

Robertson's conjecture I. Well-quasi-ordering bounded tree-width graphs by the topological minor relation

October 17, 2021

Chun-Hung Liu¹

Department of Mathematics
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843-3368, USA

and

Robin Thomas

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

Abstract

Robertson and Seymour's celebrated Graph Minor Theorem states that graphs are well-quasi-ordered by the minor relation. Unlike the minor relation, the topological minor relation does not well-quasi-order graphs in general. Among all known infinite antichains with respect to the topological containment, subdivisions of a graph obtained from an arbitrarily long path by duplicating each edge can be found. In the 1980's Robertson conjectured that this is the only obstruction. Formally, he conjectured that for every positive integer k , graphs that do not contain the graph obtained from a path of length k by duplicating each edge as a topological minor are well-quasi-ordered by the topological minor relation. The case $k = 1$ implies Kruskal's Tree Theorem, and the case $k = 2$ implies a conjecture of Vázsonyi on subcubic graphs.

This series of papers dedicates a proof of Robertson's conjecture. We prove Robertson's conjecture for graphs of bounded tree-width in this paper. It is an essential step toward the complete proof of Robertson's conjecture, and the machinery developed in this paper will be applied in future papers of the series. This bounded tree-width case proved in this paper implies all known results about well-quasi-ordering graphs by the topological minor relation that can be proved without using the Graph Minor Theorem, and our proof in this paper is self-contained.

¹Email:chliu@math.tamu.edu. Partially supported by NSF under Grant No. DMS-1929851.

1 Introduction

Graphs are finite and are allowed to have parallel edges and loops in this paper. We say that a graph G contains a graph H as a *minor* if a graph isomorphic to H can be obtained from a subgraph of G by contracting edges. And we say that G contains H as a *topological minor* if a graph isomorphic to H can be obtained from a subgraph of G by repeatedly contracting edges incident with vertices of degree two.

A (binary) relation \preceq on a set S is a *quasi-ordering* on S if it is reflexive and transitive. A quasi-ordering \preceq on a set S is a *well-quasi-ordering* if for every infinite sequence x_1, x_2, \dots over S , there exist $j < j'$ such that $x_j \preceq x_{j'}$. In this case, we say that (S, \preceq) is a *well-quasi-ordered set*, and S is *well-quasi-ordered by \preceq* . For simplicity, by saying that Q is a quasi-order (or a well-quasi-order, respectively), we mean that Q is a set equipped with a quasi-ordering (or well-quasi-ordering, respectively) \leq_Q .

The history of well-quasi-ordering graphs can be traced back to the 1940's. Vázsonyi conjectured that forests are well-quasi-ordered by the topological minor relation. This conjecture was proved by Kruskal [8] and independently by Tarkowski [19] in 1960; now it is usually called Kruskal's Tree Theorem. Then Nash-Williams [12] offered an elegant and simpler proof of this theorem. In addition, Mader [11] generalized their results to graphs with a bounded number of disjoint cycles.

Kruskal's Tree Theorem and its labelled version are important in logic, computer science and many branches of mathematics. For example, they are tools for showing that certain orderings have no infinite decreasing chains, and those orderings are used to prove the termination of systems of rewrite rules and the correctness of Knuth-Bendix completion procedures [7] (see [5]); Higman's Lemma (Theorem 6.1) is a special case of the labelled version of Kruskal's Tree Theorem and is recently used to prove that certain categories are quasi-Gröbner and hence the categories of their representations over a left-noetherian ring are noetherian [18].

One of the most prominent and deepest results in graph theory is the Graph Minor Theorem: graphs are well-quasi-ordered by the minor relation. It was first conjectured by Wagner [20], and then proved by Robertson and Seymour [16] in the 1980's. The proof is extremely difficult and consists of around 20 papers in the Graph Minors series. The tools developed in the Graph Minors series had a significant impact in structural graph theory. Moreover, since the topological minor relation is the same as the minor relation on subcubic graphs², the Graph Minor Theorem confirms another conjecture of Vázsonyi: subcubic graphs are well-quasi-ordered by the topological minor relation. Furthermore, in the (currently) last paper of the Graph Minor series, Robertson and Seymour [17] confirmed a conjecture of Nash-Williams [13]: graphs are well-quasi-ordered by the weak immersion relation.³

²A graph is *subcubic* if every vertex has degree at most three. The *degree* of a vertex is the number of edges incident with it, where every loop is counted twice.

³We omit the formal definition of weak immersion as we will not discuss this relation in the rest of this paper. But we remark that if a graph G contains another graph H as a topological minor, then G also contains H as a minor and a weak immersion; the minor relation and the weak immersion relation are incomparable. See [10] for a survey about well-quasi-ordering on graphs with respect to various graph containments.

Unlike the relations of minor and weak immersion, the topological minor relation does not well-quasi-order graphs in general. For any positive integer i , define G_i to be the graph obtained from a path of length i by duplicating each edge and attaching two leaves to each end of the path. Then it is easy to see that there exist no distinct positive integers j, j' such that G_j contains $G_{j'}$ as a topological minor. In fact, there are several different sequences where each contains no pair of graphs comparable by the topological minor relation. But each such sequence contains graphs obtained from arbitrarily long paths by duplicating each edge as topological minors. Robertson in the late 1980's conjectured that this known obstruction is the only one.

For every positive integer k , the *Robertson chain* of length k is the graph obtained from a path of length k by duplicating each edge.

Conjecture 1.1 (Robertson's conjecture). *For every positive integer k , graphs that do not contain the Robertson chain of length k as a topological minor are well-quasi-ordered by the topological minor relation.*

Conjecture 1.1 is expected to be difficult since the case $k = 2$ of Conjecture 1.1 implies the aforementioned conjecture of Vázsonyi about subcubic graphs, which is unknown how to be proved without using the Graph Minor Theorem.

Conjecture 1.1 is much general than those known results about well-quasi-ordering graphs by the topological minor relation, and graphs with no long Robertson chain that are far from being forests and subcubic graphs can be easily constructed. For example, consider a graph G that is obtained from a disjoint union of arbitrarily many graphs H_1, H_2, \dots, H_t for some integer t by adding new edges between different H_i 's such that for each i , there are at most three new edges incident with vertices in H_i . It is easy to see that if each H_i does not contain the Robertson chain of length r as a topological minor, then G does not contain the Robertson chain of length $2r$ as a topological minor. In particular, if each H_i consists of one vertex, then G can be an arbitrary subcubic graph; if each H_i is a tree, then $r = 1$ and G can contain arbitrarily many disjoint cycles; if each H_i is a subcubic graph, then $r = 2$ and G can contain arbitrarily many vertices of degree at least four.

One might notice that Conjecture 1.1 is not optimal since Robertson chains do not form an infinite antichain with respect to the topological minor relation. But it becomes optimal if vertices are labelled. Before we formally state the labelled version, we mention an equivalent definition of topological minors.

Let H and G be graphs. We say that η is a *homeomorphic embedding* from H to G if η is a pair of functions (π_V, π_E) such that

- $\pi_V : V(H) \rightarrow V(G)$ is an injection, and
- π_E maps each non-loop edge xy of H to a path in G with the ends $\pi_V(x)$ and $\pi_V(y)$ and maps each loop of H with end x to a cycle in G passing through $\pi_V(x)$ such that
 - for every two different edges e_1, e_2 of H , $\pi_E(e_1) \cap \pi_E(e_2) \subseteq \bigcup_{v \in e_1 \cap e_2} \pi_V(v)$, and
 - for every $v \in V(H)$ and $e \in E(H)$, $\pi_V(v) \in V(\pi_E(e))$ only if v is incident with e .

In this case, we write $\eta : H \hookrightarrow G$. Furthermore, we define $\eta(x) = \pi_V(x)$ if $x \in V(H)$, and define $\eta(x) = \pi_E(x)$ if $x \in E(H)$. Note that G contains H as a topological minor if and only if a homeomorphic embedding from H to G exists.

The following is the labelled version of Robertson’s conjecture.

Conjecture 1.2. *Let k be a positive integer. Let G_1, G_2, \dots be graphs that do not contain a Robertson chain of length at least k as a topological minor. Let Q be a set, and for each positive integer i , let $\phi_i : V(G_i) \rightarrow Q$ be a function. If Q is a well-quasi-order, then there exist integers j, j' with $1 \leq j < j'$ and $\eta : G_j \hookrightarrow G_{j'}$ such that $\phi_j(v) \leq_Q \phi_{j'}(\eta(v))$ for every $v \in V(G_j)$.*

Clearly, Conjecture 1.1 is the special case of Conjecture 1.2 when Q consists of one element. And the case $k = 1$ of Conjecture 1.2 implies the labelled version of Kruskal’s Tree Theorem. In addition, Conjecture 1.2 is optimal, since subdivisions of Robertson chains of different lengths with appropriate labels form an infinite antichain when Q contains at least two elements: simply take $x, y \in Q$ with $x \not\leq_Q y$ and label the ends⁴ by x and label all other vertices by y .

The main objective of this series of papers is to prove Conjecture 1.2 and provide a characterization of the topological minor ideals that are well-quasi-ordered by the topological minor relation⁵. We remark that a proof of Conjecture 1.2 was provided in the PhD dissertation of the first author [9], and this series of papers is based on that.

This paper is the first paper in the series. In this paper, we prove Conjecture 1.2 for graphs of bounded tree-width. (The formal definition of tree-width will be provided in Section 1.2.) This partial result of Conjecture 1.2 is an essential step toward the complete proof of this conjecture, and the machinery developed in this paper will be crucial for other papers of the series.

The following is the main result of this paper.

Theorem 1.3. *Let k and w be positive integers. Let G_1, G_2, \dots be graphs of tree-width at most w not containing a Robertson chain of length at least k as a topological minor. Let Q be a set, and for each positive integer i , let $\phi_i : V(G_i) \rightarrow Q$ be a function. If Q is a well-quasi-order, then there exist integers j, j' with $1 \leq j < j'$ and $\eta : G_j \hookrightarrow G_{j'}$ such that $\phi_j(v) \leq_Q \phi_{j'}(\eta(v))$ for every $v \in V(G_j)$.*

The proof of Theorem 1.3 is self-contained. The only known results in the literature that we use as a black box in this paper are Higman’s Lemma and [14, Theorem 2.1], where each of them has a short proof.

By the famous Grid Minor Theorem [15], for every planar⁶ graph H , there exists an integer w such that every graph that does not contain H as a minor has tree-width at most w . Hence we obtain the following corollary of Theorem 1.3.

Corollary 1.4. *For every positive integer k , every planar graph H and every well-quasi-order Q , if G_1, G_2, \dots are graphs that do not contain H as a minor and do not contain a Robertson chain of length at least k as a topological minor, and for each positive integer i , $\phi_i : V(G_i) \rightarrow Q$ is a function, then there exist integers j, j' with $1 \leq j < j'$ and $\eta : G_j \hookrightarrow G_{j'}$ such that $\phi_j(v) \leq_Q \phi_{j'}(\eta(v))$ for every $v \in V(G_j)$.*

⁴An *end* of a Robertson chain is an end of the original path.

⁵A statement of this characterization can be found in a survey paper of the first author [10]. This characterization is a strengthening and can be viewed as the unlabelled form of the unlabelled version of Robertson’s conjecture (Conjecture 1.1).

⁶A graph is *planar* if it can be embedded in the plane with no edge-crossing.

We remark that Theorem 1.3 (or Corollary 1.4) implies all known results about well-quasi-ordering graphs by the topological minor relation that can be proved without applying the Graph Minor Theorem. By a classical result of Erdős and Pósa [4], every graph that has a bounded number of pairwise disjoint cycles can be modified into a forest by deleting a bounded number of vertices, so such graphs have bounded tree-width and do not contain a long Robertson chain as a topological minor. Therefore, Theorem 1.3 implies Mader’s theorem and hence the aforementioned Kruskal’s Tree Theorem. In addition, the only known progress (as far as we are aware) on Conjecture 1.1 prior to the announcement of a complete proof of Conjecture 1.1 in the thesis of the first author [9] is due to Ding [2]: for every k , graphs that do not contain a Robertson chain of length k as a minor⁷ are well-quasi-ordered by the topological minor relation. Ding’s theorem is an immediate corollary of Corollary 1.4, since every Robertson chain is planar.

The first author [10] showed that Conjecture 1.2 implies a classical result of Ding [3] about subgraphs: for any positive integer k , graphs with no path of length k are well-quasi-ordered by the subgraph relation. We remark that the argument in [10] only involves with graphs of bounded tree-width, so Theorem 1.3 implies this Ding’s result about subgraphs.

In addition, graphs with bounded tree-width and with no long Robertson chain can be easily constructed as before. Consider a graph G that is obtained from a disjoint union of graphs H_1, H_2, \dots, H_t by adding edges such that each H_i is incident with at most three new edges. It is easy to see that if each H_i has tree-width at most w , and if the graph obtained from G by contracting each H_i into a vertex has tree-width at most w' , then G has tree-width at most $3w' + 3 + w$.

1.1 Proof sketch and organization

We shall use a “minimal bad sequence” argument to prove Theorem 1.3. To make it work, we need a “nice” tree-decomposition of the graphs.

The first “nice” property is a “linkedness property”. Roughly speaking, we require that the subgraph induced by the bags in the subtree rooted at a node contains the subgraph induced by the bags in a subtree rooted at “any” descendant of the previous node as a “rooted” topological minor. The key idea to obtain this linkedness property is to convert vertex-cuts realized by the bags of a tree-decomposition into “pseudo-edge-cuts.” Though we are not able to convert all vertex-cuts into pseudo-edge-cuts, it suffices to convert some of them such that the tree-decomposition has bounded “elevation.”

In Section 2, we prove a sufficient condition that ensures the existence of a long Robertson chain topological minor. Due to the lack of those topological minors, this sufficient condition must be violated. This allows us to prove the existence of pseudo-edge-cuts. The detailed arguments and the formal definitions of pseudo-edge-cuts are included in Section 3.

Though those pseudo-edge-cuts exist, they are not necessarily realized by bags of the tree-decomposition. Our strategy is to “insert” those pseudo-edge-cuts into the tree-decomposition to make them realized by bags. One difficulty of this strategy is that inserting pseudo-edge-cuts into a tree-decomposition might convert some pseudo-edge-cuts that were realized by bags into vertex-cuts, so the insertion process possibly does not terminate. We overcome this diffi-

⁷As we pointed out earlier, if G contains H as a topological minor, then G contains H as a minor.

culty in Section 4. The key is that we are manageable to repeatedly select a pseudo-edge-cut and insert it and possibly some other its “related” cuts into the tree-decomposition such that we can ensure that those pseudo-edge-cuts that we have inserted will not be inserted again even though they might be not realized by bags anymore. So we will not insert the same pseudo-edge-cut twice. This allows us to prove the existence of a tree-decomposition of bounded width and bounded “elevation.” The formal definition of elevation is included in Section 4.

Section 5 is a preparation for proving well-quasi-ordering. We show that “nicely decorated” trees are well-quasi-ordered with respect to their “decoration.” The “decoration” can be thought as an encoding of the linkedness property.

The next goal is to achieve the “absorption property” which is the other “nice property” of a tree-decomposition we want. Roughly speaking, the absorption property allows us to “encode” the subgraphs induced by the bags in the subtree rooted at the children of a given node into the bag of this given node. As the tree-decomposition have bounded width, each bag has bounded size, so the bags are easily well-quasi-ordered. The main difficulty is to find and prove the correct notion of “encoding” that allows us to recover topological minors from the encoding and is compatible with the setting of the aforementioned linkedness property. We are manageable to do so. In Section 6, we formally define the notion of encoding and shows that these encodings “simulate” the “rooted” topological minor relation.

In Section 7, we combine the main results in previous sections to prove Theorem 1.3. We show how to transform the linkedness property of a tree-decomposition into the “decoration” of trees and use the tree lemma proved in Section 5 to prove that graphs that admit a tree-decomposition of these two nice properties are well-quasi-ordered by the topological minor relation. Then Theorem 1.3 follows.

We remark that the rest of paper can be divided into parts. The first part consists of Sections 2, 3 and 4. Readers can skip Sections 2, 3 and 4 as long as they understand the statements of Lemma 4.2 and Theorem 4.9 and notion used in them. Section 5 forms its own part and it does not rely on any result or notion in previous sections. Readers can skip Section 5 as long as they understand the statement of Theorem 5.7 and notion used in this theorem. The rest of sections form the last part. Section 6 does not rely on any result or notion in previous sections; Section 7 will use Lemma 4.2, Theorems 4.9 and 5.7, and results in Section 6.

1.2 Some notations

We say that (T, \mathcal{X}) is a *tree-decomposition* of a graph G if the following hold.

- T is a tree, and $\mathcal{X} = (X_t : t \in V(T))$, where X_t is called the *bag* at t and it is a subset of $V(G)$ for every $t \in V(T)$.
- $\bigcup_{t \in V(T)} X_t = V(G)$.
- For every edge of G , some bag contains all the ends of this edge.
- For every vertex $u \in V(G)$, the nodes of T whose bags contain u induce a connected subgraph of T .

The *adhesion* of (T, \mathcal{X}) is $\max\{|X_x \cap X_y| : xy \in E(T)\}$. The *width* of (T, \mathcal{X}) is $\max\{|X_t| : t \in V(T)\} - 1$. The *tree-width*, denoted by $\text{tw}(G)$, of a graph G is the minimum width of a tree-decomposition of G .

In this paper, if (T, \mathcal{X}) is a tree-decomposition, then we always denote the bag at t by X_t , and we call each vertex of T a *node* in order to distinguish vertices of T and vertices in their bags.

Let G be a graph and let S be a subset of $V(G)$. We denote the subgraph of G induced by S by $G[S]$. And we define $G - S$ to be $G[V(G) - S]$. If v is a vertex of G , then we define $G - v$ to be $G - \{v\}$. For a function f and a subset Y of its domain, we denote the restriction of f on Y by $f|_Y$.

2 Looking for Robertson chains

Let G be a graph. A *cut-vertex* of G is a vertex v of G such that $G - v$ has more components than G . A *block* of G is a maximal subgraph of G that does not contain any cut-vertex. A *block tree* of G is a tree T with bipartition $\{A, B\}$ and a bijection f between $V(T)$ and the union of the set of blocks of G and the set of the cut-vertices of G such that

- $f(a)$ is a cut-vertex of G for every $a \in A$,
- $f(b)$ is a block of G for every $b \in B$, and
- if $a \in A$ and $b \in B$ with $ab \in E(T)$, then $f(a)$ is a cut-vertex of G contained in $V(f(b))$.

For blocks B_1, B_2 of G , we say that H is a *graph that is the path of blocks of G from B_1 to B_2* if $H = \bigcup_t f(t)$, where the union is over all nodes $t \in B$ contained in the path in T from b_1 to b_2 , where b_1, b_2 are the nodes of T with $f(b_1) = B_1$ and $f(b_2) = B_2$.

Let G be a graph and (T, \mathcal{X}) a tree-decomposition of G . Let k be a positive integer, and let t_1, t_2 be two nodes of T with $|X_{t_1}| = |X_{t_2}| = k$. Let \mathcal{P} be a collection of k disjoint paths in G from X_{t_1} to X_{t_2} . Let P be a member of \mathcal{P} with $|E(P)| \neq \emptyset$. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let v_i be the vertex in $X_{t_i} \cap V(P)$, and let B_i be the block of $G - \bigcup_{W \in \mathcal{P} - \{P\}} V(W)$ containing the edge of P incident with v_i . Let $Q_{\mathcal{P}, P}$ be the graph that is the path of blocks of $G - \bigcup_{W \in \mathcal{P} - \{P\}} V(W)$ from B_1 to B_2 . If none of the blocks in $Q_{\mathcal{P}, P}$ is an edge, then we define $L_{\mathcal{P}, P} = R_{\mathcal{P}, P} = Q_{\mathcal{P}, P}$. If some block in $Q_{\mathcal{P}, P}$ is an edge, then let Q' be the union of the blocks in $Q_{\mathcal{P}, P}$ that are single edges, and define $L_{\mathcal{P}, P}$ (and $R_{\mathcal{P}, P}$, respectively) to be the component of $Q_{\mathcal{P}, P} - E(Q')$ containing v_1 (and v_2 , respectively). (So $L_{\mathcal{P}, P}$ and $R_{\mathcal{P}, P}$ is a vertex if B_1 and B_2 , respectively, is a single edge.) Let G' be the subgraph of G induced by $X_{t_1} \cup X_{t_2}$ and $\bigcup_t X_t$, where the union is over all nodes t in the component of $T - \{t_1, t_2\}$ containing an internal node of the t_1 - t_2 path in T . A *right jump from v_1* (and *left jump from v_2* , respectively) is a path in G' from $V(L_{\mathcal{P}, P})$ (and $V(R_{\mathcal{P}, P})$, respectively) to $\bigcup_{W \notin \mathcal{P} - \{P\}} V(W)$ internally disjoint from $V(L_{\mathcal{P}, P}) \cup \bigcup_{W \in \mathcal{P}} V(W)$ (and $V(R_{\mathcal{P}, P}) \cup \bigcup_{W \in \mathcal{P}} V(W)$, respectively). We call the graphs $Q_{\mathcal{P}, P}$, $L_{\mathcal{P}, P}$ and $R_{\mathcal{P}, P}$ the (Q, \mathcal{P}, P) -graph, (L, \mathcal{P}, P) -graph and (R, \mathcal{P}, P) -graph between X_{t_1} and X_{t_2} , respectively.

Lemma 2.1. *Let r, k be positive integers. Let (T, \mathcal{X}) be a tree-decomposition of a graph G . Let Z be a subset of $V(G)$. Let t_1, t_2, \dots, t_r be nodes on a path in T appearing in the order listed with $Z \subseteq \bigcap_{i=1}^r X_{t_i}$ such that $X_{t_1} - Z, X_{t_2} - Z, \dots, X_{t_r} - Z$ are pairwise disjoint sets with the same size. Assume that there exists a collection \mathcal{P} of $|X_{t_1}|$ disjoint paths in G from X_{t_1} to X_{t_r} . Let P be a member of \mathcal{P} , and let v_i be the vertex in $X_{t_i} \cap V(P)$ for every $1 \leq i \leq r$. Assume that for every $1 \leq i \leq r - 1$, $v_i \notin Z$ and either there exist two edge-disjoint paths from v_i to v_{i+1} internally disjoint from $X_{t_i} \cup X_{t_{i+1}}$ in $G - Z$, or there exist a right jump from v_i disjoint from Z and a left jump from v_{i+1} disjoint from Z . Assume that for every $2 \leq i \leq r - 1$, if both the right jump and the left jump from v_i mentioned above exist, then these two jumps can be chosen such that they intersect in at most one vertex. If $r \geq k(k+1)|X_{t_1}|^{2k+2} + k + 3$, then $G - Z$ contains the Robertson chain of length k as a topological minor.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that Z is the empty set; otherwise we delete Z from G . For every $1 \leq i \leq r - 1$, define Q_i, L_i, R_i to be the (Q, \mathcal{P}, P) -graph, (L, \mathcal{P}, P) -graph, (R, \mathcal{P}, P) -graph between X_{t_i} and $X_{t_{i+1}}$, respectively. Denote \mathcal{P} by $\{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{|X_{t_1}|}\}$, and let s be the index such that $P = P_s$. For every $1 \leq i \leq r - 1$, define the *type* of i to be (a, b) , where $1 \leq a \leq |X_{t_1}|$ and $1 \leq b \leq |X_{t_1}|$ are some integers such that the following hold.

- If there exist two edge-disjoint paths from v_i to v_{i+1} internally disjoint from $X_{t_i} \cup X_{t_{i+1}}$ in $G - Z$, then $(a, b) = (s, s)$.
- Otherwise, there exist a right jump $J_{R,i}$ from v_i whose end not in $V(L_i)$ is in $V(P_a)$, and a left jump $J_{L,i+1}$ from v_{i+1} whose end not in $V(R_i)$ is in $V(P_b)$.

By the assumption of this lemma, we may assume that $J_{R,i}$ and $J_{L,i}$ intersect in at most one vertex when both of them are defined. Note that it is possible that there are more than one jump satisfying the property mentioned above, and in this case, we choose arbitrary such a jump to define the type of i . Furthermore, $V(J_{R,i}) \cap V(J_{L,i+1}) \subseteq \bigcup_{j \neq s} V(P_j)$ and $|V(J_{R,i}) \cap V(J_{L,i+1})| \leq 1$, since $L_i \neq R_i$ when $J_{R,i}$ and $J_{L,i+1}$ are defined. Note that if some entry of the type of i is s , then the corresponding two edge-disjoint paths exist since $L_i \neq R_i$, and hence both entries of the type of i are s .

For every $2 \leq i \leq r - 1 - k$, we define the k -*type* of i to be the sequence $(b_i, b_{i+1}, \dots, b_{i+k})$, where b_j is the type of j for every $i \leq j \leq i + k$. Observe that there are at most $|X_{t_1}|^{2k+2}$ possible k -types. Since $r - k - 2 \geq k(k+1)|X_{t_1}|^{2k+2} + 1$, there exist $2 \leq i_0 < i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq r - k - 1$ such that $i_j \equiv i_0 \pmod{k+1}$ for $1 \leq j \leq k$, and the k -types of i_0, i_1, \dots, i_k are the same.

We shall construct a homeomorphic embedding from the Robertson chain of length k to G .

Claim 1: There exists an increasing sequence (s_0, s_1, \dots, s_k) such that for every nonnegative integer m with $0 \leq m \leq k$, $s_m = i'_m + m$ for some $i'_m \in \{i_0, i_1, \dots, i_m\}$ (so $s_m - i_0 \equiv m \pmod{k+1}$), and G contains a subgraph S_m satisfying the following properties.

- (i) For every $v \in V(S_m) \cap X_{t_{s_m}}$, there exists a homeomorphic embedding η from a Robertson chain of length at least m to S_m such that $v = \eta(x)$ for some end x of the Robertson chain.

(ii) S_m is contained in the subgraph of G induced by $X_{t_{s_m}} \cup \bigcup_{t \in V(T')} X_t$, where T' is the component of $T - \{t_{s_m}\}$ containing t_1 .

(iii) $|V(S_m) \cap X_{t_{s_m}}| \in \{1, 2\}$.

(iv) If $|V(S_m) \cap X_{t_{s_m}}| = 2$, then

- J_{L, s_m} is defined,
- $V(S_m) \cap X_{t_{s_m}}$ consists of v_{s_m} and an end of J_{L, s_m} , and
- if v_{s_m} is not an end of J_{L, s_m} , then there exist a subgraph S'_m of G with $V(S'_m) \cap X_{t_{s_m}} = V(S_m) \cap X_{t_{s_m}} - \{v_{s_m}\}$ and a homeomorphic embedding η' from a Robertson chain of length at least m to S'_m such that η' maps some end of the Robertson chain to the vertex in $V(S_m) \cap X_{t_{s_m}} - \{v_{s_m}\}$.

(v) If $|V(S_m) \cap X_{t_{s_m}}| = 1$, then $V(S_m) \cap X_{t_{s_m}} = \{v_{s_m}\}$.

Proof of Claim 1: We prove the existence of (s_0, s_1, \dots, s_m) by induction on m . When $m = 0$, the statement is obviously true by choosing $s_0 = i_0$ and choosing S_0 to be the graph consists of the single vertex v_{i_0} . We assume that $m > 0$, and assume that $(s_0, s_1, \dots, s_{m-1})$ exists.

First, assume that s_{m-1} is of type (s, s) . By (iv) and (v), S_{m-1} contains $v_{s_{m-1}}$. We set $s_m = s_{m-1} + 1$ and $i'_m = i'_{m-1}$, and we define S_m to be the graph obtained from S_{m-1} by adding two edge-disjoint paths from $v_{s_{m-1}}$ to $v_{s_{m-1}+1}$ internally disjoint from $X_{t_{s_{m-1}}} \cup X_{t_{s_{m-1}+1}}$. It is clear that S_m satisfies (i)-(v).

So we may assume that s_{m-1} is of type (a, b) , where $a \neq s \neq b$. In this case, we set $i'_m = i_{q+1}$, where q is the number such that $i'_{m-1} = i_q$, and let $s_m = i'_m + m$. Since $s_m - 1 - i'_m \equiv s_{m-1} - i'_{m-1} \pmod{k+1}$, the type of $s_m - 1$ is the same as the type of s_{m-1} . So $s_m - 1 = i'_m + m - 1 \geq i'_{m-1} + k + 1 + m - 1 > s_{m-1} + 1$. Since $a \neq s \neq b$, $J_{R, s_{m-1}}, J_{L, s_{m-1}+1}, J_{R, s_m-1}, J_{L, s_m}$ are defined. Let $u_{s_{m-1}}, u_{s_{m-1}+1}, u_{s_m-1}, u_{s_m}$ be the end of $J_{R, s_{m-1}}, J_{L, s_{m-1}+1}, J_{R, s_m-1}, J_{L, s_m}$ contained in $L_{s_{m-1}}, R_{s_{m-1}}, L_{s_m}, R_{s_m}$, respectively. Since every block in $L_{s_{m-1}} \cup R_{s_{m-1}+1} \cup L_{s_m-1} \cup R_{s_m}$ is not a single edge, there exist connected subgraphs $Y_{m-1}, Y'_{m-1}, Z_{m-1}, Z'_{m-1}, Y_m, Y'_m, Z_m, Z'_m$ in G internally disjoint from $\bigcup_{j \neq s} V(P_j)$ and there exist paths W_L, W_R, W in G such that

- Y_{m-1} is a trail from $u_{s_{m-1}}$ to $u_{s_{m-1}+1}$ containing $v_{s_{m-1}}$ such that
 - if $u_{s_{m-1}}$ and $v_{s_{m-1}}$ are contained in the same block in $L_{s_{m-1}}$, then Y_{m-1} is a path,
 - otherwise, Y_{m-1} is the union of a path from $u_{s_{m-1}}$ to $u_{s_{m-1}+1}$ and two edge-disjoint paths from $v_{s_{m-1}}$ to a cut-vertex of $L_{s_{m-1}}$ contained in a block of $L_{s_{m-1}}$ containing $u_{s_{m-1}}$,
- Y'_{m-1} is a trail from $u_{s_{m-1}}$ to $v_{s_{m-1}+1}$ containing $v_{s_{m-1}}$ such that
 - if $u_{s_{m-1}}$ and $v_{s_{m-1}}$ are contained in the same block in $L_{s_{m-1}}$, then Y'_{m-1} is a path,
 - otherwise, Y'_{m-1} is the union of a path from $u_{s_{m-1}}$ to $v_{s_{m-1}+1}$ and two edge-disjoint paths from $v_{s_{m-1}}$ to a cut-vertex of $L_{s_{m-1}}$ contained in a block of $L_{s_{m-1}}$ containing $u_{s_{m-1}}$,

- Y_m is a trail from $u_{s_{m-1}}$ to u_{s_m} containing v_{s_m} such that
 - if u_{s_m} and v_{s_m} are contained in the same block in R_{s_m} , then Y_m is a path,
 - otherwise, Y_m is the union of a path from $u_{s_{m-1}}$ to u_{s_m} and two edge-disjoint paths in R_{s_m} from v_{s_m} to a cut-vertex of R_{s_m} contained in a block of R_{s_m} containing u_{s_m} ,
- Y'_m is a trail from $v_{s_{m-1}}$ to u_{s_m} containing v_{s_m} such that
 - if u_{s_m} and v_{s_m} are contained in the same block in R_{s_m} , then Y'_m is a path,
 - otherwise, Y'_m is the union of a path from $v_{s_{m-1}}$ to u_{s_m} and two edge-disjoint paths in R_{s_m} from v_{s_m} to a cut-vertex of R_{s_m} contained in a block of R_{s_m} containing u_{s_m} ,
- if $v_{s_{m-1}}$ is not an end of $J_{R,s_{m-1}}$, then Z_{m-1} (and Z'_{m-1} , respectively) is a path from $u_{s_{m-1}}$ to $u_{s_{m-1}+1}$ (to $v_{s_{m-1}+1}$, respectively) not containing $v_{s_{m-1}}$,
- if v_{s_m} is not an end of J_{L,s_m} , then Z_m (and Z'_m , respectively) is a path from $u_{s_{m-1}}$ (and $v_{s_{m-1}}$, respectively) to u_{s_m} not containing v_{s_m} ,
- W_R is the subpath of P_a connecting one end of $J_{R,s_{m-1}}$ and one end of J_{R,s_m-1} , and W_L is the subpath of P_b connecting one end of $J_{L,s_{m-1}+1}$ and one end of J_{L,s_m} , and
- if $a = b$, then W is the subpath of P_a connecting one end of $J_{R,s_{m-1}}$ and one end of J_{L,s_m} .

Now, we are ready to construct S_m (and S'_m if required). Let P' be the subpath of P connecting $v_{s_{m-1}+1}$ and $v_{s_{m-1}}$.

We first assume that $|V(S_{m-1}) \cap X_{t_{s_{m-1}}}| = 1$ or $V(J_{R,s_{m-1}}) \cap X_{t_{s_{m-1}}} \cap V(S_{m-1}) - \{v_{s_{m-1}}\} = \emptyset$. By (iv) and (v), $v_{s_{m-1}} \in V(S_{m-1}) \cap X_{t_{s_{m-1}}}$. If $a = b$, then define S_m to be the graph obtained from S_{m-1} by adding $J_{R,s_{m-1}} \cup Y'_{m-1} \cup P' \cup Y'_m \cup J_{L,s_m} \cup W$. If $a \neq b$, then define S_m to be the graph obtained from S_{m-1} by adding $J_{R,s_{m-1}} \cup Y_{m-1} \cup J_{L,s_{m-1}+1} \cup W_L \cup J_{L,s_m} \cup Y_m \cup J_{R,s_{m-1}} \cup W_R$. Note that $V(S_m) \cap X_{t_{s_m}}$ contains v_{s_m} , and if $V(S_m) \cap X_{t_{s_m}} - \{v_{s_m}\} \neq \emptyset$, then one end of J_{L,s_m} is in $X_{t_{s_m}} - \{v_{s_m}\}$, and $V(S_m) \cap X_{t_{s_m}} - \{v_{s_m}\}$ consists of this vertex. Hence S_m satisfies (i)-(iii) and (v), and to prove (iv), it suffices to show that S'_m exists when $|V(S_m) \cap X_{t_{s_m}}| = 2$ and v_{s_m} is not an end of J_{L,s_m} . In this case, if $a = b$, then we define S'_m to be the graph obtained from S_{m-1} by adding $J_{R,s_{m-1}} \cup Y'_{m-1} \cup P' \cup Z'_m \cup J_{L,s_m} \cup W$; if $a \neq b$, then we define S'_m to be the graph obtained from S_{m-1} by adding $J_{R,s_{m-1}} \cup Y_{m-1} \cup J_{L,s_{m-1}+1} \cup W_L \cup J_{L,s_m} \cup Z_m \cup J_{R,s_{m-1}} \cup W_R$. Then S_m and S'_m satisfy (iv).

Hence we may assume that $|V(S_{m-1}) \cap X_{t_{s_{m-1}}}| = 2$ and $V(J_{R,s_{m-1}}) \cap X_{t_{s_{m-1}}} \cap V(S_{m-1}) - \{v_{s_{m-1}}\} \neq \emptyset$. By (iv), $V(S_{m-1}) \cap X_{t_{s_{m-1}}}$ consists of $v_{s_{m-1}}$ and an end of $J_{L,s_{m-1}}$. So the vertex in $V(S_{m-1}) \cap X_{t_{s_{m-1}}} - \{v_{s_{m-1}}\}$ is a common vertex of $J_{L,s_{m-1}}$ and $J_{R,s_{m-1}}$. Hence $v_{s_{m-1}}$ is not a common vertex of $J_{L,s_{m-1}}$ and $J_{R,s_{m-1}}$ by our assumption.

Now we further assume that $v_{s_{m-1}}$ is an end of $J_{L,s_{m-1}}$. Hence the ends of $J_{L,s_{m-1}}$ are the two vertices in $V(S_{m-1}) \cap X_{t_{s_{m-1}}}$, and $u_{s_{m-1}} \neq v_{s_{m-1}}$. If $a = b$, then define S_m to be the graph obtained from S_{m-1} by adding $J_{R,s_{m-1}} \cup Z'_{m-1} \cup P' \cup Y'_m \cup J_{L,s_m} \cup W$. If $a \neq b$, then define S_m to be the graph obtained from S_{m-1} by adding $J_{R,s_{m-1}} \cup Z_{m-1} \cup$

$J_{L,s_{m-1}+1} \cup W_L \cup J_{L,s_m} \cup Y_m \cup J_{R,s_{m-1}} \cup W_R$. Note that $V(S_m) \cap X_{t_{s_m}}$ contains v_{s_m} , and if $V(S_m) \cap X_{t_{s_m}} - \{v_{s_m}\} \neq \emptyset$, then one end of J_{L,s_m} is in $X_{t_{s_m}} - \{v_{s_m}\}$, and $V(S_m) \cap X_{t_{s_m}} - \{v_{s_m}\}$ consists of this vertex. Hence S_m satisfies (i)-(iii) and (v), and to prove (iv), it suffices to show that S'_m exists when $|V(S_m) \cap X_{t_{s_m}}| = 2$ and v_{s_m} is not an end of J_{L,s_m} . In this case, if $a = b$, then we define S'_m to be the graph obtained from S_{m-1} by adding $J_{R,s_{m-1}} \cup Z'_{m-1} \cup P' \cup Z'_m \cup J_{L,s_m} \cup W$; if $a \neq b$, then we define S'_m to be the graph obtained from S_{m-1} by adding $J_{R,s_{m-1}} \cup Z_{m-1} \cup J_{L,s_{m-1}+1} \cup W_L \cup J_{L,s_m} \cup Z_m \cup J_{R,s_{m-1}} \cup W_R$. Then S_m and S'_m satisfy (iv).

So we may assume that $v_{s_{m-1}}$ is not an end of $J_{L,s_{m-1}}$. Hence S'_{m-1} is defined by (iv). If $a = b$, then define S_m to be the graph obtained from S'_{m-1} by adding $J_{R,s_{m-1}} \cup Y'_{m-1} \cup P' \cup Y'_m \cup J_{L,s_m} \cup W$. If $a \neq b$, then define S_m to be the graph obtained from S'_{m-1} by adding $J_{R,s_{m-1}} \cup Y_{m-1} \cup J_{L,s_{m-1}+1} \cup W_L \cup J_{L,s_m} \cup Y_m \cup J_{R,s_{m-1}} \cup W_R$. Hence S_m satisfies (i)-(iii) and (v), and to prove (iv), it suffices to show that S'_m exists when $|V(S_m) \cap X_{t_{s_m}}| = 2$ and v_{s_m} is not an end of J_{L,s_m} . In this case, if $a = b$, then we define S'_m to be the graph obtained from S'_{m-1} by adding $J_{R,s_{m-1}} \cup Y'_{m-1} \cup P' \cup Z'_m \cup J_{L,s_m} \cup W$; if $a \neq b$, then we define S'_m to be the graph obtained from S'_{m-1} by adding $J_{R,s_{m-1}} \cup Y_{m-1} \cup J_{L,s_{m-1}+1} \cup W_L \cup J_{L,s_m} \cup Z_m \cup J_{R,s_{m-1}} \cup W_R$. Then S_m and S'_m satisfy (iv). This proves the claim. \square

This lemma immediately follows from (i) and (iii) in Claim 1. \blacksquare

3 Looking for edge-cuts

3.1 Rooted tree-decomposition and strips

In this section we define some necessary notion.

A *rooted tree* is a directed graph whose underlying graph is a tree such that all but one node has in-degree one. The vertex in a rooted tree with in-degree not one is called the *root*. It is easy to see that the root has in-degree zero. For every non-root node v , the tail u of the edge with head v is the *parent* of v , and we say that v is a *child* of u in this case. If there exists a directed path from a node x to another node y , then x is an *ancestor* of y , and y is a *descendant* of x . Note that every node is an ancestor and a descendant of itself. If x, y are nodes of a rooted tree T , then we denote the set of all nodes of the path in the underlying graph of T from x to y by xTy . When there is no danger for creating confusion, we also denote the directed path in T between x and y by xTy .

We say that a tree-decomposition (T, \mathcal{X}) is a *rooted tree-decomposition* if T is a rooted tree. In this case, for every node t , we define $(T, \mathcal{X}) \uparrow t$ to be $\bigcup_s X_s$, where the union is taken over all descendants s of t ; we define $(T, \mathcal{X}) \downarrow t$ to be $\bigcup_s X_s$, where the union is taken over all nodes s where either $s = t$ or s is a non-descendant of t . When the rooted tree-decomposition is clear in the context, we simply denote $(T, \mathcal{X}) \uparrow t$ and $(T, \mathcal{X}) \downarrow t$ by $\uparrow t$ and $\downarrow t$, respectively.⁸ Note that $\downarrow t \cap \uparrow t = X_t$. We say that a node t_1 of T is a *precursor* of a node t_2 of T if $t_1 \neq t_2$ and t_1 is an ancestor of t_2 with $|X_{t_1}| = |X_{t_2}|$ and $|X_t| \geq |X_{t_1}|$ for all $t \in t_1 T t_2$.

⁸It might be helpful to absorb these notations if the readers imagine that the tree T is drawn in the plane such that the root is drawn at the bottom.

A *separation* (A, B) of a graph G is an ordered pair of subsets of $V(G)$ with $A \cup B = V(G)$ such that no edge of G has one end in $A - B$ and one end in $B - A$. The *order* of (A, B) is $|A \cap B|$. We remark that in the literature, a separation is often an ordered pair of edge-disjoint subgraphs whose union is the entire graph. But our arguments in this paper about separations only depend on the vertex-sets of the two edge-disjoint subgraphs, so we define a separation to be an order pair of subsets of vertices in this paper. When (T, \mathcal{X}) is a rooted tree-decomposition and t is a node of T , the *separation given by t in (T, \mathcal{X})* , denoted by (A_t, B_t) , is the separation $(\downarrow t, \uparrow t)$.

We say that a separation (A, B) *separates* two subsets X, Y of $V(G)$ if X and Y are not subsets of $A \cap B$, and either $X \subseteq A$ and $Y \subseteq B$, or $X \subseteq B$ and $Y \subseteq A$. When X consists of one vertex, we say (A, B) separates Y and the vertex in X . We say that a vertex $v \in A \cap B$ is *pointed for* (A, B) if v is incident with at most one edge whose other end is in $A - B$. For each subset Z of $V(G)$, we say that (A, B) is a *pseudo-edge-cut modulo Z* if every vertex in $A \cap B - Z$ is pointed for (A, B) .

For any positive integer s and subset Z of $V(G)$, a (Z, s) -*strip* in a rooted tree-decomposition (T, \mathcal{X}) of G is a sequence of nodes (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_h) of T such that the following hold.

- t_i is a precursor of t_{i+1} for every $1 \leq i \leq h - 1$.
- $Z \subseteq X_{t_i}$ and $|X_{t_i} - Z| = s$ for every $1 \leq i \leq h$.
- $X_{t_1} - Z, X_{t_2} - Z, \dots, X_{t_h} - Z$ are pairwise disjoint nonempty sets.
- There exists no node t in $t_1 T t_h$ such that $|X_t| = |X_{t_1}|$ and the separation (A_t, B_t) given by t in (T, \mathcal{X}) is a pseudo-edge-cut modulo Z .
- There exist $|X_{t_1}|$ disjoint paths in G from X_{t_1} to X_{t_h} .

The *length* of this (Z, s) -strip is h . The (Z, s) -*depth* of (T, \mathcal{X}) is the maximum length of a (Z, s) -strip in (T, \mathcal{X}) .

Let α be a positive integer. We say that a separation (A, B) of G α -*breaks* a (Z, s) -strip (t_1, \dots, t_h) in (T, \mathcal{X}) if there exist distinct indices $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_\alpha < j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_\alpha \leq h$ such that $\downarrow t_{i_\alpha} \subseteq A$ and $\uparrow t_{j_1} \subseteq B$.

