

# The excluded minors for embeddability into a compact surface

Agelos Georgakopoulos\*

Mathematics Institute, University of Warwick  
CV4 7AL, UK

January 27, 2023

## Abstract

We determine the excluded minors characterising the class of countable graphs that embed into some compact surface.

**Keywords:** excluded minor, graphs in surfaces, outerplanar, star-comb lemma.

**MSC 2020 Classification:** 05C63, 05C83, 05C10, 05C75.

## 1 Introduction

The main aim of this paper is to provide the excluded minors characterising the class of countable graphs that embed into a compact surface, whereby we put no restriction on the genus. We will prove

**Theorem 1.1.** *A countable graph  $G$  embeds into a compact (orientable) surface if and only if it does not have one of the 8 graphs of Figure 1 as a minor.*<sup>1</sup>

It is an exercise to show that none of these graphs is a minor of another. Since none of these graphs embeds into a closed surface, orientable or not, our theorem remains valid if we remove the word ‘orientable’.

\*Supported by EPSRC grants EP/V048821/1 and EP/V009044/1.

<sup>1</sup>Every non-trivial infinite graph has many ‘minor-twins’; for example, for each pair  $x, y$  of vertices of infinite degree in  $\Sigma_i, i \geq 5$ , we could add or remove the  $x$ - $y$  edge.




Figure 1: The excluded minors of  $\Sigma$  as provided by Theorem 1.1.

$\Sigma_1$  (respectively  $\Sigma_2$ ): the disjoint union of infinitely many copies of  $K_5$  (resp.  $K_{3,3}$ );

$\Sigma_3$  (resp.  $\Sigma_4$ ): the graph arising from  $\Sigma_1$  (resp.  $\Sigma_2$ ) by picking one vertex from each component and identifying them;

$\Sigma_5$  (resp.  $\Sigma_6$ ): the graph arising from  $\Sigma_1$  (resp.  $\Sigma_2$ ) by picking one edge from each component and identifying them;

$\Sigma_7$ : the graph arising from  $\Sigma_2$  by picking one pair of non-adjacent vertices from each component and identifying them; and  $\Sigma_8 = K_{3,\omega}$ .

An analogous statement for embeddings into a fixed surface that several authors attribute to private communication with Robertson & Seymour [3, 6, 11], and seems to rely on difficult machinery from the Graph Minor Theorem, states the following. For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there is  $g$ , such that for every graph  $G$  of Euler genus at least  $g$ , there is some  $\Sigma_i$  as in Figure 1, such that any subgraph of size  $n$  of  $\Sigma_i$  is a minor of  $G$ . I do not see a way to deduce this from Theorem 1.1 or vice-versa. An important difference between these two results is that if we restrict to the orientable case, then we need to allow the  $n \times n$  projective grid as a further obstruction to embeddability into a fixed surface, but Theorem 1.1 proves that we have the same excluded minors with or without the orientability restriction when allowing arbitrarily high genus.

All graphs in this paper are countable. Part of our motivation comes from a well-known conjecture of Thomas [24] postulating that the countable graphs are well-quasi-ordered under the minor relation. The analogous statement for finite graphs is the celebrated Graph Minor Theorem of Robertson & Seymour [23]. A positive answer to Thomas's conjecture would imply that every minor-closed class  $\mathcal{C}$  of countable graphs is characterised by forbidding a finite list  $\text{Ex}(\mathcal{C})$  of *excluded minors*. This is in general hard to show even for a concrete class of graphs like the class  $\Sigma$  of Theorem 1.1; indeed, it is a-priori not even clear that  $\text{Ex}(\Sigma)$  is finite. Apart from the fact that  $\Sigma$  is a natural class to consider, another

reason why the finiteness of  $\text{Ex}(\Sigma)$  is a pressing question if one is interested in Thomas's conjecture is the important role played by classes of finite graphs embeddable in a fixed surface in the proof of the Graph Minor Theorem.

Many natural minor-closed graph classes  $\mathcal{C}$ , e.g. the graphs embeddable into a fixed surface, have the property that a graph is in  $\mathcal{C}$  as soon as every finite subgraph is. This has the consequence that  $\text{Ex}(\mathcal{C})$  coincides with the list of excluded minors of the subclass of  $\mathcal{C}$  comprising its finite elements. Apart from such classes, there are very few classes  $\mathcal{C}$  of infinite graphs for which  $\text{Ex}(\mathcal{C})$  is explicitly known. The only example I am aware of are the graphs with accumulation-free embeddings in the plane [16].

We remark that the class  $\Sigma$  was studied by Mohar [18] from the perspective of cellular embedding.

Additional motivation for Theorem 1.1 comes from a question raised by Christian, Richter & Salazar [6], asking for a characterisation of the Peano continua that embed into a closed surface analogous to Claytor's [7] characterisation of the Peano continua embeddable into  $\mathbb{S}^2$ . The special case of graph-like continua was handled in [6], and the characterisation obtained is similar to Theorem 1.1. But the lack of compactness does not allow using that characterisation to deduce Theorem 1.1. Using Theorem 1.1 and the star-comb lemma (Lemma 2.1 below) it is not difficult to determine the excluded *topological* minors for  $\Sigma$ , and this could be a first step towards answering the aforementioned question of Christian et al. [6].

