we will prove that t_0 has property AB_{ij} in η' . To that end we need to construct two pairs of disjoint paths. The first pair is $Q_i(u_0) \cap Q_i(u_1) \cap P_i(u_2)$ and $Q_j(u_0) \cap Q_j(u_1) \cap P_j(u_2)$. The first path of the second pair will consist of the union of $X_i(u_0)$ with a subpath of $Q_{l_i}(u_1)$ from $X_{\eta(v_3)}$ to $X_{\eta(v_4)}$, and $Y_i(u_0)$ with a subpath of $Q_{m_i}(u_1)$ from $X_{\eta(v_3)}$ to $X_{\eta(v_4)}$, and a suitable W6-path in the outer graph of v_4 joining their ends, and the second path will consist of the union of $X_j(u_0) \cup Q_{l_j}(u_1) \cup Q_{l_j}(u_2)$ and $Y_j(u_0) \cup Q_{m_j}(u_1) \cup Q_{m_j}(u_2)$ and a suitable W6-path in the outer graph of v_7 joining their ends. See Figure 4. This completes the case that for some integer $i \in B$ either $l_i, m_i \in A$ or $l_i, m_i \in B$.

We may therefore assume that for every $i \in B$ one of l_i, m_i belongs to A and the other belongs to B . Let us recall that for every $i \in B$ a subpath of $P_i(u_0)$ joins $\xi_{v_3}(l_i)$ to $\xi_{v_3}(m_i)$ in the outer graph at v_3 and is disjoint from the η -torso at u_0 , except for its ends. Let J be the union of these subpaths; then J is a linkage from $\{\xi_{v_3}(i) : i \in A\}$ to $\{\xi_{v_3}(i) : i \in B\}$. For $i \in B$ the path $Q_i(u_0)$ is a subgraph of the η -torso at u_0 . For $i \in A$ the intersection of the path $Q_i(u_0)$ with the η -torso at u_0 consists of two paths, one from $X_{\eta(v_1)}$ to $X_{\eta(v_2)}$, and the other from $X_{\eta(v_2)}$ to $X_{\eta(v_3)}$. Let L denote the union of these subpaths over all $i \in A$. It follows that $J \cup L \cup \bigcup_{i \in B} Q_i(u_0)$ is a linkage from $X_{\eta(v_1)}$ to $X_{\eta(v_2)}$, and so by the minimality of the specified u_0 -linkages, it is equal to the specified left u_0 -linkage. It follows that u_0 has property C in η . \square




Figure 4: Second pair when $l_i, m_i \in A$ and $l_j, m_j \in B$ for some distinct $i, j \in B$.

Lemma 8.4. *Let (T, X) be a tree-decomposition of a graph G satisfying (W6) and (W7). If there exists a regular cascade $\eta : T_3 \hookrightarrow T$ with orderings ξ_t in which every major vertex has property C, then there is a weak subcascade η' of η of height one such that the major vertex in η' has property C_{ij} for some i, j .*

Proof. Let the common confinement sets for η be A, B, C, D . For a major vertex $w \in V(T_3)$ with trinity (v_1, v_2, v_3) there are disjoint paths in the η -torso at w as in the definition of property C. For $a \in A$ and $b \in B$ let $R_a(w)$ denote the path with ends $\xi_{v_1}(a)$ and $\xi_{v_2}(a)$, let $R_b(w)$ denote the path with ends $\xi_{v_1}(b)$ and $\xi_{v_3}(b)$, and let $R_{ab}(w)$ denote the path with ends $\xi_{v_2}(b)$ and $\xi_{v_3}(a)$.

Assume the major root of T_3 is u_0 and its trinity is (v_1, v_2, v_3) , and let I be the common intersection set of η . Then $\eta(v_1), \eta(v_2), \eta(v_3)$ is a triad in T with center $\eta(u_0)$ and for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ we have $X_{\eta(v_i)} \cap X_{\eta(u_0)} = I = X_{\eta(v_1)} \cap X_{\eta(v_2)} \cap X_{\eta(v_3)}$, and hence the triad is not X -separable by (W7). Thus by Lemma 3.1 there is a path $R(u_0)$ connecting two of the three sets of disjoint paths in the η -torso at u_0 . Assume without loss of generality that one end of $R(u_0)$ is in a path $R_i(u_0)$, where $i \in A$. Then the other end of $R(u_0)$ is either in a path $R_j(u_0)$, where $j \in B$; or in a path $R_{aj}(u_0)$, where $j \in B$ and $a \in A$. In the former case we define $a \in A$ to be such that $R_{aj}(u_0)$ is a path in the family.