3.2 Breaking strips

Let G be a graph. Let (T, \mathcal{X}) be a rooted tree-decomposition of G . For every node t of T that has a precursor, and for every precursor t' of t , we say that a set \mathcal{P} of $|X_t|$ disjoint paths $P_1, \dots, P_{|X_t|}$ in G from $X_{t'}$ to X_t of size $|X_t|$ is a *set of foundation paths* between t' and t . Let G' be the subgraph of G induced by $X_{t'} \cup X_t \cup \bigcup_{t''} X_{t''}$, where the union is over all nodes t'' in the component of $T - \{t, t'\}$ intersecting $t' T t$. When a set of foundation paths \mathcal{P} between t' and t and a member P of \mathcal{P} with $V(P) \cap X_t \neq V(P) \cap X_{t'}$ are given, we define $L_{\mathcal{P}, P}, R_{\mathcal{P}, P}, Q_{\mathcal{P}, P}$ to be the (L, \mathcal{P}, P) -graph, (R, \mathcal{P}, P) -graph, (Q, \mathcal{P}, P) -graph between $X_{t'}$ and X_t , respectively. A *parent-side jump at t with respect to t' at the vertex in $X_t \cap V(P)$* is a path in G' from $V(R_{\mathcal{P}, P})$ to $\bigcup_{W \in \mathcal{P} - \{P\}} V(W) - (X_{t'} \cap X_t)$ internally disjoint from $V(R_{\mathcal{P}, P}) \cup \bigcup_{W \in \mathcal{P}} V(W)$. A *child-side jump at t' with respect to t at the vertex in $X_{t'} \cap V(P)$* is a path in G' from $V(L_{\mathcal{P}, P})$ to $\bigcup_{W \in \mathcal{P} - \{P\}} V(W) - (X_{t'} \cap X_t)$ internally disjoint from $V(L_{\mathcal{P}, P}) \cup \bigcup_{W \in \mathcal{P}} V(W)$. A

parent-side (or child-side) jump at t is *ambiguous* if both its ends are in X_t ; otherwise it is *unambiguous*.

Lemma 3.1. *For any positive integers k, w, α , there exists an integer $f = f(k, w, \alpha)$ such that the following holds. Let G be a graph that does not contain the Robertson chain of length k as a topological minor. Let (T, \mathcal{X}) be a rooted tree-decomposition of G of width at most w . Let $Z \subseteq V(G)$, s be a positive integer, and $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{f+1})$ be a (Z, s) -strip in (T, \mathcal{X}) . Let $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{|Z|+s}\}$ be a set of foundation paths between t_1 and t_{f+1} , where P_i is a one-vertex path with $V(P_i) \subseteq Z$ for every $s+1 \leq i \leq s+|Z|$. Then there exists a subsequence $(t'_1, t'_2, \dots, t'_{\alpha+1})$ of $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{f+1})$ such that for every j' with $1 \leq j' \leq s$, there exist no two edge-disjoint paths in $G - \bigcup_{W \in \mathcal{P} - \{P_{j'}\}} V(W)$ from the vertex in $X_{t'_\ell} \cap V(P_{j'})$ to the vertex in $X_{t'_{\ell+1}} \cap V(P_{j'})$ for any $1 \leq \ell \leq \alpha$, and either*

- *for all j with $2 \leq j \leq \alpha + 1$, there exist no parent-side jumps at t'_j with respect to t'_{j-1} at the vertex in $X_{t'_j} \cap V(P_{j'})$ disjoint from Z , or*
- *for all j with $1 \leq j \leq \alpha$, there exist no unambiguous child-side jumps at t'_j with respect to t'_{j+1} at the vertex in $X_{t'_j} \cap V(P_{j'})$ disjoint from Z .*

Proof. Define $f = 2^{w+2}(\alpha + 1)(k(k + 1)(w + 1)^{2k+2} + k + 3)(w + 1)k$. We shall show that f satisfies the conclusion of the lemma.

Let G , (T, \mathcal{X}) , Z , s , $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{f+1})$ and \mathcal{P} be the ones mentioned in the lemma. Note that subpaths of the members of \mathcal{P} form a set of foundation paths between t_i and t_{i+1} for each $1 \leq i \leq f$. In addition, $|Z| + s = |X_{t_1}| \leq w + 1$ since the width of (T, \mathcal{X}) is at most w .

If there exist i with $1 \leq i \leq f - k$ and $P \in \{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_s\}$ such that for each j with $0 \leq j \leq k - 1$, there exist two edge-disjoint paths in $G - \bigcup_{W \in \mathcal{P} - \{P\}} V(W)$ from the vertex in $X_{t_{i+j}} \cap V(P)$ to the vertex in $X_{t_{i+j+1}} \cap V(P)$ internally disjoint from $X_{t_{i+j}} \cup X_{t_{i+j+1}}$, then there exists a homeomorphic embedding from a Robertson chain of length at least k to G , a contradiction. So for each $P \in \{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_s\}$ and $1 \leq i \leq f - k$, there exists j with $0 \leq j \leq k - 1$ such that there do not exist two edge-disjoint paths in $G - \bigcup_{W \in \mathcal{P} - \{P\}} V(W)$ from the vertex in $X_{t_{i+j}} \cap V(P)$ to the vertex in $X_{t_{i+j+1}} \cap V(P)$ internally disjoint from $X_{t_{i+j}} \cup X_{t_{i+j+1}}$.

Therefore, for each $P \in \{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_s\}$ and $1 \leq i \leq f - k$, there do not exist two edge-disjoint paths in $G - \bigcup_{W \in \mathcal{P} - \{P\}} V(W)$ from the vertex in $X_{t_i} \cap V(P)$ to the vertex in $X_{t_{i+k}} \cap V(P)$ internally disjoint from $X_{t_i} \cup X_{t_{i+k}}$.

To simplify the notation, by taking a subsequence of $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{f+1})$ of length f/k , we can call t_{ki+1} as t_i for each i with $1 \leq i \leq f/k$, and assume that for each i with $1 \leq i \leq f/k$ and $P \in \{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_s\}$, there do not exist two edge-disjoint paths in $G - \bigcup_{W \in \mathcal{P} - \{P\}} V(W)$ from the vertex in $X_{t_i} \cap V(P)$ to the vertex in $X_{t_{i+1}} \cap V(P)$. Note that it implies that for every $1 \leq i < j \leq f/k$, there do not exist two edge-disjoint paths in $G - \bigcup_{W \in \mathcal{P} - \{P\}} V(W)$ from the vertex in $X_{t_i} \cap V(P)$ to the vertex in $X_{t_j} \cap V(P)$.

Let $\beta = (k(k+1)|X_{t_1}|^{2k+2} + k + 3)s$. Suppose that there exists a sequence $(i_0, i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{\beta+1})$ with $i_0 = 1 < 2 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_\beta \leq f/k - 1 < f/k = i_{\beta+1}$ such that for each j with $1 \leq j \leq \beta$, there exists a vertex v_j in $X_{t_{i_j}} - Z$ such that there exist a parent-side jump at t_{i_j} with respect to $t_{i_{j-1}}$ at v_j disjoint from Z and an unambiguous child-side jump at t_{i_j}

with respect to $t_{i_{j+1}}$ at v_j disjoint from Z . Then there exists a sequence $(i'_0, i'_1, \dots, i'_{\beta/s+1})$ with $i'_0 = 1 < 2 \leq i'_1 < i'_2 < \dots < i'_{\beta/s} < i'_{\beta/s+1}$ such that there exists a member P of $\{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_s\}$ such that for each j with $1 \leq j \leq \beta/s$, there exists a parent-side jump at $t_{i'_j}$ with respect to $t_{i'_{j-1}}$ at the vertex in $(X_{t_{i'_j}} - Z) \cap V(P)$ disjoint from Z and an unambiguous child-side jump at $t_{i'_j}$ with respect to $t_{i'_{j+1}}$ at the vertex in $(X_{t_{i'_j}} - Z) \cap V(P)$ disjoint from Z . By Lemma 2.1, G contains the Robertson chain of length k as a topological minor, a contradiction.

So there exist at most $\beta - 1$ nodes t_i in $\{t_2, \dots, t_{f/k-1}\}$ such that each $X_{t_i} - Z$ contains a vertex v such that there exist a parent-side jump at t_i with respect to t_{i-1} at v disjoint from Z and an unambiguous child-side jump at t_i with respect to t_{i+1} at v disjoint from Z . Let $f_1 = (f/k - 2 - \beta + 1)/\beta$. Then there exists i with $2 \leq i \leq f/k - f_1 - 1$ such that for each j with $0 \leq j \leq f_1 - 1$, $X_{t_{i+j}}$ contains no vertex v such that both a parent-side jump at t_{i+j} with respect to t_{i+j-1} at v disjoint from Z and an unambiguous child-side jump at t_{i+j} with respect to t_{i+j+1} at v disjoint from Z exist.

Let $f_2 = f_1/2^s$. Then there exists a subsequence $(t'_1, t'_2, \dots, t'_{f_2})$ of $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{f+1})$ such that for each j' with $1 \leq j' \leq s$, there exist no two edge-disjoint paths in $G - \bigcup_{W \in \mathcal{P} - \{P_{j'}\}} V(W)$ from the vertex in $X_{t'_\ell} \cap V(P_{j'})$ to the vertex in $X_{t'_{\ell+1}} \cap V(P_{j'})$ for all $1 \leq \ell \leq f_2 - 1$, and either

- for all j with $2 \leq j \leq f_2$, there exist no parent-side jumps at t'_j with respect to t'_{j-1} at the vertex in $X_{t'_j} \cap V(P_{j'})$ disjoint from Z , or
- for all j with $1 \leq j \leq f_2 - 1$, there exist no unambiguous child-side jumps at t'_j with respect to t'_{j+1} at the vertex in $X_{t'_j} \cap V(P_{j'})$ disjoint from Z .

Since $f_2 \geq \alpha + 1$, this proves the lemma. ■

Let G be a graph. Let (T, \mathcal{X}) be a rooted tree-decomposition of G . Let t be a node of T , and let t' be a precursor of t . Let \mathcal{P} be a set of foundation paths between $X_{t'}$ and X_t .

For a member P of \mathcal{P} with $V(P) \cap X_t \neq V(P) \cap X_{t'}$, we say that P is *parent-side static with respect to t' and t* if there exists no parent-side jump at t with respect to t' at the vertex in $V(P) \cap X_t$ and there exist no two edge-disjoint paths in $G - \bigcup_{W \in \mathcal{P} - \{P\}} V(W)$ from the vertex in $V(P) \cap X_{t'}$ to the vertex in $V(P) \cap X_t$ internally disjoint from $X_t \cup X_{t'}$.

Assume that P is parent-side static with respect to t' and t . Let u_P be the vertex in $V(P) \cap X_{t'}$ and v_P the vertex in $V(P) \cap X_t$. Since there exists no parent-side jump at t with respect to t' at v_P and there exist no two edge-disjoint paths in $G - \bigcup_{W \in \mathcal{P} - \{P\}} V(W)$ from u_P to v_P internally disjoint from $X_t \cup X_{t'}$, there exists a unique vertex w in the (R, \mathcal{P}, P) -graph $R_{\mathcal{P}, P}$ such that w is contained in a single-edge block with edge-set $\{e\}$ of the (Q, \mathcal{P}, P) -graph $Q_{\mathcal{P}, P}$, and we define $R'_{\mathcal{P}, P}$ to be the component of $(G - (X_t - \{v_P\})) - e$ containing $R_{\mathcal{P}, P}$. Then there exists a separation (L_P, M_P) of G such that $L_P = \downarrow t - V(R'_{\mathcal{P}, P} - \{w\})$ and $M_P = \uparrow t \cup V(R'_{\mathcal{P}, P})$. Note that $L_P \cap M_P = (X_t - \{v_P\}) \cup \{w\}$, and e is the unique edge incident with w whose other end is in $L_P - M_P$.

The *parent-side progress of t with respect to t'* is the separation $(\bigcap L_{P'}, \bigcup M_{P'})$, where the intersection and the union are taken over all parent-side static members P' of \mathcal{P} with

respect to t' and t . Observe that the order of $(\bigcap L_{P'}, \bigcup M_{P'})$ is $|X_t|$, and every vertex in $\bigcap L_{P'} \cap (\bigcup M_{P'}) - X_t$ is pointed for $(\bigcap L_{P'}, \bigcup M_{P'})$.

For a member P with $V(P) \cap X_t \neq V(P) \cap X_{t'}$, we say that P is *child-side static with respect to t' and t* if there exists no unambiguous child-side jump at t' with respect to t at the vertex in $V(P) \cap X_{t'}$ and there exist no two edge-disjoint paths in $G - \bigcup_{W \in \mathcal{P} - \{P\}} V(W)$ from the vertex in $V(P) \cap X_{t'}$ to the vertex in $V(P) \cap X_t$ internally disjoint from $X_t \cup X_{t'}$. Notice that unlike the parent-side static case, it is possible that there exists an ambiguous child-side jump in the child-side static case.

Assume that P is a member of \mathcal{P} with $V(P) \cap X_t \neq V(P) \cap X_{t'}$ such that P is child-side static with respect to t' and t . Let u_P be the vertex in $V(P) \cap X_{t'}$ and v_P the vertex in $V(P) \cap X_t$. Since there exists no unambiguous child-side jump at t' with respect to t at u_P and there exist no two edge-disjoint paths in $G - \bigcup_{W \in \mathcal{P} - \{P\}} V(W)$ from u_P to v_P internally disjoint from $X_t \cup X_{t'}$, there exists a unique vertex w in the (L, \mathcal{P}, P) -graph $L_{\mathcal{P}, P}$ such that w is contained in a single-edge block with edge-set $\{e\}$ of the (Q, \mathcal{P}, P) -graph $Q_{\mathcal{P}, P}$, and we define $L'_{\mathcal{P}, P}$ to be the component of $(G - (X_{t'} - \{u_P\})) - e$ containing $L_{\mathcal{P}, P}$. In this case, there exists a separation (L'_P, M'_P) of G such that $L'_P = \downarrow t \cup V(L'_{\mathcal{P}, P}) \cup \{w'\}$ and $M'_P = \uparrow t - V(L'_{\mathcal{P}, P})$, where w' is the end of e other than w . Note that $L'_P \cap M'_P = (X_t - \{u_P\}) \cup \{w'\}$, and e is the unique edge incident with w' whose other end is in $L'_P - M'_P$.

For a precursor t'' of t' , the *child-side progress of t' with respect to t, t''* is the separation $(\bigcup L'_{P'}, \bigcap M'_{P'})$, where the union and the intersection are taken over all members P' of \mathcal{P} that are child-side static with respect to t' and t but not parent-side static with respect to t'' and t' . Observe that the order of $(\bigcup L'_{P'}, \bigcap M'_{P'})$ is $|X_t|$, and every vertex in $(\bigcup L'_{P'}) \cap \bigcap M'_{P'} - X_t$ is pointed for $(\bigcup L'_{P'}, \bigcap M'_{P'})$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let G be a graph. Let (T, \mathcal{X}) be a rooted tree-decomposition of G . Let t_1, t_2, t_3 be nodes of T such that t_1 is a precursor of t_2 , and t_2 is a precursor of t_3 . Assume that $X_{t_1}, X_{t_2}, X_{t_3}$ are pairwise disjoint sets of size s , for some positive integer s . Let \mathcal{P} be a set of foundation paths $\{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_s\}$ between X_{t_1} and X_{t_3} . Let r be an integer with $0 \leq r \leq s$ such that for every i with $1 \leq i \leq r$, P_i is parent-side static with respect to t_1 and t_2 , and for every j with $r + 1 \leq j \leq s$, P_j is not parent-side static with respect to t_1 and t_2 but is child-side static with respect to t_2 and t_3 . Let (L, M) be the parent-side progress of t_2 with respect to t_1 . Let (L', M') be the child-side progress of t_2 with respect to t_3, t_1 . Let $(L^*, M^*) = (L \cup (\uparrow t_2 \cap L' - (X_{t_2} \cap (\bigcup_{\ell=1}^r V(P_\ell))))), M' \cup (\downarrow t_2 \cap M - (X_{t_2} \cap (\bigcup_{\ell=r+1}^s V(P_\ell))))$. Then (L^*, M^*) is a pseudo-edge-cut modulo \emptyset of order s such that $\downarrow t_1 \subseteq L^*$ and $\uparrow t_3 \subseteq M^*$.*

Proof. Suppose that there exists $v \in V(G) - (L^* \cup M^*)$. Then $v \in (M - L) \cap (L' - M')$. So if $v \in X_{t_2} \cap (\bigcup_{\ell=r+1}^s V(P_\ell))$, then $v \in \uparrow t_2 \cap L' - (X_{t_2} \cap (\bigcup_{\ell=1}^r V(P_\ell))) \subseteq L^*$, a contradiction; if $v \in X_{t_2} \cap (\bigcup_{\ell=1}^r V(P_\ell))$, then $v \in \downarrow t_2 \cap M - (X_{t_2} \cap (\bigcup_{\ell=r+1}^s V(P_\ell))) \subseteq M^*$, a contradiction. Hence $v \notin X_{t_2}$. So if $v \in \downarrow t_2$, then $v \in \downarrow t_2 \cap (M - L) \subseteq M^*$, a contradiction; if $v \in \uparrow t_2$, then $v \in \uparrow t_2 \cap (L' - M') \subseteq L^*$, a contradiction.

Therefore, $L^* \cup M^* = V(G)$.

Claim 1: (L^*, M^*) is a separation of G .

Proof of Claim 1: Suppose to the contrary that (L^*, M^*) is not a separation of G . Since $L^* \cup M^* = V(G)$, there exist an edge xy of G such that $x \in L^* - M^*$ and $y \in M^* - L^*$.

We first suppose that $y \in \downarrow t_2 \cap M - (X_{t_2} \cap (\bigcup_{\ell=r+1}^s V(P_\ell)))$. If $x \in X_{t_2}$, then since $x \notin M'$, we have $x \in X_{t_2} \cap \bigcup_{\ell=r+1}^s V(P_\ell)$, so there exists a parent-side jump at t_2 with

respect to t_1 at the vertex in $X_{t_2} \cap V(P_{j'})$ for some j' with $1 \leq j' \leq r$, a contradiction. If $x \in (\uparrow t_2 \cap L' - (X_{t_2} \cap (\bigcup_{\ell=1}^r V(P_\ell)))) - X_{t_2}$, then there exists an unambiguous child-side jump at t_2 with respect to t_3 at the vertex in $X_{t_2} \cap V(P_{j'})$ for some j' with $r+1 \leq j' \leq s$, a contradiction. So $x \in L - X_{t_2}$. Since $y \in M - L$, $x \in L \cap M - X_{t_2} \subseteq \downarrow t_2 \cap M - X_{t_2} \subseteq M^*$, a contradiction.

Hence $y \in M' - (\downarrow t_2 \cap M - (X_{t_2} \cap (\bigcup_{\ell=r+1}^s V(P_\ell))))$.

Suppose $x \in \uparrow t_2 \cap L' - (X_{t_2} \cap (\bigcup_{\ell=1}^r V(P_\ell)))$. Since $x \notin M^*$, $x \in L' - M'$. So $y \in L' \cap M'$. Since $y \notin L^*$, $y \in L' \cap M' \cap X_{t_2} \cap \bigcup_{\ell=1}^r V(P_\ell)$. If $x \in X_{t_2}$, then $x \in X_{t_2} \cap \bigcup_{\ell=r+1}^s V(P_\ell)$, so there exists a parent-side jump at t_2 with respect to t_1 at the vertex in $X_{t_2} \cap V(P_{j'})$ for some $1 \leq j' \leq s$, a contradiction. So $x \notin X_{t_2}$. Hence there exists an unambiguous child-side jump at t_2 with respect to t_3 at the vertex in $X_{t_2} \cap V(P_{j'})$ for some j' with $r+1 \leq j' \leq s$, a contradiction.

Hence $x \in L - (\uparrow t_2 \cap L' - (X_{t_2} \cap (\bigcup_{\ell=1}^r V(P_\ell))))$. Since $L \subseteq \downarrow t_2$ and $x \notin M^*$, $x \notin M - (X_{t_2} \cap \bigcup_{\ell=r+1}^s V(P_\ell))$. Since $X_{t_2} \cap \bigcup_{\ell=r+1}^s V(P_\ell) \subseteq \uparrow t_2 \cap L' - (X_{t_2} \cap (\bigcup_{\ell=1}^r V(P_\ell)))$, $x \in L - M$. Similarly, $y \in M' - L'$. Since $M' - L' \subseteq \uparrow t_2 - X_{t_2}$ and $L - M \subseteq \downarrow t_2 - X_{t_2}$, $xy \notin E(G)$, a contradiction. \square

Claim 2: $L^* \cap M^* \subseteq (L \cap M \cap \bigcup_{\ell=1}^r V(P_\ell)) \cup (L' \cap M' \cap \bigcup_{\ell=r+1}^s V(P_\ell))$.

Proof of Claim 2: Note that $L^* \cap M^* \subseteq (L \cap M') \cup (L \cap M - (X_{t_2} \cap \bigcup_{\ell=r+1}^s V(P_\ell))) \cup (L' \cap M' - (X_{t_2} \cap \bigcup_{\ell=1}^r V(P_\ell)))$.

Note that $L \cap M' \subseteq \downarrow t_2 \cap \uparrow t_2 = X_{t_2}$. So if v is a vertex in $L \cap M'$, then there exists j with $1 \leq j \leq s$ such that v is the vertex in $X_{t_2} \cap V(P_j)$ and $V(P_j) \cap L \cap M = \{v\} = V(P_j) \cap L' \cap M'$. Hence $L \cap M' \subseteq (L \cap M - (X_{t_2} \cap \bigcup_{\ell=r+1}^s V(P_\ell))) \cup (L' \cap M' - (X_{t_2} \cap \bigcup_{\ell=1}^r V(P_\ell)))$.

Since $L \cap M \cap \bigcup_{\ell=r+1}^s V(P_\ell) \subseteq X_{t_2}$, $L \cap M - (X_{t_2} \cap \bigcup_{\ell=r+1}^s V(P_\ell)) = L \cap M \cap \bigcup_{\ell=1}^r V(P_\ell)$. Similarly, $L' \cap M' - (X_{t_2} \cap \bigcup_{\ell=1}^r V(P_\ell)) = L' \cap M' \cap \bigcup_{\ell=r+1}^s V(P_\ell)$. Therefore, $L^* \cap M^* \subseteq (L \cap M \cap \bigcup_{\ell=1}^r V(P_\ell)) \cup (L' \cap M' \cap \bigcup_{\ell=r+1}^s V(P_\ell))$. \square

Claim 3: (L^*, M^*) is a pseudo-edge-cut modulo \emptyset .

Proof of Claim 3: Suppose to the contrary that (L^*, M^*) is not a pseudo-edge-cut modulo \emptyset . By Claim 1, there exists $v \in L^* \cap M^*$ such that v is not pointed for (L^*, M^*) . By Claim 2, $v \in (L \cap M \cap \bigcup_{\ell=1}^r V(P_\ell)) \cup (L' \cap M' \cap \bigcup_{\ell=r+1}^s V(P_\ell))$.

We first suppose that $v \in L \cap M \cap \bigcup_{\ell=1}^r V(P_\ell)$. Since v is pointed for (L, M) , v has a neighbor u in $(L^* - M^*) - (L - M)$. Note that $(L^* - M^*) - (L - M) \subseteq (X_{t_2} \cap \bigcup_{\ell=r+1}^s V(P_\ell)) \cup (\uparrow t_2 \cap L' - (X_{t_2} \cup M'))$. If $u \in X_{t_2} \cap \bigcup_{\ell=r+1}^s V(P_\ell)$, then there exists a parent-side jump at t_2 with respect to t_1 at the vertex in $X_{t_2} \cap V(P_{j'})$ for some $1 \leq j' \leq r$, a contradiction. So $u \in \uparrow t_2 \cap L' - (X_{t_2} \cup M')$. Hence $v \in L \cap M \cap X_{t_2}$. So there exists an unambiguous child-side jump at t_2 with respect to t_3 at the vertex in $X_{t_2} \cap V(P_{j'})$ for some $r+1 \leq j' \leq s$, a contradiction.

So $v \in L' \cap M' \cap \bigcup_{\ell=r+1}^s V(P_\ell)$. Since v is pointed for (L', M') , v has a neighbor in $(L^* - M^*) - (L' - M')$. But $L^* \subseteq L'$ and $M^* \supseteq M'$, so $(L^* - M^*) - (L' - M') = \emptyset$, a contradiction. \square

By Claims 2 and 3 and the existence of $\{P_1, \dots, P_s\}$, (L^*, M^*) is a pseudo-edge-cut modulo \emptyset of size s . Note that $\downarrow t_1 \subseteq L \subseteq L^*$ and $\uparrow t_3 \subseteq M' \subseteq M^*$. This proves the lemma. \blacksquare

Lemma 3.3. *For any positive integers k, w, α , there exists an integer $f = f(k, w, \alpha)$ such that the following holds. Let G be a graph that does not contain the Robertson chain of length k as a topological minor. Let (T, \mathcal{X}) be a rooted tree-decomposition of G of width at most*

w. If there exist $Z \subseteq V(G)$, a positive integer s and a (Z, s) -strip $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{f+1})$ in (T, \mathcal{X}) , then there exists a pseudo-edge-cut (A, B) modulo Z of order $|X_{t_1}|$ α -breaking (t_1, \dots, t_{f+1}) .

Proof. Define $f = f_{3.1}(k, w, 2\alpha + 4)$, where $f_{3.1}$ is the function f mentioned in Lemma 3.1. We shall show that f satisfies the conclusion of the lemma.

Let G , (T, \mathcal{X}) , Z , s and $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{f+1})$ be the ones as mentioned in the lemma. Since $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{f+1})$ is a (Z, s) -strip, there exists a set $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{|Z|+s}\}$ of foundation paths between t_1 and t_{f+1} such that P_i is a one-vertex path with $V(P_i) \subseteq Z$ for every i with $s + 1 \leq i \leq s + |Z|$.

By Lemma 3.1, there exist a subsequence $(t'_1, t'_2, \dots, t'_{2\alpha+5})$ of $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{f+1})$ such that for each j' with $1 \leq j' \leq s$, there exist no two edge-disjoint paths in $G - \bigcup_{W \in \mathcal{P} - \{P_{j'}\}} V(W)$ from the vertex in $X_{t'_\ell} \cap V(P_{j'})$ to the vertex in $X_{t'_{\ell+1}} \cap V(P_{j'})$ for any $1 \leq \ell \leq 2\alpha + 4$, and either

- for all j with $2 \leq j \leq 2\alpha + 5$, there exist no parent-side jumps at t'_j with respect to t'_{j-1} at the vertex in $X_{t'_j} \cap V(P_{j'})$ disjoint from Z , or
- for all j with $1 \leq j \leq 2\alpha + 4$, there exist no unambiguous child-side jumps at t'_j with respect to t'_{j+1} at the vertex in $X_{t'_j} \cap V(P_{j'})$ disjoint from Z .

By permuting the indices of the members of \mathcal{P} , we may assume that

- for each j' with $1 \leq j' \leq s$ and each j with $1 \leq j \leq 2\alpha + 4$, there exist no two edge-disjoint paths in $G - \bigcup_{\ell \neq j'} V(P_\ell)$ from the vertex in $X_{t'_j} \cap V(P_\ell)$ to the vertex in $X_{t'_{j+1}} \cap V(P_\ell)$, and
- there exists an integer r with $0 \leq r \leq s$ such that
 - for all $2 \leq j \leq 2\alpha + 4$ and $1 \leq j' \leq r$, there exist no parent-side jumps at t'_j with respect to t'_{j-1} at the vertex in $X_{t'_j} \cap V(P_{j'})$ disjoint from Z , and
 - for all $2 \leq j \leq 2\alpha + 4$ and $r + 1 \leq j' \leq s$, there exists a parent-side jump at t'_j with respect to t'_{j-1} at the vertex in $X_{t'_j} \cap V(P_{j'})$ disjoint from Z , but there exist no unambiguous child-side jumps at t'_j with respect to t'_{j+1} at the vertex in $X_{t'_j} \cap V(P_{j'})$ disjoint from Z .

For every $t \in V(T)$, let $X'_t = X_t - Z$. Let $\mathcal{X}' = (X'_t : t \in V(T))$. Then (T, \mathcal{X}') is a rooted tree-decomposition of $G - Z$ of width at most w . Note that $\{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_s\}$ is a set of foundation paths between $X'_{t'_1}$ and $X'_{t'_{2\alpha+5}}$. Hence for every j with $2 \leq j \leq 2\alpha + 4$, $P_{j'}$ is parent-side static with respect to t'_{j-1} and t'_j for each j' with $1 \leq j' \leq r$, and $P_{j''}$ is not parent-side static with respect to t'_{j-1} and t'_j but is child-side static with respect to t'_j and t'_{j+1} for each j'' with $r + 1 \leq j'' \leq s$.

Let $i^* = \alpha + 2$. There exist a parent-side progress (L, M) of t'_{i^*} with respect to t'_{i^*-1} in $G - Z$ and a child-side progress (L', M') of t'_{i^*} with respect to t'_{i^*+1}, t'_{i^*-1} in $G - Z$. Define $(L_0^*, M_0^*) = (L \cup (\uparrow t'_{i^*} \cap L' - (X'_{t'_{i^*}} \cap (\bigcup_{\ell=1}^r V(P_\ell))))), M' \cup (\downarrow t'_{i^*} \cap M - (X'_{t'_{i^*}} \cap (\bigcup_{\ell=r+1}^s V(P_\ell))))$. By Lemma 3.2, (L_0^*, M_0^*) is a pseudo-edge-cut modulo \emptyset of size s in $G - Z$ such that $(T, \mathcal{X}') \downarrow t'_{i^*-1} \subseteq L_0^*$ and $(T, \mathcal{X}') \uparrow t'_{i^*+1} \subseteq M_0^*$.

Define $(L^*, M^*) = (L_0^* \cup Z, M_0^* \cup Z)$. Hence (L^*, M^*) is a pseudo-edge-cut modulo Z of size $s + |Z|$ in G such that $(T, \mathcal{X}) \downarrow t'_{\alpha+1} \subseteq L^*$ and $(T, \mathcal{X}) \uparrow t'_{\alpha+3} \subseteq M^*$. Therefore, (L^*, M^*) α -breaks $(t'_1, t'_2, \dots, t'_{2\alpha+5})$ and hence α -breaks $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{f+1})$. This proves the lemma. ■

Let (A, B) be a separation of a graph G . We say that a vertex $v \in A \cap B$ is *anti-pointed* for (A, B) if v is incident with at most one edge whose other end is in $B - A$.

Let (T, \mathcal{X}) be a rooted tree-decomposition of a graph G . Let t_1, t_2 be nodes of T , where t_1 is an ancestor of t_2 . We say that a vertex $v \in X_{t_1} \cap X_{t_2}$ is *coherent* for t_1, t_2 , if the following hold.

- Either v is not pointed for (A_{t_1}, B_{t_1}) , or there exists $i \in \{0, 1\}$ such that both the number of edges between v and $A_{t_1} - B_{t_1}$ and the number of edges between v and $A_{t_2} - B_{t_2}$ are equal to i .
- Either v is not anti-pointed for (A_{t_2}, B_{t_2}) , or there exists $i \in \{0, 1\}$ such that both the number of edges between v and $B_{t_1} - A_{t_1}$ and the number of edges between v and $B_{t_2} - A_{t_2}$ are equal to i .

Lemma 3.4. *For any positive integers k, w, α , there exist integers $f(k, w, \alpha)$ and $g(k, w, \alpha) = 9^w(f(k, w, \alpha) + 1)$ such that the following hold. Let G be a graph that does not contain the Robertson chain of length k as a topological minor. Let (T, \mathcal{X}) be a rooted tree-decomposition of G of width at most w . If there exist $Z \subseteq V(G)$, a positive integer s and a (Z, s) -strip $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{g(k, w, \alpha)})$, then there exist a (Z, s) -strip R and a pseudo-edge-cut (A, B) modulo Z of order $|X_{t_1}|$ such that the following hold.*

1. R is a subsequence of $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{g(k, w, \alpha)})$ of length $f(k, w, \alpha) + 1$.
2. Every vertex in Z is coherent for all pairs of nodes in R .
3. (A, B) α -breaks R .

Proof. Define $f(k, w, \alpha)$ to be the number $f(k, w, \alpha)$ mentioned in Lemma 3.3.

For each t_i and each $v \in Z$,

- either
 - v is not pointed for (A_{t_i}, B_{t_i}) , or
 - v is incident with exactly x edges whose other end is in $A_{t_i} - B_{t_i}$ for some $x \in \{0, 1\}$,

and

- either
 - v is not anti-pointed for (A_{t_i}, B_{t_i}) , or
 - v is incident with exactly y edges whose other end is in $B_{t_i} - A_{t_i}$ for some $y \in \{0, 1\}$.

Hence for each t_i and $v \in Z$, there are nine possibilities mentioned above, so we can use nine colors to color each pair (t_i, v) . So for each t_i , there are at most $9^{|Z|}$ different colors for the pairs in $\{(t_i, v) : v \in Z\}$. Since $|Z| \leq w$, we can use at most 9^w different colors to color each t_i according to the colors of (t_i, v) for $v \in Z$. Therefore, there are at least $g(k, w, \alpha)/9^w \geq f(k, w, \alpha) + 1$ nodes in $\{t_i : 1 \leq i \leq g(k, w, \alpha)\}$ having the same color. Let R be a subsequence of $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{g(k, w, \alpha)})$ with $f(k, w, \alpha) + 1$ entries with the same color. Then every vertex in $v \in Z$ is coherent for all nodes in R . Finally, by Lemma 3.3, there exists a pseudo-edge-cut modulo Z with order $|X_{t_1}|$ α -breaking R . This proves the lemma. ■

4 Bounding the elevation

4.1 Linkedness

Lemma 4.1. *Let (T, \mathcal{X}) be a rooted tree-decomposition of a graph G . Let $t_1, t_2 \in V(T)$ be such that t_1 is an ancestor of t_2 . Let (A, B) be a separation of G such that $X_{t_1} \subseteq A$ and $X_{t_2} \subseteq B$. Then there exists a separation (A^*, B^*) of G such that the following hold.*

- (i) $A^* \cap B^* = A \cap B$.
- (ii) $\downarrow t_1 \subseteq A^*$ and $\uparrow t_2 \subseteq B^*$.
- (iii) *For every node s of T that is a descendant of t_1 and not an ancestor or a descendant of t_2 , if $X_s \subseteq A^*$ or $X_s \subseteq B^*$, then either $\uparrow s \subseteq A^*$, or $\uparrow s \subseteq B^*$.*

Proof. Let us say that a node $s \in V(T)$ is a *side node* if s is a descendant of t_1 and not an ancestor or a descendant of t_2 . Let (A, B) be a separation as in the statement of this lemma. We say that a side node $s \in V(T)$ is *bad (for (A, B))* if $X_s \subseteq A$ or $X_s \subseteq B$ and neither $\uparrow s \subseteq A$ nor $\uparrow s \subseteq B$. We say that t_1 is *bad* if $\downarrow t_1 \not\subseteq A$ and we say that t_2 is *bad* if $\uparrow t_2 \not\subseteq B$. We proceed by induction on the number of bad nodes. If there are no bad nodes, then (A, B) satisfies the conclusion of the lemma.

If t_1 is bad, then every vertex $v \in \downarrow t_1 - A$ belongs to a component C of $G - (A \cap B)$ that is disjoint from A , and hence from X_{t_1} , and hence it is disjoint from $\uparrow t_2$ and $\uparrow s$ for every side node s . Let $A' = A \cup \bigcup V(C)$ and $B' = B - \bigcup V(C)$, where the union is over all components C of $G - (A \cap B)$ contained in $\downarrow t_1 - A$. Then (A', B') is a separation of G with $X_{t_1} \subseteq A'$ and $X_{t_2} \subseteq B'$ that satisfies $A' \cap B' = A \cap B$. Furthermore, every node that is bad for (A', B') is bad for (A, B) , but t_1 is no longer bad for (A', B') . Thus the conclusion of the lemma follows by induction applied to the separation (A', B') .

An analogous argument applies when t_2 is bad. We may therefore assume that there exists a bad side node s . Thus $X_s \subseteq A$ or $X_s \subseteq B$ and neither $\uparrow s \subseteq A$ nor $\uparrow s \subseteq B$. We assume that $X_s \subseteq A$, because the case $X_s \subseteq B$ is analogous. Since $\uparrow s \not\subseteq A$ and $X_s \subseteq A$, there exists a component C of $G - (A \cap B)$ contained in $\uparrow s - A$. Every such component is disjoint from $\downarrow t_1$, $\uparrow t_2$, and $\uparrow s'$ for every bad side node s' that is not equal to or a descendant or an ancestor of s . Let $A' = A \cup \bigcup V(C)$ and $B' = B - \bigcup V(C)$, where the union is over all components C of $G - (A \cap B)$ contained in $\uparrow s - A$. Then (A', B') is a separation of G with $X_{t_1} \subseteq A'$ and $X_{t_2} \subseteq B'$ that satisfies $A' \cap B' = A \cap B$. Furthermore, every node that

is bad for (A', B') is bad for (A, B) . To see that let s' be bad for (A', B') . Then s' is not a descendant of s , because $\uparrow s \subseteq A'$. If it is an ancestor of s , then $X_{s'} \cap A = X_{s'} \cap A'$ and $X_{s'} \cap B = X_{s'} \cap B'$. Then neither $\uparrow s' \subseteq A$, nor $\uparrow s' \subseteq B$, because the same holds for s . Thus s' is bad for (A, B) . If s' is neither a descendant nor an ancestor of s , then $X_{s'} \cap A = X_{s'} \cap A'$ and $X_{s'} \cap B = X_{s'} \cap B'$, and $\uparrow s' \cap A = \uparrow s' \cap A'$ and $\uparrow s' \cap B = \uparrow s' \cap B'$. Thus, again, s' is bad for (A, B) . But s is no longer bad for (A', B') . Thus the conclusion of the lemma follows by induction applied to the separation (A', B') . ■

Let N be a positive integer. We say that a rooted tree-decomposition (T, \mathcal{X}) of a graph G is N -linked if the following holds. If $t_1, t_2 \in V(T)$, where t_1 is a precursor of t_2 , such that $\uparrow t_2$ contains at least N vertices of G each of which cannot be separated from $\downarrow t_1$ by a separation of order less than $|X_{t_1}|$ given by a node of T , then there does not exist a separation (A, B) of G of order less than $|X_{t_1}|$ with $\downarrow t_1 \subseteq A$ and $\uparrow t_2 \subseteq B$.

We say that a rooted tree-decomposition (T, \mathcal{X}) of a graph G is *weakly N -linked* if the following holds. If t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{N+1} are nodes of T such that t_i is a precursor of t_{i+1} for all $1 \leq i \leq N$, and the sets X_{t_i} are distinct for $1 \leq i \leq N + 1$, then there exist $|X_{t_1}|$ disjoint paths in G from X_{t_1} to X_{t_2} .

The following lemma shows that every N -linked rooted tree-decomposition is weakly N -linked.

Lemma 4.2. *Let N be a positive integer and let (T, \mathcal{X}) be an N -linked rooted tree-decomposition of a graph G . Let t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{N+1} be nodes of T such that t_i is a precursor of t_{i+1} for all $1 \leq i \leq N$. If the sets X_{t_i} are distinct for $1 \leq i \leq N + 1$, then there exist $|X_{t_1}|$ disjoint paths in G from X_{t_1} to X_{t_2} .*

Proof. Suppose that there do not exist $|X_{t_1}|$ disjoint paths in G from X_{t_1} to X_{t_2} . So $X_{t_1} \neq X_{t_2}$ and $|X_{t_1}| \geq 1$. Since $X_{t_1}, X_{t_2}, \dots, X_{t_{N+1}}$ are $N + 1$ distinct sets with the same size, $X_{t_{i+1}} - \bigcup_{j=1}^i X_{t_j} \neq \emptyset$ for every i with $1 \leq i \leq N$ by the definition of a tree-decomposition. Since t_i is a precursor of t_{i+1} for every $1 \leq i \leq N$, $|X_t| \geq |X_{t_1}|$ for all $t \in t_1 T t_{N+1}$, so $\uparrow t_2$ contains at least $|X_{t_2}| + N - 1 \geq N$ vertices each of which cannot be separated from $\downarrow t_1$ by a separation of order less than $|X_{t_1}|$ given by a node of T .

Let (A, B) be a separation of G with minimum order such that $X_{t_1} \subseteq A$ and $X_{t_2} \subseteq B$. So the order of (A, B) is less than $|X_{t_1}|$ by Menger's theorem. By Lemma 4.1, there exists a separation (A^*, B^*) with $|A^* \cap B^*| = |A \cap B| < |X_{t_1}|$ such that $\downarrow t_1 \subseteq A^*$ and $\uparrow t_2 \subseteq B^*$. So (T, \mathcal{X}) is not N -linked, a contradiction. ■

4.2 Incorporation

We say that a separation (A, B) of a graph G *weakly separates* two subsets Y, Z of $V(G)$ if either $Y \subseteq A$ and $Z \subseteq B$, or $Y \subseteq B$ and $Z \subseteq A$.

Let G be a graph and let (A, B) be a separation of G . Recall that we say that a vertex $v \in A \cap B$ is *pointed for (A, B)* if v is incident with at most one edge whose other end is in $A - B$; we say that a vertex $v \in A \cap B$ is *anti-pointed for (A, B)* if v is incident with at most one edge whose other end is in $B - A$. We say that $v \in A \cap B$ is *doubly pointed for (A, B)* if it is pointed and anti-pointed for (A, B) . The *thickness* of (A, B) is the number of vertices in $A \cap B$ not pointed for (A, B) . The *breadth* of (A, B) is the sequence $(|A \cap B|, j)$, where j

is the thickness of (A, B) . In this paper, sequences are compared by the lexicographic order. So the breadth of a separation (A, B) is smaller than the breadth of a separation (C, D) if and only if either the order of (A, B) is less than the order of (C, D) , or they have the same order but the thickness of (A, B) is smaller than the thickness of (C, D) .

Let (T, \mathcal{X}) be a rooted tree-decomposition of a graph G . Let (A, B) be a separation of G . We say that (A, B) is *incorporated* in (T, \mathcal{X}) if there exists $S \subseteq V(T)$ such that the following hold.

(INC1) For every $t \in S$, the breadth of the separation (A_t, B_t) given by t in (T, \mathcal{X}) is at most the breadth of (A, B) .

(INC2) $B = \bigcup_{t \in S} B_t$.

(INC3) $\sum_{i,j} a_{i,j} 2^{i^2+j} \leq 2^{|A \cap B|^2 + \ell}$, where ℓ is the thickness of (A, B) , and $a_{i,j}$ is the number of nodes t in S such that (A_t, B_t) has breadth (i, j) .

We say that S is a *witness set* of the incorporation. In fact, (INC1) follows from (INC3), but (INC1) is included for better clarity.

Lemma 4.3. *If (A, B) is a separation that is incorporated in a rooted tree-decomposition (T, \mathcal{X}) of a graph G with witness set S , then the following hold.*

1. $|S| \leq 2^{|A \cap B|^2 + |A \cap B|}$.
2. *If (A, B) is a separation weakly separating two sets Y, Z with minimum order, and (C, D) is a separation given by a node in S of breadth at least the breadth of (A, B) weakly separating Y, Z , then $(A, B) = (C, D)$.*
3. *There exists $S' \subseteq S$ satisfying (INC1)-(INC3) such that no node in S' is an ancestor of another node in S' .*

Proof. It is clear that $|S| \leq 2^{|A \cap B|^2 + |A \cap B|}$ by (INC3) since (A, B) has thickness at most $|A \cap B|$.

Let $s \in S$ be such that (A_s, B_s) is a separation of breadth at least the breadth of (A, B) . By (INC1), the breadth of (A_s, B_s) equals the breadth of (A, B) . By (INC3), s is the unique member of S . By (INC2), $B_s = B$. Since (A, B) is a separation of minimum order weakly separating Y, Z , and (A_s, B_s) weakly separates Y, Z and the order of (A, B) is equal to the order of (A_s, B_s) , $A_s \cap B_s = A \cap B$. So $(A_s, B_s) = (A, B)$.