Our proof of Theorem 1.1 is elementary, relying only on Kuratowski's theorem and the star-comb lemma. It is carried out mostly in Sections 4 and 5. We will develop techniques that allow us to find the excluded minors of families of infinite graphs that satisfy a property up to finitely many flaws: we will characterize the graphs that become forests after deleting, or contracting, finitely many edges (Propositions 3.3 and 6.1), as well as the graphs that are outerplanar up to deleting finitely many edges (Proposition 4.4).

The star-comb lemma is one of the most useful tools in infinite graph theory. In Section 7 we obtain the following strengthening for 2-connected graphs:

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $G$  be a countable, 2-connected, graph, and  $U \subseteq V(G)$  infinite. Then  $G$  contains a subdivision of an infinite ladder, or of an infinite fan, or of  $K_{2,\infty}$ , having infinitely many vertices in  $U$ .*

If  $G$  is locally finite, then this results in a ray in  $G$  containing an infinite subset of  $U$ .

The aforementioned conjecture of Thomas was studied by Robertson, Seymour & Thomas [20, 21], and they concluded that *there is not much chance of proving* it, as it would have implications about the ordering of finite graphs. It is therefore natural to try to extend the Graph Minor Theorem to an intermediate level covering all finite graphs but not necessarily all countable ones. A concrete approach for doing so is offered by Conjecture 8.2 and other questions in Section 8 arising from our results and methods.

## 2 Preliminaries

We follow the terminology of Diestel [8]. We use  $V(G)$  to denote the set of vertices, and  $E(G)$  the set of edges of a graph  $G$ . For  $S \subseteq V(G)$ , the subgraph  $G[S]$  of  $G$  induced by  $S$  has vertex set  $S$  and contains all edges of  $G$  with both end-vertices in  $S$ .

The *degree*  $d(v) = d_G(v)$  of a vertex  $v$  in a graph  $G$ , is the number of edges of  $G$  incident with  $v$ .

A *ray* is a one-way infinite path. We say that  $G$  is *locally finite*, if no vertex of  $G$  lies in infinitely many edges.

Let  $G, H$  be graphs. An  $H$  *minor* of  $G$  is a collection of disjoint connected subgraphs  $B_v, v \in V(H)$  of  $G$ , called *branch sets*, and edges  $E_{uv}, uv \in E(H)$  of  $G$  such that each  $E_{uv}$  has one end-vertex in  $B_u$  and one in  $B_v$ . We write  $H < G$  to express that  $G$  has an  $H$  minor.

Given a set  $X$  of graphs, we write  $\text{Forb}(X)$  for the class of graphs  $H$  such that no element of  $X$  is a minor of  $H$ .

A *subdivision* of a graph  $G$  is a graph obtained by replacing some of the edges of  $G$  by paths with the same end-vertices.

A *surface* is a 2-manifold without boundary. An *embedding* of a countable graph  $G$  into a surface  $S$  is a map  $f : G \rightarrow S$  from the 1-complex obtained from  $G$  when identifying each edge with the interval  $[0, 1]$  to  $S$  such that the restriction of  $f$  to each finite subgraph of  $G$  is an embedding in the topological sense, i.e. a homeomorphism onto its image. (The reason why we restrict to finite subgraphs here is that the 1-complex topology of  $G$  is not metrizable when  $G$  is not locally finite, and so such  $G$  cannot have an embedding into a metrizable space  $S$ . For example, a star with infinitely many leaves admits an embedding into  $\mathbb{S}^2$  in our sense but it does not admit a topological embedding.)

We let  $\Sigma$  denote the class of countable graphs that embed into a compact orientable surface.

We let  $\omega$  denote the smallest infinite ordinal.

### 2.1 The star-comb lemma

Given a graph  $G$ , and an infinite set  $U \subseteq V(G)$ , we define a  $U$ -*star* to be a subdivision of the infinite star  $K_{1,\omega}$  in  $G$  all leaves of which lie in  $U$ . We define a  $U$ -*comb* to be the union of a ray  $R$  of  $G$  with infinitely many pairwise disjoint, possibly trivial,  $U$ - $R$  paths. We call  $R$  the *spine* of  $C$ , and the  $U$ - $R$  paths its *teeth*.

**Lemma 2.1** (Star-comb lemma [8, Lemma 8.2.2]). *Let  $U$  be an infinite set of vertices in a connected graph  $G$ . Then  $G$  contains either a  $U$ -star or a  $U$ -comb.*

### 3 A warm-up: almost forests

Given a minor-closed family  $\mathcal{C}$  of infinite graphs, one can define classes of graphs that are *almost* in  $\mathcal{C}$  in the following sense.