Let the major root of T_1 be t_0 and its trinity be (t_1, t_2, t_3) . Let $\gamma(t_0) = u_0$, $\gamma(t_1) = v_1$, $\gamma(t_2) = v_2$. Let the major vertex that is the child of v_3 be u_1 , and the trinity of u_1 be (v_3, v_4, v_5) . Let $\gamma(t_3) = v_5$. We will prove that t_0 has property C_{ij} in $\eta' = \eta \circ \gamma$. Let $b \in B$ be such that $R_{ib}(u_1)$ is a member of the family of the disjoint paths in the η -torso at u_1 as in the definition of property C. By Lemma 8.2, there exists a W6-path P in the outer graph at v_4 joining $\xi_{v_4}(a)$ and $\xi_{v_4}(b)$. By considering the paths $R_a(u_0)$, $R_j(u_0) \cup R_j(u_1)$, $R_{aj}(u_0) \cup R_a(u_1) \cup P \cup R_{ib}(u_1)$ and $R(u_0)$ we find that t_0 has property C_{ij} in η' , as desired. \square

Lemma 8.5. *Let $s \geq 2$ be an integer and let (T, X) be a tree-decomposition of a graph G satisfying (W6). Let $\eta : T_3 \hookrightarrow T$ be an ordered cascade in (T, X) of height three and size $|I| + s$ with orderings ξ_t and common intersection set I such that every major vertex of T_3*

has property C_{ij} for some distinct $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$. Then there exists a weak subcascade $\eta' : T_1 \hookrightarrow T$ of η of height one such that the unique major vertex of T_1 has property B_{ij} in η' .

Proof. Assume that the three major vertices at height zero and one of T_3 are u_0, u_1, u_2 . Let the trinity at u_0 be (v_1, v_2, v_3) , the trinity at u_1 be (v_4, v_5, v_6) , and the trinity at u_2 be (v_7, v_8, v_9) . Assume the major vertex of T_1 is t_0 , and its trinity is (t_1, t_2, t_3) . For a major vertex $w \in V(T_3)$ let $R_i(w), R_j(w), R_{ij}(w)$ and $R(w)$ be as in the definition of property C_{ij} .

We need to find a weakly monotone homeomorphic embedding $\gamma : T_1 \hookrightarrow T_3$ such that $\eta' = \eta \circ \gamma$ satisfies the requirement. Set $\gamma(t_0) = u_0$ and $\gamma(t_1) = v_1$. Our choice for $\gamma(t_2)$ will be v_4 or v_5 , depending on which two of the three paths $R_i(u_1), R_j(u_1), R_{ij}(u_1)$ in the torso at u_1 the path $R(u_1)$ is connecting. If $R(u_1)$ is between $R_i(u_1)$ and $R_j(u_1)$, then choose either v_4 or v_5 for $\gamma(t_2)$. If $R(u_1)$ is between $R_i(u_1)$ and $R_{ij}(u_1)$, then set $\gamma(t_2) = v_4$, and if it is between $R_j(u_1)$ and $R_{ij}(u_1)$, then set $\gamma(t_2) = v_5$. Do this similarly for $\gamma(t_3)$. Then $\eta' = \eta \circ \gamma$ will satisfy the requirement. In fact, we will prove this for the case when $R(u_1)$ is between $R_i(u_1)$ and $R_{ij}(u_1)$ and $R(u_2)$ is between $R_j(u_2)$ and $R_{ij}(u_2)$. See Figure 5. The other five cases are similar.




Figure 5: The case when $R(u_1)$ is between $R_i(u_1)$ and $R_{ij}(u_1)$ and $R(u_2)$ is between $R_j(u_2)$ and $R_{ij}(u_2)$.