If s_1, s_2 are two nodes in S such that s_1 is an ancestor of s_2 , then $S - \{s_2\}$ also satisfies (INC1)-(INC3). So we may repeat this process to remove nodes in S that are descendants of other nodes in S , until no node in S is an ancestor of another node in S . ■

Lemma 4.4. *Let (T, \mathcal{X}) be a rooted tree-decomposition of a graph G . Let w be a nonnegative integer and let $N = (w + 1) \cdot 2^{(w+1)(w+2)} + 1$. Let t_1, t_2 be two nodes of T , where t_1 is an ancestor of t_2 . Let (A, B) be a separation of G with minimum order such that $\downarrow t_1 \subseteq A$ and $\uparrow t_2 \subseteq B$. If (A, B) has order at most $w + 1$, and $\uparrow t_2$ contains N vertices each of which cannot be separated from $\downarrow t_1$ by a separation given by a node of T whose breadth is strictly less than the breadth of (A, B) , then either (A, B) is given by a node of T , or (A, B) is not incorporated.*

Proof. Suppose that (A, B) is not given by a node of T , but (A, B) is incorporated. Let S be a subset of $V(T)$ satisfying (INC1)-(INC3) witnessing that (A, B) is incorporated. Since (A, B) is a separation weakly separating $\downarrow t_1$ and $\uparrow t_2$ with minimum order, Statement 2 of Lemma 4.3 implies that every separation given by a node in S has breadth strictly less than the breadth of (A, B) .

Note that $\uparrow t_2 \subseteq \uparrow t_1$ and (A, B) is a separation of G with minimum order such that $\downarrow t_1 \subseteq A$ and $\uparrow t_2 \subseteq B$, so the order of $(\downarrow t_1, \uparrow t_1)$ is at least the order of (A, B) . That is, $|X_{t_1}| \geq |A \cap B|$.

Claim 1: $\downarrow t_1 \not\subseteq X_t$ for every $t \in S$.

Proof of Claim 1: Suppose to the contrary that there exists a node $t \in S$ such that $\downarrow t_1 \subseteq X_t$. Then $|X_{t_1}| \leq |\downarrow t_1| \leq |X_t| \leq |A \cap B| \leq |X_{t_1}|$. So $\downarrow t_1 = X_t$, which has size $|A \cap B|$. Since $\downarrow t_1 \subseteq A$ and $X_t \subseteq B$, $X_t = \downarrow t_1 = A \cap B$. Furthermore, since $B_t \subseteq B$ and $A \cap B = X_t = A_t \cap B_t$, we know $A \subseteq A_t$. So for each vertex in $A \cap B$ not pointed for (A, B) , it is in $A_t \cap B_t$ and not pointed for (A_t, B_t) . Hence the breadth of (A_t, B_t) is at least the breadth of (A, B) , a contradiction. \square

Claim 2: No node in S is an ancestor of t_1 .

Proof of Claim 2: Suppose to the contrary that some node $t \in S$ is an ancestor of t_1 . By (INC2), $B_t \subseteq B$. So $X_{t_1} \subseteq \downarrow t_1 \cap B_t \subseteq A \cap B$. But $|X_{t_1}| \geq |A \cap B|$. This implies that $X_{t_1} = A \cap B$. Hence if $A = \downarrow t_1$, then $B = \uparrow t_1$ and (A, B) is given by t_1 , a contradiction. So $A - (\downarrow t_1) \neq \emptyset$. But $A - (\downarrow t_1) \subseteq \uparrow t_1 \subseteq B_t \subseteq B$. Therefore, $(A \cap B) - (\downarrow t_1)$ is nonempty. But $A \cap B = X_{t_1}$, a contradiction. \square

Since $\uparrow t_2 \subseteq B = \bigcup_{t \in S} B_t$, for each vertex $v \in \uparrow t_2$, there exists $t_v \in S$ such that $v \in B_{t_v}$. Assume now that $v \in \uparrow t_2$ cannot be separated from $\downarrow t_1$ by a separation given by a node of T of breadth strictly less than the breadth of (A, B) . Since the breadth of each (A_{t_v}, B_{t_v}) is less than the breadth of (A, B) , (A_{t_v}, B_{t_v}) does not separate $\downarrow t_1$ and v . By Claim 1, $\downarrow t_1 \not\subseteq X_{t_v}$. So either $v \in X_{t_v}$, or $\downarrow t_1 \not\subseteq A_{t_v}$. If $\downarrow t_1 \not\subseteq A_{t_v}$, then t_v is not t_1 or a descendant of t_1 , so t_v is not an ancestor of t_1 nor a descendant of t_1 by Claim 2, and hence $v \in B_{t_v} \cap \uparrow t_2 \subseteq X_{t_v}$. That is, $v \in X_{t_v}$. Therefore, there are at least N vertices contained in $\bigcup_{s \in S} X_s$. For each $s \in S$, $|X_s| \leq |A \cap B| \leq w + 1$ by (INC1). So $\bigcup_{s \in S} X_s$ contains at most $(w + 1)|S| \leq (w + 1)2^{(w+1)(w+2)} < N$ vertices by Statement 1 of Lemma 4.3, a contradiction. \blacksquare

Let (T, \mathcal{X}) be a rooted tree-decomposition of a graph G . For all nonnegative integers i, j with $j \leq i$, let $b_{i,j}$ be the number of separations of G of breadth (i, j) incorporated in (T, \mathcal{X}) . For each nonnegative integer k , let b_k be the sequence $(b_{k,0}, b_{k,1}, \dots, b_{k,k})$. The *signature* of (T, \mathcal{X}) is the sequence $b = (b_0, b_1, \dots, b_{|V(G)|})$. If $b' = (b'_0, b'_1, \dots, b'_{|V(G)|})$ is the signature of another tree-decomposition of G , where $b'_k = (b'_{k,0}, b'_{k,1}, \dots, b'_{k,k})$, then we say that b' is *greater* than b if there exist integers $i, j \in \{0, 1, \dots, |V(G)|\}$ such that $j \leq i$, $b_0 = b'_0$, $b_1 = b'_1, \dots, b_{i-1} = b'_{i-1}$, $b_{i,0} = b'_{i,0}$, $b_{i,1} = b'_{i,1}, \dots, b_{i,j-1} = b'_{i,j-1}$, and $b_{i,j} < b'_{i,j}$.

Lemma 4.5. *Let w be a nonnegative integer and let $N = (w + 1) \cdot 2^{(w+1)(w+2)} + 1$. Let (T, \mathcal{X}) be a rooted tree-decomposition of a graph G of width at most w . If (T, \mathcal{X}) is not N -linked, then there exists a rooted tree-decomposition (T^*, \mathcal{X}^*) of G of width no more than the width of (T, \mathcal{X}) but with signature greater than the signature of (T, \mathcal{X}) .*

Proof. Since (T, \mathcal{X}) is not N -linked, there exist $t_1, t_2 \in V(T)$, where t_1 is a precursor of t_2 , such that $\uparrow t_2$ contains at least N vertices each of which cannot be separated from $\downarrow t_1$ by a separation of order less than $|X_{t_1}|$ given by a node of T , but there exists a separation (A, B) of order less than $|X_{t_1}|$ with $\downarrow t_1 \subseteq A$ and $\uparrow t_2 \subseteq B$. We may assume that the order of (A, B) is as small as possible, so there exist $|A \cap B|$ disjoint paths in G from $\downarrow t_1$ to $\uparrow t_2$ and hence from X_{t_1} to X_{t_2} . Subject to the minimality of the order of (A, B) , we further assume that $\sum_{v \in A \cap B} d_v$ is as small as possible, where d_v is the minimum distance from a node whose bag contains v to the path $t_1 T t_2$.

Since the order of (A, B) is less than $|X_{t_1}|$, we know $X_{t_1} \subseteq A$, $X_{t_1} \not\subseteq B$, $X_{t_2} \subseteq B$, and $X_{t_2} \not\subseteq A$. We claim that (A, B) is not given by a node of T . To prove the claim suppose to the contrary that (A, B) is given by a node t of T . Then $t \notin t_1 T t_2$, since $|X_t| \geq |X_{t_1}|$ as t_1 is a precursor of t_2 . If t is an ancestor of t_1 , then $X_{t_1} \subseteq B_t = B$, a contradiction. Now assume that t is not an ancestor of t_1 . Then $X_{t_2} \subseteq A_t = A$, a contradiction. This proves our claim that (A, B) is not given by a node of T .

Let us say that a node $t \in V(T)$ is a *side node* if t is a descendant of t_1 but not an ancestor or a descendant of t_2 . By Lemma 4.1, we may further assume, by replacing the separation (A, B) , that for every side node t , if $X_t \subseteq A$ or $X_t \subseteq B$, then either $\uparrow t \subseteq A$ or $\uparrow t \subseteq B$. Note that every separation of breadth less than the breadth of (A, B) has order less than $|X_{t_1}|$, so by Lemma 4.4, (A, B) is not incorporated.

Now we construct a new tree-decomposition. For each vertex v of G , let t_v be a node of T such that $v \in X_{t_v}$. Let T' be a copy of T and let T'' be a copy of the maximal subtree rooted at t_1 . For each node t of T , we denote the copy of t in T' by t' ; for each node t that is a descendant of t_1 , we denote the copy of t in T'' by t'' . Define T^* to be the rooted tree obtained from $T' \cup T''$ by adding a new node t^* and directed edges $t'_2 t^*$ and $t^* t''_1$. Define $X_{t^*} = A \cap B$. For each $t' \in V(T')$, define $X_{t'} = (X_t \cap A) \cup \{v \in A \cap B : t \in t_v T t_2\}$; for each $t'' \in V(T'')$, define $X_{t''} = (X_t \cap B) \cup \{v \in A \cap B : t \in t_1 T t_v\}$. It is straightforward to check that (T^*, \mathcal{X}^*) is a rooted tree-decomposition. (Alternatively, this can be proved by the arguments in [1, Page 542], since $(T, \mathcal{X}) \downarrow t_1 \subseteq A$.) Since there exist $|A \cap B|$ disjoint paths in G from X_{t_1} to X_{t_2} , it is not hard to show that the width of (T^*, \mathcal{X}^*) is at most the width of (T, \mathcal{X}) . Note that for every side node t , $((T^*, \mathcal{X}^*) \downarrow t', (T^*, \mathcal{X}^*) \uparrow t') = (A_t \cup B, B_t \cap A)$ and $((T^*, \mathcal{X}^*) \downarrow t'', (T^*, \mathcal{X}^*) \uparrow t'') = (A_t \cup A, B_t \cap B)$.

Note that (A, B) is incorporated in (T^*, \mathcal{X}^*) since t^* gives the separation (A, B) . To prove this lemma, it suffices to show that every separation of G of breadth no more than the breadth of (A, B) incorporated in (T, \mathcal{X}) is incorporated in (T^*, \mathcal{X}^*) .

Let (C, D) be a separation of G incorporated in (T, \mathcal{X}) of breadth no more than the breadth of (A, B) . Let S be a subset of $V(T)$ witnessing the incorporation of (C, D) . By Lemma 4.3, we may assume that no node in S is an ancestor of another node in S . Since the order of (C, D) is no more than (A, B) , every node in S has bag size less than $|X_{t_1}|$. Since t_1 is a precursor of t_2 , no node in S is in $t_1 T t_2$.

Define the following sets.

- $S_1 = \{s \in S : s \text{ belongs to the component of } T - t_1 \text{ containing the root}\}$, $S_1^* = \{s' : s \in S_1\}$.
- $S_2 = \{s \in S : s \text{ is a side node and } \uparrow s \subseteq A\}$, $S_2^* = \{s' : s \in S_2\}$.

- $S_3 = \{s \in S: s \text{ is a side node, } \uparrow s \not\subseteq A \text{ and } \uparrow s \subseteq B\}$, $S_3^* = \{s'' : s \in S_3\}$.
- $S_4 = \{s \in S: s \text{ is a descendant of } t_2\}$, $S_4^* = \{s'' : s \in S_4\}$.
- $S_5 = \{s \in S: s \text{ is a side node, } \uparrow s \not\subseteq A \text{ and } \uparrow s \not\subseteq B\}$, $S_5^* = \{s', s'' : s \in S_5\}$.
- $S^* = S_1^* \cup S_2^* \cup S_3^* \cup S_4^* \cup S_5^*$.

We have the following.

- If $s \in S_1 \cup S_2$, then $(T^*, \mathcal{X}^*) \uparrow s' = (T, \mathcal{X}) \uparrow s$.
- If $s \in S_3 \cup S_4$, then $(T^*, \mathcal{X}^*) \uparrow s'' = (T, \mathcal{X}) \uparrow s$.
- If $s \in S_5$, then $(T^*, \mathcal{X}^*) \uparrow s' \cup (T^*, \mathcal{X}^*) \uparrow s'' = (T, \mathcal{X}) \uparrow s$.
- For $s \in S_5$ the order of $(B_s \cap A, A_s \cup B)$ equals $|X_{s'}^*|$.
- For $s \in S_5$ the order of $(B_s \cap B, A_s \cup A)$ equals $|X_{s''}^*|$.

Since no node in S is in $t_1 T t_2$, it follows that $S = S_1 \cup S_2 \cup S_3 \cup S_4 \cup S_5$, and hence S^* satisfies (INC2), and (INC1) immediately follows from the claim below.

We claim that for every side node $s \in S_5$, $|X_{s'}^*| < |X_s|$ and $|X_{s''}^*| < |X_s|$. We have $A \not\supseteq X_s \not\subseteq B$, because (A, B) satisfies the conclusion of Lemma 4.1. Suppose to the contrary that $|X_{s'}^*| \geq |X_s|$. By submodularity, the order of $(B_s \cup A, A_s \cap B)$ is at most the order of (A, B) , since the order of $(B_s \cap A, A_s \cup B)$ equals $|X_{s'}^*|$ and the order of (A_s, B_s) equals $|X_s|$. Furthermore, $\downarrow t_1 \subseteq A \subseteq B_s \cup A$ and $\uparrow t_2 \subseteq A_s \cap B$. But $\sum_{v \in (B_s \cup A) \cap (A_s \cap B)} d_v < \sum_{v \in A \cap B} d_v$ unless $A \cap B \subseteq A_s$. So $A \cap B \subseteq A_s$ by the minimality of (A, B) . But it implies that $X_{s'}^* = X_s \cap A \subset X_s$, so $|X_{s'}^*| < |X_s|$, a contradiction. This proves that $|X_{s'}^*| < |X_s|$. Similarly, $|X_{s''}^*| < |X_s|$.

Therefore S^* satisfies (INC1) and (INC2). It remains to prove (INC3). Note that for each $s \in S$, if both s', s'' are contained in S^* , then $s \in S_5$, and hence $|X_{s'}^*| < |X_s|$ and $|X_{s''}^*| < |X_s|$. So S^* satisfies (INC3). This proves that (A, B) is incorporated in (T^*, \mathcal{X}^*) . ■

4.3 Reflection

Let (A, B) be a separation of G , and let U, V be two subsets of $V(G)$. We say that (A, B) *strongly separates* U, V if $U \subseteq A$, $V \subseteq B$, and every vertex in $A \cap B - (U \cap V)$ is pointed for (A, B) and is not in U . Note that (A, B) strongly separates U, V does not imply that (B, A) strongly separates V, U .

Let G be a graph and let $Z \subseteq V(G)$. Let (A_2, B_2) be a separation of G with $Z \subseteq A_2 \cap B_2$ such that every vertex in $A_2 \cap B_2 - Z$ is pointed for (A_2, B_2) . Let W be a subset of $A_2 \cap B_2$ such that every vertex in W is doubly pointed for (A_2, B_2) and no vertex in W is adjacent to some vertex in $A_2 \cap B_2 - (Z \cup W)$. We say that the separation (A_1, B_1) of a graph G is the *reflection* of (A_2, B_2) with respect to Z, W if $A_1 = A_2 - (A_2 \cap B_2 - (W \cup Z))$ and $B_1 = B_2 \cup \{u \in A_2 - B_2 : uv \in E(G) \text{ for some } v \in A_2 \cap B_2 - (W \cup Z)\}$. Notice that $A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_2 \cap B_2 = W \cup Z$. We say that a separation is a *reflection* of (A_2, B_2) with respect to Z if it is the reflection with respect to Z, W' for some subset W' of $A_2 \cap B_2$ such that

every vertex in W' is doubly pointed for (A_2, B_2) and W' is not adjacent to any vertex in $A_2 \cap B_2 - (Z \cup W')$.

Lemma 4.6. *Let G be a graph and Z a subset of $V(G)$. Let (A_2, B_2) be a separation of G with $Z \subseteq A_2 \cap B_2$ such that every vertex in $A_2 \cap B_2 - Z$ is pointed for (A_2, B_2) . Let W be a subset of $A_2 \cap B_2$ such that every vertex in W is doubly pointed for (A_2, B_2) and no vertex in W is adjacent to some vertex in $A_2 \cap B_2 - (Z \cup W)$. If there exist $X, Y \subseteq V(G)$ with $X \cap Y = Z$ such that (A_2, B_2) strongly separates X, Y , and there exist $|X|$ disjoint paths in G from X to Y , then every vertex in $A_1 \cap B_1 - Z$ is anti-pointed for (A_1, B_1) , and every vertex in W is doubly-pointed for both (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) .*

Proof. Since every vertex in $A_2 \cap B_2 - (W \cup Z)$ is pointed for (A_2, B_2) and there exist $|X|$ disjoint paths in G from X to Y , the edges with one end in $A_2 \cap B_2 - Z$ and with one end in $A_2 - B_2$ form a matching. So the order of (A_1, B_1) equals the order of (A_2, B_2) , every vertex in $A_1 \cap B_1 - (W \cup Z)$ is anti-pointed for (A_1, B_1) . Since every vertex in W is not adjacent to any vertex in $A_2 \cap B_2 - (Z \cup W)$, the set of edges with one end in W and one end in $B_1 - A_1$ equals the set of edges with one end in W and one end in $B_2 - A_2$. So every vertex in W is doubly pointed for both (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) . ■

Notice that as long as (A_2, B_2) strongly separates X, Y and there exist $|X|$ disjoint paths from X to Y , there exists a reflection of (A_2, B_2) with respect to Z , where $Z = X \cap Y$, as we can take $W = \emptyset$. Observe that if (C, D) is a separation of order $|X|$ with $X \subseteq C$ and $Y \subseteq D$ such that every vertex in $C \cap D - Z$ is anti-pointed for (C, D) , then (C, D) is a reflection of some pseudo-edge-cut modulo Z with respect to Z .

Lemma 4.7. *Let (T, \mathcal{X}) be a rooted tree-decomposition of a graph G . Let t_0, t_1, t_2, t_3 be nodes of T such that t_i is a precursor of t_{i+1} for $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, and $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_1} = X_{t_1} \cap X_{t_2} = X_{t_2} \cap X_{t_3} = \bigcap_{j=0}^3 X_j$. Assume that there exist $|X_{t_0}|$ disjoint paths $P_1, \dots, P_{|X_{t_0}|}$ in G from X_{t_0} to X_{t_3} and every vertex in $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}$ is coherent for t_0, t_3 . Let (A_2, B_2) be a separation of G of order $|X_{t_0}|$ strongly separating $\downarrow t_0$ and $\uparrow t_3$. Let W be a subset of $A_2 \cap B_2$ such that every vertex in W is doubly pointed for (A_2, B_2) , and W is not adjacent to any vertex in $A_2 \cap B_2 - (W \cup (X_{t_1} \cap X_{t_2}))$. Let (A_1, B_1) be the reflection of (A_2, B_2) with respect to $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}, W$.*

If $A_2 \supseteq \downarrow t_0 \cup (\downarrow t_1 \cap (\bigcup_{i=1}^{|X_{t_0}|} V(P_i)))$ and $B_1 \supseteq \uparrow t_3 \cup (\uparrow t_2 \cap (\bigcup_{i=1}^{|X_{t_0}|} V(P_i)))$, then there exist separations $(A'_1, B'_1), (A'_2, B'_2)$ such that the following hold.

1. $A'_1 \cap B'_1 = A_1 \cap B_1$ and $A'_2 \cap B'_2 = A_2 \cap B_2$.
2. Every vertex in $A'_2 \cap B'_2$ pointed (and doubly pointed, respectively) for (A_2, B_2) is pointed (and doubly pointed, respectively) for (A'_2, B'_2) . In particular, every vertex in $A'_2 \cap B'_2 - (X_{t_1} \cap X_{t_2})$ is pointed for (A'_2, B'_2) , and every vertex in W is doubly pointed for (A'_2, B'_2) .
3. (A'_1, B'_1) is the reflection of (A'_2, B'_2) with respect to $X_{t_1} \cap X_{t_2}, W$. In particular, every vertex in $A'_1 \cap B'_1 - (X_{t_1} \cap X_{t_2})$ is anti-pointed.
4. $A'_2 \supseteq \downarrow t_0 \cup (\downarrow t_1 \cap (\bigcup_{i=1}^{|X_{t_0}|} V(P_i)))$ and $B'_1 \supseteq \uparrow t_3 \cup (\uparrow t_2 \cap (\bigcup_{i=1}^{|X_{t_0}|} V(P_i)))$.

5. For every node t that is a descendant of t_0 but not an ancestor of t_3 , if either $X_t \subseteq A'_1$ or $X_t \subseteq B'_2$, then $\uparrow t \subseteq A'_1$ or $\uparrow t \subseteq B'_2$.

6. Every vertex in $(A_1 - A'_1) \cup (A'_1 - A_1) \cup (B_2 - B'_2) \cup (B'_2 - B_2)$ is contained in some component of $G - (W \cup (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}))$ disjoint from $X_{t_0} \cup X_{t_3}$.

Proof. We say a node of T is a *side node* if it is a descendant of t_0 but not an ancestor or a descendant of t_3 . We say that a side node t is *bad* for a pair of separations $(C_1, D_1), (C_2, D_2)$, where (C_1, D_1) is a reflection of (C_2, D_2) with respect to $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}$, if either $X_t \subseteq C_1$ or $X_t \subseteq D_2$, but neither $\uparrow t \subseteq C_1$ nor $\uparrow t \subseteq D_2$. Note that Statement 3 and $B'_1 \supseteq \uparrow t_3 \cup (\uparrow t_2 \cap (\bigcup_{i=1}^{|X_{t_0}|} V(P_i)))$ imply that $\uparrow t_3 \subseteq B'_2$. Hence to prove Statement 5, it suffices to prove Statements 3 and 4 and prove Statement 5 holds for all side nodes.

Let k be the number of bad side nodes for $(A_1, B_1), (A_2, B_2)$. We shall prove this lemma by induction on k . Clearly, when we choose (A'_i, B'_i) to be (A_i, B_i) for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, Statements 1-4 hold. Hence this lemma holds when $k = 0$. Now we assume that $k \geq 1$ and this lemma holds for all smaller k .

Let $Z = W \cup (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$, and let M be the set consisting of the edges with one end in $A_1 \cap B_1 - Z$ and one end in $A_2 \cap B_2 - Z$. Since there exist $|X_{t_1}|$ disjoint paths in G from X_{t_0} to X_{t_3} , and every vertex in $A_2 \cap B_2 - Z$ is pointed for (A_2, B_2) , M is a matching. Let G_A (and G_B , respectively) be the union of the components of $G - (M \cup Z)$ intersecting $\downarrow t_0 \cup (\downarrow t_1 \cap (\bigcup_{i=1}^{|X_{t_0}|} V(P_i)))$ and disjoint from $\uparrow t_3$ (and intersecting $\uparrow t_3 \cup (\uparrow t_2 \cap (\bigcup_{i=1}^{|X_{t_0}|} V(P_i)))$ and disjoint from $\downarrow t_0$, respectively). Note that $V(G_A) \subseteq A_1$ and $V(G_B) \subseteq B_2$. Since there exist $|X_{t_0}|$ disjoint paths in G from X_{t_0} to X_{t_3} , $A_1 \cap B_1 - Z \subseteq G_A$ and $A_2 \cap B_2 - Z \subseteq G_B$. So every component of $G - (M \cup Z)$ disjoint from $G_A \cup G_B$ is a component of $G - Z$.

In addition, the set of nodes t of T with $X_t \cap V(G_A) \neq \emptyset$ (and $X_t \cap V(G_B) \neq \emptyset$, respectively) induces a connected subgraph of T . Furthermore, since $V(G_A) \cap Z = V(G_B) \cap Z = \emptyset$, $V(G_A) \cap B_2 = \emptyset$ and $V(G_B) \cap A_1 = \emptyset$.

Claim 1: Let C be any component of $G - (M \cup Z)$ disjoint from $G_A \cup G_B$.

- If w is a vertex in $A_2 \cap B_2$ pointed for (A_2, B_2) , then w is pointed for $(A_2 \cup V(C), B_2 - V(C))$ and for $(A_2 - V(C), B_2 \cup V(C))$.
- If w is a vertex in $A_1 \cap B_1$ anti-pointed for (A_1, B_1) , then w is anti-pointed for $(A_1 \cup V(C), B_1 - V(C))$ and for $(A_1 - V(C), B_1 \cup V(C))$.

Proof of Claim 1: We assume that w is pointed for (A_2, B_2) . The case that w is anti-pointed for (A_1, B_1) can be proved analogously and we omit the proof.

Suppose that w is pointed for (A_2, B_2) but not pointed for $(A_2 \cup V(C), B_2 - V(C))$. So w is adjacent to some vertex in C . Since C is disjoint from $G_A \cup G_B$, it is a component of $G - Z$, so $w \in Z$. If $w \notin X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}$, then w is doubly pointed for (A_2, B_2) , and the neighbors of w contained in $(A_2 - B_2) \cup (B_2 - A_2)$ belong to $G_A \cup G_B$ since there are $|X_{t_0}|$ disjoint paths between X_{t_1} and X_{t_2} , so w is pointed for $(A_2 \cup V(C), B_2 - V(C))$, a contradiction. So $w \in X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}$.

Since C is disjoint from G_B , C is disjoint from $\uparrow t_3$. So $V(C) \subseteq A_{t_3}$. Since $A_2 \cup V(C) \subseteq A_{t_3}$ and w is not pointed for $(A_2 \cup V(C), B_2 - V(C))$, w is incident with at least two edges whose other ends are in $(A_2 \cup V(C)) - (B_2 - V(C)) \subseteq A_{t_3} - B_{t_3}$. That is, w is not pointed for

(A_{t_3}, B_{t_3}) . Since w is pointed for (A_2, B_2) , w is pointed for (A_{t_0}, B_{t_0}) . Since every vertex in $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}$ is coherent for t_0, t_3 , w is pointed for (A_{t_3}, B_{t_3}) , a contradiction.

Therefore, if w is pointed for (A_2, B_2) , then it is pointed for $(A_2 \cup V(C), B_2 - V(C))$. In addition, since $A_2 - V(C) \subseteq A_2$, w is pointed for $(A_2 - V(C), B_2 \cup V(C))$ if w is pointed for (A_2, B_2) . This proves the claim. \square

Let s be a bad side node. We assume that $X_s \subseteq A_1$ and $\uparrow s - A_1 \neq \emptyset$. (The case that $X_s \subseteq B_2$ and $\uparrow s - B_2 \neq \emptyset$ can be proved analogously, so we omit the proof of that case.) Since $V(G_A) \subseteq A_1$, $\uparrow s - A_1$ is clearly disjoint from G_A . Since $V(G_B) \cap A_1 = \emptyset$ and $X_s \subseteq A_1$, X_s is disjoint from G_B . Since the set of nodes of T whose bags intersect G_B induces a connected subgraph of T , and t_3 is in that set, $\uparrow s - A_1$ is disjoint from G_B . Define (A_1^*, B_1^*) (and (A_2^*, B_2^*) , respectively) to be the separation obtained from (A_1, B_1) (and (A_2, B_2) , respectively) by removing all components of $G - (M \cup Z)$ intersecting $\uparrow s - A_1$ from B_1 (and B_2 , respectively) and adding them into A_1 (and A_2 , respectively). Since $\uparrow s \subseteq A_1^*$, s is not a bad side node for (A_1^*, B_1^*) , (A_2^*, B_2^*) .

Let C be the union of the components that we moved. By Claim 1, every vertex in $A_2 \cap B_2 - (X_{t_1} \cap X_{t_2})$ is pointed for $(A_2 \cup V(C), B_2 - V(C))$, and every vertex in $A_1 \cap B_1 - (X_{t_1} \cap X_{t_2})$ is anti-pointed for $(A_1 \cup V(C), B_1 - V(C))$. So (A_1^*, B_1^*) is the reflection of (A_2^*, B_2^*) with respect to $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}, W$.

Furthermore, $A_2^* \supseteq A_2 \supseteq \downarrow t_0 \cup (\downarrow t_1 \cap (\bigcup_{i=1}^{|X_{t_0}|} V(P_i)))$. Since C is disjoint from $G_A \cup G_B$, C is disjoint from $\uparrow t_3 \cup (\uparrow t_2 \cap (\bigcup_{i=1}^{|X_{t_0}|} V(P_i)))$. Therefore, $B_1^* \supseteq \uparrow t_3 \cup (\uparrow t_2 \cap (\bigcup_{i=1}^{|X_{t_0}|} V(P_i)))$.

Since C is a union of components of $G - (M \cup Z)$ disjoint from $G_A \cup G_B$, C is a union of components of $G - Z$ disjoint from $X_{t_0} \cup X_{t_3}$. Since $(A_1 - A_1^*) \cup (A_1^* - A_1) \cup (B_2 - B_2^*) \cup (B_2^* - B_2)$ is contained in C , every vertex in $(A_1 - A_1^*) \cup (A_1^* - A_1) \cup (B_2 - B_2^*) \cup (B_2^* - B_2)$ is contained in some component of $G - Z$ disjoint from $X_{t_0} \cup X_{t_3}$.

Now we prove that the number of bad side nodes for (A_1^*, B_1^*) , (A_2^*, B_2^*) is less than the number of bad side nodes for (A_1, B_1) , (A_2, B_2) . As s is bad for (A_1, B_1) , (A_2, B_2) but not for (A_1^*, B_1^*) , (A_2^*, B_2^*) , it suffices to prove that every bad side node for (A_1^*, B_1^*) , (A_2^*, B_2^*) is a bad side node for (A_1, B_1) , (A_2, B_2) . Suppose that there exists a side node s' that is bad for (A_1^*, B_1^*) , (A_2^*, B_2^*) but is not bad for (A_1, B_1) , (A_2, B_2) . Since $\uparrow s \subseteq A_1^*$, s' is not a descendant of s .

Suppose that s' is an ancestor of s . Since s' is bad for (A_1^*, B_1^*) , (A_2^*, B_2^*) , either $X_{s'} \subseteq A_1^*$ or $X_{s'} \subseteq B_2^*$. Since $V(C) \subseteq \uparrow s - X_s$, either $X_{s'} \subseteq A_1$ or $X_{s'} \subseteq B_2$. Since s' is not bad for (A_1, B_1) , (A_2, B_2) , either $\uparrow s' \subseteq A_1$ or $\uparrow s' \subseteq B_2$. But $\uparrow s \not\subseteq A_1$, so $\uparrow s' \not\subseteq A_1$, and hence $\uparrow s' \subseteq B_2$. Then $\uparrow s \subseteq B_2$, so s is not bad for (A_1, B_1) , (A_2, B_2) , a contradiction.

So s' is not an ancestor or a descendant of s . Since $V(C)$ is a subset of $\uparrow s$ and is disjoint from X_s , $V(C)$ is disjoint from $\uparrow s'$. Therefore, s' is bad for (A_1^*, B_1^*) , (A_2^*, B_2^*) if and only if it is bad for (A_1, B_1) , (A_2, B_2) , a contradiction. This proves that the number of bad side nodes for (A_1^*, B_1^*) , (A_2^*, B_2^*) is less than the number of bad side nodes for (A_1, B_1) , (A_2, B_2) . Therefore, the lemma follows by induction applied to the separations (A_1^*, B_1^*) , (A_2^*, B_2^*) . \blacksquare

4.4 Integration

Let N be a positive integer. We say that (T, \mathcal{X}) is N -integrated if for all nodes t_0, t_1, t_2, t_3 of T such that

- t_i is an ancestor of t_{i+1} for $i = 0, 1, 2$,
- $|X_{t_i}| = |X_{t_0}|$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$,
- there exist $|X_{t_0}|$ disjoint paths in G from X_{t_0} to X_{t_3} ,
- $X_{t_i} \cap X_{t_j} = \bigcap_{\ell=0}^3 X_{t_\ell}$ for all i, j with $0 \leq i < j \leq 3$,
- every vertex in $\bigcap_{i=0}^3 X_{t_i}$ is coherent for t_0, t_3 ,
- there exists a separation (A, B) of G strongly separating $\downarrow t_1$ and $\uparrow t_2$ of breadth $(|X_{t_1}|, k)$, where k is the number of vertices in $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}$ non-pointed for (A_{t_3}, B_{t_3}) , and
- $\uparrow t_3$ contains at least N vertices of G each of which cannot be separated from $\downarrow t_0$ by a separation of breadth less than the breadth of (A, B) given by a node in T ,

there exists a separation given by a node in $t_0 T t_3$ of breadth equal to the breadth of (A, B) .

Lemma 4.8. *Let w be a nonnegative integer and let $N = (w+1) \cdot 2^{(w+1)(w+2)} + 1$. Let (T, \mathcal{X}) be a rooted tree-decomposition of a graph G of width at most w . If (T, \mathcal{X}) is not N -integrated, then there exists a rooted tree-decomposition (T^*, \mathcal{X}^*) of G of width no more than the width of (T, \mathcal{X}) but the signature is greater than (T, \mathcal{X}) .*

Proof. Suppose that (T, \mathcal{X}) is not N -integrated. Let t_0, t_1, t_2, t_3 be nodes of T and (A, B) a separation satisfying the conditions in the definition of the N -integrated property, and assume that no separation given by a node in $t_0 T t_3$ has breadth equal to the breadth of (A, B) .

Note that it implies that every separation given by a node in $t_0 T t_3$ has breadth larger than the breadth of (A, B) . In particular, (A_{t_i}, B_{t_i}) have breadth greater than (A, B) for all $i \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$, and $|A \cap B| \leq |X_{t_0}|$. Since there are $|X_{t_0}|$ disjoint paths in G from X_{t_0} to X_{t_3} , $|A \cap B| = |X_{t_0}|$.

If $X_{t_i} = X_{t_j}$ for some $0 \leq i < j \leq 3$, then $X_{t_0} = X_{t_1} = X_{t_2} = X_{t_3}$, and (A_{t_1}, B_{t_1}) and (A, B) have the same breadth, since every vertex in $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}$ is coherent for t_0, t_3 , a contradiction. Hence $X_{t_0}, X_{t_1}, X_{t_2}, X_{t_3}$ are pairwise distinct.

Note that the breadth of (A, B) is minimum among all separations strongly separating $\downarrow t_0$ and $\uparrow t_3$ by definition, since every vertex in $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}$ is coherent for t_0, t_3 .

We say that a node of T is a *side node* if it is a descendant of t_0 but not an ancestor or a descendant of t_3 .

Let $P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{|X_{t_0}|}$ be disjoint paths in G from X_{t_0} to X_{t_3} . Define $G_A = \downarrow t_0 \cup (\downarrow t_1 \cap (\bigcup_{i=1}^{|X_{t_0}|} V(P_i)))$ and define $G_B = \uparrow t_3 \cup (\uparrow t_2 \cap (\bigcup_{i=1}^{|X_{t_0}|} V(P_i)))$.

Claim 1: There exist separations (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) satisfying the following.

- The breadth of (A_2, B_2) equals the breadth of (A, B) .
- (A_1, B_1) is a reflection of (A_2, B_2) with respect to $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}$, and every vertex v in $A_1 \cap B_1 - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$ is anti-pointed for (A_1, B_1) .
- $\downarrow t_0 \subseteq A_1$ and $\uparrow t_3 \subseteq B_2$.

(d) $A_2 \supseteq G_A$ and $B_1 \supseteq G_B$.

(e) If t is a descendant of t_0 but not an ancestor of t_3 , and either $X_t \subseteq A_1$ or $X_t \subseteq B_2$, then either $\uparrow t \subseteq A_1$ or $\uparrow t \subseteq B_2$.

Proof of Claim 1: If we take $(A_2, B_2) = (A, B)$ and take (A_1, B_1) to be a reflection of (A, B) with respect to $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}$, then (a)-(d) hold. If we further apply Lemma 4.7 to the chosen (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) , then we obtain a pair of separations (A'_1, B'_1) and (A'_2, B'_2) satisfying (b)-(e) such that the breadth of (A'_2, B'_2) is not strictly greater than the breadth of (A, B) . But (A, B) is the separation with minimum breadth strongly separating $\downarrow t_0$ and $\uparrow t_3$, so the breadth of (A'_2, B'_2) equals the breadth of (A, B) and hence (a) is satisfied. This shows the existence of $(A_1, B_1), (A_2, B_2)$. \square

By Claim 1, there exist separations (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) satisfying (a)-(e) and the following.

(f) Subject to (a)-(e), the number of side nodes t such that either $A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_2 \cap B_2 - A_t \neq \emptyset$, or there exists an edge uv of G such that $u \in A_1 \cap B_1 - ((A_2 \cap B_2) \cup A_t)$ and $v \in A_2 \cap B_2 - ((A_1 \cap B_1) \cup A_t)$ is as small as possible.

We say that a side node t is *(f)-bad* for separations (C_1, D_1) and (C_2, D_2) if (C_1, D_1) and (C_2, D_2) satisfy (a)-(e), but either $C_1 \cap D_1 \cap C_2 \cap D_2 - A_t \neq \emptyset$ or there exists an edge uv of G such that $u \in C_1 \cap D_1 - ((C_2 \cap D_2) \cup A_t)$ and $v \in C_2 \cap D_2 - ((C_1 \cap D_1) \cup A_t)$.

That is, (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) are separations satisfying (a)-(e) such that the number of (f)-bad side nodes is minimum.

We say that a side node t is *(g)-bad* for separations (C_1, D_1) and (C_2, D_2) if (C_1, D_1) and (C_2, D_2) satisfy (a)-(f), t is not (f)-bad, and either

- some vertex in $C_2 \cap D_2 \cap X_t - (C_1 \cap D_1)$ is adjacent to a vertex in $C_1 \cap D_1 - ((C_2 \cap D_2) \cup A_t)$ and a vertex $D_2 - (C_2 \cup A_t \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{|X_{t_0}|} V(P_i))$, or
- some vertex in $C_1 \cap D_1 \cap X_t - (C_2 \cap D_2)$ is adjacent to a vertex in $C_2 \cap D_2 - ((C_1 \cap D_1) \cup A_t)$ and a vertex in $C_1 - (D_1 \cup A_t \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{|X_{t_0}|} V(P_i))$.

We further assume that (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) satisfy (a)-(f) and the following.

(g) Subject to (a)-(f), $\sum_q (|V(T)| + 1)^{d_q}$ is minimum, where the sum is over all (g)-bad side nodes q , and d_q is the distance in T from q to $t_0 T t_3$.

We say that a side node t is *(h)-bad* for separations (C_1, D_1) and (C_2, D_2) if (C_1, D_1) and (C_2, D_2) satisfy (a)-(g), and either $C_1 \cap D_1 - A_t \neq \emptyset$ or $C_2 \cap D_2 - A_t \neq \emptyset$.

We further assume that (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) satisfy (a)-(g) and the following.

(h) Subject to (a)-(g), the number of (h)-bad side nodes for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) is as small as possible.

That is, (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) are separations satisfying (a)-(g), and subject to those, the number of (h)-bad side nodes is minimum.

Claim 2: (A_2, B_2) is not given by a node of t .

Proof of Claim 2: Suppose that (A_2, B_2) is given by a node t of T . Since the breadth of the separation given by any node in t_0Tt_3 is greater than (A, B) , (A_2, B_2) is not given by a node in t_0Tt_3 by (a). So $t \notin t_0Tt_3$. Suppose that t is a descendant of t_3 , then $\downarrow t_3 \subseteq A_t = A_2$. By (c), $\uparrow t_3 \subseteq B_2$, so $A_{t_3} \subseteq A_2$ and $B_{t_3} \subseteq B_2$. Since the breadth of (A_2, B_2) is at most the breadth of (A_{t_3}, B_{t_3}) , $(A_2, B_2) = (A_{t_3}, B_{t_3})$, a contradiction.

So t is not a descendant of t_3 . Suppose that t is an ancestor of t_0 . So $X_{t_0} \cup X_{t_1} \subseteq B_2$. By (d), $A_2 \supseteq G_A \supseteq X_{t_0} \cup X_{t_1}$. So $A_2 \cap B_2 \supseteq X_{t_0} \cup X_{t_1}$. But $X_{t_0} \neq X_{t_1}$, so $|X_{t_0}| = |A_2 \cap B_2| \geq |X_{t_0} \cup X_{t_1}| > |X_{t_0}|$, a contradiction. So t is not an ancestor of t_0 . Since $t \notin t_0Tt_3$ and t is not a descendant of t_3 or an ancestor of t_0 , $\uparrow t_3 \subseteq A_t = A_2$. By (c), $\uparrow t_3 \subseteq A_2 \cap B_2$. However, $\uparrow t_3$ contains at least N vertices and $N > w + 1$, a contradiction. Therefore, (A_2, B_2) is not given by a node of t . \square

Claim 3: (A_2, B_2) is not incorporated.

Proof of Claim 3: Since there are $|X_{t_0}| = |A_2 \cap B_2|$ disjoint paths from X_{t_0} to X_{t_3} , (A_2, B_2) is a separation of G with minimum order such that $\downarrow t_0 \subseteq A_2$ and $\uparrow t_3 \subseteq B_2$. Furthermore, the order of (A_2, B_2) is $|A \cap B| = |X_{t_1}| \leq w + 1$, and $\uparrow t_3$ contains at least N vertices of G each of which cannot be separated from $\downarrow t_0$ by a separation of breadth less than the breadth of (A_2, B_2) given by a node of T . By Lemma 4.4 and Claim 2, (A_2, B_2) is not incorporated. \square

For each vertex v of G , define t_v to be a node of T with $v \in X_{t_v}$. Let T' be a copy of T and let T'' be a copy of the maximal subtree of T rooted at t_0 . For each node t of T , let t' be the copy of t in T' ; for each node t that is a descendant of t_0 , let t'' be the copy of t in T'' . Define T^* to be the tree obtained from $T' \cup T''$ by adding a path $q_0q_1q_2\dots q_{k+1}$ and new edges $t'_3q_0, q_{k+1}t''_0$, where $k = |A_1 \cap B_1 - (A_2 \cap B_2)|$. We define the following.

- For each node t' of T' , define $X_{t'}^* = (X_t \cap A_1) \cup \{v \in A_1 \cap B_1 : t \in t_vTt_3\}$.
- For each node t'' of T'' , define $X_{t''}^* = (X_t \cap B_2) \cup \{v \in A_2 \cap B_2 : t \in t_vTt_0\}$.
- Define $X_{q_0}^* = A_1 \cap B_1$ and $X_{q_{k+1}}^* = A_2 \cap B_2$.
- Let u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k be the vertices in $A_1 \cap B_1 - (A_2 \cap B_2)$, and let v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k be the vertices in $A_2 \cap B_2 - (A_1 \cap B_1)$ such that u_i is adjacent to v_i for all i with $1 \leq i \leq k$. For each i with $1 \leq i \leq k$, define $X_{q_i}^* = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_i, u_i, u_{i+1}, \dots, u_k\} \cup (A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_2 \cap B_2)$.

Hence (T^*, \mathcal{X}^*) is a rooted tree-decomposition of G similarly as in the proof of Lemma 4.5. Note that every node $t \in t_0Tt_3$ has bag size at least $|A \cap B|$ in (T, \mathcal{X}) , and some node in t_0Tt_3 has bag size at least $|A \cap B| + 1$ in (T, \mathcal{X}) since there exist $|X_{t_0}|$ disjoint paths in G between distinct sets X_{t_0}, X_{t_3} . So the width of (T^*, \mathcal{X}^*) is at most the width of (T, \mathcal{X}) .