**Definition 3.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}_\vee$  (respectively,  $\mathcal{C}_\text{E}$ ) denote the class of graphs  $G$ , such that by removing finitely many vertices (resp. edges) from  $G$  we obtain a graph belonging to  $\mathcal{C}$ . Similarly, we let  $\mathcal{C}_{/\text{E}}$  denote the graphs that belong to  $\mathcal{C}$  after contracting finitely many edges.*

*It is easy to see that  $(\mathcal{C}_\text{E})_{/\text{E}} = (\mathcal{C}_{/\text{E}})_\text{E}$  for every  $\mathcal{C}$ , and we will simply write  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{E}/\text{E}}$  instead.*

The following examples show that neither of  $\mathcal{C}_{/\text{E}}, \mathcal{C}_\text{E}$  is contained in the other in general.

Example 1: Let  $M$  denote the graph consisting of a ray emanating from the centre of an infinite star  $K_{1,\omega}$  (we could call  $M$  the infinite mop), and let  $\mathcal{C} := \text{Forb}(M)$ . Then  $\mathcal{C}_{/\text{E}} = \mathcal{C} \subsetneq \mathcal{C}_\text{E}$ , because  $\mathcal{C}_\text{E}$  contains  $M$  while  $\mathcal{C}$  does not.

Example 2: Easily,  $\Sigma = \Sigma_\text{E}$ . But  $\Sigma \subsetneq \Sigma_{/\text{E}}$ , because  $K_{3,\omega} \in \Sigma_{/\text{E}}$ .

The aim of this section (completed in Section 6) is to provide the excluded minors of the classes of almost forests, i.e. the classes of Definition 3.1 when  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{F}$  is the class of countable forests. At the same time, this section provides a gentle introduction to the techniques we will use to prove our main result (Theorem 1.1) later.

**Definition 3.2.** *We write  $\omega \cdot H$  for the disjoint union of countably infinitely many copies of a graph  $H$ . If  $H$  is vertex-transitive, we let  $\bigvee H$  denote the graph obtained from  $\omega \cdot H$  by picking one vertex from each copy of  $H$  and identifying them (by vertex-transitivity, it does not matter which vertices we pick).*

For example,  $\bigvee K_3$  is a *bouquet of triangles*, i.e. an infinite union of triangles having exactly one vertex in common.

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  denote the class of countable forests. Then  $\mathcal{F}_\text{E} = \text{Forb}(\omega \cdot K_3, \bigvee K_3, K_{2,\omega})$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $G \notin \mathcal{F}_\text{E}$ . Then the set  $\mathcal{C}$  of cycles of  $G$  is infinite. If  $\mathcal{C}$  contains an infinite subset consisting of pairwise disjoint cycles, then we obtain a  $\omega \cdot K_3$  minor and we are done. Otherwise, we claim that there is a vertex  $v$  having infinitely many incident edges in  $\bigcup \mathcal{C}$ . In particular,  $v$  is contained in each cycle of an infinite subset  $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ . Indeed, if this fails for every  $v \in V(G)$ , then we can greedily find an infinite sequence  $(C_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of pairwise vertex-disjoint cycles, by removing, at each step  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  all the edges of all the cycles intersecting  $\bigcup_{j < n} C_j$ ; since the edges we thereby remove are finitely many, and  $G \notin \mathcal{F}_\text{E}$ , we can always find a new cycle  $C_n$  avoiding  $\bigcup_{j < n} C_j$ .

If  $v$  is the only vertex incident with infinitely many cycles in  $\mathcal{C}'$ , then by a similar greedy construction we obtain a  $\bigvee K_3$  minor in  $\bigcup \mathcal{C}'$ , with  $v$  being the vertex of infinite degree. Otherwise, let  $w \neq v$  be a vertex contained in each cycle of an infinite subset  $\mathcal{C}'' \subseteq \mathcal{C}'$ . Note that  $G' := \bigcup \mathcal{C}'' - v$  is a connected

graph, because  $C - v$  contains  $w$  for every  $C \in \mathcal{C}''$ . We apply the star-comb Lemma 2.1 to  $G'$  with  $U$  being the set of neighbours of  $v$ , to obtain a  $U$ -star or a  $U$ -comb  $X$ . If  $X$  is a  $U$ -star, then attaching  $v$  to  $X$  we obtain a subdivision of  $K_{2,\omega}$  in  $G$ . If  $X$  is a  $U$ -comb, then contracting its ray, and attaching  $v$ , we again obtain a  $K_{2,\omega}$  minor in  $G$ .

In all cases we have obtained one of  $\omega \cdot K_3, \vee K_3, K_{2,\omega}$  as a minor of  $G$ .  $\square$

The class  $\mathcal{F}_V$  is easier to characterise in terms of excluded minors: we have  $\mathcal{F}_V = \text{Forb}(\omega \cdot K_3)$ . This is a special case of the following helpful fact. Its main argument is well-known in the context of Andreae's ubiquity conjecture [1].