In this case, our choice is $\gamma(t_0) = u_0, \gamma(t_1) = v_1, \gamma(t_2) = v_4, \gamma(t_3) = v_7$. Assume the two endpoints of $R(u_1)$ are x and y and the two endpoints of $R(u_2)$ are w and z . By Lemma 8.2, there exists a W6-path P_1 between $\xi_{v_5}(i)$ and $\xi_{v_5}(j)$ in the outer graph at v_5 and a W6-path P_2 between $\xi_{v_6}(i)$ and $\xi_{v_6}(j)$ in the outer graph at v_6 . Now let

$$P = yR_{ij}(u_1)\xi_{v_5}(i) \cup P_1 \cup R_j(u_1) \cup R_{ij}(u_0) \cup R_i(u_2) \cup P_2 \cup \xi_{v_6}(j)R_{ij}(u_2)w,$$

$$L_i = R_i(u_0) \cup R_i(u_1) \cup R(u_1) \cup P \cup wR_{ij}(u_2)\xi_{v_7}(i)$$

and

$$L_j = R_j(u_0) \cup R_j(u_2) \cup R(u_2) \cup P \cup yR_{ij}(u_1)\xi_{v_4}(j).$$

The tripods L_i and L_j show that the major vertex of $\eta' = \eta \circ \gamma : T_1 \hookrightarrow T$ has property B_{ij} . \square

Lemma 8.6. *For every positive integers h' and $w \geq 2$ there exists a positive integer $h = h(h', w)$ such that the following holds. Let s be a positive integer such that $2 \leq s \leq w$. Let (T, X) be a tree-decomposition of a graph G of width less than w and satisfying (W6) and (W7). Assume there exists a regular cascade $\eta : T_h \hookrightarrow T$ of size $|I| + s$ with specified linkages that are minimal, where I is its common intersection set. Then there exist distinct integers $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$ and a weak subcascade $\eta' : T_{h'} \hookrightarrow T$ of η of height h' such that*

- every major vertex of $T_{h'}$ has property A_{ij} in η' , or
- every major vertex of $T_{h'}$ has property B_{ij} in η'

Proof. Let $h(a, k)$ be the function of Lemma 7.2, let $a_3 = 3h'$, $a_2 = h(a_3, 2^{\binom{w}{2}})$, $a_1 = 5a_2$ and $h = h(a_1, 2)$. Consider having property C or not having property C as colors, then by Lemma 7.2 there exists a monotone homeomorphic embedding $\gamma : T_{a_1} \hookrightarrow T_h$ such that either $\gamma(t)$ has property C in η for every major vertex $t \in V(T_{a_1})$ or $\gamma(t)$ does not have property C in η for every major vertex $t \in V(T_{a_1})$. By Lemma 7.3 $\eta_1 = \eta \circ \gamma : T_{a_1} \hookrightarrow T$ is still a regular cascade with specified linkages that are minimal. Also, either t has property C in η_1 for every major vertex $t \in V(T_{a_1})$ or t does not have property C in η_1 for every major vertex $t \in V(T_{a_1})$.

If t has property C in η_1 for every major vertex $t \in V(T_{a_1})$, then by Lemma 8.4 there exists a weak subcascade η_2 of η_1 of height a_2 such that every major vertex of T_{a_2} has property C_{ij} in η_2 for some distinct $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$. Consider each choice of pair i, j as a color; then by Lemma 7.2 there exists a monotone homeomorphic embedding $\gamma_1 : T_{a_3} \hookrightarrow T_{a_2}$ such that for some distinct $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$, $\gamma_1(t)$ has property C_{ij} in η_2 for every major vertex $t \in V(T_{a_3})$. Let $\eta_3 = \eta_2 \circ \gamma_1$. Then by Lemma 7.3 this implies t has property C_{ij} in η_3 for every major vertex $t \in V(T_{a_3})$. Then by Lemma 8.5 there exists a weak subcascade $\eta_4 : h' \hookrightarrow a_3$ of η_3 such that every major vertex of $T_{h'}$ has property B_{ij} in η_4 . Hence η_4 is as desired.