Observe that (A_2, B_2) is incorporated in (T^*, \mathcal{X}^*) with witness set $\{q_{k+1}\}$. To prove this lemma, it suffices to prove that every separation of G of breadth at most (A_2, B_2) incorporated in (T, \mathcal{X}) is incorporated in (T^*, \mathcal{X}^*) . Let (C, D) be a separation of breadth at most the breadth of (A_2, B_2) incorporated in (T, \mathcal{X}) , and let S be a witness set for the incorporation of (C, D) in (T, \mathcal{X}) . By Lemma 4.3, we may assume that no node in S is an ancestor of another node in S . By (INC1), there exists no node s in S in the path t_0Tt_3 .

Define the following sets.

- $S_1 = \{s \in S : s \text{ belongs to the component of } T - t_0 \text{ containing the root}\}$, $S_1^* = \{s' : s \in S_1\}$.

- $S_2 = \{s \in S : s \text{ is a side node and } \uparrow s \subseteq A_1\}$, $S_2^* = \{s' : s \in S_2\}$.
- $S_3 = \{s \in S : s \text{ is a side node, } \uparrow s \not\subseteq A_1 \text{ and } \uparrow s \subseteq B_2\}$, $S_3^* = \{s'' : s \in S_3\}$.
- $S_4 = \{s \in S : s \text{ is a descendant of } t_3\}$, $S_4^* = \{s'' : s \in S_4\}$.
- $S_5 = \{s \in S : s \text{ is a side node, } \uparrow s \not\subseteq A_1 \text{ and } \uparrow s \not\subseteq B_2\}$, $S_5^* = \{s', s'' : s \in S_5\}$.
- $S^* = S_1^* \cup S_2^* \cup S_3^* \cup S_4^* \cup S_5^*$.

To prove this lemma, it suffices to prove that (C, D) is incorporated in (T^*, \mathcal{X}^*) , and S^* is a witness set for (C, D) being incorporated in (T^*, \mathcal{X}^*) .

By (c), (e) and the fact that $A_1 \cup B_2 = V(G)$, we have the following.

- If $s \in S_1 \cup S_2$, then $(T^*, \mathcal{X}^*) \uparrow s' = (T, \mathcal{X}) \uparrow s$.
- If $s \in S_3 \cup S_4$, then $(T^*, \mathcal{X}^*) \uparrow s'' = (T, \mathcal{X}) \uparrow s$.
- If $s \in S_5$, then $(T^*, \mathcal{X}^*) \uparrow s' \cup (T^*, \mathcal{X}^*) \uparrow s'' = (T, \mathcal{X}) \uparrow s$.
- If $s \in S_5$, then $(A_{s'}, B_{s'}) = (A_s \cup B_1, B_s \cap A_1)$ in (T^*, \mathcal{X}^*) , and $(A_{s''}, B_{s''}) = (A_2 \cup A_s, B_2 \cap B_s)$ in (T^*, \mathcal{X}^*) .

Since no node in S is in $t_0 T t_3$, it follows that $S = S_1 \cup S_2 \cup S_3 \cup S_4 \cup S_5$, and hence S^* satisfies (INC2).

Now we prove that S^* satisfies (INC1) and (INC3). Let s be an element of S . If $s' \in S_1^* \cup S_2^*$ (or $s'' \in S_3^* \cup S_4^*$, respectively), then it is clear that the separation given by s' (or s'' , respectively) has breadth at most the breadth of the separation given by s .

Assume that $s \in S$ with $s', s'' \in S^*$. So $s \in S_5$ and $s', s'' \in S_5^*$. To prove this lemma, it suffices to show that the breadth of $(A_{s'}, B_{s'})$ and the breadth of $(A_{s''}, B_{s''})$ are less than the breadth of (A_s, B_s) . We will only prove that the breadth of $(A_{s'}, B_{s'})$ is less than the breadth of (A_s, B_s) since the case for $(A_{s''}, B_{s''})$ can be proved analogously.

Since there exist $|X_{t_0}|$ disjoint paths in G from X_{t_0} to X_{t_3} , $\max\{|X_{s'}^*|, |X_{s''}^*|\} \leq |X_s|$.

Claim 4: The breadth of $(A_{s'}, B_{s'})$ is at most the breadth of (A_s, B_s) .

Proof of Claim 4: We may assume that $|X_{s'}^*| = |X_s|$, for otherwise we are done. By the submodularity, the order of $(A_s \cap B_1, B_s \cup A_1)$ is at most the order of (A_1, B_1) . By (c), $(A_s \cap B_1, B_s \cup A_1)$ separates $\downarrow t_0$ and $\uparrow t_3$. Since there exist $|X_{t_0}|$ disjoint paths from X_{t_0} to X_{t_3} , the order of $(A_s \cap B_1, B_s \cup A_1)$ equals the order of (A_1, B_1) . So every vertex in $X_s \cap A_1 \cap B_1$ is adjacent to a vertex in $(A_s \cap B_1) - (B_s \cup A_1)$; otherwise X_{t_0} and X_{t_3} can be separated by a separation of order less than the order of (A, B) .

Let $v \in X_{s'}^*$. If $v \in X_{s'}^* - B_1$, then $v \in X_s - B_1$. If $v \in X_{s'}^* - B_1$ and v is pointed for (A_s, B_s) , then it is pointed for $(A_s \cup B_1, B_s \cap A_1)$. If $v \in X_{s'}^* - A_s$, then $v \in (A_1 \cap B_1) - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$, so v is anti-pointed for (A_1, B_1) by (b) and is pointed for $(A_s \cup B_1, B_s \cap A_1)$.

Assume that $v \in X_{s'}^* \cap A_s \cap B_1$ and v is pointed for (A_s, B_s) , then v is adjacent to a vertex in $A_s \cap B_1 - (B_s \cup A_1)$ and hence v has no neighbor in $A_s \cap A_1 - B_s$. If we further assume that $v \notin X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}$, then v has no neighbor in $B_1 \cap B_s$ since v is anti-pointed for (A_1, B_1) by (b), so v is pointed for $(A_{s'}, B_{s'})$; if we further assume that $v \in X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}$, since v is pointed for (A_s, B_s) , it is anti-pointed for (A_{t_3}, B_{t_3}) , so it is anti-pointed for (A_{t_0}, B_{t_0}) as

v is coherent for t_0, t_3 , and hence v has no neighbor in $B_1 \cap B_s$ and is pointed for $(A_{s'}, B_{s'})$. This proves that the breadth of $(A_{s'}, B_{s'})$ is at most the breadth of (A_s, B_s) . \square

Suppose to the contrary that the breadth of $(A_{s'}, B_{s'})$ is at least the breadth of (A_s, B_s) . By Claim 4, (A_s, B_s) and $(A_{s'}, B_{s'})$ have the same breadth.

Then every vertex in $X_s - A_1$ is pointed for (A_s, B_s) , since every vertex in $X_{s'}^* - X_s$ is pointed for $(A_{s'}, B_{s'})$.

Claim 5: s is not a descendant of t_2 .

Proof of Claim 5: Suppose to the contrary that s is a descendant of t_2 . Since $s \in S_5$, $X_s - A_1 \neq \emptyset$ by (e). Since (A_s, B_s) and $(A_{s'}, B_{s'})$ have the same breadth, $|X_s| = |X_{s'}^*|$, so one of $P_1, \dots, P_{|X_{t_0}|}$, say Q , passes through a vertex x in $X_{t_0} - X_{t_3}$, a vertex y in $V(A_1 \cap B_1) \cap (\uparrow s - X_s)$, a vertex z in $X_s - A_1$, and a vertex $b \in X_{t_3} - X_{t_0}$ in the order listed. Since s is a descendant of t_0 and $y \in \uparrow s - X_s$, the subpath of Q between x, y contains a vertex a in X_s . Since s is a descendant of t_2 , the subpath of Q between x, a contains a vertex a' in X_{t_2} . Note that a' is the unique vertex belonging to $V(Q) \cap X_{t_2}$, since $P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{|X_{t_0}|}$ are $|X_{t_2}|$ disjoint paths intersecting X_{t_2} . Note that $y \in \uparrow s - X_s$, so $y \notin X_{t_2}$ and $y \neq a'$.

Since $t_0 \in t_0 T t_3$, the breadth of (A, B) is smaller than the breadth of (A_{t_0}, B_{t_0}) . So the order of (A, B) is at most $|X_{t_0}|$. By (a) and (b), the order of (A_1, B_1) equals $|X_{t_0}|$. So y is the unique vertex belonging to $V(Q) \cap A_1 \cap B_1$. Since $B_1 \supseteq G_B \supseteq X_{t_2}$ by (d), $a' \in B_1$. Since $y \in A_1 \cap B_1 - X_{t_2}$, Q passes through x, y, a' in the order listed, a contradiction. \square

Define $(A'_1, B'_1) = (A_1 \cup B_s, B_1 \cap A_s)$.

Claim 6: Every vertex in $A'_1 \cap B'_1 - (X_{t_0} \cup X_{t_3})$ is anti-pointed for (A'_1, B'_1) .

Proof of Claim 6: Let v be a vertex in $A'_1 \cap B'_1 - (X_{t_0} \cup X_{t_3})$. If $v \in A_1$, then $v \in A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_s - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$, so v is anti-pointed for (A_1, B_1) by (b), and hence is anti-pointed by (A'_1, B'_1) since $B'_1 - A'_1 \subseteq B_1 - A_1$. If $v \in B_1 - A_1$, then $v \in X_s - A_1$, so v is pointed for (A_s, B_s) , and hence v is anti-pointed for (A'_1, B'_1) since $B'_1 - A'_1 \subseteq A_s - B_s$. Hence every vertex in $A'_1 \cap B'_1 - (X_{t_0} \cup X_{t_3})$ is anti-pointed for (A'_1, B'_1) . \square

Claim 7: For every vertex $u \in A'_1 \cap B'_1 - (X_{t_0} \cup X_{t_3})$, there uniquely exists a neighbor u' of u in $B'_1 - A'_1$. Furthermore, some member of $\{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{|X_{t_0}|}\}$ contains both u and u' , and $u' \in \downarrow t_3$. In addition, if u_1, u_2 are distinct vertices in $A'_1 \cap B'_1 - (X_{t_0} \cup X_{t_3})$, then $u'_1 \neq u'_2$.

Proof of Claim 7: Since $|X_{s'}^*| = |X_s|$, $|A'_1 \cap B'_1| \leq |A_1 \cap B_1|$ by the submodularity. Since $X_{t_0} \subseteq A_1 \subseteq A'_1$ and $X_{t_3} \subseteq B_2 \cap A_s \subseteq B_1 \cap A_s = B'_1$, the existence of $P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{|X_{t_0}|}$ implies that $|A'_1 \cap B'_1| \geq |X_{t_0}| \geq |A \cap B| = |A_1 \cap B_1|$. So $|A'_1 \cap B'_1| = |A \cap B| = |X_{t_0}|$. Hence for every vertex $u \in A'_1 \cap B'_1$, there exists a unique member P_u of $\{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{|X_{t_0}|}\}$ containing u . Since $B_1 \supseteq G_B$ and $\uparrow t_2 \subseteq A_s$ by Claim 5, $\uparrow t_2 \cap (\bigcup_{i=1}^{|X_{t_0}|} V(P_i)) \subseteq B_1 \cap A_s = B'_1$. So for each $u \in A'_1 \cap B'_1 - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$, the subpath of P_u between u and $X_{t_3} \cap V(P_u)$ contains at least two vertices. So for every $u \in A'_1 \cap B'_1 - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$, there exists a neighbor u' of u contained in the subpath of P_u between u and $X_{t_3} \cap V(P_u)$. Note that $u' \in \downarrow t_3$. Since $|X_{t_0}| = |A'_1 \cap B'_1|$, $u' \in B'_1 - A'_1$. By Claim 6, u' is the unique neighbor of u in $B'_1 - A'_1$. Since $P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{|X_{t_0}|}$ are disjoint, for distinct $u_1, u_2 \in A'_1 \cap B'_1 - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$, $u'_1 \neq u'_2$. \square

Claim 8: There exists a separation (A'_2, B'_2) such that (A'_1, B'_1) is the reflection of (A'_2, B'_2) with respect to $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}, \emptyset$.

Proof of Claim 8: For each $u \in A'_1 \cap B'_1 - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$, let u' be the neighbor of u in $B'_1 - A'_1$. Let $R = A'_1 \cap B'_1 - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$. Let $R' = \{u' : u \in R\}$. Define $A'_2 = A'_1 \cup R'$ and define $B'_2 = B'_1 - R$. By Claim 7, every vertex in $A'_2 \cap B'_2 - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}) = R'$ is pointed for

(A'_2, B'_2) . So (A'_1, B'_1) is the reflection of (A'_2, B'_2) with respect to $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}, \emptyset$. \square

Define (A'_2, B'_2) to be the separation such that (A'_1, B'_1) is the reflection of (A'_2, B'_2) with respect to $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}, \emptyset$. The existence of (A'_2, B'_2) follows from Claim 8.

Claim 9: There exist separations (A_1^*, B_1^*) and (A_2^*, B_2^*) satisfying (a)-(e) such that $A_1^* \cap B_1^* = A'_1 \cap B'_1$, $A_2^* \cap B_2^* = A'_2 \cap B'_2$, and every vertex in $(A_1^* - A'_1) \cup (A'_1 - A_1^*) \cup (B_2^* - B'_2) \cup (B'_2 - B_2^*)$ is contained in some component of $G - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$ disjoint from $X_{t_0} \cup X_{t_3} \cup (A'_1 \cap B'_1) \cup (A'_2 \cap B'_2)$.

Proof of Claim 9: Since $s \notin t_0 T t_3$ and s is not a descendant of t_2 by Claim 5, $A_s \supseteq \uparrow t_2 \supseteq G_B$. So $B'_1 \supseteq G_B$ by (d). Hence $B'_2 \supseteq \uparrow t_3$. Since $A'_1 \supseteq A_1$ and (A'_1, B'_1) is the reflection of (A'_2, B'_2) with respect to $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}, \emptyset$, we have $A'_2 \supseteq A_2$. Since $A_2 \supseteq G_A$ by (d), $A'_2 \supseteq G_A$. So (A'_1, B'_1) and (A'_2, B'_2) satisfy (b)-(d).

Since (A'_1, B'_1) and (A'_2, B'_2) satisfy (d), (A'_2, B'_2) strongly separates $\downarrow t_0$ and $\uparrow t_3$. Recall that the breadth of (A, B) is minimum among all separations strongly separating $\downarrow t_0$ and $\uparrow t_3$. So the breadth of (A'_2, B'_2) is at least the breadth of (A, B) . Since every vertex in $A'_2 \cap B'_2 - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$ is pointed for (A'_2, B'_2) , and every vertex in $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}$ is coherent for t_0, t_3 , the breadth of (A'_2, B'_2) is at most the breadth of (A, B) . Hence (A'_1, B'_1) and (A'_2, B'_2) satisfy (a)-(d).

By Lemma 4.7, there exist separations (A_1^*, B_1^*) and (A_2^*, B_2^*) satisfying (a)-(e) such that $A_1^* \cap B_1^* = A'_1 \cap B'_1$, $A_2^* \cap B_2^* = A'_2 \cap B'_2$, and every vertex in $(A_1^* - A'_1) \cup (A'_1 - A_1^*) \cup (B_2^* - B'_2) \cup (B'_2 - B_2^*)$ is contained in some component of $G - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$ disjoint from $X_{t_0} \cup X_{t_3}$ since (A'_1, B'_1) is the reflection of (A'_2, B'_2) with respect to $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}, \emptyset$. By the existence of $P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{|X_{t_0}|}$, every component of $G - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$ disjoint from $X_{t_0} \cup X_{t_3}$ is disjoint from $(A'_1 \cap B'_1) \cup (A'_2 \cap B'_2)$. \square

Since $|X_{s'}^*| = |X_s|$ and there exist $|A_1 \cap B_1|$ disjoint paths in G from X_{t_0} to X_{t_3} , if $A_1 \cap B_1 - A_s = \emptyset$, then $X_s \subseteq A_1$, so $s \notin S_5$ by (e), a contradiction. So $A_1 \cap B_1 - A_s \neq \emptyset$.

Claim 10: Every side node that is (f)-bad for (A_1^*, B_1^*) and (A_2^*, B_2^*) is (f)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) .

Proof of Claim 10: Suppose to the contrary that t is a side node that is (f)-bad for (A_1^*, B_1^*) and (A_2^*, B_2^*) but not (f)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) . So $A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_2 \cap B_2 - A_t = \emptyset$ and for every edge $xy \in E(G)$ with $x \in A_1 \cap B_1 - (A_2 \cap B_2)$ and $y \in A_2 \cap B_2 - (A_1 \cap B_1)$, either $x \in A_t$ or $y \in A_t$.

Since (A_1^*, B_1^*) is the reflection of (A_2^*, B_2^*) with respect to $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}, \emptyset$, we know $A_1^* \cap B_1^* \cap A_2^* \cap B_2^* - A_t \subseteq X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3} - A_t = \emptyset$. So there exists an edge $u'v'$ of G such that $u' \in A_1^* \cap B_1^* - ((A_2^* \cap B_2^*) \cup A_t)$ and $v' \in A_2^* \cap B_2^* - ((A_1^* \cap B_1^*) \cup A_t)$.

Suppose that $u' \in A_1 \cap B_1$. Since $u' \notin A_t$ and $A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_2 \cap B_2 - A_t = \emptyset$, $u' \notin A_2 \cap B_2$. So u' is anti-pointed for (A_1, B_1) . Since $v' \in A_2^* \cap B_2^* - (A_1^* \cap B_1^*) = A_2 \cap B_2 - (A_1 \cap B_1) \subseteq B_1 - A_1 \subseteq B_1 - A_1$, v' is the unique neighbor of u' in $B_1 - A_1$. So $v' \in A_2 \cap B_2 - (A_1 \cap B_1)$. Since $u' \in A_1 \cap B_1 - ((A_2 \cap B_2) \cup A_t)$ and $u'v' \in E(G)$, we know $v' \notin A_2 \cap B_2 - ((A_1 \cap B_1) \cup A_t)$, so $v' \in A_t$, contradicting $v' \in A_2 \cap B_2 - ((A_1 \cap B_1) \cup A_t)$.

So $u' \notin A_1 \cap B_1$. Since $A_1^* \cap B_1^* - (A_1 \cap B_1) = A'_1 \cap B'_1 - (A_1 \cap B_1) \subseteq X_s$, $u' \in X_s - (A_t \cup A_1)$. In particular, $X_s - A_t \neq \emptyset$. So t is an ancestor of s . That is, $A_t \subseteq A_s$.

Since $|X_{s'}^*| = |X_s|$, there exist $x \in A_1 \cap B_1 - A_s$ and i with $1 \leq i \leq |X_{t_0}|$ such that P_i contains both x and u' , and the subpath Q_i of P_i between x and u' is contained in $G[B_s]$ and is internally disjoint from X_s . Let y be the neighbor of x in Q_i . Since $|A_1 \cap B_1| = |A \cap B| = |X_{t_0}|$, x is the only vertex in $V(P_i) \cap A_1 \cap B_1$, so $y \in B_1 - A_1$. Since $A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_2 \cap B_2 - A_t = \emptyset$ and $A_t \subseteq A_s$, $x \notin A_2 \cap B_2$. Hence $x \in A_1 \cap B_1 - ((A_2 \cap B_2) \cup A_t)$, and $y \in A_2 \cap B_2 - (A_1 \cap B_1)$

by (b). Since $xy \in E(G)$ and t is not (f)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) , $y \in A_t \subseteq A_s$. Since $x \in B_s - A_s$ and $xy \in E(G)$, $y \in X_s$. So $y = u' \notin A_t$, a contradiction. \square

Claim 11: $A_2 \cap B_2 - A_s = \emptyset$.

Proof of Claim 11: Suppose to the contrary that $A_2 \cap B_2 - A_s \neq \emptyset$. Let $v \in A_2 \cap B_2 - A_s$. Since $A_1^* \cap B_1^* - A_s = A'_1 \cap B'_1 - A_s = \emptyset$, s is not (f)-bad for (A_1^*, B_1^*) and (A_2^*, B_2^*) . Since (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) satisfy (f), by Claim 10, s is not (f)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) . So $v \notin A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_2 \cap B_2 - A_s$. Hence $v \in A_2 \cap B_2 - ((A_1 \cap B_1) \cup A_s)$. Let u be the neighbor of v in $A_2 - B_2$. So $u \in A_1 \cap B_1 - (A_2 \cap B_2)$. Since s is not (f)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) , $u \in A_s$. Since $v \notin A_s$, $u \in B_s$. That is, $u \in A_1 \cap B_1 \cap X_s - (A_2 \cap B_2) \subseteq A'_1 \cap B'_1 - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$. Since u is anti-pointed for (A_1, B_1) , v is the unique neighbor of u in $B_1 - A_1$. By Claim 7, u has a neighbor u' in $B'_1 - A'_1 = (B_1 \cap A_s) - (A_1 \cup B_s)$. However, u' and v are distinct neighbors of u in $B_1 - A_1$, a contradiction. \square

Claim 12: $X_s - A_1 \subseteq A_2 \cap B_2$.

Proof of Claim 12: Let $v \in X_s - A_1$. Since $|X_{s'}^*| = |X_s|$, there exists i with $1 \leq i \leq |X_{t_0}|$ such that P_i contains v and a vertex x in $A_1 \cap B_1 - A_s$, and the subpath P'_i of P_i between v and x is contained in $G[B_s \cap B_1]$ and is internally disjoint from X_s . By Claim 11, $x \notin A_2 \cap B_2$. So the neighbor y of x in P'_i is in $A_2 \cap B_2$. By Claim 11, $y \in A_s$. Since $x \notin A_s$ and $xy \in E(G)$, $y \in X_s$. So $v = y \in A_2 \cap B_2$. \square

Since (A_1, B_1) is a reflection of (A_2, B_2) with respect to $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}$, there exists $F \subseteq A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_2 \cap B_2$ with $F \cup (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}) = A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_2 \cap B_2$ such that (A_1, B_1) is the reflection of (A_2, B_2) with respect to $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}, F$. Since $F \subseteq A_2 \cap B_2$, $F \subseteq A_s$ by Claim 11.

Let $(A'_1, B'_1) = (A'_1, B'_1)$.

Claim 13: There exists a separation (A''_2, B''_2) such that (A''_1, B''_1) is the reflection of (A''_2, B''_2) with respect to $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}, F$, and (A''_1, B''_1) and (A''_2, B''_2) satisfy (b)-(d).

Proof of Claim 13: For every $u \in A'_1 \cap B'_1 - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$, let u' be the unique neighbor of u in $B'_1 - A'_1 = B''_1 - A''_1$ mentioned in Claim 7.

Let $R = (A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_s - (A_2 \cap B_2)) \cup (X_s - A_1)$. Let $R' = \{u' : u \in R\}$. Let $A''_2 = A''_1 \cup R'$ and $B''_2 = B''_1 - R$. Note that $A''_1 \cap B''_1 - R = A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_2 \cap B_2 = F \cup (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$.

We first show that (A''_2, B''_2) is a separation. Since $R \subseteq A''_1$, $A''_2 \cup B''_2 = V(G)$. Suppose there exists $ab \in E(G)$ such that $a \in A''_2 - B''_2$ and $b \in B''_2 - A''_2$. Then $b \in B'_1 - (R \cup A''_1 \cup R')$. Since (A''_1, B''_1) is a separation, $a \in B''_1$. Since $a \notin B''_2 = B''_1 - R$, $a \in R$. Since $b \in B''_1 - A''_1 = B'_1 - A'_1$ and $a \in R \subseteq A'_1 \cap B'_1 - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$, $b = a' \in R'$, a contradiction.

Hence (A''_2, B''_2) is a separation of G . Note that $A''_2 \cap B''_2 = (A''_1 \cap B''_1 - R) \cup R' = (A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_2 \cap B_2) \cup R'$.

Now we show that (A''_1, B''_1) and (A''_2, B''_2) satisfy (c) and (d). Note that as shown in the proof of Claim 9, (A'_1, B'_1) and (A'_2, B'_2) satisfy (c) and (d). Since $A''_1 = A'_1$ and $B''_2 \supseteq B'_2$, (A''_1, B''_1) and (A''_2, B''_2) satisfy (c). Since $A''_2 \supseteq A_2$ and $B''_1 = B'_1$, (A''_1, B''_1) and (A''_2, B''_2) satisfy (d).

Now we show that (A''_1, B''_1) is the reflection of (A''_2, B''_2) with respect to $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}, F$.

Since (A''_1, B''_1) and (A''_2, B''_2) satisfy (c) and (d), they separate $\downarrow t_0$ and $\uparrow t_3$. Since every vertex in $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}$ is coherent for t_0, t_3 and every vertex in F is doubly pointed for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) , every vertex in $F \cap X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}$ is doubly pointed for (A''_1, B''_1) and (A''_2, B''_2) and is not adjacent to any vertex in $A''_2 \cap B''_2 - (F \cup (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}))$.

Since $B''_1 - A''_1 \subseteq B_1 - A_1$ and every vertex in $F - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$ is anti-pointed for (A_1, B_1) , every vertex in $F - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$ is anti-pointed for (A''_1, B''_1) and (A''_2, B''_2) . Since $A''_2 \cap B''_2 -$

$(F \cup (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})) \subseteq R'$, every vertex in $F - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$ is not adjacent to any vertex in $A_2'' \cap B_2'' - (F \cup (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}))$.

Hence every vertex in F is not adjacent to any vertex in $A_2'' \cap B_2'' - (F \cup (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}))$. So to show that (A_1'', B_1'') is the reflection of (A_2'', B_2'') with respect to $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}, F$, it suffices to show that every vertex in $A_2'' \cap B_2'' - (F \cup (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})) \subseteq R'$ is pointed for (A_2'', B_2'') , and every vertex in $F - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$ is doubly pointed for (A_2'', B_2'') .

Any neighbor of some vertex in R' in $A_2'' - B_2''$ is in $A_1'' \cap B_1'' - B_2'' = (R \cup (A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_2 \cap B_2)) - (B_1'' - R) \subseteq R$. Since the set of edges between R and R' is a matching, every vertex in R' is pointed for (A_2'', B_2'') .

Let $c \in F - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$. So c is doubly pointed for (A_2, B_2) and anti-pointed for (A_1, B_1) by (b). Since $F \subseteq A_1' \cap B_1'$ (by Claim 11) and c' is a neighbor of c in $B_1' - A_1' \subseteq B_1 - A_1$, c has no neighbor in $(B_1 - A_1) \cap A_1'$. Note that $A_2'' - B_2'' = (A_1' \cup R') - (B_1' - R) = (A_1 \cup B_s \cup R') - (B_1 \cap A_s - R)$. Let c_0 be a neighbor of c in $A_2'' - B_2''$. Note that $A_2'' - B_2'' = (A_1' \cup R') - B_2'' = A_1'' - B_2''$. So $c_0 \in A_1'' - B_2''$ and hence $c_0 \notin R'$. If $c_0 \notin A_1$, then $c_0 \in (B_1 - A_1) \cap A_1'' = (B_1 - A_1) \cap A_1'$, a contradiction. So $c_0 \in A_1 = (A_2 - B_2) \cup (A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_2 \cap B_2)$. Since $c_0 \notin B_2'' = B_1' - R \supseteq A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_2 \cap B_2$, $c_0 \in A_2 - B_2$. That is, every neighbor of c in $A_2'' - B_2''$ is in $A_2 - B_2$. Since c is pointed for (A_2, B_2) , c is pointed for (A_2'', B_2'') . Since c is anti-pointed for (A_1, B_1) and $B_2'' - A_2'' \subseteq B_1'' - A_1'' \subseteq B_1 - A_1$, c is anti-pointed for (A_2'', B_2'') . Therefore, every vertex in $F - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$ is doubly pointed for (A_2'', B_2'') .

Hence (A_1'', B_1'') is the reflection of (A_2'', B_2'') with respect to $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}, F$. Therefore, (A_1'', B_1'') and (A_2'', B_2'') satisfy (b). \square

Claim 14: There exist separations (A_1^{**}, B_1^{**}) and (A_2^{**}, B_2^{**}) satisfying (a)-(e) such that $A_1^{**} \cap B_1^{**} = A_1' \cap B_1'$, $A_2^{**} \cap B_2^{**} = A_2'' \cap B_2''$, and every vertex in $(A_1^{**} - A_1') \cup (A_1' - A_1^{**}) \cup (B_2^{**} - B_2'') \cup (B_2'' - B_2^{**})$ is contained in some component of $G - (F \cup (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}))$ disjoint from $X_{t_0} \cup X_{t_3} \cup (A_1' \cap B_1') \cup (A_2'' \cap B_2'')$.

Proof of Claim 14: By Claim 13, (A_1'', B_1'') and (A_2'', B_2'') satisfy (b)-(d). Since (A_1'', B_1'') and (A_2'', B_2'') satisfy (d), (A_2'', B_2'') strongly separates $\downarrow t_0$ and $\uparrow t_3$. Recall that the breadth of (A, B) is minimum among all separations strongly separating $\downarrow t_0$ and $\uparrow t_3$. So the breadth of (A_2'', B_2'') is at least the breadth of (A, B) . Since every vertex in $A_2'' \cap B_2'' - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$ is pointed for (A_2'', B_2'') , and every vertex in $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}$ is coherent for t_0, t_3 , the breadth of (A_2'', B_2'') is at most the breadth of (A, B) . Hence (A_1'', B_1'') and (A_2'', B_2'') satisfy (a)-(d). Then this claim follows from Lemma 4.7. \square

Claim 15: The set of (f)-bad side nodes for (A_1^{**}, B_1^{**}) and (A_2^{**}, B_2^{**}) equals the set of (f)-bad side nodes for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) .

Proof of Claim 15: Since (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) satisfy (f), it suffices to show that every (f)-bad side node for (A_1^{**}, B_1^{**}) and (A_2^{**}, B_2^{**}) is (f)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) . Suppose to the contrary that there exists a side node t that is (f)-bad for (A_1^{**}, B_1^{**}) and (A_2^{**}, B_2^{**}) but not (f)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) .

Since $A_1^{**} \cap B_1^{**} \cap A_2^{**} \cap B_2^{**} = F \cup (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}) = A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_2 \cap B_2$ and t is not (f)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) , there exist $x \in A_1^{**} \cap B_1^{**} - ((A_2^{**} \cap B_2^{**}) \cup A_t)$ and $y \in A_2^{**} \cap B_2^{**} - ((A_1^{**} \cap B_1^{**}) \cup A_t)$ such that $xy \in E(G)$. Note that $A_1^{**} \cap B_1^{**} - (A_2^{**} \cap B_2^{**}) = A_1' \cap B_1' - (A_2'' \cap B_2'') = (A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_s - (A_2 \cap B_2)) \cup (X_s - A_1)$.

Suppose that $x \in A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_s - (A_2 \cap B_2)$. Then x is anti-pointed for (A_1, B_1) . Since $y \in A_2^{**} \cap B_2^{**} - (A_1^{**} \cap B_1^{**}) = A_2'' \cap B_2'' - (A_1'' \cap B_1'') \subseteq B_1'' - A_1'' \subseteq B_1 - A_1$, y is the unique neighbor of x in $B_1 - A_1$. So $y \in A_2 \cap B_2 - (A_1 \cap B_1)$. Hence $y \in (A_2 \cap B_2) - ((A_1 \cap B_1) \cup A_t)$.

Since $x \in A_1 \cap B_1 - ((A_2 \cap B_2) \cup A_t)$, t is (f)-bad, a contradiction.

Hence $x \in X_s - A_1$. Since $x \notin A_t$, t is an ancestor of s . That is, $A_t \subseteq A_s$.

Since $|X_{s'}^*| = |X_s|$, there exist $a \in A_1 \cap B_1 - A_s$ and i with $1 \leq i \leq |X_{t_0}|$ such that P_i contains both a and x , and the subpath Q_i of P_i between a and x is contained in $G[B_s]$ and is internally disjoint from X_s . Let b be the neighbor of a in Q_i . Since $|A_1 \cap B_1| = |A \cap B| = |X_{t_0}|$, a is the only vertex in $V(P_i) \cap A_1 \cap B_1$, so $b \in B_1 - A_1$. Since t is not (f)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) , $A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_2 \cap B_2 - A_t = \emptyset$. Since $A_t \subseteq A_s$, $a \notin A_2 \cap B_2$. Hence $a \in A_1 \cap B_1 - ((A_2 \cap B_2) \cup A_t)$, and $b \in A_2 \cap B_2 - (A_1 \cap B_1)$ by (b). Since $ab \in E(G)$ and t is not (f)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) , $b \in A_t \subseteq A_s$. Since $a \in B_s - A_s$, $b \in X_s$. So $b = x \notin A_t$, a contradiction. \square

Claim 15 implies that (A_1^{**}, B_1^{**}) and (A_2^{**}, B_2^{**}) satisfy (a)-(f).

Claim 16: Let t be a side node that is (g)-bad for (A_1^{**}, B_1^{**}) and (A_2^{**}, B_2^{**}) . Then t is not a descendant of s , and if t is not an ancestor of s , then t is (g)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) .

Proof of Claim 16: Since $A_1^{**} \cap B_1^{**} = A'_1 \cap B'_1$, $A_1^{**} \cap B_1^{**} \subseteq A_s$. By Claim 7, $A_2^{**} \cap B_2^{**} \subseteq A_s$. Since t is (g)-bad for (A_1^{**}, B_1^{**}) and (A_2^{**}, B_2^{**}) , $((A_1^{**} \cap B_1^{**}) \cup (A_2^{**} \cap B_2^{**})) - A_t \neq \emptyset$, so t is not a descendant of s .

Suppose to the contrary that t is not an ancestor of s , and t is not (g)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) .

By Claim 15, if t is (f)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) , then t is (f)-bad for (A_1^{**}, B_1^{**}) and (A_2^{**}, B_2^{**}) , so t is not (g)-bad for (A_1^{**}, B_1^{**}) and (A_2^{**}, B_2^{**}) , a contradiction. Hence t is not (f)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) .

We first suppose that there exist $v \in A_2^{**} \cap B_2^{**} \cap X_t - (A_1^{**} \cap B_1^{**})$ such that v is adjacent to a vertex $u \in A_1^{**} \cap B_1^{**} - ((A_2^{**} \cap B_2^{**}) \cup A_t)$ and a vertex $a \in B_2^{**} - (A_2^{**} \cup A_t \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{|X_{t_0}|} V(P_i))$.

Since $A_1^{**} \cap B_1^{**} = A'_1 \cap B'_1$ and $u \notin A_t \supseteq B_s$, $u \in A_1 \cap B_1 - A_t$. If $u \in A_2 \cap B_2$, then $u \in A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_2 \cap B_2 - A_t$, so t is (f)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) , a contradiction. So $u \in A_1 \cap B_1 - ((A_2 \cap B_2) \cup A_t)$. Since $v \notin A_1^{**} \cap B_1^{**}$, v is the unique neighbor of u in $B_1^{**} - A_1^{**}$. If $v \notin B_1'' - A_1''$, then by Claim 14, v is contained in some component of $G - (F \cup (X_{t_0} \cup X_{t_3})) = G - (A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_2 \cap B_2)$ disjoint from $A_1'' \cap B_1''$ containing $u \in A_1^{**} \cap B_1^{**} = A_1'' \cap B_1''$, a contradiction. So v is in $B_1'' - A_1'' \subseteq B_1 - A_1$. Since $u \in A_1 \cap B_1 - ((A_2 \cap B_2) \cup A_t)$, v is the unique neighbor of u in $B_1 - A_1$. Hence $v \in A_2 \cap B_2 - (A_1 \cap B_1)$. Since $uv \in E(G)$ and $u \notin A_t$, $v \in B_t$. If $v \notin X_t$, then $v \notin A_t$, so t is (f)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) , a contradiction. So $v \in A_2 \cap B_2 \cap X_t - (A_1 \cap B_1)$. Since $v \in A_2 \cap B_2 \cap X_t - (A_1 \cap B_1)$, u is the unique neighbor of v in $A_2 - B_2$. So $a \in B_2 - A_t$. Since $A_1'' \supseteq A_1$ and $A_1'' \cap B_1'' \cap A_2'' \cap B_2'' = F \cup (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}) \subseteq A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_2 \cap B_2$, $A_2'' \supseteq A_2$. Since $a \in B_2 - (A_t \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{|X_{t_0}|} V(P_i))$ and t is not (g)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) , $a \in A_2 \cap B_2 - (A_t \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{|X_{t_0}|} V(P_i)) \subseteq A_2'' \cap B_2'' - (A_t \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{|X_{t_0}|} V(P_i))$. Since $a \notin A_2^{**} \cap B_2^{**} = A_2'' \cap B_2''$, $a \in B_2 - B_2''$. So $a \in A_1'' = A_1 \cup B_s$. Since $a \notin A_t$, $a \notin B_s$, so $a \in A_1$. Since $a \in A_2 \cap B_2 \cap A_1$, $a \in A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_2 \cap B_2$. But $a \notin A_t$, so t is (f)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) , a contradiction.

Therefore, there exist $x \in A_1^{**} \cap B_1^{**} \cap X_t - (A_2^{**} \cap B_2^{**})$ adjacent to a vertex $y \in A_2^{**} \cap B_2^{**} - ((A_1^{**} \cap B_1^{**}) \cup A_t)$ and a vertex $z \in A_1^{**} - (B_1^{**} \cup A_t \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{|X_{t_0}|} V(P_i))$.

Suppose $z \notin A_1''$. By Claim 14, z is contained in some component C of $G - (F \cup (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}))$ disjoint from $A_1'' \cap B_1'' = A_1^{**} \cap B_1^{**}$. But since $xz \in E(G)$ and $x \notin A_1^{**} \cap B_1^{**} \cap A_2^{**} \cap B_2^{**} = F \cup (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$, C contains $x \in A_1^{**} \cap B_1^{**}$, a contradiction.

So $z \in A_1''$. Since $z \in A_1' - A_t$ and t is not an ancestor or descendant of s , $z \in A_1 - B_s$.

Since $z \notin A_1^{**} \cap B_1^{**}$ and $z \in A_1 - B_s$, $z \in A_1 - (B_1 \cup B_s)$. Since $xz \in E(G)$, $x \in A_1 \cap A_s$. Since $x \in A_1^{**} \cap B_1^{**}$, $x \in A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_s$. Since $x \notin X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}$, x has a unique neighbor in $B_1 - A_1$. Since $y \in A_2^{**} \cap B_2^{**} - (A_1^{**} \cup B_1^{**}) = A_2'' \cap B_2'' - (A_1'' \cap B_1'')$, $y \notin A_1'' \supseteq A_1$. Hence y is the unique neighbor of x in $B_1 - A_1$. Since $x \notin A_1^{**} \cap B_1^{**} \cap A_2^{**} \cap B_2^{**} = F \cup (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}) = A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_2 \cap B_2$, $x \in A_1 \cap B_1 - (A_2 \cap B_2)$, and hence $y \in A_2 \cap B_2 - (A_1 \cap B_1)$. Therefore, t is (g)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) , a contradiction. \square

Claim 17: Every vertex in $X_s - A_1$ is doubly pointed for (A_2, B_2) .

Proof of Claim 17: Suppose to the contrary that there exists $u \in X_s - A_1$ not doubly pointed for (A_2, B_2) . By Claim 12, $u \in A_2 \cap B_2$. Recall that every vertex in $X_s - A_1$ is pointed for (A_s, B_s) . So u is pointed for (A_s, B_s) .

If $u \in X_{t_3}$, then since s is not a descendant of t_2 by Claim 5, $u \in X_{t_2} \cap X_{t_3} = X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3} \subseteq A_1$, a contradiction. So $u \notin X_{t_3}$. In particular, $u \notin X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}$. Hence u is pointed for (A_2, B_2) . Since u is not doubly pointed for (A_2, B_2) , u is not anti-pointed for (A_2, B_2) . Since u is pointed for (A_s, B_s) but not anti-pointed for (A_2, B_2) , there exists a neighbor v of u in $(B_2 - A_2) \cap B_s$. Since $v \notin A_2$, $v \notin A_1$. So if $v \in X_s$, then $v \in X_s - A_1 \subseteq A_2 \cap B_2$ by Claim 12, a contradiction. Hence $v \in B_2 - (A_2 \cup A_s)$.

Suppose there exists $P \in \{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{|X_{t_0}|}\}$ such that $v \in V(P)$. Let P' be the subpath of P between v and $V(P) \cap X_{t_3}$. Since $v \notin A_s$, $V(P') \cap X_s \neq \emptyset$. Since $|V(P) \cap A_2 \cap B_2| = 1$ and $(V(P) \cap X_{t_3}) \cup \{v\} \subseteq B_2 - A_2$, $V(P') \subseteq B_2 - A_2$. Hence $V(P') \cap X_s - A_2 \neq \emptyset$. But $X_s - A_2 = X_s - (A_1 \cup A_2) = (X_s - A_1) - A_2 \subseteq A_2 \cap B_2 - A_2 = \emptyset$ by Claim 12, a contradiction.

So $v \in B_2 - (A_2 \cup A_s \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{|X_{t_0}|} V(P_i))$. Since $|X_s^*| = |X_s|$, u is adjacent to some vertex z in $((A_2 - B_2) \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^{|X_{t_0}|} V(P_i)) - A_s \subseteq A_2 - (B_2 \cup A_s)$. Since $u \in X_s - A_1$, $u \in A_2 \cap B_2 - (A_1 \cap B_1)$. Since $z \in A_2 - B_2$, $z \in A_1 \cap B_1 - (A_2 \cap B_2)$. So $z \in A_1 \cap B_1 - ((A_2 \cap B_2) \cup A_s)$. Hence s is (g)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) .

Since $B_s \subseteq A_1''$, $A_2^{**} \cap B_2^{**} - A_s = A_2'' \cap B_2'' - A_s = \emptyset$. And $A_1^{**} \cap B_1^{**} - A_s = A_1'' \cap B_1'' - A_s = \emptyset$. So s is not (g)-bad for (A_1^{**}, B_1^{**}) and (A_2^{**}, B_2^{**}) . Let Q be the set consisting of the side nodes q such that q is (g)-bad for (A_1^{**}, B_1^{**}) and (A_2^{**}, B_2^{**}) but not (g)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) . Since s is (g)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) but not (g)-bad for (A_1^{**}, B_1^{**}) and (A_2^{**}, B_2^{**}) , $Q \neq \emptyset$ by (g). By Claim 16, every element in Q is an ancestor of s and $s \notin Q$. Since $|Q| \leq |V(T)|$, $(|V(T)| + 1)^{d_s} > \sum_{q \in Q} (|V(T)| + 1)^{d_q}$, where d_s and d_q are the distance in T from s and q , respectively, to $t_0 T t_3$. Hence (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) do not satisfy (g), a contradiction. \square

Let $(C_1, D_1) = (A'_1, B'_1)$.

Claim 18: There exists a separation (C_2, D_2) such that (C_1, D_1) is the reflection of (C_2, D_2) with respect to $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}$, $F \cup (X_s - A_1)$, and (C_1, D_1) and (C_2, D_2) satisfy (b)-(d).

Proof of Claim 18: For every $u \in A'_1 \cap B'_1 - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$, let u' be the unique neighbor of u in $B'_1 - A'_1 = D_1 - C_1$ mentioned in Claim 7.

Let $R = A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_s - (A_2 \cap B_2)$. Let $R' = \{u' : u \in R\}$. Let $C_2 = C_1 \cup R'$ and $D_2 = D_1 - R$.

We first show that (C_2, D_2) is a separation. Since $R \subseteq C_2$, $C_2 \cup D_2 = V(G)$. Suppose there exists $ab \in E(G)$ such that $a \in C_2 - D_2$ and $b \in D_2 - C_2$. Then $b \in D_1 - (R \cup C_1 \cup R')$. Since (C_1, D_1) is a separation, $a \in D_1$. Since $a \notin D_2 = D_1 - R$, $a \in R$. Since $b \in D_2 - C_2 \subseteq D_1 - C_1 = B'_1 - A'_1$ and $a \in R \subseteq A'_1 \cap B'_1 - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$, $b = a' \in R'$, a contradiction.