**Proposition 3.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{P} = \text{Forb}(H_1, \dots, H_k)$  be a minor-closed class of countable graphs, where the  $H_i$  are finite. Then  $\mathcal{P}_V = \text{Forb}(\omega \cdot H_1, \dots, \omega \cdot H_k)$ .*

*Proof.* If  $G \notin \mathcal{P}_V$ , then  $G$  has a minor  $K = K_0$  isomorphic to some  $H_i$ . We may assume that each branch set of  $K$  is finite since  $H_i$  is finite. Notice that  $G_1 := G - K$  does not belong to  $\mathcal{P}_V$  either. By repeating the argument to  $G_1$ , and continuing recursively, we obtain a sequence  $(K_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of minors of  $G$ , with pairwise disjoint branch sets, each isomorphic to some  $H_i$ . By passing to a subsequence we may assume that  $i$  is fixed. Thus we have found  $\omega \cdot H_i$  as a minor of  $G$ , establishing  $\mathcal{P}_V \supseteq \text{Forb}(\omega \cdot H_1, \dots, \omega \cdot H_k)$ .

The converse is straightforward: if  $\omega \cdot H_i < G$ , then  $G - F \notin \mathcal{P}$  for any finite  $F \subset V(G)$  as  $H_i < G - F$  holds.  $\square$

As an example application of Proposition 3.4, we deduce that  $\text{Planar}_V = \text{Forb}(\omega \cdot K_5, \omega \cdot K_{3,3})$ , where we write  $\text{Planar}$  for the class of planar graphs. Since  $\text{Planar}_V \subset \Sigma_V$ , and  $\omega \cdot K_5, \omega \cdot K_{3,3} \notin \Sigma_V$  ([2], see also the proof of Theorem 1.1) this yields

**Corollary 3.5.**  $\Sigma_V = \text{Planar}_V = \text{Forb}(\omega \cdot K_5, \omega \cdot K_{3,3})$ .

**Remark 1.** The aforementioned fact that  $\mathcal{F}_V = \text{Forb}(\omega \cdot K_3)$  can be thought of as the infinite version of the classical result of Erdős & Pósa [10] saying that every finite graph has either a  $k \cdot K_3$  minor or a set of at most  $f(k)$  vertices the removal of which results into a forest. I do not expect there to be an easy way to deduce the one from the other, as this Erdős-Pósa property fails for non-planar graphs in the finite case [22], while the infinite version holds for every finite graph by Proposition 3.4.

## 4 Relatively outerplanar graphs

By Proposition 3.4, if a graph  $G$  does not lie in  $\Sigma_V = \text{Planar}_V$  then it has one of the desired minors, and so the most challenging part of our proof of Theorem 1.1 is to handle the case where  $G$  becomes planar after removing a finite vertex set  $W$ . When  $W$  is a single vertex, the latter is tantamount to saying that  $G - W$  is outerplanar *relative to* the neighbourhood of  $W$ . The aim of this section is to characterise graphs that are outerplanar relative to a




Figure 2: The excluded marked minors for relative outerplanarity. The marked vertices are shown in grey.

vertex set  $U$  in terms of forbidden minors that are *marked* by  $U$ . The precise definitions follow.

Let  $G$  be a graph and  $U \subset V(G)$ . Define the  $U$ -cone  $C_U(G)$  of  $G$  to be the graph obtained from  $G$  by adding a new vertex  $u$ , the *cone vertex*, and joining it to each vertex in  $U$  with an edge. We say that  $G$  is  $U$ -outerplanar, if  $C_U(G)$  is planar. If  $G$  is finite, it is easy to see that  $G$  is  $U$ -outerplanar if and only if it admits an embedding into  $\mathbb{S}^2$  such that all vertices in  $U$  lie on a common face-boundary. Moreover, by letting  $U = V(G)$  we recover the standard notion of outerplanarity:  $G$  is outerplanar if and only if it is  $V(G)$ -outerplanar.

A *marked graph* is a pair consisting of a graph  $G$  and a subset  $U$  of  $V(G)$ , called the *marked vertices*. Given marked graphs  $G, H$ , an  $H$  *marked minor* of  $G$  is defined just like an  $H$  minor (see Section 2), except that for each marked vertex  $v$  of  $H$ , we require that the corresponding branch set  $B_v$  contains at least one marked vertex of  $G$ .

Our next lemma adapts the well-known fact that the finite outerplanar graphs coincide with  $\text{Forb}(K_4, K_{2,3})$ .

**Lemma 4.1.** *Suppose  $G$  is a countable planar graph, and let  $U \subset V(G)$ . Then  $G$  is  $U$ -outerplanar unless it contains one of the graphs  $\Theta_i, 1 \leq i \leq 4$  of Figure 2 as a  $U$ -marked minor.*

*Proof.* Since a graph is planar if and only if each of its finite subgraphs is [9], we may assume for simplicity that  $G$  is finite.

Let  $G' := C_U(G)$ , as defined above. If  $\Theta_i < G$  for some  $i$ , then it is easy to find a  $K_5$  or  $K_{3,3}$  minor in  $G'$ , hence  $G$  is not  $U$ -outerplanar.