If t does not have property C in η_1 for every major vertex $t \in V(T_{a_1})$, then by Lemma 8.3 there exists a weak subcascade η_2 of η_1 of height a_2 such that every major vertex of T_{a_2} has property A_{ij} or B_{ij} for some distinct $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$. Consider each property A_{ij} or B_{ij} as a color; then by Lemma 7.2 there exists a monotone homeomorphic embedding $\gamma_1 : T_{h'} \hookrightarrow T_{a_2}$ such that for some distinct $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$, either $\gamma_1(t)$ has property A_{ij} in η_2 for every major vertex $t \in V(T_{h'})$ or $\gamma_1(t)$ has property B_{ij} in η_2 for every major vertex $t \in V(T_{h'})$. Let $\eta_3 = \eta_2 \circ \gamma_1$. Then t has property A_{ij} in η_3 for every major vertex $t \in V(T_{h'})$ or t has property B_{ij} in η_3 for every major vertex $t \in V(T_{h'})$ by Lemma 7.3. Hence η_3 is as desired. \square

9 Proof of Theorem 1.3

By Lemmas 2.2 and 2.4 Theorem 1.3 is equivalent to the following theorem.

Theorem 9.1. *For any positive integer k , there exists a positive integer $p = p(k)$ such that for every 2-connected graph G , if G has path-width at least p , then G has a minor isomorphic to \mathcal{P}_k or \mathcal{Q}_k .*

We need the following three lemmas. We state them in greater generality than immediately necessary in order to be able to use them in a subsequent paper.

Definition For a positive integer k , let \mathcal{P}'_k be the graph consisting of CT_k plus two distinct vertices each adjacent to every leaf of CT_k , let \mathcal{P}''_k be the graph consisting of CT_k plus three distinct vertices each adjacent to every leaf of CT_k , let \mathcal{Q}'_k be \mathcal{Q}_k plus a vertex, called the *apex*, adjacent to its vertices of degree two, and let \mathcal{Q}''_k be \mathcal{Q}_k plus two vertices, called the *apices*, each adjacent to its vertices of degree two.

Lemma 9.2. *Let (T, X) be a tree-decomposition of a graph G satisfying (W6), let $k \geq 1$ be an integer, let $h = 2k + 1$, let $\eta : T_h \hookrightarrow T$ be an ordered cascade in (T, X) with orderings ξ_t of height h and size $s + |I|$, where I is the common intersection set, and let $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$ be distinct and such that every major vertex of T_h has property A_{ij} in η . Then*

- (i) G has a minor isomorphic to \mathcal{P}_h ,
- (ii) if $|I| \geq 1$, then G has a minor isomorphic to \mathcal{P}'_h , and
- (iii) if $|I| \geq 2$, then G has a minor isomorphic to \mathcal{P}''_h .

Proof. We only prove (iii), since the other two statements are analogous, and, in fact, easier. Let R be the union of the corresponding tripods as in the definition of property A_{ij} , over all major vertices $t \in V(T_h)$ at height at most $h - 2$. It follows that R is the union of two disjoint trees, each containing a subtree isomorphic to CT_k . Let t be a minor vertex of T_h at height $h - 1$, and let $x, y \in I$. By Lemma 8.2 there exist W6-paths with ends u and v in the outer graph at t for every pair of distinct vertices $u, v \in \{\xi_t(i), \xi_t(j), x, y\}$. By contracting one of the trees comprising R and by considering these W6-paths we deduce that G has a \mathcal{P}''_k minor, as desired. \square

Lemma 9.3. *Let (T, X) be a tree-decomposition of a graph G satisfying (W6), let $h \geq 1$ be an integer, let $\eta : T_h \hookrightarrow T$ be an ordered cascade in (T, X) with orderings ξ_t of height h and size $s + |I|$, where I is the common intersection set, and let $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$ be distinct and such that every major vertex of T_h has property B_{ij} in η . Let t be the minor root of T_h , and let $w_1 w_2$ be the base edge of \mathcal{Q}_h . Then*

- (i) G has a minor isomorphic to $\mathcal{Q}_h - w_1 w_2$ in such a way that $\xi_t(i)$ belongs to the node of w_1 and $\xi_t(j)$ belongs to the node of w_2 ,
- (ii) if $x \in I$, then G has a minor isomorphic to $\mathcal{Q}'_{h-1} - w_1 w_2$ in such a way that $\xi_t(i)$ belongs to the node of w_1 , $\xi_t(j)$ belongs to the node of w_2 and x belongs to the node of the apex, and
- (iii) if $x, y \in I$ are distinct, then G has a minor isomorphic to $\mathcal{Q}''_{h-1} - w_1 w_2$ in such a way that $\xi_t(i)$ belongs to the node of w_1 , $\xi_t(j)$ belongs to the node of w_2 and x and y belong to the nodes of the apices, respectively.