Hence (C_2, D_2) is a separation of G . Note that $C_2 \cap D_2 = (C_1 \cap D_1 - R) \cup R' =$

$(A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_2 \cap B_2) \cup (X_s - A_1) \cup R'$.

Now we show that (C_1, D_1) and (C_2, D_2) satisfy (c) and (d). Note that as shown in the proof of Claim 9, (A'_1, B'_1) and (A'_2, B'_2) satisfy (c) and (d). Since $C_1 = A'_1$ and $D_2 \supseteq B'_2$, (C_1, D_1) and (C_2, D_2) satisfy (c). Suppose that $C_2 \not\supseteq G_A$. Since $C_2 \supseteq C_1 \supseteq A_1$ and $A_2 \supseteq G_A$ by (d), $G_A \cap A_2 - A_1 \neq \emptyset$. Note that $A_2 = A_1 \cup (A_2 \cap B_2)$, so $G_A - C_2 \subseteq A_2 \cap B_2 - (A_1 \cup B_s)$. Hence each vertex in $G_A - C_2$ is a neighbor of some vertex in $A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_s - (A_2 \cap B_2) = R$ contained in $A_2 \cap B_2 - (A_1 \cup B_s) \subseteq B'_1 - A'_1$. So $G_A - C_2 \subseteq R' \subseteq C_2$, a contradiction. Hence $C_2 \supseteq G_A$. Since $C_2 \supseteq G_A$ and $D_1 = B'_1$, (C_1, D_1) and (C_2, D_2) satisfy (d).

Now we show that (C_1, D_1) is the reflection of (C_2, D_2) with respect to $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}, F \cup (X_s - A_1)$.

Since (C_1, D_1) and (C_2, D_2) satisfy (c) and (d), they separate $\downarrow t_0$ and $\uparrow t_3$. Since every vertex in $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}$ is coherent for t_0, t_3 and every vertex in F is doubly pointed for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) , every vertex in $F \cap X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}$ is doubly pointed for (C_1, D_1) and (C_2, D_2) and is not adjacent to any vertex in $C_2 \cap D_2 - (F \cup (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}))$.

Since $D_1 - C_1 \subseteq B_1 - A_1$ and every vertex in $F - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$ is anti-pointed for (A_1, B_1) , every vertex in $F - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$ is anti-pointed for (C_1, D_1) and (C_2, D_2) . Since every vertex in $X_s - A_1$ is pointed for (A_s, B_s) , every vertex in $X_s - A_1$ is anti-pointed for $(A'_1, B'_1) = (C_1, D_1)$ and hence is anti-pointed for (C_2, D_2) . Since $C_2 \cap D_2 - ((F \cup (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})) \cup (X_s - A_1)) \subseteq R'$, every vertex in $(F - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})) \cup (X_s - A_1)$ is not adjacent to any vertex in $C_2 \cap D_2 - (F \cup (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})) \cup (X_s - A_1)$ by Claim 7.

Hence every vertex in $F \cup (X_s - A_1)$ is not adjacent to any vertex in $C_2 \cap D_2 - (F \cup (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})) \cup (X_s - A_1)$. So to show that (C_1, D_1) is the reflection of (C_2, D_2) with respect to $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}, F \cup (X_s - A_1)$, it suffices to show that every vertex in $C_2 \cap D_2 - (F \cup (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})) \cup (X_s - A_1) = R'$ is pointed for (C_2, D_2) , and every vertex in $(F - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})) \cup (X_s - A_1)$ is pointed for (C_2, D_2) .

Any neighbor of some vertex in R' in $C_2 - D_2$ is in $C_1 \cap D_1 - D_2 \subseteq R$. Since the set of edges between R and R' is a matching, every vertex in R' is pointed for (C_2, D_2) .

Since $C_2 - D_2 \subseteq A''_2 - B''_2$ and every vertex in $F - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$ is pointed for (A''_2, B''_2) , every vertex in $F - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$ is pointed for (C_2, D_2) . Suppose there exists a vertex $c \in X_s - A_1$ not pointed for (C_2, D_2) . Note that $C_2 - D_2 = C_1 - (C_1 \cap D_1 \cap C_2 \cap D_2) = C_1 - (F \cup (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}) \cup (X_s - A_1)) = (A'_1 - B'_1) \cup R$. Since $c \notin A_1$, every neighbor of c is in B_1 . So every neighbor of c in $C_2 - D_2$ is in $((A'_1 - B'_1) \cup R) \cap B_1 \subseteq (B_1 - A_s) \cup R$. Since every vertex in R is anti-pointed for (A_1, B_1) , the neighbors of R in $B_1 - A_1$ are contained in R' , so c is not adjacent to R . Hence every neighbor of a vertex c in $C_2 - D_2$ is in $B_1 - A_s$. By Claim 17, $c \in X_s - A_1$ is doubly pointed for (A_2, B_2) . By Claim 7, c' is a neighbor of c in $(B'_1 - A'_1) \cap (\bigcup_{i=1}^{|X_{t_0}|} V(P_i))$, c' is the unique neighbor of c in $B_2 - A_2$. Hence c has no neighbor in $(B_2 - A_2) \cap A'_1 \supseteq (B_2 - A_2) \cap B_s$. Recall that every neighbor of c in $C_2 - D_2$ is in $B_1 - A_s$, so every neighbor of c in $C_2 - D_2$ is in $B_1 \cap A_2 - A_s$. Since $A_2 \cap B_2 \subseteq A_s$ by Claim 11, c has no neighbor in $A_2 \cap B_2$. So every neighbor of c in $C_2 - D_2$ is in $A_2 - B_2$. Since c is pointed for (A_2, B_2) , c is pointed for (C_2, D_2) , a contradiction. Hence every vertex in $(F - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})) \cup (X_s - A_1)$ is pointed for (C_2, D_2) .

This shows that (C_1, D_1) is the reflection of (C_2, D_2) with respect to $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}, F \cup (X_s - A_1)$. Therefore, (C_1, D_1) and (C_2, D_2) satisfy (b). \square

Claim 19: There exist separations (C_1^*, D_1^*) and (C_2^*, D_2^*) satisfying (a)-(e) such that $C_1^* \cap$

$D_1^* = C_1 \cap D_1$, $C_2^* \cap D_2^* = C_2 \cap D_2$, and every vertex in $(C_1^* - C_1) \cup (C_1 - C_1^*) \cup (D_2^* - D_2) \cup (D_2 - D_2^*)$ is contained in some component of $G - (F \cup (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}) \cup (X_s - A_1))$ disjoint from $X_{t_0} \cup X_{t_3} \cup (C_1 \cap D_1) \cup (C_2 \cap D_2)$.

Proof of Claim 19: By Claim 18, (C_1, D_1) and (C_2, D_2) satisfy (b)-(d). Since (C_1, D_1) and (C_2, D_2) satisfy (d), (C_2, D_2) strongly separates $\downarrow t_0$ and $\uparrow t_3$. Recall that the breadth of (A, B) is minimum among all separations strongly separating $\downarrow t_0$ and $\uparrow t_3$. So the breadth of (C_2, D_2) is at least the breadth of (A, B) . Since every vertex in $C_2 \cap D_2 - (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3})$ is pointed for (C_2, D_2) , and every vertex in $X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}$ is coherent for t_0, t_3 , the breadth of (C_2, D_2) is at most the breadth of (A, B) . Hence (C_1, D_1) and (C_2, D_2) satisfy (a)-(d). Then this claim follows from Lemma 4.7. \square

Claim 20: The set of (f)-bad side nodes for (C_1^*, D_1^*) and (C_2^*, D_2^*) equals the set of (f)-bad side nodes for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) .

Proof of Claim 20: Since (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) satisfy (f), it suffices to show that every (f)-bad side node for (C_1^*, D_1^*) and (C_2^*, D_2^*) is (f)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) . Suppose to the contrary that there exists a side node t that is (f)-bad for (C_1^*, D_1^*) and (C_2^*, D_2^*) but not (f)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) .

Suppose that $C_1^* \cap D_1^* \cap C_2^* \cap D_2^* - A_t \neq \emptyset$. Note that $C_1^* \cap D_1^* \cap C_2^* \cap D_2^* = F \cup (X_{t_0} \cap X_{t_3}) \cup (X_s - A_1) = (A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_2 \cap B_2) \cup (X_s - A_1)$. Since t is not (f)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) , $(X_s - A_1) - A_t \neq \emptyset$. Hence t is an ancestor of s . Let $a \in (X_s - A_1) - A_t$. Note that $a \in A_2 \cap B_2 - A_1$ by Claim 12. Since $|X_{s'}^*| = |X_s|$, the neighbor b of a in $A_1 \cap B_1 - (A_2 \cap B_2)$ is contained in $B_s - A_s \subseteq B_t - A_t$. Hence $ab \in E(G)$, $b \in A_1 \cap B_1 - ((A_2 \cap B_2) \cup A_t)$ and $a \in A_2 \cap B_2 - ((A_1 \cap B_1) \cup A_t)$. So t is (f)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) , a contradiction.

Hence there exist $x \in C_1^* \cap D_1^* - ((C_2^* \cap D_2^*) \cup A_t) \subseteq A_1^{**} \cap B_1^{**} - ((A_2^{**} \cap B_2^{**}) \cup A_t)$ and $y \in C_2^* \cap D_2^* - ((C_1^* \cap D_1^*) \cup A_t) \subseteq A_2^{**} \cap B_2^{**} - ((A_1^{**} \cap B_1^{**}) \cup A_t)$ such that $xy \in E(G)$. So t is (f)-bad for (A_1^{**}, B_1^{**}) and (A_2^{**}, B_2^{**}) . Hence by Claim 15, t is (f)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) , a contradiction. \square

Claims 19 and 20 imply that (C_1^*, D_1^*) and (C_2^*, D_2^*) satisfy (a)-(f).

Claim 21: The set of (g)-bad side nodes for (C_1^*, D_1^*) and (C_2^*, D_2^*) equals the set of (g)-bad side nodes for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) .

Proof of Claim 21: Since (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) satisfy (g), it suffices to show that every (g)-bad side node for (C_1^*, D_1^*) and (C_2^*, D_2^*) is (g)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) . Suppose to the contrary that there exists a side node t that is (g)-bad for (C_1^*, D_1^*) and (C_2^*, D_2^*) but not (g)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) .

By Claim 20, if t is (f)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) , then t is (f)-bad for (C_1^*, D_1^*) and (C_2^*, D_2^*) , so t is not (g)-bad for (C_1^*, D_1^*) and (C_2^*, D_2^*) , a contradiction. Hence t is not (f)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) .

We first suppose that there exist $v \in C_2^* \cap D_2^* \cap X_t - (C_1^* \cap D_1^*)$ such that v is adjacent to a vertex $u \in C_1^* \cap D_1^* - ((C_2^* \cap D_2^*) \cup A_t)$ and a vertex $a \in D_2^* - (C_2^* \cup A_t \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{|X_{t_0}|} V(P_i))$.

Since $C_2^* \cap D_2^* - (C_1^* \cap D_1^*) \subseteq A_2 \cap B_2 - (A_1 \cap B_1)$, $v \in A_2 \cap B_2 \cap X_t - (A_1 \cap B_1)$. By the existence of $P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{|X_{t_0}|}$, $u \in A_1 \cap B_1 - (A_2 \cap B_2)$, so $u \in A_1 \cap B_1 - ((A_2 \cap B_2) \cup A_t)$.

Note that u is the unique neighbor of v in $A_2 - B_2$. So $a \in B_2 - (C_2^* \cup A_t \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{|X_{t_0}|} V(P_i))$.

Since t is not (g)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) , $a \in A_2 \cap B_2 - (C_2^* \cup A_t \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{|X_{t_0}|} V(P_i))$.

Since $X_s - A_1 \subseteq A_2 \cap B_2 \cap C_2^*$ by Claim 12, $a \in A_2 \cap B_2 - (X_s - A_1)$. If $a \in A_1$, then $a \in A_1 \cap B_1 \cap A_2 \cap B_2 \subseteq C_2^*$, a contradiction. So $a \in A_2 \cap B_2 - (A_1 \cup X_s)$. Since $A_2 \cap B_2 \subseteq A_s$

by Claim 11, $a \in A_2 \cap B_2 - (A_1 \cup B_s) \subseteq C_2^*$, a contradiction.

Therefore, there exist $x \in C_1^* \cap D_1^* \cap X_t - (C_2^* \cap D_2^*)$ adjacent to a vertex $y \in C_2^* \cap D_2^* - ((C_1^* \cap D_1^*) \cup A_t)$ and a vertex $z \in C_1^* - (D_1^* \cup A_t \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{|X_{t_0}|} V(P_i))$.

So $x \in A_1 \cap B_1 \cap X_t - (A_2 \cap B_2)$. By the existence of $P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{|X_{t_0}|}$, we have $y \in A_2 \cap B_2 - ((A_1 \cap B_1) \cup A_t)$, and y is the unique neighbor of x in $B_1 - A_1$. So $z \in A_1$. Since $z \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^{|X_{t_0}|} V(P_i)$, $z \notin A_1 \cap B_1$. So $z \in A_1 - (B_1 \cup A_t \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{|X_{t_0}|} V(P_i))$. Hence t is (g)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) , a contradiction. \square

By Claim 21, (C_1^*, D_1^*) and (C_2^*, D_2^*) satisfy (a)-(g).

Claim 22: Every side node that is (h)-bad for (C_1^*, D_1^*) and (C_2^*, D_2^*) is (h)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) .

Proof of Claim 22: Suppose there exists an (h)-bad side node t for (C_1^*, D_1^*) and (C_2^*, D_2^*) but not (h)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) . Since t is (h)-bad for (C_1^*, D_1^*) and (C_2^*, D_2^*) , t is not (f)-bad for (C_1^*, D_1^*) and (C_2^*, D_2^*) , so $C_1^* \cap D_1^* \cap C_2^* \cap D_2^* - A_t = \emptyset$.

Suppose there exists $v \in C_1^* \cap D_1^* - A_t$. Since $C_1^* \cap D_1^* \cap C_2^* \cap D_2^* - A_t = \emptyset$, $v \in C_1^* \cap D_1^* - ((C_2^* \cap D_2^*) \cup A_t) = A_1 \cap B_1 - ((A_2 \cap B_2) \cup A_t)$. So t is (h)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) , a contradiction.

Hence there exists $u \in C_2^* \cap D_2^* - A_t$. Since $C_1^* \cap D_1^* \cap C_2^* \cap D_2^* - A_t = \emptyset$, $u \in C_2^* \cap D_2^* - ((C_1^* \cap D_1^*) \cup A_t) = A_2 \cap B_2 - ((A_1 \cap B_1) \cup A_t)$. So t is (h)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) , a contradiction. \square

Note that $C_1^* \cap D_1^* = C_1 \cap D_1 \subseteq A_s$ and $C_2^* \cap D_2^* = C_2 \cap D_2 \subseteq A_s$. Hence s is not (h)-bad for (C_1^*, D_1^*) and (C_2^*, D_2^*) . Since $A_1 \cap B_1 - A_s \neq \emptyset$, s is (h)-bad for (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) . Therefore, (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) do not satisfy (h) by Claim 22, a contradiction.

This proves that the breadth of $(A_{s'}, B_{s'})$ is less than the breadth of (A_s, B_s) .

It can be shown that the breadth of $(A_{s''}, B_{s''})$ is less than the breadth of (A_s, B_s) analogously, so we omit the details.

Therefore, for every $t \in S$ with $t', t'' \in S^*$, the breadth of $(A_{t'}, B_{t'})$ and the breadth of $(A_{t''}, B_{t''})$ are less than the breadth of (A_t, B_t) . This immediately implies that S^* satisfies (INC1) and (INC3). This proves that every separation of breadth at most the breadth of (A_2, B_2) incorporated in (T, \mathcal{X}) is also incorporated in (T^*, \mathcal{X}^*) . So the proof of this lemma is complete. \blacksquare

4.5 Elevation

Let (T, \mathcal{X}) be a rooted tree-decomposition of a graph G . The *elevation* of (T, \mathcal{X}) is the maximum (Z, s) -depth among all $Z \subseteq V(G)$ and positive integers s .

Now we are ready to prove the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 4.9. *For all positive integers k, w , there exist integers $N = (w + 1)2^{(w+1)(w+2)} + 1$ and $f = f(k, w)$ such that if G is a graph of tree-width at most w not containing the Robertson chain of length k as a topological minor, then there exists an N -linked and N -integrated rooted tree-decomposition (T, \mathcal{X}) of G of width $\text{tw}(G)$ and elevation at most $f(k, w)$ such that for every edge xy of T , either $X_x \subseteq X_y$ or $X_y \subseteq X_x$.*

Proof. Define $f(k, w) = g_{3.4}(k, w, N + 2)$, where $g_{3.4}$ is the function g mentioned in Lemma 3.4. Let (T, \mathcal{X}) be a rooted tree-decomposition of G of width $\text{tw}(G)$, and subject to this, the

signature of (T, \mathcal{X}) is as large as possible, and subject to these, the number of edges xy of T such that $X_x \not\subseteq X_y$ and $X_y \not\subseteq X_x$ is as small as possible. By Lemma 4.5, (T, \mathcal{X}) is N -linked. By Lemma 4.8, (T, \mathcal{X}) is N -integrated.

If there exists an edge xy of T such that $X_x \not\subseteq X_y$ and $X_y \not\subseteq X_x$, then subdividing xy and defining the bag of the new node to be $X_x \cap X_y$ will result in a rooted tree-decomposition of G of width $\text{tw}(G)$ and signature at least (T, \mathcal{X}) , but smaller number of “bad” edges, a contradiction. So for every edge xy of T , either $X_x \subseteq X_y$ or $X_y \subseteq X_x$.

Suppose that the elevation of (T, \mathcal{X}) is greater than $f(k, w)$. So there exists a (Z, s) -strip in (T, \mathcal{X}) with length at least $f(k, w)$, for some $Z \subseteq V(G)$ and integer s with $0 < s \leq w$. By Lemma 3.4, there exist a (Z, s) -strip R in (T, \mathcal{X}) and a pseudo-edge-cut (A, B) modulo Z of order $|Z| + s$ such that every vertex in Z is coherent for all pairs of nodes in R , and (A, B) is a separation $(N + 2)$ -breaking R . So there exist $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{2N+4} \in R$, where t_i is a precursor of t_{i+1} for $1 \leq i \leq 2N + 3$, such that $\downarrow t_{N+2} \subseteq A$ and $\uparrow t_{N+3} \subseteq B$. Note that $X_{t_1}, X_{t_{N+4}}, X_{t_{N+5}}, \dots, X_{t_{2N+4}}$ are distinct. By Lemma 4.2, since (T, \mathcal{X}) is N -linked, there exist $|X_{t_1}|$ disjoint paths in G from X_{t_1} to $X_{t_{N+4}}$. Hence, (A, B) is a separation of G strongly separating $\downarrow t_{N+1}$ and $\uparrow t_{N+3}$ of breadth $(|X_{t_1}|, r)$, where r is the number of vertices in Z non-pointed for $(A_{t_{N+4}}, B_{t_{N+4}})$, since every vertex in Z is coherent for all pairs of nodes in R . Note that since $s > 0$ and the sets $X_{t_i} - Z$ are nonempty and pairwise disjoint for all $1 \leq i \leq 2N + 4$, we know that for each integer j with $j \geq N + 5$, there exists a vertex $v_j \in X_{t_j} - X_{t_{j-1}}$. So $\{v_j : N + 5 \leq j \leq 2N + 4\}$ contains N vertices that cannot be separated from $\downarrow t_N$ by a separation of breadth less than the breadth of (A, B) given by a node of T . However, since (T, \mathcal{X}) is N -integrated, there exists a node $t \in t_N T t_{N+4}$ of breadth equal to the breadth of (A, B) . It is impossible since R is a (Z, s) -strip. Therefore, (T, \mathcal{X}) has elevation at most $f(k, w)$. ■

5 A tree lemma

We shall strengthen [14, Theorem 2.2] in this section. This strengthening will be used to prove well-quasi-ordering in the next section.

A *stable set* in a finite or infinite graph is a subset of pairwise nonadjacent vertices. We say that a subset I of vertices of an infinite graph G is *rich* in G if no infinite subset of I is a stable set.

To strengthen [14, Theorem 2.2], we shall use the following weaker version.

Theorem 5.1 ([14, Theorem 2.1]). *Let T_1, T_2, \dots be a countable sequence of disjoint rooted trees. Let M be an infinite graph with $V(M) = V(T_1 \cup T_2 \cup \dots)$ such that for $i' > i \geq 1$, if $u \in V(T_i)$ is adjacent to $w \in V(T_{i'})$ in M , then u is adjacent in M to all non-root ancestors of w . If the set of the roots of T_1, T_2, \dots is a stable set of M , then there is an infinite stable set X of M such that $|X \cap V(T_i)| \leq 1$ for each $i \geq 1$ and such that the set of heads of all edges of $T_1 \cup T_2 \cup \dots$ with tails in X is rich in M .*

For every nonnegative integer n and any set X , we define $[X]^{\leq n}$ to be the collection of subsets of X with size at most n .

Let X be a set and n be a nonnegative integer. Let T be a rooted tree, and let ϕ, τ be functions from $E(T)$ to $[X]^{\leq n}$ such that $\tau(e) \subseteq \phi(e)$ for all $e \in E(T)$. Let N be a nonnegative

integer and $\mu : E(T) \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2, \dots, N\}$. For $v, w \in V(T)$, we say that v precedes w in T with respect to (ϕ, τ, μ) if the following hold.

- v is not the root of T .
- v is an ancestor of w .
- Let e, f be the edges of T with heads v, w , respectively. Then $|\phi(e)| = |\phi(f)|$, $\tau(e) = \tau(f)$ and $\mu(e) = \mu(f)$.
- $|\phi(g)| \geq |\phi(f)|$ for all edges g in vTw .
- $\mu(g) \geq \mu(e)$ for all edges g in vTw with $|\phi(g)| = |\phi(e)|$.

Let m be a positive integer. We say that (T, ϕ, τ, μ) is (n, m, N) -decorated if the following hold.

- If $e, e', e'' \in E(T)$ and they appear on a directed path in T in the order listed, then $\phi(e) \cap \phi(e'') \subseteq \phi(e')$.
- $t \leq m$ if t is a positive integer that satisfies the following.
 - P is a directed path in T .
 - $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_t \in E(P)$ are directed edges appearing in P in the order listed with $|\phi(e_1)| = |\phi(e_2)| = \dots = |\phi(e_t)|$.
 - There exists Z such that $\phi(e_i) \cap \phi(e_j) = Z$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq t$.
 - $|\phi(e)| \geq |\phi(e_1)|$ for every edge e of P .
 - $\tau(e) \not\subseteq Z$ and $\mu(e) = \mu(e_1)$ for every edge e of P with $|\phi(e)| = |\phi(e_1)|$.

For the rest of the section, we define the following and make the following assumptions. Let T_1, T_2, \dots be an infinite sequence of pairwise disjoint rooted trees. Let N, h, d be integers with $N, h \geq 0$ and $d > 0$, and let L be a set. For each $i \geq 1$, let $\mu_i : E(T_i) \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2, \dots, N\}$, and let ϕ_i, τ_i be functions from $E(T_i)$ to $[L]^{\leq h}$ such that $(T_i, \phi_i, \tau_i, \mu_i)$ is (h, d, N) -decorated. Assume that D is an infinite graph with $V(D) = V(T_1 \cup T_2 \cup \dots)$ such that for $i' > i \geq 1$, if $u \in V(T_i)$ is adjacent to $w \in V(T_{i'})$ in D , and $v \in V(T_{i'})$ precedes w in $T_{i'}$ with respect to $(\phi_{i'}, \tau_{i'}, \mu_{i'})$, then u is adjacent to v in D . Assume that the roots of T_1, T_2, \dots form a stable set in D .

Lemma 5.2. *If there exists a positive integer ℓ such that each T_i has no directed path of length ℓ , then there exists an infinite stable set S of D such that $|S \cap V(T_i)| \leq 1$ for each $i \geq 1$ and such that the set of heads of all edges of $T_1 \cup T_2 \cup \dots$ with tails in S is rich in D .*

Proof. Let R be the set of the roots of T_1, T_2, \dots . We shall do induction on ℓ . When $\ell = 1$, each T_i contains only one node, so the lemma holds by choosing $S = R$ since the empty set is rich. So we may assume that $\ell > 1$ and this lemma holds for all smaller ℓ .

Let C be the set of the children of all nodes in R . If C is rich, then we are done by choosing $S = R$. So we may assume that C contains an infinite stable set W in D . Since

each T_i is finite, we may assume that $|W \cap T_i| \leq 1$ for all i . Let $i_1 < i_2 < \dots$ be the indices j such that $W \cap T_j \neq \emptyset$. For each $j \geq 1$, define T'_j to be the maximal subtree of T_{i_j} rooted at $W \cap T_{i_j}$. So each T'_j has no directed path of length $\ell - 1$. Furthermore, the roots of T'_j are stable in D . Let $D' = D[V(T'_1 \cup T'_2 \cup \dots)]$. By the induction hypothesis, there exists a stable set S in D' such that $|S \cap T'_j| \leq 1$ for all j and the set of all heads of all edges of $T'_1 \cup T'_2 \cup \dots$ with tails in S is rich in D' . And the set of all heads of all edges of $T'_1 \cup T'_2 \cup \dots$ with tails in S in D' is the same as the set of all heads of all edges of $T_1 \cup T_2 \cup \dots$ with tails in S in D . This proves the lemma. ■

For $i \geq 1$ and $F_i \subseteq E(T_i)$, we define the F_i -contraction of $(T_i, \phi_i, \tau_i, \mu_i)$ to be the tuple $(T'_i, \phi'_i, \tau'_i, \mu'_i)$ as follows.

- Define T'_i to be the rooted tree obtained from T_i by contracting each component of $T_i - F_i$ into a node such that the root of T'_i is the node obtained by contracting the component of $T_i - F_i$ containing the root of T_i .
- Define $\phi'_i = \phi|_{F_i}$, $\tau'_i = \tau_i|_{F_i}$, and $\mu'_i = \mu_i|_{F_i}$.

And we define the $(\bigcup_{i \geq 1} F_i)$ -contraction of D , denoted by D' , to be the infinite graph with $V(D') = V(T'_1 \cup T'_2 \cup \dots)$ such that for $x \in V(T'_i)$ and $y \in V(T'_j)$ for some i and j , x and y are adjacent in D' if and only if $i \neq j$ and the root of the component of $T_i - F_i$ contracted into x and the root of the component of $T_j - F_j$ contracted into y are adjacent in D .

Lemma 5.3. *For each $i \geq 1$, let $F_i \subseteq E(T_i)$, and denote the F_i -contraction of $(T_i, \phi_i, \tau_i, \mu_i)$ by $(T'_i, \phi'_i, \tau'_i, \mu'_i)$. Denote the $(\bigcup_{i \geq 1} F_i)$ -contraction of D by D' . Assume that there exists an infinite stable set S' of D' such that $|S' \cap V(T'_i)| \leq 1$ for each $i \geq 1$ and such that the set of heads of all edges of $T'_1 \cup T'_2 \cup \dots$ with tails in S' is rich in D' . Let $i_1 < i_2 < \dots$ be the indices j such that $S' \cap V(T'_j) \neq \emptyset$. For each $j \geq 1$, define T''_j to be the component of $T_{i_j} - F_{i_j}$ contracted into the node in $S' \cap V(T'_{i_j})$. Define $D'' = D[V(T''_1 \cup T''_2 \cup \dots)]$.*

If there exists an infinite stable set S'' of D'' such that $|S'' \cap V(T''_i)| \leq 1$ for each $i \geq 1$ and such that the set of heads of all edges of $T''_1 \cup T''_2 \cup \dots$ with tails in S'' is rich in D'' , then there exists an infinite stable set S of D such that $|S \cap V(T_i)| \leq 1$ for each $i \geq 1$ and such that the set of heads of all edges of $T_1 \cup T_2 \cup \dots$ with tails in S is rich in D .

Proof. We claim that we may choose S to be S'' . Suppose that the set of heads of all edges of $T_1 \cup T_2 \cup \dots$ with tails in S contains an infinite stable set R in D . Since $R \cap V(T''_1 \cup T''_2 \cup \dots)$ is finite by assumption, $R - V(T''_1 \cup T''_2 \cup \dots)$, denoted by R' , is infinite. But each node in R' is the root of some component of $T_i - F_i$ contracted into a child in T'_i of a node in S' , so R' is finite, a contradiction. This proves the lemma. ■

Lemma 5.4. *For each $i \geq 1$, let W_i be a subset of $\{e \in E(T_i) : |\phi_i(e)| = \min_{e' \in E(T_i)} |\phi_i(e')|\}$ and let $(T_i^W, \phi_i^W, \tau_i^W, \mu_i^W)$ to be the W_i -contraction of $(T_i, \phi_i, \tau_i, \mu_i)$. If for every $i \geq 1$, there exists a nonnegative integer p_i such that $\mu_i(e) = p_i$ for all edges e of T_i , then a node v of T_i^W precedes a node w of T_i^W in T_i^W with respect to $(\phi_i^W, \tau_i^W, \mu_i^W)$ if and only if the root of the component of $T_i - W_i$ contracted to v precedes the root of the component of $T_i - W_i$ contracted to w in T_i with respect to (ϕ_i, τ_i, μ_i) .*

Proof. This lemma immediately follows from the assumption that for each $i \geq 1$, W_i is a subset of $\{e \in E(T_i) : |\phi_i(e)| = \min_{e' \in E(T_i)} |\phi_i(e')|\}$ and $\mu_i(e) = p_i$ for all edges e of T_i . ■

Lemma 5.5. *If for each $i \geq 1$, $\phi_i(e') \cap \phi_i(e'') = \emptyset$ for every pair of distinct edges e', e'' of T_i , and there exist nonnegative integers h_i, p_i with $|\phi_i(e)| = h_i$ and $\mu_i(e) = p_i$ for all $e \in E(T_i)$, then there exists an infinite stable set S of D such that $|S \cap V(T_i)| \leq 1$ for each $i \geq 1$ and such that the set of heads of all edges of $T_1 \cup T_2 \cup \dots$ with tails in S is rich in D .*

Proof. For each $i \geq 1$, we define $F_i = \{e \in E(T_i) : \tau_i(e) = \emptyset\}$ and define $(T'_i, \phi'_i, \tau'_i, \mu'_i)$ to be the F_i -contraction of $(T_i, \phi_i, \tau_i, \mu_i)$. Define D' to be the $(\bigcup_{i \geq 1} F_i)$ -contraction of D .

For each i , since $|\phi'_i(e)| = h_i$ and $\mu_i(e) = p_i$ for all $e \in E(T'_i)$, by Lemma 5.4, if $x \in V(T'_i), y \in V(T'_j)$ with $i < j$ and x is adjacent to y in D' , then x is adjacent to all non-root ancestors of y in T'_j . By Theorem 5.1, there exists an infinite stable set $S' \subseteq V(D')$ in D' such that $|S' \cap V(T'_i)| \leq 1$ for each $i \geq 1$ and such that the set of the children of the members of S' is rich in D' .

Let $i_1 < i_2 < \dots$ be the indices j such that $S' \cap V(T'_j) \neq \emptyset$. For each $j \geq 1$, define T''_j to be the component of $T_{i_j} - F_{i_j}$ contracted into the node in $S' \cap V(T'_{i_j})$. Define $D'' = D[V(T''_1 \cup T''_2 \cup \dots)]$.

Note that for each $i \geq 1$ and each edge e in a component of $T_i - F_i$, $\tau_i(e) \neq \emptyset$. Since T_i is (h, d, N) -decorated and the sets $\phi_i(e)$ (for $e \in E(T_i)$) are pairwise disjoint sets with the same size and $\mu_i(e)$ (for $e \in E(T_i)$) is a constant, each component of $T_i - F_i$ has no directed path with length $d + 1$. By Lemma 5.2, there exists an infinite stable set S in D'' such that $|S \cap V(T''_i)| \leq 1$ for all $i \geq 1$ and the set of heads of all edges of $T''_1 \cup T''_2 \cup \dots$ with tails in S is rich in D'' . Then the lemma follows from Lemma 5.3. ■

Lemma 5.6. *If for every $i \geq 1$, there exists a nonnegative integer p_i such that $\mu_i(e) = p_i$ for all edges e of T_i , then there exists an infinite stable set S of D such that $|S \cap V(T_i)| \leq 1$ for each $i \geq 1$ and such that the set of heads of all edges of $T_1 \cup T_2 \cup \dots$ with tails in S is rich in D .*

Proof. Let $b = \min\{|\phi_i(e)| : i \geq 1, e \in E(T_i)\}$. Note that $b \geq 0$ exists. We shall prove this lemma by induction on the lexicographic order of $(h, h - b)$. When $h = 0$, $\phi_i(e) = \emptyset$ for all $i \geq 1$ and $e \in E(T_i)$, so every non-root node precedes its descendant, so this lemma follows from Theorem 5.1. So we may assume that $h \geq 1$ and this lemma holds for all smaller $(h, h - b)$.

For each $i \geq 1$, we define $W_i = \{e \in E(T_i) : |\phi_i(e)| = b\}$ and define $(T_i^W, \phi_i^W, \tau_i^W, \mu_i^W)$ to be the W_i -contraction of $(T_i, \phi_i, \tau_i, \mu_i)$. Define D_W to be the $(\bigcup_{i \geq 1} W_i)$ -contraction of D .

For each i , since $|\phi_i^W(e')| = b$ for all $e' \in E(T_i^W)$ and $\mu_i(e) = p_i$ for all $e \in E(T_i)$, by Lemma 5.4, if $x \in V(T_i^W), y \in V(T_j^W)$ with $i < j$ and x is adjacent to y in D_W , then x is adjacent to all nodes of T_j^W preceding y in D_W .

Note that for $i \geq 1$ and for every edge e contained in a component of $T_i - W_i$, $|\phi_i(e)| \geq b + 1$. So the induction hypothesis and Lemma 5.3 imply that we may restrict the problem to $(T_i^W, \phi_i^W, \tau_i^W, \mu_i^W)$ (for all $i \geq 1$) and D_W .

That is, we may assume that $|\phi_i(e)|$ is a constant for all $i \geq 1$ and $e \in E(T_i)$.

For each $i \geq 1$, we define F_i to be a maximal subset of $E(T_i)$ with the following properties.

- Every edge incident with the root of T_i belongs to F_i .

- If $e_1, e_2 \in F_i$, P is a directed path in T_i with $E(P) \cap F_i = \{e_1, e_2\}$ and with the first edge e_1 and the last edge e_2 , then $\phi_i(e_1) \cap \phi_i(e_2) = \emptyset$, and for every $e \in E(P) - \{e_2\}$, $\phi_i(e) \cap \phi_i(e_1) \neq \emptyset$.

So for each $i \geq 1$, the sets $\phi_i(e)$ (for $e \in F_i$) are pairwise disjoint. Since $|\phi_i(e)|$ is a constant for all i and e , by Lemmas 5.4 and 5.5, there is an infinite stable set of the $(\bigcup_{i \geq 1} F_i)$ -contraction of D intersecting each F_i -contraction of T_i in at most one node such that the set of heads of all tree edges of the F_i -contractions of T_i (for all $i \geq 1$) with tails in the stable set is rich in the $(\bigcup_{i \geq 1} F_i)$ -contraction of D . By Lemma 5.3, to prove this lemma, we may restrict the problem to the components of $T_i - F_i$.

That is, we may assume that for each $i \geq 1$, there exists a set $Q_i \in [L]^{\leq h}$ such that $|\phi_i(e)| = |Q_i|$ is a constant and $\phi_i(e) \cap Q_i \neq \emptyset$ for all $e \in E(T_i)$.

For each $i \geq 1$, we define F'_i to be a maximal subset of $E(T_i)$ with the following properties.

- Every edge of T_i incident with the root of T_i belongs to F'_i .
- If $e_1, e_2 \in F'_i$, P is a directed path in T_i with $E(P) \cap F'_i = \{e_1, e_2\}$ and with the first edge e_1 and the last edge e_2 , then $\phi_i(e_1) \cap Q_i \neq \phi_i(e_2) \cap Q_i$, and for every $e \in E(P) - \{e_2\}$, $\phi_i(e) \cap Q_i = \phi_i(e_1) \cap Q_i$.

Recall that we assume that for every directed path P in T_i , if e, e', e'' are distinct edges appearing in P in the order listed, then $\phi_i(e) \cap \phi_i(e'') \subseteq \phi_i(e')$. So for each $i \geq 1$ and for each directed path P in T_i , the sets $\phi_i(e) \cap Q_i$ (for $e \in F'_i \cap E(P)$) are pairwise distinct.

For each $i \geq 1$, define $(T'_i, \phi'_i, \tau'_i, \mu'_i)$ to be the F'_i -contraction of $(T_i, \phi_i, \tau_i, \mu_i)$. Since there are at most 2^h different subsets of Q_i , there exists no directed path in T'_i with length $2^h + 1$. So by Lemma 5.2, there exists an infinite stable set of the $(\bigcup_{i \geq 1} F'_i)$ -contraction of D intersecting each F'_i -contraction of T_i in at most one node such that the set of heads of all tree edges of the F'_i -contractions of T_i (for all $i \geq 1$) with tails in the stable set is rich in the $(\bigcup_{i \geq 1} F'_i)$ -contraction of D . By Lemma 5.3, to prove this lemma, we may restrict the problem to the components of $T_i - F'_i$.

That is, we may further assume that for each $i \geq 1$, there exist a number h_i with $h_i \leq h$, $Q_i \in [L]^{\leq h}$ and a nonempty set X_i such that $|\phi_i(e)| = h_i$ and $\phi_i(e) \cap Q_i = X_i$ for all $e \in E(T_i)$.

For each $i \geq 1$, let z_i be an element of X_i , define $F''_i = \{e \in E(T_i) : z_i \in \tau_i(e)\}$, and define the F''_i -contraction of $(T_i, \phi_i, \tau_i, \mu_i)$ to be $(T''_i, \phi''_i, \tau''_i, \mu''_i)$. Since for each $i \geq 1$, $|\phi_i(e)|$ is a constant for all $e \in E(T_i)$, a node v precedes a node w in the $\bigcup_{i \geq 1} F''_i$ -contraction if and only if the root corresponding to v precedes the root corresponding to w in D by Lemma 5.4.

By Lemma 5.3, we may assume that for each $i \geq 1$, there exist a number h_i with $h_i \leq h$ and an element x_i such that $|\phi_i(e)| = h_i$, $x_i \in \phi_i(e)$ for every $e \in E(T_i)$, and either $x_i \in \tau_i(e)$ for all $e \in E(T_i)$, or $x_i \notin \tau_i(e)$ for all $e \in E(T_i)$.

For each $i \geq 1$ and each edge $e \in E(T_i)$, define $\phi_e^*(e) = \phi_i(e) - \{x_i\}$, $\tau_i^*(e) = \tau_i(e) - \{x_i\}$. It is straightforward to verify that for each $i \geq 1$, $(T_i, \phi_i^*, \tau_i^*, \mu_i)$ is $(h - 1, d, N)$ -decorated, and for distinct nodes $v, w \in T_i$, v precedes w in T_i with respect to (ϕ_i, τ_i, μ_i) if and only if v precedes w in T_i with respect to $(\phi_i^*, \tau_i^*, \mu_i)$. Then this lemma immediately follows from the induction hypothesis. ■

The following is the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 5.7. *Let T_1, T_2, \dots be an infinite sequence of pairwise disjoint rooted trees. Let N, h, d be integers with $N, h \geq 0$ and $d > 0$, and let L be a set. For each $i \geq 1$, let ϕ_i, τ_i be functions from $E(T_i)$ to $[L]^{\leq h}$ and μ_i a function from $E(T_i)$ to $\{0, 1, \dots, N\}$ such that $(T_i, \phi_i, \tau_i, \mu_i)$ is (h, d, N) -decorated. Assume that D is an infinite graph with $V(D) = V(T_1 \cup T_2 \cup \dots)$ such that for $i' > i \geq 1$, if $u \in V(T_i)$ is adjacent to $w \in V(T_{i'})$ in D , and $v \in V(T_{i'})$ precedes w in $T_{i'}$ with respect to $(\phi_{i'}, \tau_{i'}, \mu_{i'})$, then u is adjacent to v in D . If the roots of T_1, T_2, \dots form a stable set in D , then there exists an infinite stable set S of D such that $|S \cap V(T_i)| \leq 1$ for each $i \geq 1$ and such that the set of heads of all edges of $T_1 \cup T_2 \cup \dots$ with tails in S is rich in D .*

Proof. Let $b = \min\{\mu_i(e) : i \geq 1, e \in E(T_i)\}$, and let $c = \min\{|\phi_i(e)| : i \geq 1, e \in E(T_i)\}$. We shall prove this lemma by induction on $N + h - b - c$. Note that $b \leq N$ and $c \leq h$, so $N + h - b - c \geq 0$. When $b = N$, this theorem follows from Lemma 5.6 for any c . So we may assume that $b < N$ and this lemma holds for all smaller $N + h - b - c$.

For each $i \geq 1$, we define $F_i = \{e \in E(T_i) : \mu_i(e) = b, |\phi_i(e)| = c\}$ and define $(T'_i, \phi'_i, \tau'_i, \mu'_i)$ to be the F_i -contraction of $(T_i, \phi_i, \tau_i, \mu_i)$. Define D' to be the $(\bigcup_{i \geq 1} F_i)$ -contraction of D .

For each i , since $|\phi'_i(e)| = c$ and $\mu'_i(e) = b$ for all $e \in E(T'_i)$, a node v of T'_i precedes a node w of T'_i in T'_i with respect to $(\phi'_i, \tau'_i, \mu'_i)$ if and only if the root of the component of $T_i - F_i$ contracted to v precedes the root of the component of $T_i - F_i$ contracted to w in T_i with respect to (ϕ_i, τ_i, μ_i) . Hence, if $x \in V(T'_i), y \in V(T'_j)$ with $i < j$ and x is adjacent to y in D' , then x is adjacent in D' to all nodes of T'_j preceding y . By Lemma 5.6, there exists an infinite stable set $S' \subseteq V(D')$ in D' such that $|S' \cap V(T'_i)| \leq 1$ for each $i \geq 1$ and such that the set of the children of the members of S' is rich in D' .

Let $i_1 < i_2 < \dots$ be the indices j such that $S' \cap V(T'_j) \neq \emptyset$. For each $j \geq 1$, define T''_j to be the component of $T_{i_j} - F_{i_j}$ contracted into the node in $S' \cap V(T'_{i_j})$. Define $D'' = D[V(T''_1 \cup T''_2 \cup \dots)]$.

Note that for each $i \geq 1$ and each edge e in a component of $T_i - F_i$, $\mu_i(e) + |\phi_i(e)| \geq b + c + 1$. By the induction hypothesis, there exists an infinite stable set S in D'' such that $|S \cap V(T''_i)| \leq 1$ for all $i \geq 1$ and the set of heads of all edges of $T''_1 \cup T''_2 \cup \dots$ with tails in S is rich in D'' . Then the theorem follows from Lemma 5.3. ■

6 Assemblages, encodings and simulation

We say that (S, \preceq) is a *well-quasi-ordered set* if \preceq is a well-quasi-ordering on S . Note that if (S_1, \preceq_1) and (S_2, \preceq_2) are two well-quasi-ordered sets, then $S_1 \times S_2$ is well-quasi-ordered by \preceq_3 , where $(s_1, s_2) \preceq_3 (s'_1, s'_2)$ if and only if $s_1 \preceq_1 s'_1$ and $s_2 \preceq_2 s'_2$. We call $(S_1 \times S_2, \preceq_3)$ the *well-quasi-ordered set obtained from $(S_1, \preceq_1), (S_2, \preceq_2)$ by Cartesian product*, and denote it by $(S_1 \times S_2, \preceq_1 \times \preceq_2)$. For every two sets A, B , we define $A \uplus B$ to be the union of A and a disjoint copy of B . Then $S_1 \uplus S_2$ is well-quasi-ordered by \preceq_4 , where $s \preceq_4 s'$ if and only if either $s, s' \in S_1$ and $s \preceq_1 s'$, or $s, s' \in S_2$ and $s \preceq_2 s'$. We call $(S_1 \uplus S_2, \preceq_4)$ the *well-quasi-ordered set obtained from $(S_1, \preceq_1), (S_2, \preceq_2)$ by disjoint union*.