For the other direction, if  $G'$  is non-planar, i.e.  $G$  is not  $U$ -outerplanar, then by Kuratowski's theorem  $G'$  contains a subdivision  $K$  of  $K_5$  or  $K_{3,3}$ . Since  $G$  is planar,  $K$  contains the cone vertex  $u$ . There are four simple cases depending on which of  $K_5, K_{3,3}$  it coincides with, and on whether  $u$  is a branch vertex or a subdivision vertex:

Case 1:  $K$  is a subdivision of  $K_5$ , and  $d_K(u) = 4$ . In this case we obtain  $\Theta_1$  as a  $U$ -marked minor of  $G$  as follows. We remove  $u$  from  $K$ , and for each of the four neighbours  $v_i \in U, 1 \leq i \leq 4$  of  $u$ , we define a branch set  $B_i$  containing the (possibly trivial) path of  $K$  joining  $v_i$  to a vertex  $x_i \neq u$




Figure 3: Turning  $K$  into a  $\Theta_1$  marked-minor in Case 1. The dashed enclosures represent the branch sets  $B_i$ , and the grey vertices represent the  $v_i$ .

with  $d_K(x_i) = 4$ . We extend the  $B_i$  so that each vertex of  $K - u$  lies in exactly one  $B_i$  (Figure 3).

Case 2:  $K$  is a subdivision of  $K_5$ , and  $d_K(u) = 2$ . Similarly to the previous case, we obtain  $\Theta_2$  as a  $U$ -marked minor of  $G$ . Indeed,  $\Theta_2$  is isomorphic to  $K_5$  with the edge joining the two marked vertices removed.

Case 3:  $K$  is a subdivision of  $K_{3,3}$ , and  $d_K(u) = 3$ . Similarly to Case 1, we obtain  $\Theta_3$  as a  $U$ -marked minor of  $G$ .

Case 4:  $K$  is a subdivision of  $K_{3,3}$ , and  $d_K(u) = 2$ . Similarly to Case 2, we obtain  $\Theta_4$  as a  $U$ -marked minor of  $G$ , whereby we use the fact that  $\Theta_4$  is isomorphic to  $K_{3,3}$  with the edge joining the two marked vertices removed.

Thus in each case we have found a  $\Theta_i$  as a marked minor in  $G$ . □

**Remark 2.** *It follows from Lemma 4.1 that  $G$  is  $U$ -outerplanar as soon as each of its finite subgraphs is.*

Let  $\text{OP}$  denote the class of countable outerplanar graphs. For a graph  $G$  and  $U \subseteq V(G)$ , we say that  $G$  is  $U\text{-OP}_E$ , if there are finite sets  $F \subset E(G), W \subset U$  such that  $G - F$  is  $(U \setminus W)$ -outerplanar.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Suppose  $G$  is a countable planar graph which is not  $U\text{-OP}_E$  for some  $U \subset V(G)$ . Then  $G$  contains one of the marked graphs  $U_i, 1 \leq i \leq 5$  of Figure 4 or one of the marked graphs  $\omega \cdot \Theta_i, 1 \leq i \leq 4$ , with  $\Theta_i$  as in Figure 2, as a  $U$ -marked minor.*

*Proof.* We claim that for some  $1 \leq i \leq 4$ , there is an infinite family  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $U$ -marked  $\Theta_i$  minors of  $G$ , and the elements of  $\mathcal{C}$  are pairwise edge-disjoint, and






Figure 4: Some of the excluded marked minors of  $U\text{-OP}_E$ . The grey vertices represent the marked ones.

no vertex in  $U$  lies in the intersection of two of them. Indeed, such a family  $C_i, i \in \mathbb{N}$  can be constructed inductively by applying Lemma 4.1 to  $G$  (for  $i = 0$ ), or to the graph obtained from  $G$  after deleting the edges of  $\bigcup_{j < i} \Theta_j$  and removing the vertices of  $\bigcup_{j < i} \Theta_j$  from  $U$  (for  $i > 0$ ). Here, we used the fact that all these graphs are planar, being subgraphs of  $G$ , but not in  $U\text{-OP}_E$  since the latter is by definition stable under such finite modifications. We distinguish the following cases:

Case A: *No vertex of  $G$  lies in infinitely many elements of  $\mathcal{C}$ .*

In this case we can greedily find an infinite sub-set  $\mathcal{C}'$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  with pairwise vertex-disjoint elements similarly with Proposition 3.4. Then infinitely many elements of  $\mathcal{C}'$  must coincide with one of the four  $\Theta_i$ 's, and so we obtain  $\omega \cdot \Theta_i$  as a  $U$ -marked minor of  $G$  for some  $1 \leq i \leq 4$ .