Proof. We only prove (i), noting that the other two statements follow similarly as the previous lemma. We proceed by induction on h . Let t_0 be the major root of T_h , let (t_1, t_2, t_3) be its trinity, and let L_i and L_j be the tripods in the η -torso at t_0 as in the definition of property B_{ij} . The graph $L_i \cup L_j$ contains a path P joining $\xi_{t_1}(i)$ to $\xi_{t_1}(j)$, which shows that the lemma holds for $h = 1$.

We may therefore assume that $h > 1$ and that the lemma holds for $h-1$. For $k \in \{2, 3\}$ let R_k be the subtree of T_h rooted at t_k , let η_k be the restriction of η to R_k , and let G_k be the subgraph of G induced by $\bigcup\{X_r : r \in sp(\eta_k)\}$. By the induction hypothesis applied to η_k and G_k , the graph G_k has a minor isomorphic to $\mathcal{Q}_{h-1} - u_1u_2$ in such a way that $\xi_{t_k}(i)$ belongs to the node of u_1 and $\xi_{t_k}(j)$ belongs to the node of u_2 , where u_1u_2 is the base edge of \mathcal{Q}_{h-1} . By using these two minors, the path P and the rest of the tripods L_i and L_j we find that G has the desired minor. \square

Lemma 9.4. *For every two integers $w, k \geq 1$ there exists an integer $h \geq 2k + 1$ such that the following holds. Let (T, X) be a tree-decomposition of a graph G of width less than w satisfying (W6) and (W7), and let $\eta : T_h \hookrightarrow T$ be a regular cascade in (T, X) of height h and size $s + |I|$ with specified t_0 -linkages that are minimal for every major vertex $t_0 \in V(T_h)$, where $s \geq 2$ and I is the common intersection set. Then*

- (i) G has a minor isomorphic to \mathcal{P}_k or \mathcal{Q}_k ,
- (ii) if $|I| \geq 1$, then G has a minor isomorphic to \mathcal{P}'_k or \mathcal{Q}'_k , and
- (iii) if $|I| \geq 2$, then G has a minor isomorphic to \mathcal{P}''_k or \mathcal{Q}''_k .

Proof. Let $h' = 2k + 1$ and let $h = h(h', w)$ be the number as in Lemma 8.6. We claim that h satisfies the conclusion of the lemma. To prove that let $G, (T, X)$ and η be as in the statement of the lemma. By Lemma 8.6 there exist distinct integers $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$ and a weak subcascade $\eta' : T_{h'} \hookrightarrow T$ of η of height h' such that

- every major vertex of $T_{h'}$ has property A_{ij} in η' , or
- every major vertex of $T_{h'}$ has property B_{ij} in η'

If every major vertex of $T_{h'}$ has property A_{ij} in η' , then by Lemma 9.2 G has a minor isomorphic to \mathcal{P}_k , as desired. We may therefore assume that every major vertex of $T_{h'}$ has property B_{ij} in η' . It follows from Lemma 9.3 that G has a minor isomorphic to $\mathcal{Q}_{h'-1}$, as desired. This proves (i). The other two statements follow similarly. \square

We deduce Theorem 9.1 from the following lemma.

Lemma 9.5. *Let k and w be positive integers. There exists a number $p = p(k, w)$ such that for every 2-connected graph G , if G has tree-width less than w and path-width at least p , then G has a minor isomorphic to \mathcal{P}_k or \mathcal{Q}_k .*

Proof. Let $h = h(k, w)$ be the number as in Lemma 9.4, and let p be as in Theorem 7.5 applied to $a = h$ and w . We claim that p satisfies the conclusion of the lemma. By Theorem 7.5, there exists a tree-decomposition (T, X) of G such that:

- (T, X) has width less than w ,
- (T, X) satisfies (W1)–(W7), and
- for some s , where $2 \leq s \leq w$, there exists a regular cascade $\eta : T_h \leftrightarrow T$ of height h and size s in (T, X) with specified t_0 -linkages that are minimal for every major vertex $t_0 \in V(T_h)$.