The following theorem was proved by Higman and gave another way to obtain another well-quasi-ordered set from a well-quasi-ordered set.

Theorem 6.1 ([6]). *Let (S, \preceq) be a well-quasi-ordered set. For every finite sequences $A = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$ and $B = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_m)$ over S , we say that $A \preceq' B$ if there exist $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_n \leq m$ such that $a_j \preceq b_{i_j}$ for every $1 \leq j \leq n$. Then the finite sequences over S are well-quasi-ordered by \preceq' .*

We call the new well-quasi-ordered set mentioned in Theorem 6.1 the *well-quasi-ordered set obtained from S by Higman's lemma*.

A *march* in a graph is either the empty set or a sequence of distinct vertices of the graph such that each entry is associated with a number in $\{0, 1, 2\}$, called the *essential number*.

We say that (G, γ) is a *rooted graph* if G is a graph and γ is a march in G . In this case, we say that γ is the *root march* of G . We denote the entries of γ by $V(\gamma)$. Let $\gamma = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k)$ and assume that v_i is associated with essential number a_i in γ for each i with $1 \leq i \leq k$. The *rooted extension* of (G, γ) is the graph G' obtained from G by adding vertices u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k , and for each i with $1 \leq i \leq k$, adding a_i parallel edges between v_i, u_i . We call the sequence (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k) the *indicator* of G' .

If f is a function and $\sigma = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ is a sequence whose entries are in the domain of f , then we define $f(\sigma) = (f(x_1), f(x_2), \dots, f(x_n))$. Similarly, if S is a subset of the domain of f , then we define $f(S) = \{f(x) : x \in S\}$.

Let (G_1, γ_1) and (G_2, γ_2) be rooted graphs. Let G'_1, G'_2 be the rooted extensions of $(G_1, \gamma_1), (G_2, \gamma_2)$ with indicators I_1, I_2 , respectively. We say that η is a *homeomorphic embedding* from (G_1, γ_1) to (G_2, γ_2) if the following hold.

- γ_1 and γ_2 have the same length.
- η is a homeomorphic embedding from G'_1 to G'_2 such that $\eta(I_1) = I_2$.
- If v is the i -th vertex in γ_2 for some i with $1 \leq i \leq |V(\gamma_2)|$, and v is an internal vertex of $\eta(e)$ for some edge e of G'_1 , then either
 - e is an edge incident with the i -th vertex in I_1 , or
 - the essential number associated with the i -th vertex in γ_1 is 0, and e is an edge incident with the i -th vertex in γ_1 .
- If v is the i -th vertex in γ_2 for some i with $1 \leq i \leq |V(\gamma_2)|$, and $v = \eta(v')$ for some vertex v' of G'_1 , then v' is the i -th vertex in γ_1 .

In this case, we say that (G_1, γ_1) is a *rooted topological minor* of (G_2, γ_2) and write $\eta : (G_1, \gamma_1) \hookrightarrow (G_2, \gamma_2)$.

We say that (G, γ_0, Γ) is an *assemblage* if (G, γ_0) is a rooted graph and Γ is a finite multiset of marches in G .

For simplicity, for a quasi-order Q , we also denote its ground set by Q , and denote the relation by \leq_Q .

Let Q be a quasi-order. We say that $(G, \gamma_0, \Gamma, f, \phi)$ is a Q -*assemblage* if (G, γ_0, Γ) is an assemblage, $f : \Gamma \rightarrow Q$ and $\phi : V(G) \rightarrow Q$. We call (G, γ_0, Γ) the *underlying assemblage* of the Q -assemblage $(G, \gamma_0, \Gamma, f, \phi)$. We say that a Q -assemblage $(G', \gamma'_0, \Gamma', f', \phi')$ *simulates* $(G, \gamma_0, \Gamma, f, \phi)$ if there exist $\eta : (G, \gamma_0) \hookrightarrow (G', \gamma'_0)$ and an injection $\iota : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma'$ such that

$\phi(v) \leq_Q \phi'(\eta(v))$ for every $v \in V(G)$, and for every $\sigma \in \Gamma$, $\eta(\sigma) = \iota(\sigma)$ and $f(\sigma) \leq_Q f'(\iota(\sigma))$. In this case, we write $(G, \gamma_0, \Gamma, f, \phi) \preceq (G', \gamma'_0, \Gamma', f', \phi')$.

We say that (T, \mathcal{X}, α) is a *rooted tree-decomposition* of an assemblage (G, γ_0, Γ) if (T, \mathcal{X}) is a rooted tree-decomposition of G such that $V(\gamma_0)$ is contained in the bag of the root of T , and α is a function from Γ to $V(T)$ such that $V(\sigma) \subseteq X_{\alpha(\sigma)}$ for each $\sigma \in \Gamma$. A *rooted tree-decomposition* of a Q -assemblage (for some quasi-order Q) is a rooted tree-decomposition of its underlying assemblage.

Let Q be a quasi-order and let (T, \mathcal{X}, α) be a rooted tree-decomposition of a Q -assemblage $(G, \gamma_0, \Gamma, f, \phi)$. Let t be a non-root node of T and let p be the parent of t . Assume there exists an ordering π_t on $X_t \cap X_p$, and assume that γ_p is defined, where $\gamma_p = \gamma_0$ if p is the root of T . We define $\gamma_t, \Gamma_t, f_t, \phi_t, S_t$ as follows.

- γ_t is the march such that $V(\gamma_t) = X_t \cap X_p$ with the ordering π_t , where for each vertex $v \in V(\gamma_t)$, the essential number j associated with v is defined as follows.
 - $j = 0$, if the following hold.
 - * $v \notin V(\sigma)$ for every $\sigma \in \Gamma$ in which $\alpha(\sigma)$ is a non-descendant of t .
 - * There exists no edge incident with v whose other end is in $V(G) - \uparrow t$.
 - * Either $v \notin V(\gamma_0)$, or $v \in V(\gamma_0)$ and v is associated with essential number 0 in γ_0 .
 - $j = 1$, if the following hold.
 - * $v \notin V(\sigma)$ for every $\sigma \in \Gamma$ in which $\alpha(\sigma)$ is a non-descendant of t .
 - * either
 - v is incident with exactly one edge whose other end is in $V(G) - \uparrow t$, and either $v \notin V(\gamma_0)$, or $v \in V(\gamma_0)$ and v is associated with essential number 0 in γ_0 , or
 - there exists no edge incident with v whose other end is in $V(G) - \uparrow t$, $v \in V(\gamma_0)$, and v is associated with essential number 1 in γ_0 .
 - $j = 2$, otherwise.
- $\Gamma_t = \{\sigma \in \Gamma : \alpha(\sigma) \text{ is a descendent of } t\}$.
- $f_t = f|_{\Gamma_t}$.
- $\phi_t = \phi|_{\uparrow t}$.
- S_t is the Q -assemblage $(G[\uparrow t], \gamma_t, \Gamma_t, f_t, \phi_t)$.

We call S_t the (f, ϕ) -*branch* of (T, \mathcal{X}, α) at t (with respect to π_t), and we call the underlying assemblage of S_t the *branch* of (T, \mathcal{X}, α) at t (with respect to π_t).

Lemma 6.2. *Let Q be a quasi-order and let (T, \mathcal{X}, α) be a rooted tree-decomposition of a Q -assemblage $(G, \gamma_0, \Gamma, f, \phi)$. Assume that for every node t' other than the root of T , there exists an ordering $\pi_{t'}$ on $X_{t'} \cap X_{p'}$, where p' is the parent of t' . Let t be a non-root node of T . Let $(G[\uparrow t], \gamma_t, \Gamma_t, f_t, \phi_t)$ be the (f, ϕ) -branch at t with respect to π_t . Denote \mathcal{X} by*

$(X_t : t \in V(T))$. Let T' be the rooted subtree of T induced by the descendants of t rooted at t . Let $\mathcal{X}' = (X_t : t \in V(T'))$. Let $\alpha' = \alpha|_{\Gamma_t}$. Then $(T', \mathcal{X}', \alpha')$ is a rooted tree-decomposition of $(G[\uparrow t], \gamma_t, \Gamma_t, f_t, \phi_t)$ such that for every descendant t' of t with $t' \neq t$, the (f_t, ϕ_t) -branch of $(T', \mathcal{X}', \alpha')$ at t' with respect to $\pi_{t'}$ is the same as the (f, ϕ) -branch of (T, \mathcal{X}, α) at t' with respect to $\pi_{t'}$.

Proof. It is clear that $(T', \mathcal{X}', \alpha')$ is a rooted tree-decomposition of $(G[\uparrow t], \gamma_t, \Gamma_t, f_t, \phi_t)$. Let t' be a descendant of t with $t' \neq t$. Denote the (f, ϕ) -branch of (T, \mathcal{X}, α) at t' with respect to $\pi_{t'}$ by $(G[\uparrow t'], \gamma_{t'}, \Gamma_{t'}, f_{t'}, \phi_{t'})$. Denote the (f_t, ϕ_t) -branch of $(T', \mathcal{X}', \alpha')$ at t' with respect to $\pi_{t'}$ by $(G[\uparrow t'], \gamma'_{t'}, \Gamma_{t'}, f_{t'}, \phi_{t'})$. Note that $V(\gamma'_{t'}) = V(\gamma_{t'})$. Let $v \in V(\gamma_{t'})$. To show that the (f_t, ϕ_t) -branch of $(T', \mathcal{X}', \alpha')$ at t' with respect to $\pi_{t'}$ is the same as the (f, ϕ) -branch of (T, \mathcal{X}, α) at t' with respect to $\pi_{t'}$, it suffices to show that the essential number associated with v in $\gamma'_{t'}$ equals the essential number associated with v in $\gamma_{t'}$. Note that it is obvious unless $v \in V(\gamma_t)$. So we may assume that $v \in V(\gamma_t)$.

Let ℓ be the essential number associated with v in $\gamma_{t'}$. Let ℓ' be the essential number associated with v in $\gamma'_{t'}$. Let ℓ_t be the essential number associated with v in γ_t . Suppose to the contrary that $\ell \neq \ell'$.

Suppose that there exists $\sigma \in \Gamma$ such that $v \in V(\sigma)$, and $\alpha(\sigma)$ is a non-descendant of t' . So $\ell = 2$. If $\alpha(\sigma)$ is a descendant of t , then $\sigma \in \Gamma_t$, so $\ell = \ell' = 2$, a contradiction. So $\alpha(\sigma)$ is a non-descendant of t . Hence $\ell_t = 2$. This implies that $\ell' = 2 = \ell$, a contradiction.

So there exists no $\sigma \in \Gamma$ such that $v \in V(\sigma)$, and $\alpha(\sigma)$ is a non-descendant of t' . Hence there exists no $\sigma \in \Gamma_t$ such that $v \in V(\sigma)$, and $\alpha'(\sigma)$ is a non-descendant of t' .

Suppose that there exists no edge of G incident with v whose other end is in $V(G) - (T, \mathcal{X}) \uparrow t'$. So there exists no edge of $G[\uparrow t]$ incident with v whose other end is in $V(G[\uparrow t]) - (T', \mathcal{X}') \uparrow t'$. If $v \notin V(\gamma_0)$, then $\ell_t = \ell = 0$, so $\ell' = 0 = \ell$, a contradiction. So $v \in V(\gamma_0)$. Hence both ℓ and ℓ_t equal the essential number associated with v in γ_0 . Since there exists no edge of $G[\uparrow t]$ incident with v whose other end is in $V(G[\uparrow t]) - (T', \mathcal{X}') \uparrow t'$, $\ell' = \ell_t$. So $\ell' = \ell$, a contradiction.

So there exists an edge of G incident with v whose other end is in $V(G) - (T, \mathcal{X}) \uparrow t'$.

Suppose that there exists exactly one edge e of G incident with v whose other end is in $V(G) - (T, \mathcal{X}) \uparrow t'$.

Suppose that the end of e other than v is in $V(G) - (T, \mathcal{X}) \uparrow t$. Then $\ell_t = \ell$. Note that there exists no edge of $G[\uparrow t]$ incident with v whose other end is in $V(G[\uparrow t]) - (T', \mathcal{X}') \uparrow t'$. Since $v \in V(\gamma_t)$, $\ell' = \ell_t$. Hence $\ell = \ell'$, a contradiction.

So the end of e other than v is in $(T, \mathcal{X}) \uparrow t - (T, \mathcal{X}) \uparrow t'$. Hence there exists no edge of G incident with v whose other end is in $V(G) - (T, \mathcal{X}) \uparrow t$. If $v \notin V(\gamma_0)$, then $\ell_t = 0$ and $\ell = 1$, so $\ell' = 1 = \ell$, a contradiction. So $v \in V(\gamma_0)$. If v is associated with essential number 0 in γ_0 , then $\ell_t = 0$ and $\ell = 1$, so $\ell' = 1 = \ell$, a contradiction. So v is associated with essential number 1 or 2 in γ_0 , then $\ell_t \geq 1$ and $\ell = 2$, so $\ell' = 2 = \ell$, a contradiction.

Hence there exist at least two edges of G incident with v whose other ends are in $V(G) - (T, \mathcal{X}) \uparrow t'$. So $\ell = 2$. If there exists no edge of G incident with v whose other end is in $V(G) - (T, \mathcal{X}) \uparrow t$, then there exist at least two edges of G incident with v whose other ends are in $V(G[\uparrow t]) - (T', \mathcal{X}') \uparrow t'$, so $\ell' = 2 = \ell$, a contradiction. So there exists an edge of G incident with v whose other end is in $V(G) - (T, \mathcal{X}) \uparrow t$. In particular, $\ell_t \geq 1$. So if there exists an edge of $G[\uparrow t]$ incident with v whose other end is in $V(G[\uparrow t]) - (T, \mathcal{X}) \uparrow t'$,

then $\ell' = 2 = \ell$, a contradiction. Hence there exists no edge of $G[\uparrow t]$ incident with v whose other end is in $V(G[\uparrow t]) - (T, \mathcal{X}) \uparrow t'$. This implies that there exist at least two edges of G incident with v whose other ends are in $V(G) - (T, \mathcal{X}) \uparrow t$. So $\ell_t = 2$, and hence $\ell' = 2 = \ell$, a contradiction. ■

Let Q be a quasi-order and let (T, \mathcal{X}, α) be a rooted tree-decomposition of a Q -assemblage $(G, \gamma_0, \Gamma, f, \phi)$. Let t be a non-root node of T and let p be the parent of t . Assume there exists an ordering π_t on $X_t \cap X_p$, and assume that γ_p is defined, where $\gamma_p = \gamma_0$ if p is the root of T . Let S_t be the (f, ϕ) -branch at t with respect to π_t . Denote S_t by $(G[\uparrow t], \gamma_t, \Gamma_t, f_t, \phi_t)$. Define b_t to be the sequence with length $|V(\gamma_t)|$ such that for every integer i with $1 \leq i \leq |V(\gamma_t)|$, the i -th entry of b_t is

- 1 if the i -th vertex in γ_t is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow t - V(\gamma_t)$, and
- 0 otherwise.

Now let t be a node of T (possibly the root of T). Let $S = \{S_c : c \text{ is a child of } t\}$ and let it be ordered by the simulation relation. So S is a quasi-order. Let $S' = \{b_c : c \text{ is a child of } t\}$ and let it be ordered by the equality relation. So S' is a quasi-order. Let S'' be the quasi-order obtained by the Cartesian product of S and S' . Define Q' to be the quasi-order obtained from Q and S'' by disjoint union. The *encoding of (T, \mathcal{X}, α) at t (with respect to π_t and π_c for all children c of t)* is the Q' -assemblage $(H, \gamma_H, \Gamma_H, f_H, \phi_H)$ such that the following hold.

- $H = G[X_t]$.
- $\gamma_H = \gamma_t$ if t is not the root of T ; $\gamma_H = \gamma_0$ if t is the root of T .
- $\Gamma_H = \Lambda_1 \uplus \Lambda_2$, where $\Lambda_1 = \{\gamma_c : c \text{ is a child of } t\}$ and $\Lambda_2 = \{\sigma \in \Gamma : \alpha(\sigma) = t\}$. (Note that we keep both elements in Γ_H if some element appears in both Λ_1 and Λ_2 .)
- $f_H(\sigma) = (S_c, b_c)$ if $\sigma \in \Lambda_1$ and $\sigma = \gamma_c$; $f_H(\sigma) = f(\sigma)$ if $\sigma \in \Lambda_2$.
- $\phi_H = \phi|_{V(H)}$.

We compare encodings by the simulation relation (with respect to Q').

Lemma 6.3. *Let Q be a quasi-order. Let $(G, \gamma_0, \Gamma, f, \phi)$ and $(G', \gamma'_0, \Gamma', f', \phi')$ be Q -assemblages with rooted tree-decompositions (T, \mathcal{X}, α) and $(T', \mathcal{X}', \alpha')$, respectively. Let r and r' be the roots of T and T' , respectively. Let $\gamma_r = \gamma_0$ and $\gamma_{r'} = \gamma'_0$. Assume that for every $t \in \{r, r'\}$, there exists an ordering π_t of $V(\gamma_t)$ which is the same as the ordering of γ_t , and for every child c of t , there exists an ordering π_c of $X_t \cap X_c$. If the encoding of $(T', \mathcal{X}', \alpha')$ at r' (with respect to $\pi_{r'}$ and π_c for all children c of r') simulates the encoding of (T, \mathcal{X}, α) at r (with respect to π_r and π_c for all children of r), then $(G', \gamma'_0, \Gamma', f', \phi')$ simulates $(G, \gamma_0, \Gamma, f, \phi)$.*

Proof. Let $(H, \gamma_0, \Gamma_H, f_H, \phi_H)$ and $(H', \gamma'_0, \Gamma'_H, f'_H, \phi'_H)$ be the encodings of (T, \mathcal{X}, α) and $(T', \mathcal{X}', \alpha')$ at r and r' , respectively. Let $\eta : (H, \gamma_0) \hookrightarrow (H', \gamma'_0)$ and ι be the functions witnessing the simulation between these two encodings. For each child c of r or r' , we define S_c, b_c to be the (f, ϕ) -branch (or (f', ϕ') -branch) at c and the sequence, respectively,

as mentioned in the definition of encodings, and define γ_c to be the march in Γ_H or $\Gamma_{H'}$ mapped to (S_c, b_c) by f_H or $f_{H'}$. For each child c of r , define η_c, ι_c to be the functions that witness the simulation $f_H(\gamma_c) \leq_{Q'} f'_H(\iota(\gamma_c))$, where Q' is the quasi-order mentioned in the definition of encodings. Let $\overline{G}, \overline{G'}, \overline{H}, \overline{H'}$ be the rooted extensions of G, G', H, H' , respectively.

Claim 1: If c is a child of r and $v \in V(\gamma_c)$ such that $\eta_c(v) \notin V(\overline{H'})$, then the essential number associated with v in γ_c is 0 or 1.

Proof of Claim 1: Since $\eta_c(v) \notin V(\overline{H'})$, $\eta_c(v) \notin V(\iota(\gamma_c))$. If the essential number associated with v is 2, then there are two edges between v and the corresponding indicator, so $\eta_c(v) \in V(\iota(\gamma_c))$, a contradiction. So v is associated with essential number 0 or 1 in γ_c . \square

Let $A = \bigcup_c V(\gamma_c)$, where the union is over all children c of r . For each vertex $v \in A$, define L_v to be the set of children c of r such that $v \in V(\gamma_c)$ and $\eta_c(v) \notin V(\overline{H'})$.

Claim 2: If $v \in A$, then the following hold.

- If c is a node with $c \in L_v$ such that v is associated with essential number 1 in γ_c , then v is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow c - V(\gamma_c)$, and $|L_v| \leq 2$.
- If c is a node with $c \in L_v$ such that v is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow c - V(\gamma_c)$ and v is associated with essential number 0 in γ_c , then $L_v = \{c\}$.
- If for every $c \in L_v$, v is associated with essential number 0 in γ_c and v is not adjacent to any vertex in $\uparrow c - V(\gamma_c)$, then for every $c \in L_v$, $V(\gamma_c)$ contains all neighbors of v .

Proof of Claim 2: For each child c of r , let c' be the child of r' such that $\gamma_{c'} = \iota(\gamma_c)$.

We first assume that $c \in L_v$ and v is associated with essential number 1 in γ_c . Since $\eta_c(v) \notin V(\overline{H'})$, there exists a path in $G'[(T', \mathcal{X}') \uparrow c']$ from $\eta_c(v)$ to $\eta(v)$ disjoint from $V(\eta(\gamma_c)) - \{\eta(v)\}$. So $\eta(v)$ is adjacent to a vertex in $(T', \mathcal{X}') \uparrow c' - V(\gamma_{c'})$. Since $b_c = b_{c'}$, v is adjacent to a vertex in $(T, \mathcal{X}) \uparrow c - V(\gamma_c)$. So v is associated with essential number 1 or 2 in γ_d for every child d of r with $v \in V(\gamma_d)$ and $d \neq c$. If there exists $d \neq c$ with $d \in L_v$, then since v is adjacent to some vertex in $(T, \mathcal{X}) \uparrow c - V(\gamma_c)$, the essential number associated with v in γ_d is 1 by Claim 1, so a similar argument shows that v is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow d - V(\gamma_d)$; since v is adjacent to one vertex in $(T, \mathcal{X}) \uparrow c - V(\gamma_c)$ and one vertex in $(T, \mathcal{X}) \uparrow d - V(\gamma_d)$, v is associated with essential number 2 in $\gamma_{d'}$ for every child d' of r other than c, d , so $L_v = \{c, d\}$ by Claim 1. This proves the first statement.

Now we assume that $c \in L_v$, v is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow c - V(\gamma_c)$, and v is associated with essential number 0 in γ_c . Suppose that there exists $d \in L_v - \{c\}$. Since v is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow c - V(\gamma_c)$, v is associated with essential number 1 in γ_d by Claim 1. By Statement 1 of this claim, v is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow d - V(\gamma_d)$, contradicting that v is associated with essential number 0 in γ_c . This proves the second statement.

Finally, we assume that for every $c \in L_v$, v is associated with essential number 0 in γ_c , and v is not adjacent to any vertex in $\uparrow c - V(\gamma_c)$. So for every $c \in L_v$, v is not adjacent to any vertex in $V(G) - \uparrow c$ and is not adjacent to any vertex in $\uparrow c - V(\gamma_c)$, so all neighbors of v belong to $V(\gamma_c)$. This proves the claim. \square

Claim 3: If c_1, c_2 are different children of r such that $v \in V(\gamma_{c_1}) \cap V(\gamma_{c_2})$, $\eta_{c_1}(v) \notin V(\overline{H'})$, $\eta_{c_2}(v) \notin V(\overline{H'})$, and at least one of the essential numbers associated with v in $\gamma_{c_1}, \gamma_{c_2}$ is non-zero, then the following hold.

- v is associated with essential number 1 in both $\gamma_{c_1}, \gamma_{c_2}$, and v is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow c_1 - V(\gamma_{c_1})$ and adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow c_2 - V(\gamma_{c_2})$.
- For every neighbor $u \in V(\gamma_{c_1}) \cap V(\gamma_{c_2})$ of v , $\eta_{c_1}(u)$ and $\eta_{c_2}(u)$ are either both in $V(\overline{H'})$ or both not in $V(\overline{H'})$.

Proof of Claim 3: For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let c'_i be the child of r' such that $\iota(\gamma_{c'_i}) = \gamma_{c_i}$. We know $\{c_1, c_2\} \subseteq L_v$ since $v \in V(\gamma_{c_1}) \cap V(\gamma_{c_2})$, $\eta_{c_1}(v) \notin V(\overline{H'})$ and $\eta_{c_2}(v) \notin V(\overline{H'})$. Since one of the essential numbers associated with v in $\gamma_{c_1}, \gamma_{c_2}$ is non-zero, say in γ_{c_i} for some $i \in [2]$, by Statement 1 of Claim 2, $L_v = \{c_1, c_2\}$ and v is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow c_i - V(\gamma_{c_i})$. Hence v is associated with essential number 1 in $\gamma_{c_{3-i}}$ and hence in both $\gamma_{c_1}, \gamma_{c_2}$. Again by Statement 1 of Claim 2, v is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow c_1 - V(\gamma_{c_1})$ and a vertex in $\uparrow c_2 - V(\gamma_{c_2})$. So the first statement of this claim holds.

Let $u \in V(\gamma_{c_1}) \cap V(\gamma_{c_2})$ be a neighbor of v . Suppose that $\eta_{c_1}(u) \notin V(\overline{H'})$ and $\eta_{c_2}(u) \in V(\overline{H'})$. Since v is associated with essential number 1 in γ_{c_2} and $\eta_{c_2}(v) \notin V(\overline{H'})$ and $\eta_{c_2}(u) \in V(\overline{H'})$, $\eta_{c_2}(u)$ is adjacent to a vertex in $(T', \mathcal{X}') \uparrow c'_2 - V(\gamma_{c'_2})$. Since $b_{c_2} = b_{c'_2}$, u is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow c_2 - V(\gamma_{c_2})$, so u is not associated with essential number 0 in γ_{c_1} . Since $\eta_{c_1}(u) \notin V(\overline{H'})$, u is associated with essential number 1 in γ_{c_1} by Claim 1. So there uniquely exists a vertex $w \in \uparrow c_2 - V(\gamma_{c_2})$ adjacent to u . Similarly, $\eta(u)$ is associated essential number 1 in $\gamma_{c'_1}$ and is adjacent to a vertex in $(T', \mathcal{X}') \uparrow c'_1 - V(\gamma_{c'_1})$, so there uniquely exists a vertex $w' \in (T', \mathcal{X}') \uparrow c'_1 - V(\gamma_{c'_1})$ adjacent to $\eta(u)$. Since $\eta_{c_2}(v), \eta_{c_2}(w) \notin V(\overline{H'})$, we know $w' \in \eta_{c_2}(wv) \cap \eta_{c_2}(wu)$, so $v = w$. But $v \in V(\gamma_{c_2})$ and $w \notin V(\gamma_{c_2})$, so $v \neq w$, a contradiction. This proves that $\eta_{c_1}(u)$ and $\eta_{c_2}(u)$ are either both in $V(\overline{H'})$ or both not in $V(\overline{H'})$. \square

Claim 4: If $v \in V(\gamma_r) \cap A$ and v is associated with essential number 2 in γ_r , then $L_v = \emptyset$.

Proof of Claim 4: Let c be a child of r such that $v \in V(\gamma_c)$. To prove this claim, it suffices to prove that $\eta_c(v) \in V(\overline{H'})$. Since v is associated with essential number 2 in γ_r , v is associated with essential 2 in γ_c by definition. So $\eta_c(v) \in V(\overline{H'})$ by Claim 1. \square

Claims 1 and 4 imply that if $v \in A$ and $L_v \neq \emptyset$, then for every $c \in L_v$, the essential number associated with v in γ_c equals the number of edges incident with v whose other end is in $V(\overline{G}) - \uparrow c$.

Claim 5: If c is a child of r and $v_1, v_2 \in V(\gamma_c)$ with $c \in L_{v_2} - L_{v_1}$ are adjacent, then either v_1 is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow c - V(\gamma_c)$, or the following holds.

- v_2 is associated with essential number 0 in γ_c ,
- v_2 is not adjacent to any vertex in $V(G) - \uparrow c$,
- there uniquely exists an edge e of G between v_1 and v_2 , and
- there exists a path in $\eta_c(e)$ from $\eta_c(v_2) \notin V(\overline{H'})$ to $\eta(v_2)$ disjoint from $V(\eta(\gamma_c)) - \{\eta(v_2)\}$ such that $\eta_c(e)$ is the union of this path and an edge between $\eta(v_1)$ and $\eta(v_2)$.

Proof of Claim 5: Let c' be the child of r' such that $\iota(\gamma_{c'}) = \gamma_c$. Since $c \notin L_{v_1}$, $\eta_c(v_1) = \eta(v_1)$. Since $c \in L_{v_2}$, $\eta_c(v_2) \notin V(\eta(\gamma_c))$. Since $v_1 v_2 \in E(G)$, $\eta_c(v_1 v_2)$ is a path in $G'[(T', \mathcal{X}') \uparrow c']$ from $\eta_c(v_2) \notin V(\overline{H'})$ to $\eta_c(v_1) = \eta(v_1)$. Note that $\eta_c(v_1 v_2)$ is disjoint from $V(\eta(\gamma_c)) - \{\eta(v_1), \eta(v_2)\}$, where $v_1 v_2$ is an arbitrary edge of G between v_1 and v_2 . If $\eta(v_2) \notin V(\eta_c(v_1 v_2))$, then $\eta(v_1)$ is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow c' - V(\gamma_{c'})$; since $b_c = b_{c'}$, v_1 is adjacent to a vertex in

$\uparrow c - V(\gamma_c)$. So we may assume that $\eta(v_2) \in V(\eta_c(v_1v_2))$. Since $\eta(v_2) \in V(\overline{H'})$, $\eta_c(v_2) \neq \eta(v_2)$. So $\eta(v_2) \in V(\gamma_{c'})$ is an internal vertex of $\eta_c(v_1v_2)$. Hence the essential number associated with v_2 in γ_c is 0, and v_1v_2 is the unique edge of G between v_1 and v_2 . So there exists no edge incident with v_2 whose other end is in $V(G) - \uparrow c$. Since $\eta(v_2)$ is an internal vertex of $\eta_c(v_1v_2)$, there exists a path P in $G'[(T', \mathcal{X}') \uparrow c']$ from $\eta_c(v_2) \notin V(\overline{H'})$ to $\eta(v_2)$ disjoint from $V(\eta(\gamma_c)) - \{\eta(v_2)\}$. Since v_1 is not adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow c - V(\gamma_c)$, $\eta_c(v_1v_2)$ is the union of P and an edge between $\eta(v_1)$ and $\eta(v_2)$. \square

Claim 6: If $v_1, v_2 \in A$ are distinct adjacent vertices, $c_1 \in L_{v_1}, c_2 \in L_{v_2}, v_1, v_2 \in V(\gamma_{c_1}) \cap V(\gamma_{c_2}), c_1 \neq c_2, v_1$ is associated with essential number 1 in γ_{c_1} , and v_2 is not adjacent to any vertex in $V(G) - \uparrow c_2$, then

- $L_{v_2} = \{c_1, c_2\}$,
- v_2 is associated with essential number 0 in γ_{c_1} ,
- all neighbors of v_2 are contained in $V(\gamma_{c_1}) \cap V(\gamma_{c_2})$, and
- either $L_{v_1} = \{c_1\}$ or $L_{v_1} = \{c_1, c_2\}$.

Proof of Claim 6: For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let c'_i be the child of r' such that $\iota(\gamma_{c'_i}) = \gamma_{c_i}$.

Since v_2 is not adjacent to any vertex in $V(G) - \uparrow c_2$, by Statement 1 of Claim 2, v_2 is associated with essential number 0 or 2 in γ_{c_1} .

Suppose $\eta_{c_1}(v_2) = \eta(v_2)$. Since $c_1 \in L_{v_1}$ and v_1 is associated with essential number 1 in γ_{c_1} , $\eta_{c_1}(v_1v_2)$ is a path in $G'[\uparrow c'_1]$ from $\eta_{c_1}(v_1) \notin V(\gamma_{c'_1})$ to $\eta_{c_1}(v_2) = \eta(v_2)$ disjoint from $V(\gamma_{c'_1}) - \{\eta_{c_1}(v_2)\}$. Since $b_{c_1} = b_{c'_1}$, v_2 is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow c_1 - V(\gamma_{c_1}) \subseteq V(G) - \uparrow c_2$, a contradiction.

So $\eta_{c_1}(v_2) \neq \eta(v_2)$. Hence $c_1 \in L_{v_2}$ and v_2 is associated with essential number 0 in γ_{c_1} . This implies that v_2 is not adjacent to any vertex in $V(G) - \uparrow c_1$. Hence all neighbors of v_2 are contained in $\uparrow c_1 \cap \uparrow c_2 \subseteq V(\gamma_{c_1}) \cap V(\gamma_{c_2})$.

It remains to prove that $L_{v_2} = \{c_1, c_2\}$, and either $L_{v_1} = \{c_1\}$ or $L_{v_1} = \{c_1, c_2\}$.

Since $\eta_{c_1}(v_2) \neq \eta(v_2)$, $\{c_1, c_2\} \subseteq L_{v_2}$. By Statement 1 of Claim 2, $|L_{v_1}| \leq 2$. If $L_{v_2} \subseteq L_{v_1}$, then $L_{v_1} = L_{v_2} = \{c_1, c_2\}$.

So we may assume that $L_{v_2} - L_{v_1} \neq \emptyset$.

Suppose there exists $d \in L_{v_2}$ such that $v_1 \notin V(\gamma_d)$. Then the assumption $d \in L_{v_2}$ and the existence of edge v_1v_2 implies that v_2 is associated with essential number 1 in γ_d . But it implies that v_2 is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow d - V(\gamma_d)$ by Statement 1 of Claim 2, a contradiction.

Hence for every $d \in L_{v_2}$, $v_1 \in V(\gamma_d)$.

Let $c \in L_{v_2} - L_{v_1}$. Note that $v_1 \in V(\gamma_c)$ and $c \neq c_1$. Since all neighbors of v_2 are contained in $V(\gamma_{c_1}) \cap V(\gamma_{c_2})$, the existence of $\eta_c(v_1v_2)$ implies that v_1 is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow c - V(\gamma_c)$. Since v_1 is associated with essential number 1 in γ_{c_1} , $\uparrow c_1 \cup \uparrow c$ contains all neighbors of v_1 , and c is the unique element in $L_{v_2} - L_{v_1}$. Hence either $c_2 \in L_{v_1} \cap L_{v_2}$, or c_2 is the unique element in $L_{v_2} - L_{v_1}$. If $c_2 \in L_{v_1}$, then $L_{v_1} = \{c_1, c_2\}$ by Statement 1 of Claim 2, so $c \neq c_2$ and v_1 is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow c_1 - V(\gamma_{c_1})$ (by Statement 1 of Claim 2) and a vertex in $\uparrow c - V(\gamma_c)$, and hence v_1 is associated with essential number 2 in c_2 and $c_2 \notin L_{v_1}$, a contradiction. So c_2 is the unique element in $L_{v_2} - L_{v_1}$. Since v_1 is adjacent to a vertex

in $\uparrow c_1 - V(\gamma_{c_1})$ (by Statement 1 of Claim 2) and a vertex in $\uparrow c_2 - V(\gamma_{c_2})$, $L_{v_1} \subseteq \{c_1, c_2\}$. Since $c_2 \notin L_{v_1}$, $L_{v_1} = \{c_1\}$. And by the uniqueness of c , $L_{v_2} = \{c_1, c_2\}$. \square

Claim 7: If $v_1, v_2 \in A$ are adjacent vertices, $L_{v_1} \neq L_{v_2}$, c_1, c_2 are children of r such that $v_1, v_2 \in V(\gamma_{c_1}) \cap V(\gamma_{c_2})$ with $c_1 \neq c_2$, and for every $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $c_i \in L_{v_i}$ and v_i is associated with essential number 0 in γ_{c_i} , then

- there uniquely exists an edge e of G between v_1 and v_2 , and
- for every $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $L_{v_i} = \{c_i\}$ and there exists a path in $\eta_{c_i}(e)$ from $\eta_{c_i}(v_i)$ to $\eta(v_i)$ disjoint from $V(\eta(\gamma_{c_i})) - \{\eta(v_i)\}$.

Proof of Claim 7: We first assume that there exists $c \in L_{v_1} - L_{v_2}$. If $v_2 \notin V(\gamma_c)$, then $c \neq c_1$ and v_2 is a vertex in $V(G) - \uparrow c$ adjacent to v_1 , so v_1 is associated with essential number 1 in γ_c by Claim 1; by Statement 1 of Claim 2, v_1 is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow c - V(\gamma_c)$, so v_1 is not associated with essential number 0 in γ_{c_1} , a contradiction. So $v_2 \in V(\gamma_c)$. Since $c_2 \in L_{v_2}$, $c \neq c_2$. Since v_2 is associated with essential number 0 in γ_{c_2} , v_2 is not adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow c - V(\gamma_c)$. Since $c \in L_{v_1} - L_{v_2}$, by Claim 5, v_1 is not adjacent to any vertex in $V(G) - \uparrow c$. Since $c \in L_{v_1}$, $\eta_c(v_1v_2)$ is a path in $G'[(T', \mathcal{X}') \uparrow c']$ from $\eta_c(v_1) \notin V(\gamma_{c'})$ to $\eta_c(v_2) = \eta(v_2)$, where v_1v_2 is an arbitrary edge of G between v_1 and v_2 , and c' is the child of r' such that $\iota(\gamma_c) = \gamma_{c'}$. Since v_2 is not adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow c - V(\gamma_c)$ and $b_c = b_{c'}$, $\eta(v_1)$ is an internal vertex of $\eta_c(v_1v_2)$. Hence there exists a path in $\eta_c(v_1v_2)$ from $\eta_c(v_1)$ to $\eta(v_1)$ disjoint from $V(\gamma_c) - \{\eta(v_1)\}$. So $\eta(v_1)$ is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow c' - V(\gamma_{c'})$, and the edge of G between v_1 and v_2 is unique. Since $b_c = b_{c'}$, v_1 is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow c - V(\gamma_c)$. Since v_1 is associated with essential number 0 in γ_{c_1} , $c = c_1$. By Statement 2 of Claim 2, $L_{v_1} = \{c_1\}$. Since $c = c_1$, there exists a path in $\eta_{c_1}(v_1v_2)$ from $\eta_{c_1}(v_1)$ to $\eta(v_1)$ disjoint from $V(\gamma_{c_1}) - \{\eta(v_1)\}$.

Hence if $L_{v_1} \not\subseteq L_{v_2}$, then there uniquely exists an edge e of G between v_1 and v_2 , $L_{v_1} = \{c_1\}$, and there exists a path in $\eta_{c_1}(e)$ from $\eta_{c_1}(v_1)$ to $\eta(v_1)$ disjoint from $V(\gamma_{c_1}) - \{\eta(v_1)\}$. Similarly, if $L_{v_2} \not\subseteq L_{v_1}$, then there uniquely exists an edge e of G between v_1 and v_2 , $L_{v_2} = \{c_2\}$, and there exists a path in $\eta_{c_2}(e)$ from $\eta_{c_2}(v_2)$ to $\eta(v_2)$ disjoint from $V(\gamma_{c_2}) - \{\eta(v_2)\}$.

Since $L_{v_1} \neq L_{v_2}$, by symmetry, we may assume that $L_{v_1} \not\subseteq L_{v_2}$. So there uniquely exists an edge e of G between v_1 and v_2 , $L_{v_1} = \{c_1\}$, and there exists a path in $\eta_{c_1}(e)$ from $\eta_{c_1}(v_1)$ to $\eta(v_1)$ disjoint from $V(\gamma_{c_1}) - \{\eta(v_1)\}$.

Since $c_2 \notin \{c_1\} = L_{v_1}$, $L_{v_2} \not\subseteq L_{v_1}$. So $L_{v_2} = \{c_2\}$, and there exists a path in $\eta_{c_2}(e)$ from $\eta_{c_2}(v_2)$ to $\eta(v_2)$ disjoint from $V(\gamma_{c_2}) - \{\eta(v_2)\}$. \square

Claim 8: If $v_1, v_2 \in A$ are distinct adjacent vertices, $c_1 \in L_{v_1}, c_2 \in L_{v_2}$, $c_1 \neq c_2$, and $v_1, v_2 \in V(\gamma_{c_1}) \cap V(\gamma_{c_2})$, then either

- $L_{v_1} = L_{v_2}$, or
- there uniquely exists an edge e of G between v_1 and v_2 , and either
 - for every $i \in \{1, 2\}$, v_i is associated with essential number 0 in γ_{c_i} , $L_{v_i} = \{c_i\}$, and there exists a path in $\eta_{c_i}(e)$ from $\eta_{c_i}(v_i)$ to $\eta(v_i)$ disjoint from $V(\eta(\gamma_{c_i})) - \{\eta(v_i)\}$, or
 - there exists $i^* \in \{1, 2\}$ such that $L_{v_{i^*}} = \{c_{i^*}\}$, $L_{v_{3-i^*}} = \{c_1, c_2\}$, and all neighbors of v_{3-i^*} are contained in $V(\gamma_{c_1}) \cap V(\gamma_{c_2})$.

Proof of Claim 8: For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let c'_i be the child of r' such that $\iota(\gamma_{c_i}) = \gamma_{c'_i}$. We may assume that $L_{v_1} \neq L_{v_2}$, for otherwise we are done.

If for every $i \in \{1, 2\}$, v_i is associated with essential number 0 in γ_{c_i} , then by Claim 7, the second statement of this claim holds.

Hence by symmetry and Claim 1, we may assume that v_1 is associated with essential number 1 in γ_{c_1} . By Statement 1 of Claim 2, v_1 is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow c_1 - V(\gamma_{c_1})$ and $|L_{v_1}| \leq 2$. So v_1 is associated with essential number 1 or 2 in γ_{c_2} .

We first assume that v_2 is not adjacent to any vertex in $V(G) - \uparrow c_2$. Then by Claim 6, $c_1 \in L_{v_1} \subseteq L_{v_2} = \{c_1, c_2\}$ and all neighbors of v_2 are contained in $V(\gamma_{c_1}) \cap V(\gamma_{c_2})$. Since $L_{v_1} \neq L_{v_2}$, $L_{v_1} = \{c_1\}$. Since v_1 is associated with essential number 1 in γ_{c_1} , there exists at most one edge incident with v_1 whose other end is in $\uparrow c_2 - V(\gamma_{c_2})$. So $\eta(v_1)$ is associated with essential number 1 in $\gamma_{c'_1}$ and there exists at most one edge e' incident with $\eta(v_1)$ whose other end is in $\uparrow c'_2 - V(\gamma_{c'_2})$. This together with the fact $c_2 \in L_{v_2} - L_{v_1}$ imply that there are at most two edges of G between v_1 and v_2 . And if there are two edges e_1, e_2 of G between v_1 and v_2 , one of $\eta_{c_2}(e_1)$ and $\eta_{c_2}(e_2)$ contains e' , and the other contains $\eta(v_2)$ and an edge between $\eta(v_1)$ and $\eta(v_2)$. But all neighbors of v_2 are contained in $V(\gamma_{c_1}) \cap V(\gamma_{c_2})$. So v_2 has no neighbor in $\uparrow c_2 - V(\gamma_{c_2})$. Hence $\eta(v_2)$ has no neighbor in $\uparrow c'_2 - V(\gamma_{c'_2})$. Since $c_2 \in L_{v_2}$, none of $\eta_{c_2}(e_1)$ and $\eta_{c_2}(e_2)$ contains $\eta(v_2)$. So there exists a unique edge of G between v_1 and v_2 . Hence Statement 2 of this claim holds.

So we may assume that v_2 is adjacent to some vertex in $V(G) - \uparrow c_2$. In particular, v_2 is associated with essential number 1 or 2 in γ_{c_2} . Since $c_2 \in L_{v_2}$, v_2 is associated with essential number 1 in γ_{c_2} .

Suppose that v_1 is not adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow c_2 - V(\gamma_{c_2})$. Since v_1 is associated with essential number 1 or 2 in γ_{c_2} , by Statement 1 of Claim 2, either $c_2 \notin L_{v_1}$, or v_1 is associated with essential number 2 in γ_{c_2} . So $\eta_{c_2}(v_1) = \eta(v_1)$. That is, $c_2 \notin L_{v_1}$. So $c_2 \in L_{v_2} - L_{v_1}$. By Claim 5, since v_1 is not adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow c_2 - V(\gamma_{c_2})$, v_2 is not adjacent to any vertex in $V(G) - \uparrow c_2$, a contradiction.