Case B: *There is an infinite  $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  with  $|V(\bigcap \mathcal{C}')| \geq 2$ .*

In this case let  $y, z$  be distinct vertices in  $\bigcap \mathcal{C}'$ , and for each  $C \in \mathcal{C}'$ , pick a  $y$ - $z$  path  $P_C$  in  $C$  containing a vertex  $v_C \in U$ . Recall that the  $v_C$  are pairwise distinct by our choice of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then  $\bigcup_{C \in \mathcal{C}'} P_C$  has  $U_5 \cong K_{2,\omega}$  as a  $U$ -marked minor, with the infinite partition class consisting of the  $v_C$ ; the other two desired branch sets are obtained by uniting the subpaths of the  $P_C$  between  $y$  (respectively,  $z$ ) and  $v_C$ .

Case C: *There is an infinite  $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  with  $V(\bigcap \mathcal{C}') \neq \emptyset$ , but no infinite  $\mathcal{C}'' \subseteq \mathcal{C}'$  with  $|V(\bigcap \mathcal{C}'')| \geq 2$ .*

In this case let  $y$  be the unique vertex in  $\bigcap \mathcal{C}'$ . By passing to a subset of  $\mathcal{C}'$ , we can, similarly to Case A, greedily ensure that no two elements share a vertex other than  $y$ . We form a minor  $M$  of  $\bigcup \mathcal{C}' \subseteq G$  as follows. For each  $C \in \mathcal{C}'$  we let  $B_y$  denote the branch set of  $C$  containing  $y$ , and we declare their union  $Y := \bigcup_{C \in \mathcal{C}'} B_y$  to be a branch set of  $M$ . Every other branch set of any  $C \in \mathcal{C}'$  is declared to be a branch set of  $M$  too. The latter are pairwise disjoint since  $y$  is the only common vertex of any two elements of  $\mathcal{C}'$ . This  $M$  is an  $U_i$  minor of  $G$  for one the desired graphs  $U_i$  determined by the value of  $i$ .

Thus in every possible case we have found one of the desired  $U$ -marked graphs




Figure 5: Two of the excluded minors of Proposition 4.4, arising by combining infinitely many copies of  $K_{2,3}$ .

as a minor of  $G$ . □

**Corollary 4.3.** *If  $G$  is in  $\text{Planar}_E$  but not in  $U\text{-OP}_E$ , then the same conclusion as in Lemma 4.2 holds.*

*Proof.* Let  $F$  be a finite subset of  $E(G)$  such that  $G' := G - F$  is planar, and apply Lemma 4.2 to  $G'$ . □

It could be interesting to obtain the analogue of Lemma 4.2 where we contract finitely many edges instead of deleting them. I suspect that the excluded minors for this class  $U\text{-OP}_{/E}$  are the same as in Lemma 4.2, except that  $U_5 = K_{2,\omega}$  must be omitted.

**Remark 3.** The converse of Lemma 4.2 holds too, that is, if  $G$  has one of the  $U$ -marked minors as in the statement, then  $G$  is not  $U\text{-OP}_E$ . This is because the  $U$ -cone of each of these graphs cannot be made planar by deleting finitely many edges and vertices in  $U$ . Indeed, such a cone contains one of the forbidden structures of Theorem 1.1.

## 4.1 Almost outerplanar graphs

The aim of this section is to prove the analogue of Proposition 3.3 for outerplanar graphs. This is not needed for the proof of Theorem 1.1, but included as a result of independent interest. The reader may skip to the next section.

Let  $G_1$  (respectively,  $G_2$ ) be the graph obtained from  $\omega \cdot K_{2,3}$  by choosing a vertex of degree 3 (resp. degree 2) from each copy of  $K_{2,3}$  and identifying them (Figure 5).

**Proposition 4.4.**  $OP_E = \text{Forb}(\omega \cdot K_4, \omega \cdot K_{2,3}, \bigvee K_4, G_1, G_2, K_{2,\omega})$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $G \notin OP_E$ . If  $G \notin OP_V$ , then by Proposition 3.4, and the well-known fact that  $OP = \text{Forb}(K_4, K_{2,3})$ , we deduce that  $G$  contains one of  $\omega \cdot K_4, \omega \cdot K_{2,3}$  as a minor, and we are done. Thus we may assume that  $G \in OP_V$ .

Choose a finite, minimal  $W \subset V(G)$  such that  $G - W \in OP_E$ , which exists since we can even achieve  $G - W \in OP$ . Pick  $v \in W$ , and let  $G' := G - (W \setminus \{v\})$ . Then  $G' \notin OP_E$ , but  $G' - v \in OP_E$  by the choice of  $W$ . We will find one of the desired minors in  $G'$ .

Note that there must be infinitely many subdivisions of  $K_4$  or  $K_{2,3}$  in  $G'$  containing  $v$ . Even more,

there is an infinite set  $\mathcal{C}$  of subdivisions of  $K_4$  or  $K_{2,3}$  in  $G'$  containing  $v$ , no two of which share an edge of  $v$ . (1)

Indeed, if not, then there is a finite set  $F$  of edges of  $v$  such that  $G' - F$  contains no subdivision of  $K_4$  or  $K_{2,3}$  containing  $v$ , which contradicts  $G' \notin OP_E$ .