Let I be the common intersection set of η , let ξ_t be the orderings, and let $s_1 = s - |I|$. Then $s_1 \geq 1$ by the definition of injective cascade.

Assume first that $s_1 = 1$. Since $s \geq 2$, it follows that $I \neq \emptyset$. Let $x \in I$. Let R be the union of the left and right specified t -linkage with respect to η , over all major vertices $t \in V(T_h)$ at height at most $h - 2$. The minimality of the specified linkages implies that R has a subtree isomorphic to a subdivision of $CT_{\lfloor (h-1)/2 \rfloor}$. Let t be a minor vertex of T_h at height $h - 1$. By Lemma 8.2 there exists a W6-path with ends $\xi_t(1)$ and x and every internal vertex in the outer graph at t . Since $h \geq 2k + 1$, the union of R and these W6-paths shows that G has a \mathcal{P}_k minor, as desired.

We may therefore assume that $s_1 \geq 2$. The lemma now follows from Lemma 9.4. \square

Proof of Theorem 9.1. Let a positive integer k be given. By Theorem 1.1 there exists an integer w such that every graph of tree-width at least w has a minor isomorphic to \mathcal{P}_k . Let $p = p(k, w)$ be as in Lemma 9.5. We claim that p satisfies the conclusion of the theorem. Indeed, let G be a 2-connected graph of path-width at least p . By Theorem 1.1, if G has tree-width at least w , then G has a minor isomorphic to \mathcal{P}_k , as desired. We may therefore assume that the tree-width of G is less than w . By Lemma 9.5 G has a minor isomorphic to \mathcal{P}_k or \mathcal{Q}_k , as desired. \square

Acknowledgments

The second author would like to acknowledge that Christopher Anhalt wrote a “Diplomarbeit” under his supervision in 1994 on the subject of this paper, but the proof is incomplete. The results of this paper form part of the Ph.D. dissertation [3] of the first author, written under the guidance of the second author. After our paper has been posted on the arXiv and submitted, a different proof by Huynh, Joret, Micek and Wood [8] appeared. Our proof has the advantage that it can be generalized to graphs of higher connectivity [3].

References

- [1] P. Bellenbaum and R. Diestel, Two short proofs concerning tree-decompositions, *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* **11** (2002), 541–547.
- [2] D. Bienstock, N. Robertson, P. Seymour, R. Thomas, Quickly excluding a forest, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **52** (1991) 274–283.

- [3] T. N. Dang, Minors of graphs of large path-width, Ph.D. dissertation, Georgia Institute of Technology, January 2018.
- [4] N. Dean, Open problems, In: Graph Structure Theory, N. Robertson and P. D. Seymour eds., *Contemporary Math.* 147, Providence, RI (1993), 677-688.
- [5] R. Diestel, Graph Minors I: a short proof of the path-width theorem, *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* **4** (1995), 27–30.
- [6] R. Diestel, Graph Theory, 5th edition, Springer, 2017.
- [7] J. Geelen, A. Gerards, G. Whittle, Excluding a planar graph from $\text{GF}(q)$ -representable matroids, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **97** (2007), 971-998.
- [8] T. Huynh, G. Joret, P. Micek, D. R. Wood, Seymour’s conjecture on 2-connected graphs of large pathwidth, [arXiv:1801.01833](https://arxiv.org/abs/1801.01833).
- [9] E. Marshall, D. Wood, Circumference and path-width of highly connected graphs, *J. Graph Theory*, **79** (2014), 222-232.
- [10] B. Oporowski, J. Oxley, R. Thomas, Typical subgraphs of 3- and 4-connected graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **57** (1993), 239-257.
- [11] N. Robertson, P. D. Seymour, Graph Minors I. Excluding a forest, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **35** (1983), 39-61.
- [12] N. Robertson, P. D. Seymour, Graph Minors V. Excluding a planar graph, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **41** (1986), 92-114.
- [13] R. Thomas, A Menger-like property of tree-width. The finite case, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **48** (1990), 67-76.