Hence v_1 is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow c_2 - V(\gamma_{c_2})$. Since v_1 is associated with essential number 1 in γ_{c_1} , there uniquely exists a vertex, say w , in $\uparrow c_2 - V(\gamma_{c_2})$ adjacent to v_1 . Since $b_{c_1} = b_{c'_1}$ and $\eta(v_1)$ is associated with essential number 1 in $\gamma_{c'_1}$, there uniquely exists a vertex w' in $\uparrow c'_2 - V(\gamma_{c'_2})$ adjacent to $\eta(v_1)$. If $c_2 \notin L_{v_1}$, then since $c_2 \in L_{v_2}$ and v_2 is associated with essential number 1 in γ_{c_2} , w' belongs to $\eta_{c_2}(v_1 w) \cap \eta_{c_2}(v_1 v_2)$, a contradiction. So $c_2 \in L_{v_1}$. Since $|L_{v_1}| \leq 2$, $L_{v_1} = \{c_1, c_2\}$.

Since v_1 is adjacent to v_2 , applying Statement 2 of Claim 3 by taking $v = v_1$ and $u = v_2$, we know that either $\{c_1, c_2\} \subseteq L_{v_2}$, or $\{c_1, c_2\} \cap L_{v_2} = \emptyset$. Since $c_2 \in L_{v_2}$, $\{c_1, c_2\} \subseteq L_{v_2}$. Since v_2 is associated with essential number 1 in γ_{c_2} and $c_2 \in L_{v_2}$, by Statement 1 of Claim 2, $|L_{v_2}| = 2$. So $L_{v_2} = \{c_1, c_2\} = L_{v_1}$, a contradiction. \square

Claim 9: If $v_1, v_2 \in A$ are adjacent vertices, $c_1 \in L_{v_1}, c_2 \in L_{v_2}$ with $c_1 \neq c_2$ and $L_{v_1} \neq L_{v_2}$, then there uniquely exists an edge e of G between v_1 and v_2 , and either

- for every $i \in \{1, 2\}$, there exist an edge f_i of the rooted extension of $(G[\uparrow c_i], \gamma_{c_i})$ incident with v_i and a path in $\eta_{c_i}(f_i)$ from $\eta_{c_i}(v_i)$ to $\eta(v_i)$ disjoint from $V(\eta(\gamma_{c_i})) - \{\eta(v_i)\}$ such that if $v_1, v_2 \in V(\gamma_{c_i})$, then $f_i = e$, and if $v_{3-i} \notin V(\gamma_{c_i})$, then f_i is the edge between v_i and a vertex in the indicator, or

- $v_1, v_2 \in V(\gamma_{c_1}) \cap V(\gamma_{c_2})$, and there exists $i^* \in \{1, 2\}$ such that $L_{v_{i^*}} = \{c_{i^*}\}$, $L_{v_{3-i^*}} = \{c_1, c_2\}$ and all neighbors of v_{3-i^*} are contained in $V(\gamma_{c_1}) \cap V(\gamma_{c_2})$.

Proof of Claim 9: If $v_1, v_2 \in V(\gamma_{c_1}) \cap V(\gamma_{c_2})$, then this claim follows from Claim 8.

So we may assume that at least one of v_1, v_2 does not belong to $V(\gamma_{c_1}) \cap V(\gamma_{c_2})$. If $v_1 \notin V(\gamma_{c_2})$ and $v_2 \notin V(\gamma_{c_1})$, then for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, v_{3-i} is a neighbor of v_i not contained in $\uparrow c_i$, so v_i is associated with essential number 1 in γ_{c_i} , and hence there uniquely exists an edge e of G between v_1 and v_2 , and for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, there exists a path in $\eta_{c_i}(f_i)$ from $\eta_{c_i}(v_i)$ to $\eta(v_i)$ disjoint from $V(\eta(\gamma_{c_i})) - \{\eta(v_i)\}$, where f_i is the edge of the rooted extension of $(G[\uparrow c_i], \gamma_{c_i})$ between v_i and the vertex in the indicator adjacent to v_i . So we are done.

Hence we may assume that $v_1 \notin V(\gamma_{c_2})$ and $v_2 \in V(\gamma_{c_1})$ by symmetry. Since v_1 is adjacent to v_2 and $c_2 \in L_{v_2}$, v_2 is associated with essential number 1 in γ_{c_2} . So v_2 is not adjacent to any vertex in $\uparrow c_1 - V(\gamma_{c_1})$, and there uniquely exists an edge e of G between v_1 and v_2 . Since $c_2 \in L_{v_2}$ and v_2 is associated with essential number 1 in γ_{c_2} , there exists a path in $\eta_{c_2}(f)$ from $\eta_{c_2}(v_2)$ to $\eta(v_2)$ disjoint from $V(\eta(\gamma_{c_2})) - \{\eta(v_2)\}$, where f is the edge of the rooted extension of $(G[\uparrow c_2], \gamma_{c_2})$ between v_2 and the vertex in the indicator adjacent to v_2 .

Since v_2 is associated with essential number 1 in γ_{c_2} , v_2 is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow c_2 - V(\gamma_{c_2})$ by Statement 1 of Claim 2. Since e is an edge incident with v_2 whose other end is in $V(G) - \uparrow c_2$, v_2 is not adjacent to any vertex in $\uparrow c_1 - V(\gamma_{c_1})$. If $c_1 \in L_{v_1} - L_{v_2}$, then by Claim 5, there exists a path in $\eta_{c_1}(e)$ from $\eta_{c_1}(v_1) \notin V(\overline{H'})$ to $\eta(v_1)$ disjoint from $V(\eta(\gamma_{c_1})) - \{\eta(v_1)\}$, so we are done.

Hence we may assume that $c_1 \notin L_{v_1} - L_{v_2}$. Since $c_1 \in L_{v_1}$, $c_1 \in L_{v_2}$. Since v_2 is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow c_2 - V(\gamma_{c_2})$, v_2 is associated with essential number 1 in γ_{c_1} by Claim 1. By Statement 1 of Claim 2, v_2 is adjacent to some vertex in $\uparrow c_1 - V(\gamma_{c_1})$, a contradiction. \square

Claim 10: There exists a function g that maps each vertex $v \in A$ with $L_v \neq \emptyset$ to an element in L_v such that the following hold.

- If $x, y \in A$ with $L_x = L_y$, then $g(x) = g(y)$.
- If $v_1, v_2 \in A$ are adjacent vertices with $L_{v_1} \neq \emptyset \neq L_{v_2}$ and $g(v_1) \neq g(v_2)$, then there uniquely exists an edge e of G between v_1 and v_2 , and either
 - for every $i \in \{1, 2\}$, v_i is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow g(v_i) - V(\gamma_{g(v_i)})$, and there exist an edge f_i of the rooted extension of $(G[\uparrow g(v_i)], \gamma_{g(v_i)})$ incident with v_i and a path in $\eta_{g(v_i)}(f_i)$ from $\eta_{g(v_i)}(v_i)$ to $\eta(v_i)$ disjoint from $V(\eta(\gamma_{g(v_i)})) - \{\eta(v_i)\}$ such that if $v_1, v_2 \in V(\gamma_{g(v_i)})$, then $f_i = e$, and if $v_{3-i} \notin V(\gamma_{g(v_i)})$, then f_i is the edge between v_i and a vertex in the indicator, or
 - $v_1, v_2 \in V(\gamma_{g(v_1)}) \cap V(\gamma_{g(v_2)})$, and there exist $i^* \in \{1, 2\}$ and $c^* \in L_{v_{i^*}}$ such that $L_{v_{i^*}} = \{g(v_{i^*}), c^*\}$, v_{i^*} is not adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow g(v_{i^*}) - V(\gamma_{g(v_{i^*})})$, and for every neighbor $z \in A$ of v_{i^*} with $L_z \neq \emptyset$ and with $g(z) \neq g(v_{i^*})$, we have
 - * $L_z = \{c^*\}$, $g(z) = c^*$,
 - * there uniquely exists an edge of G between z and v_{i^*} ,
 - * z is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow g(z) - V(\gamma_{g(z)})$,
 - * z is associated with essential number 1 in $\gamma_{g(z)}$,

- * $\eta_{g(v_{i^*})}(v_{i^*}z)$ is a path in G from $\eta_{g(v_{i^*})}(v_{i^*})$ to $\eta_{g(v_{i^*})}(z) = \eta(z)$ disjoint from $V(\eta(\gamma_{g(v_{i^*})})) - \{\eta(z)\}$, and
- * there exists a path in $\eta_{c^*}(f_z)$ from $\eta_{c^*}(z)$ to $\eta(z)$ disjoint from $V(\eta(\gamma_{c^*})) - \{\eta(z)\}$, where f_z is the edge of the rooted extension of $(G[\uparrow c^*], \gamma_{c^*})$ between z and a vertex in the indicator.

Proof of Claim 10: Clearly, there exists a function that maps each vertex $v \in A$ with $L_v \neq \emptyset$ to an element in L_v such that if $x, y \in A$ with $L_x = L_y$, then $g(x) = g(y)$. We shall prove that g satisfies the second statement of this claim.

Let $A_1 = \{x \in A : L_x \neq \emptyset, x \text{ is adjacent to a vertex in } \uparrow g(x) - V(\gamma_{g(x)})\}$. Let $A_0 = \{x \in A : L_x \neq \emptyset, x \text{ is not adjacent to a vertex in } \uparrow g(x) - V(\gamma_{g(x)})\}$.

Let $v_1, v_2 \in A$ be adjacent vertices with $g(v_1) \neq g(v_2)$. Note that $g(v_1) \in L_{v_1}, g(v_2) \in L_{v_2}$, and $g(v_1) \neq g(v_2)$. So $L_{v_1} \neq L_{v_2}$ by Statement 1. By Claim 9, there uniquely exists an edge of G between v_1 and v_2 .

We first assume that $\{v_1, v_2\} \subseteq A_1$. Since $\{v_1, v_2\} \subseteq A_1$, for every $i \in \{1, 2\}$, v_i is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow g(v_i) - V(\gamma_{g(v_i)})$, and by Claim 9, there exist an edge f_i of the rooted extension of $(G[\uparrow g(v_i)], \gamma_{g(v_i)})$ incident with v_i and a path in $\eta_{g(v_i)}(f_i)$ from $\eta_{g(v_i)}(v_i)$ to $\eta(v_i)$ disjoint from $V(\eta(\gamma_{g(v_i)})) - \{\eta(v_i)\}$ such that if $v_1, v_2 \in V(\gamma_{g(v_i)})$, then $f_i = e$, and if $v_{3-i} \notin V(\gamma_{g(v_i)})$, then f_i is the edge between v_i and a vertex in the indicator.

So we may assume that at least one of v_1, v_2 is not in A_1 . So at least one of v_1, v_2 is in A_0 . By Claim 9, there uniquely exists an edge e of G between v_1 and v_2 , $v_1, v_2 \in V(\gamma_{g(v_1)}) \cap V(\gamma_{g(v_2)})$, and there exists $i^* \in \{1, 2\}$ such that $L_{v_{3-i^*}} = \{g(v_{3-i^*})\}$, $L_{v_{i^*}} = \{g(v_1), g(v_2)\}$ and all neighbors of v_{i^*} are contained in $V(\gamma_{g(v_1)}) \cap V(\gamma_{g(v_2)})$. Since all neighbors of v_{i^*} are contained in $V(\gamma_{g(v_1)}) \cap V(\gamma_{g(v_2)})$, $v_{i^*} \in A_0$. Since $g(v_{i^*}) \in L_{v_{i^*}} - L_{v_{3-i^*}}$ and $v_{i^*} \in A_0$, $\eta_{g(v_{i^*})}(e)$ is a path in G from $\eta_{g(v_{i^*})}(v_{i^*})$ to $\eta_{g(v_{i^*})}(v_{3-i^*}) = \eta(v_{3-i^*})$ disjoint from $V(\gamma_{g(v_{i^*})}) - \{\eta(v_{3-i^*})\}$ and shows that v_{3-i^*} is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow g(v_{i^*}) - V(\gamma_{g(v_{i^*})})$. Since $g(v_{3-i^*}) \in L_{v_{3-i^*}}$, v_{3-i^*} is associated with essential number 1 in $\gamma_{g(v_{3-i^*})}$. So $v_{3-i^*} \in A_1$ by Statement 1 of Claim 2, and there exists a path in $\eta_{g(v_{3-i^*})}(f_{v_{3-i^*}})$ from $\eta_{g(v_{3-i^*})}(v_{3-i^*})$ to $\eta(v_{3-i^*})$ disjoint from $V(\eta(\gamma_{g(v_{3-i^*})})) - \{\eta(v_{3-i^*})\}$, where $f_{v_{3-i^*}}$ is the edge of the rooted extension of $(G[\uparrow g(v_{3-i^*})], \gamma_{g(v_{3-i^*})})$ between v_{3-i^*} and a vertex in the indicator.

Let $c^* = g(v_{3-i^*})$.

Let $Z = \{z \in A : zv_{i^*} \in E(G), L_z \neq \emptyset, g(z) \neq g(v_{i^*})\}$. Since $v_{i^*} \in A_0$, the above argument shows that for every $z \in Z$, $z \in A_1$ and is associated with essential number 1 in γ_{c^*} , there uniquely exists an edge e_z of G between v_{i^*} and z , $\{z, v_{i^*}\} \subseteq V(\gamma_{g(z)}) \cap V(\gamma_{g(v_{i^*})})$, and $L_z = \{c^*\}$, $L_{v_{i^*}} = \{g(v_{i^*}), g(z)\}$, all neighbors of v_{i^*} are contained in $V(\gamma_{g(v_{i^*})}) \cap V(\gamma_{g(z)})$, $\eta_{g(v_{i^*})}(e_z)$ is a path in G from $\eta_{g(v_{i^*})}(v_{i^*})$ to $\eta_{g(v_{i^*})}(z) = \eta(z)$ disjoint from $V(\gamma_{g(v_{i^*})}) - \{\eta(z)\}$, and there exists a path in $\eta_{c^*}(f_z)$ from $\eta_{c^*}(z)$ to $\eta(z)$ disjoint from $V(\eta(\gamma_{c^*})) - \{\eta(z)\}$, where f_z is the edge of the rooted extension of $(G[\uparrow c^*], \gamma_{c^*})$ between z and a vertex in the indicator. So this claim holds. \square

Let g be a function that maps each vertex $v \in A$ with $L_v \neq \emptyset$ to an element in L_v satisfying Claim 10. Note that for every vertex $v \in V(G) - V(H)$, there uniquely exists a child c of r such that $v \in \uparrow c - V(\gamma_c)$, and we define $g(v) = c$. Hence g is a function whose domain is $\{v \in A : L_v \neq \emptyset\} \cup (V(G) - V(H))$.

Note that if $v \in A$ with $L_v = \emptyset$, then $\eta_c(v)$ equals $\eta(v)$ for all children c of r with $v \in V(\gamma_c)$.

Now we define $\pi_V : V(\overline{G}) \rightarrow V(\overline{G'})$ as follows.

- For each vertex $v \in V(G) - V(H)$, there uniquely exists a child c of r such that $v \in \uparrow c$, and we define $\pi_V(v) = \eta_c(v)$.
- For each vertex $v \in A$ with $L_v \neq \emptyset$, define $\pi_V(v) = \eta_{g(v)}(v)$.
- For each vertex $v \in A$ with $L_v = \emptyset$, define $\pi_V(v) = \eta(v)$. (Recall that $\eta(v) = \eta_c(v)$ for every child c of r with $v \in V(\gamma_c)$ in this case.)
- For each vertex $v \in V(H) - A$, define $\pi_V(v) = \eta(v)$.
- For each $j \in [|\gamma_0|]$, π_V maps the j -th entry of the indicator of \overline{G} to the j -th entry of the indicator of $\overline{G'}$.

Note that if $v \in A$ and $\pi_V(v) \in V(\overline{H'})$, then $L_v = \emptyset$ and $\pi_V(v) = \eta(v)$.

We define π_E to be a function that maps each edge e of \overline{G} , say with ends u, v , to a subgraph of $\overline{G'}$ as follows. (Note that u, v are the same when e is a loop.)

- If $\pi_V(u), \pi_V(v) \in V(\overline{H'})$, then $\pi_V(u) = \eta(u)$ and $\pi_V(v) = \eta(v)$, and we define $\pi_E(e) = \eta(e)$.
- If $\pi_V(u) \in V(\overline{H'})$ and $\pi_V(v) \notin V(\overline{H'})$, then $\pi_V(u) = \eta(u)$, and $g(v)$ is the unique child c of r such that $\pi_V(v) = \eta_c(v)$, and we define $\pi_E(e)$ as follows.
 - If $u \in \uparrow g(v)$, then $\eta_{g(v)}(u) = \eta(u) = \pi_V(u)$, and we define $\pi_E(e)$ to be $\eta_{g(v)}(e)$.
 - If $u \notin \uparrow g(v)$, then v is associated with essential number 1 in $\gamma_{g(v)}$, $u \in V(\overline{H})$ and there exists a path in the image of $\eta_{g(v)}$ from $\eta_{g(v)}(v)$ to $\eta(v)$ disjoint from $V(\eta(\gamma_{g(v)})) - \{\eta(v)\}$, and we define $\pi_E(e)$ to be the path obtained by concatenating the path $\eta(e)$ and the path in the image of $\eta_{g(v)}$ from $\eta_{g(v)}(v)$ to $\eta(v)$ just mentioned.
- If $\pi_V(u), \pi_V(v) \notin V(\overline{H'})$, then $g(u), g(v)$ are the unique children c_u, c_v of r , respectively, such that $\pi_V(u) = \eta_{c_u}(u)$ and $\pi_V(v) = \eta_{c_v}(v)$, and we define $\pi_E(e)$ as follows.
 - If $g(u) = g(v)$, then define $\pi_E(e) = \eta_{g(u)}(e)$.
 - If $g(u) \neq g(v)$ and $e \in E(H)$, then
 - * if u is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow g(u) - V(\gamma_{g(u)})$, and v is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow g(v) - V(\gamma_{g(v)})$, then define $\pi_E(e)$ to be the path obtained by concatenating the path in the image of $\eta_{g(u)}$ from $\eta_{g(u)}(u)$ to $\eta(u)$ disjoint from $V(\eta(\gamma_{g(u)})) - \{\eta(u)\}$ mentioned in Claim 10, the path $\eta(e)$, and the path in the image of $\eta_{g(v)}$ from $\eta(v)$ to $\eta_{g(v)}(v)$ disjoint from $V(\eta(\gamma_{g(v)})) - \{\eta(v)\}$ mentioned in Claim 10,
 - * otherwise, by Claim 10, $u, v \in V(\gamma_{g(u)}) \cap V(\gamma_{g(v)})$, and we may assume by symmetry that u is not adjacent to any vertex in $\uparrow g(u) - V(\gamma_{g(u)})$, and we define $\pi_E(e)$ to be the path obtained by concatenating the path $\eta_{g(u)}(e)$ and the path in the image of $\eta_{g(v)}$ from $\eta_{g(v)}(v)$ to $\eta(v)$ disjoint from $V(\gamma_{g(v)}) - \{\eta(v)\}$ mentioned in Claim 10.

- If $g(u) \neq g(v)$ and $e \notin E(H)$, then by symmetry we may assume that $u \in V(H)$ and $v \in \uparrow g(v) - V(H)$, so u is associated with essential number 1 in $\gamma_{g(u)}$ and with essential number 1 or 2 in $\gamma_{g(v)}$ (by Claim 2), and we define $\pi_E(e)$ to be the path obtained by concatenating the path in the image of $\eta_{g(u)}$ from $\eta_{g(u)}(u)$ to $\eta(u)$ disjoint from $V(\eta(\gamma_{g(u)})) - \{\eta(u)\}$, the path in the image of $\eta_{g(v)}$ from $\eta(u)$ to $\eta_{g(v)}(u)$ disjoint from $V(\eta(\gamma_{g(v)})) - \{\eta(u)\}$, and $\eta_{g(v)}(e)$.

It is straightforward to check that for every $e \in E(\overline{G})$, say with ends u, v , the intersection of $\pi_E(e)$ and the image of π_V is $\{\pi_V(u), \pi_V(v)\}$. Note that for each $e \in E(G)$, $\pi_E(e)$ is contained in a union of $\eta(e)$ (if $\eta(e)$ is defined) and subpaths of $\eta_c(e')$ intersecting $V(\overline{H'})$ only in $\{\eta(u), \eta(v)\}$ (ignore $\eta(u)$ or $\eta(v)$ if it is undefined), for some children c of r and edges e' of the rooted extension of $(G[\uparrow c], \gamma_c)$ with ends u, v such that either $e' = e$ or e' is the edge between $\{u, v\}$ and a vertex in the indicator by Claim 10.

Claim 11: If $e_1, e_2 \in E(G)$ such that $\pi_E(e_1) \cap \pi_E(e_2) \not\subseteq \bigcup_{x \in V(e_1 \cap e_2)} \pi_V(x)$, then each of e_1, e_2 is incident with a vertex in $V(H)$.

Proof of Claim 11: By symmetry, suppose to the contrary that e_1 is not incident with a vertex in $V(H)$. So there exists a child c of r such that both ends of e_1 are contained in $\uparrow c - V(\gamma_c)$. Let u_1, v_1 be the ends of e_1 . Hence $\pi_V(u_1) = \eta_c(u_1) \notin V(H')$, $\pi_V(v_1) = \eta_c(v_1) \notin V(H')$, and $\pi_E(e_1) = \eta_c(e_1)$ is contained in $G[\uparrow c - V(\gamma_c)]$. Since η_c is a homeomorphic embedding, $\pi_E(e_1) \cap \pi_E(e_2) \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in V(e_1 \cap e_2)} \pi_V(x)$, a contradiction. \square

Claim 12: If $e_1, e_2 \in E(G)$ such that $\pi_E(e_1) \cap \pi_E(e_2) \not\subseteq \bigcup_{x \in V(e_1 \cap e_2)} \pi_V(x)$, then each of e_1, e_2 is an edge of H .

Proof of Claim 12: By symmetry, suppose to the contrary that e_1 is not an edge of H . By Claim 11, e_1 has exactly one end in $V(H)$. Let u, v be the ends of e_1 . By symmetry, we may assume that there exists a child c of r such that $v \in \uparrow c - V(\gamma_c)$ and $u \in V(H)$. Note that $\pi_V(v) \notin V(H')$ and $c = g(v)$.

Suppose $\pi_E(e_1) = \eta_{g(v)}(e_1)$. Then $V(\pi_E(e_1)) \cap V(H') \subseteq \{\eta(u)\}$. Since $\pi_E(e_1) \cap \pi_E(e_2) \not\subseteq \bigcup_{x \in V(e_1 \cap e_2)} \pi_V(x)$, $V(\pi_E(e_1)) \cap V(H') \neq \emptyset$ and u is an end of e_2 . So $V(\pi_E(e_1)) \cap V(H') = \{\eta(u)\}$. If $\eta(u)$ is not an internal vertex of $\pi_E(e_1)$, then since $V(\pi_E(e_1)) \cap V(H') = \{\eta(u)\}$, $\pi_V(u) = \eta(u)$, so $\pi_E(e_1) \cap \pi_E(e_2) \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in V(e_1 \cap e_2)} \pi_V(x)$, a contradiction. Hence $\eta(u)$ is an internal vertex of $\pi_E(e_1)$. So $\eta_{g(v)}(u) = \pi_V(u) \notin V(H')$, $g(u) = g(v)$, and u is associated essential number 0 in $\gamma_{g(u)}$. Hence the end of e_2 other than u , denoted by v_2 , belongs to $\uparrow g(u)$. If $\pi_E(e_2) = \eta_{g(u)}(e_2)$, then $\pi_E(e_1) \cap \pi_E(e_2) \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in V(e_1 \cap e_2)} \pi_V(x)$, a contradiction. So $\pi_E(e_2) \neq \eta_{g(u)}(e_2)$. Hence $\pi_V(v_2) \notin V(H')$, $g(v_2)$ is defined, and $g(v_2) \neq g(u)$. Since $v_2 \in \uparrow g(u)$ and $g(v_2) \neq g(u)$, $e_2 \in E(H)$. Note that u is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow g(u) - V(\gamma_{g(u)})$. If v_2 is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow g(v_2) - V(\gamma_{g(v_2)})$, then by Lemma 10, $\eta(u)$ is an internal vertex of both $\eta_{g(u)}(e_1)$ and $\eta_{g(u)}(e'_1)$ for some edge e'_1 of the rooted extension of $(G[\uparrow g(u)], V(\gamma_{g(u)}))$ different from e_1 , a contradiction. So v_2 is not adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow g(v_2) - V(\gamma_{g(v_2)})$. By Claim 10, u is associated with essential number 1 in $\gamma_{g(u)}$, a contradiction.

Hence $\pi_E(e_1) \neq \eta_{g(v)}(e_1)$. Since $u \in \uparrow g(v)$, $\pi_V(u) \notin V(H')$. So $g(u)$ is defined and $g(u) \neq g(v)$. Since $v \in \uparrow g(v) - V(\gamma_{g(v)})$ and $g(u) \neq g(v)$, u is associated with essential number 1 in $\gamma_{g(u)}$. Since $g(u) \neq g(v)$ and $e_1 \notin E(H)$, $\pi_E(e_1)$ is obtained from by concatenating the path P in the image of $\eta_{g(u)}$ from $\eta_{g(u)}(u)$ to $\eta(u)$ disjoint from $V(\eta(\gamma_{g(u)})) - \{\eta(u)\}$ and a path in the image of $\eta_{g(v)}$ only intersecting $V(H')$ at $\eta(u)$. Since u is associated with essential number 1 in $\gamma_{g(u)}$, P is a subpath of $\eta_{g(u)}(f_u)$, where f_u is the edge of the rooted extension

of $(G[\uparrow g(u)], \gamma_{g(u)})$ between u and a vertex in the indicator.

So $\pi_E(e_1) \cap \pi_E(e_2) - \bigcup_{x \in V(e_1 \cap e_2)} \pi_V(x) = \{\eta(u)\}$ and u is an end of e_2 . Let v_2 be the end of e_2 other than u . Since u is associated with essential number 1 in $\gamma_{g(u)}$ and e_1 is between u and $V(G) - \uparrow g(u)$, $v_2 \in \uparrow g(u)$. Since $P \subseteq \eta_{g(u)}(f_u)$, $\pi_E(e_2) \neq \eta_{g(u)}(e_2)$, for otherwise $\pi_E(e_1) \cap \pi_E(e_2) \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in V(e_1 \cap e_2)} \pi_V(x)$. So $\pi_V(v_2) \notin V(H')$. Hence $g(v_2)$ is defined, $g(v_2) \neq g(u)$, and $v_2 \in V(\gamma_{g(u)})$.

Suppose v_2 is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow g(v_2) - V(\gamma_{g(v_2)})$. Since u is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow g(u) - V(\gamma_{g(u)})$ and $u, v_2 \in V(\gamma_{g(u)})$, by Claim 10, $\eta(u) \in V(P) \cap V(\eta_{g(u)}(e_2)) \subseteq V(\eta_{g(u)}(f_u)) \cap V(\eta_{g(u)}(e_2)) = \{\eta_{g(u)}(u)\}$, a contradiction.

So v_2 is not adjacent to any vertex in $\uparrow g(v_2) - V(\gamma_{g(v_2)})$. By Claim 10, $\{u, v_2\} \subseteq V(\gamma_{g(u)}) \cap V(\gamma_{g(v_2)})$, and $g(v_2) \notin L_u$. Since $g(v_2) \notin L_u$ and v_2 is not adjacent to any vertex in $\uparrow g(v_2) - V(\gamma_{g(v_2)})$, there exists an edge e'_2 of $\eta_{g(v_2)}(e_2)$ incident with $\eta(u)$ whose other end is in $\uparrow g(v_2)' - V(\gamma_{g(v_2)'})$, where $g(v_2)'$ is the child of r' with $\iota(\gamma_{g(v_2)}) = \gamma_{g(v_2)'}$. Since u is associated with essential number 1 in $\gamma_{g(u)}$, $g(v_2) = g(v)$. Hence $\eta(u)$ is incident with an edge e'_1 in $\eta_{g(v_2)'}(e_1)$. Since $e_1 \neq e_2$, e'_1 and e'_2 are distinct. So u is not associated with essential number 1 in $\gamma_{g(u)}$, a contradiction. \square

Claim 13: There exist no distinct edges $e_1, e_2 \in E(G)$ such that $\pi_E(e_1) \cap \pi_E(e_2) \not\subseteq \bigcup_{x \in V(e_1 \cap e_2)} \pi_V(x)$.

Proof of Claim 13: Suppose to the contrary that there exist distinct $e_1, e_2 \in E(G)$ such that $\pi_E(e_1) \cap \pi_E(e_2) \not\subseteq \bigcup_{x \in V(e_1 \cap e_2)} \pi_V(x)$. By Claim 12, e_1 and e_2 are edges of H . For each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let u_i, v_i be the ends of e_i . Recall that $\pi_E(e_1) \cap \pi_E(e_2) - \bigcup_{x \in V(e_1 \cap e_2)} \pi_V(x) \subseteq \{\eta(u_1), \eta(v_1), \eta(u_2), \eta(v_2)\}$. And for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $V(\pi_E(e_i)) \cap V(H') \subseteq V(\eta(e_i))$. So $\{u_1, v_1\} \cap \{u_2, v_2\} \neq \emptyset$. By symmetry, we may assume that $u_1 = u_2$.

Suppose $\pi_V(u_1) \in V(H')$. If $\pi_V(v_1) \in V(H')$, then $\pi_V(u_1) = \eta(u_1)$ and $\pi_V(v_1) = \eta(v_1)$, so $\pi_E(e_1) \cap \pi_E(e_2) \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in V(e_1 \cap e_2)} \pi_V(x)$. So $\pi_V(v_1) \notin V(H')$. Similarly, $\pi_V(v_2) \notin V(H')$. Hence $g(v_1)$ and $g(v_2)$ are defined. If $u_1 \in \uparrow g(v_1) \cap \uparrow g(v_2)$, then $\pi_E(e_1) \cap \pi_E(e_2) \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in V(e_1 \cap e_2)} \pi_V(x)$. So by symmetry, we may assume that $u_1 \notin \uparrow g(v_1)$. Hence v_1 is associated with essential number 1 in $\gamma_{g(v_1)}$, so $v_1 \neq v_2$. So $\pi_E(e_1)$ is contained in $\eta(e_1) \cup \eta_{g(v_1)}(f_1)$, where f_1 is the edge of the rooted extension of $(G[\uparrow g(v_1)], \gamma_{g(v_1)})$ between v_1 and a vertex in the indicator. Since $\pi_E(e_1) \cap \pi_E(e_2) \not\subseteq \bigcup_{x \in V(e_1 \cap e_2)} \pi_V(x)$ and $v_1 \neq v_2$, we have $u_1 \notin \uparrow g(v_2)$, $g(v_1) \neq g(v_2)$, and v_2 is associated with essential number 1 in $\gamma_{g(v_2)}$. Since $\pi_V(u_1) = \eta(u_1)$, $\{\eta(v_1), \eta(v_2)\} \cap V(\pi_E(e_1)) \cap V(\pi_E(e_2)) \neq \emptyset$. By symmetry, we may assume that $\eta(v_1) \in V(\pi_E(e_1)) \cap V(\pi_E(e_2))$. Since $g(v_1) \neq g(v_2)$, v_1 is incident with an edge whose other end is in $\uparrow g(v_2) - V(\gamma_{g(v_2)})$ which does not contain u . So v_1 is not associated with essential number 1 in $\gamma_{g(v_1)}$, a contradiction.

So $\pi_V(u_1) \notin V(H')$. Suppose $\pi_V(v_1) \in V(H')$ and $\pi_V(v_2) \in V(H')$. Since $\pi_E(e_1) \cap \pi_E(e_2) \not\subseteq \bigcup_{x \in V(e_1 \cap e_2)} \pi_V(x)$, either $v_1 \notin \uparrow g(u_1)$ or $v_2 \notin \uparrow g(u_1)$. So u_1 is associated with essential number 1 in $\gamma_{g(u_1)}$. Hence exactly one of v_1 and v_2 is not in $\uparrow g(u_1)$. But it implies that $\pi_E(e_1) \cap \pi_E(e_2) \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in V(e_1 \cap e_2)} \pi_V(x)$ since u_1 is associated with essential number 1 in $\gamma_{g(u_1)}$, a contradiction.

Hence by symmetry, we may assume that $\pi_V(u_1) \notin V(H')$ and $\pi_V(v_1) \notin V(H')$.

Suppose $\pi_E(e_1) = \eta_{g(u_1)}(e_1)$ and $\pi_V(v_2) \in V(H')$. In particular, $g(u_1) = g(v_1)$. Then $v_2 \notin \uparrow g(u_1)$, for otherwise $\pi_E(e_1) \cap \pi_E(e_2) \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in V(e_1 \cap e_2)} \pi_V(x)$. So u_1 is associated with essential number 1 in $\gamma_{g(u_1)}$, and e_2 is the unique edge incident with u_1 whose other end is in $V(G) - \uparrow g(u_1)$. Since $g(u_1) = g(v_1)$, $v_1 \in V(\gamma_{g(u_1)})$, so $v_1 \neq v_2$. So $\pi_E(e_1) \cap \pi_E(e_2) \subseteq$

$\bigcup_{x \in V(e_1 \cap e_2)} \pi_V(x)$, a contradiction.

Hence either $\pi_E(e_1) \neq \eta_{g(u_1)}(e_1)$ or $\pi_V(v_2) \notin V(H')$. Suppose $\pi_E(e_1) = \eta_{g(u_1)}(e_1)$. In particular, $g(u_1) = g(v_1)$ and $\pi_V(v_2) \notin V(H')$. Hence $g(u_1) \neq g(v_2)$, for otherwise $\pi_E(e_1) \cap \pi_E(e_2) \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in V(e_1 \cap e_2)} \pi_V(x)$. Since $g(v_1) = g(u_1) \neq g(v_2)$, $v_1 \neq v_2$. Since $\pi_E(e_1) = \eta_{g(u_1)}(e_1)$ and $g(u_1) \neq g(v_2)$, by Claim 10, $\pi_E(e_1) \cap \pi_E(e_2) \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in V(e_1 \cap e_2)} \pi_V(x)$, a contradiction.

Hence $\pi_E(e_1) \neq \eta_{g(u_1)}(e_1)$. So $g(u_1) \neq g(v_1)$.

Suppose $v_2 \notin \uparrow g(u_1)$. So u_1 is associated with essential number 1 in $\gamma_{g(u_1)}$, and e_2 is the unique edge of G incident with u_1 whose other end is in $V(G) - \uparrow g(u_1)$. Hence $v_1 \in \uparrow g(u_1)$, and $\eta(u_1)$ is contained in $\eta_{g(u_1)}(f_u)$, where f_u is the edge of the rooted extension of $(G[\uparrow g(u_1)], \gamma_{g(u_1)})$ between u_1 and a vertex in the indicator. Since $e_1 \in E(H)$, $v_1 \in V(\gamma_{g(u_1)})$. Since $g(u_1) \in L_{u_1}$, u_1 is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow g(u_1) - V(\gamma_{g(u_1)})$ by Claim 2. If v_1 is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow g(v_1) - V(\gamma_{g(v_1)})$, then by Claim 10, since $v_1 \in V(\gamma_{g(u_1)})$, $\eta(u_1) \in V(\eta_{g(u_1)}(e_1))$, contradicting $\eta(u_1) \in V(\eta_{g(u_1)}(f_u)) - \{\eta_{g(u_1)}(u_1)\}$. So v_1 is not adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow g(v_1) - V(\gamma_{g(v_1)})$. Then $\pi_E(e_1)$ contains $\eta_{g(v_1)}(e_2)$ which contains an edge incident with $\eta(u_1)$ whose other end is in $\uparrow g(v_1)' - V(\gamma_{g(v_1)'})$ by Claim 10, where $g(v_1)'$ is the child of r' with $\iota(\gamma_{g(v_1)}) = \gamma_{g(v_1)'}$. So u_1 is incident with an edge whose other end is in $\uparrow g(v_1) - V(\gamma_{g(v_1)})$ which is different from e_2 , a contradiction.

Hence $v_2 \in \uparrow g(u_1)$. Suppose $\pi_V(v_2) \in V(H')$. Then $\pi_E(e_2) = \eta_{g(u_1)}(e_2)$ and $v_1 \neq v_2$. So by Claim 10, $\pi_E(e_1) \cap \pi_E(e_2) \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in V(e_1 \cap e_2)} \pi_V(x)$.

So $\pi_V(v_2) \notin V(H')$. Note that we showed that $\pi_V(u_1) \notin V(H')$ and $\pi_V(v_1) \notin V(H')$ imply $g(u_1) \neq g(v_1)$ and $v_2 \in \uparrow g(u_1)$. As $\pi_V(u_1) \notin V(H')$ and $\pi_V(v_2) \notin V(H')$, a similar argument shows that $g(u_1) \neq g(v_2)$ and $v_1 \in \uparrow g(u_1)$. By Claim 10, for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, there unique exists an edge between u_1 and v_i . So $v_1 \neq v_2$.

Since $v_1 \neq v_2$, if u_1 is not adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow g(u_1) - V(\gamma_{g(u_1)})$, then by Claim 10, $V(\pi_E(e_1)) \cap V(\pi_E(e_2)) = \{\pi_V(u_1)\}$, a contradiction. So u_1 is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow g(u_1) - V(\gamma_{g(u_1)})$.

Suppose for every $i \in \{1, 2\}$, v_i is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow g(v_i) - V(\gamma_{g(v_i)})$. Since $\{v_1, v_2\} \subseteq \uparrow g(u_1)$, by Claim 10, $\eta(u_1) \in V(\eta_{g(u_1)}(e_1)) \cap V(\eta_{g(u_1)}(e_2)) = \{\eta_{g(u_1)}(u_1)\}$, contradicting the definition of $g(u_1)$.

So by symmetry, we may assume that v_1 is not adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow g(v_1) - V(\gamma_{g(v_1)})$. By Claim 10, $\eta(u_1)$ is incident with an edge e_1^* in $\eta_{g(v_1)}(e_1)$ whose other end is in $\uparrow g(v_1)' - V(\gamma_{g(v_1)'})$, where $g(v_1)'$ is the child of r' with $\iota(\gamma_{g(v_1)}) = \gamma_{g(v_1)'}$. So u_1 is associated with essential number 1 in $\gamma_{g(u_1)}$, and $\eta(u_1)$ is contained in $\eta_{g(u_1)}(f_u)$, where f_u is the edge of the rooted extension of $(G[\uparrow g(u_1)], \gamma_{g(u_1)})$ between u_1 and a vertex in the indicator. If v_2 is adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow g(v_2) - V(\gamma_{g(v_2)})$, then by Claim 10, $\eta(u_1) \in V(\eta_{g(u_1)}(e_2)) \cap V(\eta_{g(u_1)}(f_u)) = \{\eta_{g(u_1)}(u_1)\}$, a contradiction. So v_2 is not adjacent to a vertex in $\uparrow g(v_2) - V(\gamma_{g(v_2)})$. By Claim 10, $\eta(u_1)$ is incident with an edge e_2^* in $\eta_{g(v_2)}(e_2)$ whose other end is in $\uparrow g(v_2)' - V(\gamma_{g(v_2)'})$, where $g(v_2)'$ is the child of r' with $\iota(\gamma_{g(v_2)}) = \gamma_{g(v_2)'}$. Since $e_1 \neq e_2$, $e_1^* \neq e_2^*$. Since $g(u_1) \neq g(v_1)$ and $g(u_1) \neq g(v_2)$, u_1 is not associated with essential number 1 in $\gamma_{g(u_1)}$, a contradiction. This proves the claim. \square

By Claim 13, (π_V, π_E) defines a homeomorphic embedding from \overline{G} to $\overline{G'}$ such that for every i with $1 \leq i \leq |V(\gamma_0)|$, π_V maps the i -th entry in the indicator of \overline{G} to the i -th entry in the indicator of $\overline{G'}$.

Claim 14: If v is the i -th vertex of γ'_0 for some i with $1 \leq i \leq |V(\gamma'_0)|$ and is an internal

vertex of $\pi_E(e)$ for some edge e of \overline{G} , then either e is an edge incident with the i -th vertex in the indicator of \overline{G} , or the essential number associated with the i -th vertex in γ_0 is 0 and e is an edge incident with the i -th vertex in γ_0 .

Proof of Claim 14: We may assume that e is not an edge incident with the i -th vertex in the indicator of \overline{G} , for otherwise we are done. Since (π_V, π_E) defines a homeomorphic embedding from \overline{G} to $\overline{G'}$ such that for every i with $1 \leq i \leq |V(\gamma_0)|$, π_V maps the i -th entry in the indicator of \overline{G} to the i -th entry in the indicator of $\overline{G'}$, the essential number associated with the i -th vertex in γ_0 is 0.

Let the ends of e be x and y . Since η is a homeomorphic embedding from (H, γ_0) to (H', γ'_0) , either $e \notin E(\overline{H})$, or $e \in E(\overline{H})$ and $\pi_E(e) \neq \eta(e)$. So either $\pi_V(x) \notin V(\overline{H'})$, or $\pi_V(y) \notin V(\overline{H'})$. By symmetry, we may assume that $\pi_V(y) \notin V(\overline{H'})$. If $\pi_V(x) \in V(\overline{H'})$, then e is an edge incident with the i -th vertex in γ_0 , since η is a homeomorphic embedding from (H, γ_0) to (H', γ'_0) and $\eta_{g(y)}$ is a homeomorphic embedding from $(G[\uparrow g(y)], \gamma_{g(y)})$ to $(G'[\uparrow g(y)'], \gamma_{g(y)'})$, where $g(y)'$ is the child of r' with $\iota(\gamma_{g(y)}) = \gamma_{g(y)'}$. So $\pi_V(x) \notin V(\overline{H'})$. Similarly, $g(x) \neq g(y)$. Since $\eta, \eta_{g(x)}$ and $\eta_{g(y)}$ are homeomorphic embeddings, e is an edge incident with the i -th vertex in γ_0 . \square

If v' is the i -th vertex in γ'_0 for some $1 \leq i \leq |V(\gamma'_0)|$, and $\pi_V(v) = v'$ for some vertex v of \overline{G} , then $\pi_V(v) = \eta(v)$, so v is the i -th vertex in γ_0 since $\eta : (H, \gamma_0) \hookrightarrow (H', \gamma'_0)$.

Therefore, (π_V, π_E) defines a homeomorphic embedding from (G, γ_0) to (G', γ'_0) .

It is clear that $\phi(v) \leq_Q \phi'(\pi_V(v))$ for every $v \in V(G)$. So to prove that $(G', \gamma'_0, \Gamma', f', \phi')$ simulates $(G, \gamma_0, \Gamma, f, \phi)$, it suffices to define an injection $\iota^* : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma'$ such that for every $\sigma \in \Gamma$, $\pi_V(\sigma) = \iota^*(\sigma)$ and $f(\sigma) \leq_Q f'(\iota^*(\sigma))$.

Define $\iota^* : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma'$ such that for every $\sigma \in \Gamma$,

- if $\alpha(\sigma) = r$, then $\iota^*(\sigma) = \iota(\sigma)$;
- if $\alpha(\sigma)$ is a descendant of c for some child c of r , then $\iota^*(\sigma) = \iota_c(\sigma)$. (Note that such child c is unique, so $\alpha(\sigma)$ is well-defined.)

Claim 15: ι^* is an injection.

Proof of Claim 15: Note that for distinct children c and c' of r , ι, ι_c and $\iota_{c'}$ are injections with disjoint images. So ι^* is an injection. \square

Claim 16: For every $\sigma \in \Gamma$, $\pi_V(\sigma) = \iota^*(\sigma)$.

Proof of Claim 16: Suppose to the contrary that there exists $\sigma \in \Gamma$ such that $\pi_V(\sigma) \neq \iota^*(\sigma)$.