We distinguish two cases. If  $v$  is the only vertex contained in infinitely many elements of  $\mathcal{C}$ , then we can greedily find an infinite subset  $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  such that  $C \cap D = \{v\}$  holds for every  $C, D \in \mathcal{C}'$ . We may further assume that all elements of  $\mathcal{C}'$  are copies of  $K_4$  or they are all copies of  $K_{2,3}$ , and that  $v$  has the same degree—either 2 or 3—in each of them. Thus we find one of  $\bigvee K_4, G_1, G_2$  as a minor of  $\bigcup \mathcal{C}'$ , with  $v$  being the vertex of infinite degree.

Otherwise, there is a vertex  $w \neq v$  contained in each element of an infinite subset  $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ . Note that  $G'' := \bigcup \mathcal{C}' - v$  is a connected graph, containing infinitely many neighbours of  $v$  by (1). We apply the star-comb lemma to  $G''$  with  $U$  being the set of neighbours of  $v$ , to obtain a  $K_{2,\omega}$  minor in  $G''$  as in the proof of Proposition 3.3.

In all cases we have obtained one of  $\omega \cdot K_4, \omega \cdot K_{2,3}, \bigvee K_4, G_1, G_2, K_{2,\omega}$  as a minor of  $G$ .  $\square$

## 5 The excluded minors of $\Sigma$

We can now prove our main result.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Let us start with the easy direction, that if  $G$  has a minor as in the statement, then  $G \notin \Sigma$ . It suffices to show that none of these graphs lies in  $\Sigma$ . This is indeed the case, as finite subgraphs of those graphs are well-known to have unbounded Euler genus; see e.g. [19] for  $\Sigma_8 = K_{3,\omega}$ , and [17] for the other seven  $\Sigma_i$ .

In particular, none of the  $\Sigma_i$  embed in a closed non-orientable surface either, and so we can drop the word ‘orientable’ in the statement of Theorem 1.1.

For the other direction, suppose  $G \notin \Sigma$ . If  $G \notin \Sigma_V$ , then similarly to Proposition 3.4, we can greedily find  $\omega \cdot K_5$  or  $\omega \cdot K_{3,3}$  as a minor of  $G$ , and so our statement holds in this case.

So assume  $G \in \Sigma_V$ , and recall that this implies  $G \in \text{Planar}_V$  by Corollary 3.5. Thus we can choose a smallest set of vertices  $F = v_1, \dots, v_k$  such that  $G - F$  lies in  $\text{Planar}_E$ , which is possible since we could even choose  $G - F$  to be planar.

Let  $U = N(F)$  be the set of vertices of  $G' := G - F$  sending an edge to  $F$ . If  $G'$  lies in  $U\text{-OP}_{\mathbb{E}}$ , then  $G' + v_1 := G - \{v_2, \dots, v_k\}$  lies in  $\text{Planar}_{\mathbb{E}}$ . But this contradicts the minimality of  $F$ .

This contradiction proves that  $G'$  does not lie in  $U\text{-OP}_{\mathbb{E}}$ . Thus by Corollary 4.3, we obtain  $G' > X$  where  $X$  is one of the excluded marked graphs of Lemma 4.2. We will use an additional branch set  $B$  to obtain the  $U$ -cone  $X' := C_U(X)$  as a minor of  $G$ . Ignoring the marking, we will thus obtain one of the graphs of Figure 1 as a minor, depending on which graph  $X$  coincides with. The easiest case is where  $X = U_5$ . In this case there is some  $v_i$  sending edges to infinitely many marked vertices of  $X$  by the pigeonhole principle. Letting  $B := \{v_i\}$  be our additional branch set, we obtain  $X' = \Sigma_8 = K_{3,\omega}$  as a minor of  $G$ .

If  $X = U_1$ , we have  $X' > \Sigma_3 = \bigvee K_5$ . But we need to be a bit more careful in order to find  $X'$  as a minor of  $G$ , because it might be that no single  $v_i$  sends enough edges to any copy of  $K_4$  in  $X$ . But we can avoid this difficulty by contracting a finite subgraph of  $G$  containing some  $v_i$ 's as follows. For every  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, |F|\}$  such that both  $v_i, v_j$  send an edge to a marked vertex of the same copy  $K$  of  $K_4$  in  $X$ , let  $P_{ij}$  be a  $v_i$ - $v_j$  path in  $K$  avoiding the branch set corresponding to the infinite degree vertex of  $U_1$ . Let  $H$  be the union of all these  $P_{ij}$ . Let  $C$  be a component of  $H$  sending infinitely many edges to marked vertices of  $X$ , which exists by the pigeonhole principle, and let  $K_0, K_1, \dots$  be an enumeration of the copies of  $K_4$  in  $X$  that send an edge to  $C$  and are disjoint from  $H$ . Since  $H$  is finite, there are infinitely many  $K_i$ . Note that no other component  $C'$  can send an edge to any  $K_i$ , because we would have put a  $C$ - $C'$  path through  $K_i$  in  $H$  if that was the case. It follows that  $C$  sends an edge to all three marked vertices of each  $K_i$ . Letting  $B := C$  be a branch set, we thus obtain a  $X'$  minor in  $B \cup \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} K_n$ .