Suppose $\alpha(\sigma) = r$. Then each vertex v in $V(\sigma)$ is either not in γ_c for every child c of r , or is associated with essential number 2 in γ_c for every child c of r with $v \in V(\gamma_c)$ since r is a non-descendant of every child of r . So for every $v \in V(\sigma)$, $\pi_V(v) = \eta(v)$. Hence $\pi_V(\sigma) = \eta(\sigma) = \iota(\sigma) = \iota^*(\sigma)$, a contradiction.

So there exists a child c^* of r such that $\alpha(\sigma)$ is a descendant of c^* . If $\pi_V(\sigma) = \eta_{c^*}(\sigma)$, then $\pi_V(\sigma) = \eta_{c^*}(\sigma) = \iota_{c^*}(\sigma) = \iota^*(\sigma)$, a contradiction. Hence there exists a vertex $v \in V(\sigma)$ such that $\pi_V(v) \neq \eta_{c^*}(v)$. So $v \in V(\gamma_{c^*})$, $L_v \neq \emptyset$ and $g(v) \neq c^*$. Hence, v is in $V(\gamma_{g(v)})$ and is associated with essential number 0 or 1 in $\gamma_{g(v)}$. However, since $\alpha(\sigma)$ is a descendant of $c^* \neq g(v)$, and c^* is a non-descendant of $g(v)$, $\alpha(\sigma)$ is a non-descendant of $g(v)$. So v is associated with essential number 2 in $\gamma_{g(v)}$, a contradiction. This proves $\pi_V(\sigma) = \iota^*(\sigma)$. \square

Since $\pi_V(\sigma) = \iota^*(\sigma)$ for all $\sigma \in \Gamma$, it is straightforward to verify that $f(\sigma) \leq_Q f'(\iota^*(\sigma))$ by the properties of f_H and f_c for all children c of r . This proves that $(G', \gamma'_0, \Gamma', f', \phi')$ simulates $(G, \gamma_0, \Gamma, f, \phi)$. ■

7 Well-behaved assemblages

We say that a set \mathcal{F} of assemblages is *well-behaved* if for every well-quasi-order Q , for every infinite sequence of Q -assemblages S_1, S_2, \dots each having underlying assemblage in \mathcal{F} , there exist $1 \leq i < i'$ such that $S_{i'}$ simulates S_i .

Lemma 7.1. *Let n be a nonnegative integer. If \mathcal{F}^n is the set of assemblages (G, γ_0, Γ) with $|V(G)| \leq n$, then \mathcal{F}^n is well-behaved.*

Proof. Let Q be a well-quasi-order. Let $((G_1, \gamma_1, \Gamma_1, f_1, \phi_1), (G_2, \gamma_2, \Gamma_2, f_2, \phi_2), \dots)$ be an infinite sequence of Q -assemblages whose underlying assemblages belong to \mathcal{F}^n . Since n is finite, we may assume that G_1, G_2, \dots have the same number of vertices and may assume that $V(\overline{G_1}) = V(\overline{G_2}) = \dots$, where each $\overline{G_i}$ is the rooted extension of G_i . And we may further assume that for any $i < j$, and for every pair of distinct elements v, v' of $V(G_1)$, the number of loops incident with v in G_i is at most the number of loops incident with v in G_j , and the number of edges in G_i with ends v, v' is at most the number of edges in G_j with ends v, v' . Therefore, for $i < j$, G_i is a subgraph of G_j . Since there are only finitely many distinct marches on $V(G_1)$, we may assume that $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = \dots$. Furthermore, since $V(G_1)$ is finite, we may assume that for every $v \in V(G_1)$, $\phi_1(v) \leq_Q \phi_2(v) \leq_Q \dots$. For each $i \geq 1$ and for each march σ with $V(\sigma) \subseteq V(G_1)$, let $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots$ be the elements of the multiset Γ_i with $\sigma_j = \sigma$ for all j , and we define $f'_i(\sigma) = (f_i(\sigma_1), f_i(\sigma_2), \dots)$. Note that Γ_i is finite, so $f'_i(\sigma)$ is a finite sequence. Hence f'_i is a function from the set of marches on $V(G_1)$ to the well-quasi-order set, denoted by Q' , obtained from Q by Higman's Lemma. Since the domain of each f'_i is finite, there exist $1 \leq j < j'$ such that $f'_j(\sigma) \leq_{Q'} f'_{j'}(\sigma)$ for all marches σ with $V(\sigma) \subseteq V(G_1)$. So there exists an injection $\iota : \Gamma_j \rightarrow \Gamma_{j'}$ such that $\iota(\gamma)$ is the same march as γ , and $f_j(\gamma) \leq_Q f_{j'}(\iota(\gamma))$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma_j$. Define η to be the identity homeomorphic embedding from (G_j, γ_j) to $(G_{j'}, \gamma_{j'})$. Then $(G_{j'}, \gamma_{j'}, \Gamma_{j'}, f_{j'}, \phi_{j'})$ simulates $(G_j, \gamma_j, \Gamma_j, f_j, \phi_j)$ witnessed by η, ι . ■

Let (T, \mathcal{X}, α) be a rooted tree-decomposition of an assemblage (G, γ_0, Γ) . Denote \mathcal{X} by $(X_t : t \in V(T))$. Let N be a positive integer. We say that (T, \mathcal{X}, α) is *N -unimpeded* if the following holds. If $s_1, t_1, s_2, t_2, \dots, s_{N+1}, t_{N+1}$ are (not necessarily distinct) nodes of T appearing in a directed path in T in the order listed such that

- $s_1 t_1, s_2 t_2, \dots, s_{N+1} t_{N+1}$ are edges of T ,
- $X_{s_1} \cap X_{t_1}, X_{s_2} \cap X_{t_2}, \dots, X_{s_{N+1}} \cap X_{t_{N+1}}$ are pairwise distinct sets with the same size, and
- $|X_x \cap X_y| \geq |X_{s_1} \cap X_{t_1}|$ for all edges xy of T in which s_1, t_{N+1} belong to different components of $T - xy$, then there exist $|X_{s_1} \cap X_{t_1}|$ disjoint paths in G from $X_{s_1} \cap X_{t_1}$ to $X_{s_2} \cap X_{t_2}$.

Let (T, \mathcal{X}, α) be a rooted tree-decomposition of an assemblage (G, γ_0, Γ) . Denote \mathcal{X} by $(X_t : t \in V(T))$. The *node-realizer* of (T, \mathcal{X}, α) is the rooted tree-decomposition $(T', \mathcal{X}', \alpha)$ obtained from (T, \mathcal{X}, α) by subdividing each edge xy of T once, defining the bag of the corresponding new node to be $X_x \cap X_y$, and adding a new vertex, which is the root of T' , adjacent to the root of T and defining its bag to be $V(\gamma_0)$. Denote \mathcal{X}' by $(X'_t : t \in V(T'))$. For each edge e of T , e is a node of T' , and we let t_e be the head of e in T , and let γ_{t_e} be the march mentioned in the definition of the (f, ϕ) -branch of (T, \mathcal{X}, α) at t_e (with respect to arbitrary ordering of X'_e). Note that the definition of γ_{t_e} is independent with f and ϕ . For each edge e of T and each $Z \subseteq V(G)$, we say that the node e of T' corresponds to a Γ -pseudo-edge-cut modulo Z if every vertex v in $V(\gamma_{t_e}) - Z$ is associated with essential number 0 or 1 in γ_{t_e} . The Γ -elevation of the node-realizer $(T', \mathcal{X}', \alpha)$ is the elevation of (T', \mathcal{X}') but pseudo-edge-cuts in the definition for elevation, (Z, s) -strips and (Z, s) -depth are replaced by Γ -pseudo-edge-cuts.

Let \mathcal{F} be a family of assemblages. We say that a *rooted tree-decomposition* (T, \mathcal{X}, α) of an assemblage is over \mathcal{F} if for every $t \in V(T)$ and for every ordering π of vertices in the bags, the underlying assemblage of the encoding of (T, \mathcal{X}, α) at t (with respect to π) belongs to \mathcal{F} .

The *adhesion* of a rooted tree-decomposition (T, \mathcal{X}, α) of an assemblage is the adhesion of (T, \mathcal{X}) .

Theorem 7.2. *Let \mathcal{F} be a well-behaved family of assemblages. Let h, d, N be positive integers. Let $\mathcal{F}_{h,d,N}$ be the family of all assemblages (G, γ_0, Γ) where each has an N -unimpeded rooted tree-decomposition over \mathcal{F} of adhesion at most h and whose node-realizer has Γ -elevation at most d . Then $\mathcal{F}_{h,d,N}$ is well-behaved.*

Proof. Let Q be a well-quasi-order. For each positive integer i , let $(G_i, \gamma_i, \Gamma_i) \in \mathcal{F}_{h,d,N}$, $(G_i, \gamma_i, \Gamma_i, f_i, \phi_i)$ be a Q -assemblage, and $(T^i, \mathcal{X}^i, \alpha^i)$ be an N -unimpeded rooted tree-decomposition of $(G_i, \gamma_i, \Gamma_i)$ over \mathcal{F} of adhesion at most h and whose node-realizer, denoted by $(R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i, \alpha^i)$, has elevation at most d , and let \overline{G}_i be the rooted extension of (G_i, γ_i) . We shall prove that there exist $i' > i \geq 1$ such that $(G_{i'}, \gamma_{i'}, \Gamma_{i'}, f_{i'}, \phi_{i'})$ simulates $(G_i, \gamma_i, \Gamma_i, f_i, \phi_i)$.

For each $i \geq 1$, denote \mathcal{X}^i by $(X_t^i : t \in V(T^i))$ and denote \mathcal{Y}^i by $(Y_t^i : t \in V(R^i))$.

Since $(T^i, \mathcal{X}^i, \alpha^i)$ is N -unimpeded, (R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i) is weakly N -linked. We call a node t of R^i a *chopper* in (R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i) if either t has no precursor, or there do not exist $|Y_t^i|$ disjoint paths in G from $Y_{t'}^i$ to Y_t^i , where t' is the precursor of t closest to t .

We define the *level* of each node t of R^i , denote by $\mu_i(t)$, recursively according to the breadth-first-search order of R^i as follows.

- If t has no precursor, then define $\mu_i(t) = 0$.
- If t has a precursor, then let t' be the precursor of t closest to t , and define the level of t as follows.
 - If t is a chopper, then define $\mu_i(t) = \mu_i(t') + 1$.
 - If t is not a chopper, then some precursor of t is a chopper, and let t'' be such a chopper closest to t and define
 - * $\mu_i(t) = \mu_i(t')$, if $Y_t^i \cap Y_{t''}^i = Y_{t'}^i \cap Y_{t''}^i$, and for every vertex $v \in Y_t^i \cap Y_{t''}^i$,

- if there exists $\sigma \in \Gamma_i$ with $v \in V(\sigma)$ such that $\alpha^i(\sigma)$ is a non-descendant of t , then there exists $\sigma' \in \Gamma_i$ with $v \in V(\sigma')$ such that $\alpha^i(\sigma')$ is a non-descendant of t' , and
- the number of edges incident with v whose other ends are in $V(\overline{G_i}) - (R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i) \uparrow t$ and the number of edges incident with v whose other ends are in $V(\overline{G_i}) - (R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i) \uparrow t'$ are either both at least two or both equal to a number j with $j \in \{0, 1\}$;
- * $\mu_i(t) = \mu_i(t') + 1$, otherwise.

Let $N' = (3^h(h+1)^2 + 2)(N+1)$.

Claim 1: The level of every node is at most N' .

Proof of Claim 1: Suppose to the contrary that some node of R^i has level at least $N'+1$. So there exist nodes $t_0, t_1, \dots, t_{N'}, t_{N'+1}$ of R^i such that $\mu_i(t_0) = 0$, t_j is a precursor of t_{j+1} with $\mu_i(t_{j+1}) = \mu_i(t_j) + 1$, and $\mu_i(t) = \mu_i(t_j)$ for every precursor t of t_{j+1} contained in the path between t_j and t_{j+1} for every $0 \leq j \leq N'$.

Suppose that there exist $0 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_{N+1} \leq N'+1$ such that t_{j_ℓ} is a chopper for each $1 \leq \ell \leq N+1$. So for each $1 \leq \ell \leq N$, there exist no $|Y_{j_1}^i|$ disjoint paths in G from $Y_{j_\ell}^i$ to $Y_{j_{\ell+1}}^i$. In particular, $Y_{j_1}^i, \dots, Y_{j_{N+1}}^i$ are pairwise distinct sets with the same size. Since (R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i) is weakly N -linked, there exist $|Y_{j_1}^i|$ disjoint paths in G from $Y_{j_1}^i$ to $Y_{j_2}^i$, a contradiction.

Hence at most N nodes in $\{t_j : 0 \leq j \leq N'+1\}$ are choppers. Let $c = 3^h(h+1)^2$. Since $N' \geq (c+1)(N+1) + N$, there exists a with $1 \leq a \leq N'+1 - c$ such that $t_a, t_{a+1}, \dots, t_{a+c}$ are not choppers. Let t'' be the chopper that is the precursor of t_a closest to t_a . Since $\mu_i(t_j) = \mu_i(t)$ for each j and for each precursor t of t_{j+1} contained in the path between t_j and t_{j+1} , there exist $|Y_{t_1}^i|$ disjoint paths in G from $Y_{t_a}^i$ to $Y_{t_{a+c}}^i$. So t'' is the chopper that is the precursor of t_{a+j} closest to t_{a+j} for each $1 \leq j \leq c$. Since (R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i) is a tree-decomposition of adhesion at most h , there are at most $h+1$ different possibilities for $Y_{t_{a+j}}^i \cap Y_{t''}^i$ for $0 \leq j \leq c$. And for each $v \in Y_{t''}^i$ and $0 \leq j \leq c$, either $v \notin Y_{t_{a+j}}^i$, or $v \in Y_{t_{a+j}}^i \cap Y_{t''}^i$ and v is incident with at least two edges whose other ends are in $V(\overline{G_i}) - (R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i) \uparrow t_{a+j}$, or $v \in Y_{t_{a+j}}^i \cap Y_{t''}^i$ and v is incident with exactly ℓ edge whose other end is in $V(\overline{G_i}) - (R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i) \uparrow t_{a+j}$ for some $\ell \in \{0, 1\}$. Since $c+1 > 3^h(h+1)^2$, there exist $a \leq q_1 < q_2 < \dots < q_{h+2} \leq a+c$ such that for every $1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq h+2$, $Y_{t_{q_{j_1}}}^i \cap Y_{t''}^i = Y_{t_{q_{j_2}}}^i \cap Y_{t''}^i$ and for every vertex $v \in Y_{t_{q_{j_1}}}^i \cap Y_{t''}^i$, the number of edges incident with v whose other ends are in $V(\overline{G_i}) - (R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i) \uparrow t_{q_{j_1}}$ and the number of edges incident with v whose other ends are in $V(\overline{G_i}) - (R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i) \uparrow t_{q_{j_2}}$ are either both at least two, or both equal to some number ℓ with $\ell \in \{0, 1\}$.

By the definition of μ_i , for every $1 \leq \ell \leq h+1$, since $\mu_i(t_{q_\ell}) < \mu_i(t_{q_{\ell+1}})$, there exist $v_\ell \in Y_{t_{q_1}}^i \cap Y_{t''}^i$ and $\sigma_\ell \in \Gamma_i$ such that $v_\ell \in V(\sigma_\ell)$ and $\alpha^i(\sigma_\ell)$ is a non-descendant of $t_{q_{\ell+1}}$ but there exists no $\sigma' \in \Gamma_i$ with $v \in V(\sigma')$ such that $\alpha^i(\sigma')$ is a non-descendant of t_{q_ℓ} . Note that v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{h+1} are distinct vertices in $Y_{t_{q_1}}^i \cap Y_{t''}^i$ which has size at most h , a contradiction. \square

Since (R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i) is a node-realizer, if a node t of some R^i has a precursor, then Y_t^i is a subset of the bag of its parent. For each node t of R^i , we define π'_t to be an ordering of the vertices in Y_t^i such that the following hold.

- If t is the root of R^i , then π'_t is the ordering same as γ_i .

- If t is a chopper in (R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i) but not the root of R^i , then π'_t is an arbitrary ordering.
- If t is not a chopper in (R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i) , then there exist $|Y_t^i|$ disjoint paths $P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{|Y_t^i|}$ in G_i from Y_t^i to $Y_{t'}^i$, where t' is the precursor of t closest to t , such that the ends of P_j are the j -th vertices in Y_t^i and $Y_{t'}^i$ with respect to π'_t and $\pi'_{t'}$, respectively, for each j with $1 \leq j \leq |Y_t^i|$.

Then for each non-root node t of T^i with parent p , we define $\pi_t = \pi'_{pt}$, where pt is the node of R^i obtained by subdividing the edge pt of T^i , and we define γ_t to be the march as the march γ_t in the definition of the (f_i, ϕ_i) -branch of $(T^i, \mathcal{X}^i, \alpha^i)$ at t with respect to π_t .

For each $i \geq 1$, define ψ_i, τ_i to be the functions from $E(T^i)$ to $[V(G_i)]^{\leq h}$ such that for all edges pt of T^i , where t is a child of p , the following hold.

- $\psi_i(pt) = X_p^i \cap X_t^i$.
- If t is a chopper in (R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i) , then $\tau_i(pt) = \psi_i(pt)$; otherwise, $\tau_i(pt)$ is defined to be the set of all vertices $v \in V(\gamma_t)$ associated with essential number 2 in γ_t .

Note that when t is not a chopper, $\tau_i(pt)$ consists of the vertices v in $V(\gamma_t) = \psi_i(pt)$ such that either v is incident with at least two edges whose other ends are in $V(\overline{G_i}) - (R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i) \uparrow pt$, or $v \in V(\sigma)$ for some $\sigma \in \Gamma_i$ in which $\alpha^i(\sigma)$ is a non-descendant of t in R^i . Note that μ_i is defined on the nodes of R^i , so its domain contains $E(T^i)$.

Claim 2: For each $i \geq 1$, if a node v of T^i precedes another node w of T^i with respect to (ψ_i, τ_i, μ_i) , then the following hold.

- There exist $|V(\gamma_v)|$ disjoint paths $P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{|V(\gamma_v)|}$ in G_i from X_v^i to X_w^i such that for each ℓ with $1 \leq \ell \leq |V(\gamma_v)|$, the ends of P_ℓ are the ℓ -th vertices in γ_v and γ_w .
- Let e_v, e_w be the edges of T^i with heads v, w , respectively. For every j with $1 \leq j \leq |V(\gamma_v)|$, either
 - the j -th entry of γ_v is associated with essential number 2 in γ_v and the j -th entry of γ_w is associated with essential number 2 in γ_w , or
 - there exists $\ell \in \{0, 1\}$ such that the j -th entry of γ_v is associated with essential number ℓ in γ_v , the j -th entry of γ_w is associated with essential number ℓ in γ_w , and $\ell_v = \ell_w = \ell$, where ℓ_v is the number of edges incident with the j -th entry of γ_v whose other ends are in $V(\overline{G_i}) - (R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i) \uparrow e_v$, and ℓ_w is the number of edges incident with the j -th entry of γ_w whose other ends are in $V(\overline{G_i}) - (R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i) \uparrow e_w$.

Proof of Claim 2: Let e_v, e_w be the edges of T^i with heads v, w , respectively. Since v precedes w with respect to (ψ_i, τ_i, μ_i) , $|\psi_i(e)| \geq |\psi_i(e_v)| = |\psi_i(e_w)| = |V(\gamma_v)|$ for every edge e in $vT^i w$. So e_v is a precursor of e_w in (R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i) . Let t_1, t_2, \dots, t_c , for some integer c , be the nodes in $e_v R^i e_w$ with $|Y_{t_j}^i| = |\psi_i(e_v)|$ for every j with $1 \leq j \leq c$ such that they appear in $e_v R^i e_w$ in the order listed. So $t_1 = e_v$, $t_c = e_w$, and for each j with $1 \leq j \leq c - 1$, t_j is the closest precursor of t_{j+1} . Hence $\mu_i(t_1) \leq \mu_i(t_2) \leq \dots \leq \mu_i(t_c)$ by the definition of μ_i . Since v precedes w , $\mu_i(t_1) = \mu_i(e_v) = \mu_i(e_w) = \mu_i(t_c)$, so $\mu_i(t_j) = \mu_i(t_1)$ for all j with $1 \leq j \leq c$. By the definition of the levels, for each j with $1 \leq j \leq c - 1$, there exist $|V(\gamma_v)|$ disjoint

paths $P_1^j, P_2^j, \dots, P_{|V(\gamma_v)|}^j$ in G_i from $Y_{t_j}^i$ to $Y_{t_{j+1}}^i$ such that for each ℓ with $1 \leq \ell \leq |V(\gamma_v)|$, the ends of P_ℓ^j are the ℓ -th vertices of γ_{t_j} and $\gamma_{t_{j+1}}$. By concatenating those paths, we obtain paths $P_1, \dots, P_{|V(\gamma_v)|}$ in G_i from $Y_{t_1}^i$ to $Y_{t_c}^i$ such that for each ℓ with $1 \leq \ell \leq |V(\gamma_v)|$, the ends of P_ℓ are the ℓ -th vertices in γ_v and γ_w . This proves the first statement of the claim since $Y_{t_1}^i = V(\gamma_v) \subseteq X_v^i$ and $Y_{t_c}^i = V(\gamma_w) \subseteq X_w^i$.

Now we prove Statement 2 of this claim. Suppose that x and y are the j -th vertices of γ_v and γ_w , respectively, for some j with $1 \leq j \leq |V(\gamma_v)|$, such that x and y violate Statement 2 of this claim. Let ℓ_v be the number of edges incident with x whose other ends are in $V(\overline{G_i}) - (R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i) \uparrow e_v$. Let ℓ_w be the number of edges incident with y whose other ends are in $V(\overline{G_i}) - (R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i) \uparrow e_w$.

We first suppose that $\tau_i(e_v) \neq \psi_i(e_v)$. Since v precedes w in T^i with respect to (ψ_i, τ_i, μ_i) , $\tau_i(e_v) = \tau_i(e_w)$ and $|\psi_i(e_v)| = |\psi_i(e_w)|$. So $\tau_i(e_w) \neq \psi_i(e_w)$. In particular, e_v and e_w are not choppers in (R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i) . Since e_v, e_w are not choppers in (R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i) , there exist e'_v, e'_w such that e'_v is the precursor that is the chopper of e_v closest to e_v , and e'_w is the precursor of e_w that is the chopper closest to e_w in (R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i) . Since $\mu_i(e_v) = \mu_i(e_w)$, no internal node of the path $e_v R^i e_w$ with bag size $|\psi_i(e_v)|$ is a chopper in (R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i) . So $e'_v = e'_w$. Since $\mu_i(e_v) = \mu_i(e_w)$ and e_v is a precursor of e_w , $Y_{e'_v}^i \cap Y_{e'_w}^i = Y_{e'_v}^i \cap Y_{e'_w}^i$. Since $\tau_i(e_v) = \tau_i(e_w) \subseteq \psi_i(e_v) \cap \psi_i(e_w)$, either $x \in \tau_i(e_v)$ and $y \in \tau_i(e_w)$, or $x \notin \tau_i(e_v)$ and $y \notin \tau_i(e_w)$. Since e_v, e_w are not choppers in (R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i) , if $x \in \tau_i(e_v)$ and $y \in \tau_i(e_w)$, then x is associated with essential number 2 in γ_v and y is associated with essential number 2 in γ_w , a contradiction. So $x \notin \tau_i(e_v)$ and $y \notin \tau_i(e_w)$. Hence $\ell_v \leq 1$, $\ell_w \leq 1$, x is associated with essential number ℓ_v in γ_v , and y is associated with essential number ℓ_w in γ_w . If $x \in Y_{e'_v}^i \cap Y_{e'_w}^i$, then $x = y$, and by the definition of μ_i , the $\ell_v = \ell_w = \ell$ for some $\ell \in \{0, 1\}$, a contradiction. So $x \notin Y_{e'_v}^i \cap Y_{e'_w}^i$. Since $e_v \in e'_v R^i e_w$, $y \notin Y_{e'_v}^i \cap Y_{e'_w}^i$. Since e_v, e_w are not choppers, $\ell_v \neq 0 \neq \ell_w$. So $\ell_v = \ell_w = 1$, a contradiction.

Hence $\tau_i(e_v) = \psi_i(e_v)$. Since $\tau_i(e_v) = \tau_i(e_w)$ and $|\psi_i(e_v)| = |\psi_i(e_w)|$, $\tau_i(e_w) = \psi_i(e_w)$. So $Y_{e'_v}^i = Y_{e'_w}^i$, $x = y$, and no internal node of the path $e_v R^i e_w$ with bag size $|\psi_i(e_v)|$ is a chopper. Hence the precursor e^* that is the chopper closest to e_v is the precursor that is the chopper closest to e_w . Since $\mu_i(e_v) = \mu_i(e_w)$, if $x = y \in Y_{e^*}^i \cap Y_{e^*}^i$, then by the definition of μ_i , the number of edges incident with x whose other ends are in $V(\overline{G_i}) - (R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i) \uparrow e_v$ and the number of edges incident with y whose other ends are in $V(\overline{G_i}) - (R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i) \uparrow e_w$ are either both at least two or both equal to a number ℓ with $\ell \in \{0, 1\}$, and either there exists $\sigma \in \Gamma_i$ with $x = y \in V(\sigma)$ in which $\alpha^i(\sigma)$ is a non-descendant of e_v , or there exists no $\sigma' \in \Gamma_i$ with $x = y \in V(\sigma')$ in which $\alpha^i(\sigma')$ is a non-descendant of e_w , so x and y do not violate Statement 2 of this claim, a contradiction. So $x = y \notin Y_{e^*}^i \cap Y_{e^*}^i$. In particular, $e^* \neq e_v$. So e_v is not a chopper. Since e_v and e_w are not choppers and $x = y \in \tau_i(e_v) = \tau_i(e_w)$, x is associated with essential number 2 in γ_v and y is associated with essential number 2 in γ_w , a contradiction. This proves the second statement of this claim. \square

Claim 3: For each $i \geq 1$, $(T^i, \psi_i, \tau_i, \mu_i)$ is $(h, d + 1, N')$ -decorated.

Proof of Claim 3: By Claim 1, the image of μ_i is contained in $\{0, 1, \dots, N'\}$. By the definition of a tree-decomposition, it is easy to see that if $e, e', e'' \in E(T^i)$ and they appear on a directed path in T^i in the order listed, then $\psi_i(e) \cap \psi_i(e'') \subseteq \psi_i(e')$.

Suppose that $(T^i, \psi_i, \tau_i, \mu_i)$ is not $(h, d + 1, N')$ -decorated. Then there exist a directed path P in T^i , edges e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{d+2} in P appeared in the order listed with $|\psi_i(e_1)| = |\psi_i(e_2)| = \dots = |\psi_i(e_{d+2})|$, and a set Z with $\psi_i(e_j) \cap \psi_i(e_\ell) = Z$ for all $1 \leq j < \ell \leq d + 2$ such that

for every $e \in E(P)$, $|\psi_i(e)| \geq |\psi_i(e_1)|$, and for every edge e' of $E(P)$ with $|\psi_i(e')| = |\psi_i(e_1)|$, we have $\tau_i(e') \not\subseteq Z$ and $\mu_i(e') = \mu_i(e_1)$. Note that $Z \neq \psi_i(e_1)$, for otherwise $\psi_i(e_1) = Z = \psi_i(e_1) \cap \psi_i(e_2)$, so $\psi_i(e_2) = \psi_i(e_1) = Z$ and e_2 is an edge e' of $E(P)$ with $|\psi_i(e')| = |\psi_i(e_1)|$ and $\tau_i(e_2) \subseteq \psi_i(e_2) = Z$. In addition, no node in $e_2 R^i e_{d+2} \subseteq e_1 R^i e_{d+2} - \{e_1\}$ with bag size $|\psi_i(e_1)|$ is a chopper.

So in (R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i) , e_2, e_3, \dots, e_{d+2} are nodes of R^i such that

- e_j is a precursor of e_{j+1} for every $2 \leq j \leq d+1$.
- $Z \subseteq Y_{e_j}^i$ for all j with $2 \leq j \leq d+2$.
- $Y_{e_j}^i - Z$ are pairwise disjoint nonempty sets with the same size for all $2 \leq j \leq d+2$.
- There exist $|Y_{e_1}^i|$ disjoint paths in G from $Y_{e_2}^i$ to $Y_{e_{d+2}}^i$.

Since the Γ_i -elevation of $(R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i, \alpha^i)$ is at most d , there exists a node e^* of R^i belonging to the directed path in R^i from e_2 to e_{d+2} such that $|Y_{e^*}^i| = |Y_{e_2}^i|$, and (A_{e^*}, B_{e^*}) is a Γ_i -pseudo-edge-cut modulo Z . Since (R^i, \mathcal{Y}^i) is the node-realizer of (T^i, \mathcal{X}^i) , and e_2 and e_{d+2} are edges of T^i , we may assume that e^* is an edge of T^i . So e^* is an edge in P . Hence, $|\psi_i(e^*)| = |\psi_i(e_2)|$. So $\tau_i(e^*) \not\subseteq Z$.

Hence there exists $v \in \tau_i(e^*) - Z$. Since $|Y_{e^*}^i| = |Y_{e_2}^i|$ and $e^* \in e_2 R^i e_{d+2}$, e^* is not a chopper. Since $v \in \tau_i(e^*)$, v is associated with essential number 2 in $\gamma_{t_{e^*}}$, where t_{e^*} is the head of e^* in T^i . But $v \notin Z$, contradicting that (A_{e^*}, B_{e^*}) is a Γ_i -pseudo-edge-cut modulo Z . \square

Define D to be an infinite graph such that $V(D) = \bigcup_{i \geq 1} V(T^i)$ such that for $i' > i \geq 1$, if a vertex $x \in V(T^i)$ is adjacent to a vertex $y \in V(T^{i'})$, then either

- x is the root of T^i , y is the root of $T^{i'}$, and $(G_{i'}, \gamma_{i'}, \Gamma_{i'}, f_{i'}, \phi_{i'})$ simulates $(G_i, \gamma_i, \Gamma_i, f_i, \phi_i)$, or
- x is not the root of T^i , y is not the root of $T^{i'}$, and the $(f_{i'}, \phi_{i'})$ -branch of $(T^{i'}, \mathcal{X}^{i'}, \alpha^{i'})$ at y with respect to π_y simulates the (f_i, ϕ_i) -branch of $(T^i, \mathcal{X}^i, \alpha^i)$ at x with respect to π_x .

Claim 4: If $i' > i \geq 1$, $u \in V(T^i)$ is adjacent in D to $w \in V(T^{i'})$, and $v \in V(T^{i'})$ precedes w in $T^{i'}$ with respect to $(\psi_{i'}, \tau_{i'}, \mu_{i'})$, then u is adjacent in D to v .

Proof of Claim 4: We may assume $v \neq w$, for otherwise we are done. Since v precedes w , we have that v and w are not the root of $T^{i'}$. Since u is adjacent to w , u is not the root of T^i . Since the simulation relation for Q -assemblages is transitive, it suffices to prove that the $(f_{i'}, \phi_{i'})$ -branch of $(T^{i'}, \mathcal{X}^{i'}, \alpha^{i'})$ at v with respect to π_v simulates the $(f_{i'}, \phi_{i'})$ -branch of $(T^{i'}, \mathcal{X}^{i'}, \alpha^{i'})$ at w with respect to π_w .

Since v precedes w , by Claim 2, there exist $|V(\gamma_v)|$ disjoint paths $P_1, \dots, P_{|V(\gamma_v)|}$ in $G_{i'}[\uparrow v]$ from $V(\gamma_v)$ to $V(\gamma_w)$ such that for each j , the ends of P_j are the j -th entries of γ_v and γ_w . Let e_v, e_w be the edges of $T^{i'}$ with heads v, w , respectively. So e_w is not a chopper. Hence $\tau_{i'}(e_w)$ is the set of vertices in γ_w associated with essential number 2 in γ_w . Since $\tau_{i'}(e_v) = \tau_{i'}(e_w)$, $\tau_{i'}(e_v) = \tau_{i'}(e_w) \subseteq \psi_{i'}(e_v) \cap \psi_{i'}(e_w) \subseteq V(\gamma_v) \cap V(\gamma_w)$. In particular, every vertex in γ_w associated with essential number 2 is contained in $V(\gamma_w) \cap V(\gamma_v)$. Note that by Claim 2,

for each j , there exists $\ell_j \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ such that the vertex in $V(P_j) \cap V(\gamma_v)$ is associated with essential number ℓ_j in γ_v , and the vertex in $V(P_j) \cap V(\gamma_w)$ is associated with essential number ℓ_j in γ_w .

Let H_v, H_w be the rooted extensions of $(G_{v'}[\uparrow v], \gamma_v), (G_{v'}[\uparrow w], \gamma_w)$, respectively. Define $\pi_V : V(H_w) \rightarrow V(H_v)$ such that $\pi_V|_{\uparrow w}$ is the identity map and π_V maps the j -th entry in the indicator of H_w to the j -th entry in the indicator of H_v for each j . Define π_E to be the function with domain $E(H_w)$ such that for every $e \in E(H_w)$,

- if $e \in G_{v'}[\uparrow w]$ or e is incident with an entry in the indicator which is adjacent to a vertex associated with essential number 2 in γ_w , then $\pi_E(e) = e$;
- otherwise, e is an edge incident with an entry in the indicator of H_w with degree one, say the j -th entry, then we define $\pi_E(e)$ to be the path obtained by concatenating P_j with the edge incident with the j -th entry in the indicator of H_v .

It is clear that (π_V, π_E) is a homeomorphic embedding from (G_w, γ_w) to (G_v, γ_v) , since every vertex in γ_w associated with essential number 2 is contained in $V(\gamma_w) \cap V(\gamma_v)$, and for each j , there exists $\ell_j \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ such that the vertex in $V(P_j) \cap V(\gamma_v)$ is associated with essential number ℓ_j in γ_v , and the vertex in $V(P_j) \cap V(\gamma_w)$ is associated with essential number ℓ_j in γ_w . Define $\iota : \Gamma_w \rightarrow \Gamma_v$ to be the identity map. Then (π_V, π_E) and ι witness that the $(f_{v'}, \phi_{v'})$ -branch of $(T^{i'}, \mathcal{X}^{i'}, \alpha^{i'})$ at v simulates the one at w . \square

We may assume that the roots of T^1, T^2, \dots form a stable set in D otherwise we are done. By Claims 3, 4 and Theorem 5.7, there exists an infinite stable set S of D such that $|S \cap V(T^i)| \leq 1$ for every $i \geq 1$, and the set, denoted by C , of heads of all edges of $T^1 \cup T^2 \cup \dots$ with tails in S is rich in D . By deleting some trees, we may assume that $|S \cap V(T^i)| = 1$ for all i .

For each $i \geq 1$, let s_i be the vertex in $S \cap V(T^i)$. Let C' be the set of (f_i, ϕ_i) -branches of $(T^i, \mathcal{X}^i, \alpha^i)$ at c among all $c \in C \cap V(T^i)$ and all $i \geq 1$. Since C is rich, C' is well-quasi-ordered by the simulation relation.

For each $i \geq 1$,

- if s_i is the root of T^i , then let $B_i = (G_i, \gamma_i, \Gamma_i, f_i, \phi_i)$, and let $(T_i^*, \mathcal{X}_i^*, \alpha_i^*) = (T^i, \mathcal{X}^i, \alpha^i)$,
- otherwise, let B_i be the (f_i, ϕ_i) -branch of $(T^i, \mathcal{X}^i, \alpha^i)$ at s_i , and let $(T_i^*, \mathcal{X}_i^*, \alpha_i^*)$ be the rooted tree-decomposition of B_i by taking the subtree of T^i rooted at s_i .

By Lemma 6.2, C' is the set of (f_i, ϕ_i) -branches of $(T_i^*, \mathcal{X}_i^*, \alpha_i^*)$ at c among all $c \in C \cap V(T_i^*)$ and all $i \geq 1$.

For each $i \geq 1$, we define W_i to be the encoding of $(T_i^*, \mathcal{X}_i^*, \alpha_i^*)$ at s_i . Since each $(T^i, \mathcal{X}^i, \alpha^i)$ is over \mathcal{F} , each $(T_i^*, \mathcal{X}_i^*, \alpha_i^*)$ is over \mathcal{F} by Lemma 6.2. So the underlying assemblage of W_i is in \mathcal{F} for each $i \geq 1$. Since Q is a well-quasi-order, and C' is well-quasi-ordered by the simulation relation, there exists a well-quasi-order Q^* such that for each $i \geq 1$, W_i is a Q^* -assemblage. Since \mathcal{F} is well-behaved, there exist $i' > i \geq 1$ such that $W_{i'}$ simulates W_i . Since $s_{i'}$ is the root of $T_{i'}^*$ and s_i is the root of T_i^* , by Lemma 6.3, $B_{i'}$ simulates B_i .

Since S is infinite, either infinitely many elements of S are the roots of some trees in $\{T^1, T^2, \dots\}$, or infinitely many elements of S are not the roots of some trees in $\{T_1, T_2, \dots\}$. So by deleting some trees, we may assume that either all elements of S are the roots of

some trees in $\{T^1, T^2, \dots\}$, or all elements of S are not the roots of some trees in $\{T_1, T_2, \dots\}$. For the former, $B_{i'} = (G_{i'}, \gamma_{i'}, \Gamma_{i'}, f_{i'}, \phi_{i'})$ simulates $B_i = (G_i, \gamma_i, \Gamma_i, f_i, \phi_i)$, so we are done. For the latter, $B_{i'}$ simulates B_i , and $s_{i'}$ and s_i are not roots, so s_i is adjacent to $s_{i'}$ in D , contradicting that S is stable in D . This proves the theorem. ■

Lemma 7.3. *Let w, k, d, N be positive integers. Let \mathcal{F}^w be the set of assemblages on at most $w + 1$ vertices. If G is a graph that has an N -linked rooted tree-decomposition (T, \mathcal{X}) of width at most w and elevation at most d such that for every edge xy of T , either $X_x \subseteq X_y$ or $X_y \subseteq X_x$, then the assemblage $(G, \emptyset, \emptyset)$ has a $2N$ -unimpeded rooted tree-decomposition over \mathcal{F}^w of adhesion at most $w + 1$ and whose node-realizer has \emptyset -elevation at most d .*

Proof. Define α to be the function with empty domain. Then (T, \mathcal{X}, α) is a rooted tree-decomposition of the assemblage $(G, \emptyset, \emptyset)$. By Lemma 4.2, since (T, \mathcal{X}) is N -linked, (T, \mathcal{X}) is weakly N -linked. Since (T, \mathcal{X}) is weakly N -linked and for each edge xy of T , either $X_x \subseteq X_y$ or $X_y \subseteq X_x$, (T, \mathcal{X}, α) is a $2N$ -unimpeded rooted tree-decomposition of $(G, \emptyset, \emptyset)$, and the \emptyset -elevation of the node-realizer of (T, \mathcal{X}, α) equals the elevation of (T, \mathcal{X}) . Furthermore, the width of (T, \mathcal{X}) is at most w , so (T, \mathcal{X}, α) is over \mathcal{F}^w and has adhesion at most $w + 1$. ■

Now we are ready to prove the labelled version of Robertson's conjecture for graphs with bounded tree-width.

Proof of Theorem 1.3: Let $k, w, G_1, G_2, \dots, Q, \phi_1, \phi_2, \dots$ be the ones as in the statement of Theorem 1.3.

Let $N, f(k, w)$ be the numbers mentioned in Theorem 4.9. Let \mathcal{F}^w be the set of assemblages on at most $w + 1$ vertices. By Lemma 7.1, \mathcal{F}^w is well-behaved. Let \mathcal{F} be the set of all assemblages (G, γ, Γ) that have an $2N$ -unimpeded rooted tree-decomposition over \mathcal{F}^w of adhesion at most $w + 1$ and whose node-realizer has Γ -elevation at most $f(k, w)$. By Theorem 7.2, \mathcal{F} is well-behaved. By Theorem 4.9, every graph G of tree-width at most w not containing the Robertson chain of length k as a topological minor has an N -linked rooted tree-decomposition (T, \mathcal{X}) of width at most w and elevation at most $f(k, w)$ such that for every edge xy of T , either $X_x \subseteq X_y$ or $X_y \subseteq X_x$. By Lemma 7.3, $(G, \emptyset, \emptyset)$ belongs to \mathcal{F} . Hence $(G_1, \emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset, \phi_1), (G_2, \emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset, \phi_2), \dots$ are Q -assemblages whose underlying assemblages are in \mathcal{F} . Since \mathcal{F} is well-behaved, there exist $i' > i \geq 1$ such that $(G_{i'}, \emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset, \phi_{i'})$ simulates $(G_i, \emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset, \phi_i)$. Therefore, there exists a homeomorphic embedding η from G_i to $G_{i'}$ such that $\phi_i(v) \leq_Q \phi_{i'}(\eta(v))$ for every $v \in V(G_i)$. This completes the proof. □

References

- [1] P. Bellenbaum and R. Diestel, *Two short proofs concerning tree-decompositions*, *Combin. Probab. Comput.* (2002), 541–547.
- [2] G. Ding, *Excluding a long double path minor*, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 66 (1996), 11–23.
- [3] G. Ding, *Subgraphs and well-quasi-ordering*, *J. Graph Theory* 16 (1992), 489–502.

- [4] P. Erdős and L. Pósa, *On independent circuits contained in a graph*, *Canad. J. Math.* 17 (1965), 347–352.
- [5] J. H. Gallier, *What’s so special about Kruskal’s theorem and the ordinal Γ_0 ? A survey of some results in proof theory*, *Ann. Pure Appl. Log.* 53 (1991), 199–260.
- [6] G. Higman, *Ordering by divisibility in abstract algebras*, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* 2 (1952), 326–336.
- [7] D. E. Knuth and P. B. Bendix, *Simple word problems in universal algebras*, in: J. Leech, ed., *Computational Problems in Abstract Algebra*, Pergamon Press, New York (1970).
- [8] J. B. Kruskal, *Well-quasi-ordering, the tree theorem, and Vászonyi’s conjecture*, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 95 (1960), 210–225.
- [9] C.-H. Liu, *Graph structures and well-quasi-ordering*, PhD dissertation, Georgia Institute of Technology, 2014.
- [10] C.-H. Liu, *Recent progress on well-quasi-ordering graphs*, in: P. M. Schuster, M. Seisenberger and A. Weiermann (eds), *Well-Quasi Orders in Computation, Logic, Language and Reasoning. Trends in Logic (Studia Logica Library) 53* (2020), Springer, Cham.
- [11] W. Mader, *Wohlquasi-geordnete Klassen endlicher Graphen*, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. B* 12 (1972), 105–122.
- [12] C. St. J. A. Nash-Williams, *On well-quasi-ordering finite trees*, *Proc. Camb. Philos. Soc.* 59 (1963), 833–835.
- [13] C. St. J. A. Nash-Williams, *On well-quasi-ordering trees*, *Theory of Graphs and Its Applications (Proc. Symp. Smolenice, 1963)*, *Publ. House Czechoslovak Acad. Sci.* (1964), 83–84.
- [14] N. Robertson and P. D. Seymour, *Graph minors. IV. Tree-width and well-quasi-ordering*, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. B* 48 (1990), 227–254.
- [15] N. Robertson and P. D. Seymour, *Graph minors. V. Excluding a planar graph*, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. B* 41 (1986), 92–114.
- [16] N. Robertson and P. D. Seymour, *Graph minors. XX. Wagner’s conjecture*, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. B* 92 (2004), 325–357.
- [17] N. Robertson, P. D. Seymour, *Graph minors. XXIII. The Nash-Williams immersion conjecture*, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. B* 100 (2010), 181–205.
- [18] S. V. Sam and A. Snowden, *Gröbner methods for representations of combinatorial categories*, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 30 (2017), 159–203.
- [19] S. Tarkowski, *On the comparability of dendrites*, *Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. Ser. Sci. Math. Astronom. Phys.* 8 (1960), 39–41.

- [20] K. Wagner, *Graphentheorie*, B. J. Hochschultaschenbuecher 248/248a, Mannheim (1970), 61.