The remaining cases can be treated similarly:

If  $X = U_2$ , we have  $X' > \Sigma_6$  (think of the cone vertex as being grey).

If  $X = U_3$ , we have  $X' > \Sigma_7$ . If  $X = U_4$ , we have  $X' > \Sigma_5$ .

If  $X$  is  $\omega \cdot \Theta_1$  or  $\omega \cdot \Theta_4$ , we have  $X' > \Sigma_3 = \bigvee K_5$  (Figure 2).

Finally, if  $X$  is  $\omega \cdot \Theta_2$  or  $\omega \cdot \Theta_3$ , we have  $X' > \Sigma_4 = \bigvee K_{3,3}$ .

□

## 6 Almost forests revisited

The aim of this section is to prove the following result, which complements Proposition 3.3.

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  denote the class of countable forests. Then  $\mathcal{F}_{/\mathbb{E}} = \text{Forb}(\omega \cdot K_3, \bigvee K_3) = \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{E}/\mathbb{E}}$ .*

Combined with Proposition 3.3, it follows that  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{E}} \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_{/\mathbb{E}}$ . For our proof we will need the following extension of the star-comb lemma.

A *2-star* is a graph obtained from the star  $K_{1,\omega}$  by subdividing each edge at least once. In other words, a 2-star is obtained from the disjoint union of

infinitely many paths of length at least 2 by identifying their first vertices.

We say that a vertex-set  $D$  *dominates* another vertex-set  $U$  of a graph, if  $\overline{N}(D) \supseteq U$ , where  $\overline{N}(D)$  consists of  $D$  and all vertices sending an edge to  $D$ .

**Lemma 6.2.** *Let  $G$  be a connected graph, and  $U \subseteq V(G)$  infinite. Then  $G$  contains at least one of the following:*

- (i) *A  $U$ -comb;*
- (ii) *a 2-star with leaves in  $U$ ;*
- (iii) *a finite vertex-set dominating  $U$ .*

*Proof.* We say that a vertex  $v$  is  *$U$ -dominant*, if  $|N(v) \cap U| = \infty$ , where  $N(v)$  stands for the set of neighbours of  $v$ . Let  $D$  denote the set of  $U$ -dominant vertices of  $G$ .

If  $|D| = \infty$ , we apply the star-comb lemma to  $G, D$ , to obtain either a  $D$ -star  $S$  or a  $D$ -comb  $K$ . In the former case, we construct a 2-star with leaves in  $U$  as follows. Let  $(w_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be an enumeration of the leaves of  $S$ , and let  $s$  be the centre of  $S$ . Pick a neighbour  $u_0 \neq s \in U$  of  $w_0$ , and add the  $w_0$ - $u_0$  edge to  $S$ . If  $u_0 \in V(S)$ , then we also *delete* the subpath of  $S - s$  containing  $u_0$ . For  $i = 1, 2, \dots$ , we proceed similarly: we let  $w_{a_i}$  be the next leaf of  $S$  that has not been deleted, we pick a neighbour  $u_i \in U$  of  $w_{a_i}$  that does not coincide with  $s$  or any  $u_j, j < i$ , attach it to  $w_{a_i}$ , and delete the subpath of  $S - s$  containing  $u_i$  if it exists. Such a  $u_j$  always exists, because  $w_{a_i} \in D$  has infinitely many neighbours in  $U$ . After  $\omega$  steps we have transformed  $S$  into the desired 2-star  $S'$  witnessing (ii).

In the other case where we obtain a comb  $K$ , then either  $|K \cap U| = \infty$ , and we are done as (i) holds, or we may assume that  $|K \cap U| = \emptyset$  by replacing  $K$  with a sub-comb. In this case we construct a comb  $K'$  by attaching leaves in  $U$  to infinitely many vertices of  $K \cap D$  by imitating the way we obtained  $S'$  from  $S$  (except that now we never have to delete anything).

Thus we have settled the case  $|D| = \infty$ , and we now proceed to the case where  $|D| < \infty$ . Suppose first that  $U' := U \setminus \overline{N}(D)$  is finite. Then  $D \cup U'$  is a finite set dominating  $U$ , i.e. option (iii) holds. So suppose  $U'$  is infinite, and consider the following two cases:

Case i: No component of  $G - \overline{N}(D)$  has infinite intersection with  $U'$ . In this case we obtain a 2-star with leaves in  $U$  as follows. For each of the infinitely many components  $C_i$  of  $G - \overline{N}(D)$  intersecting  $U'$ , let  $P_i$  be a  $U'$ - $N(D)$  path in  $G$ . If infinitely many of these  $P_i$  terminate at a common vertex  $w$  of  $N(D)$ , then their union contains the desired 2-star; indeed, since  $w \notin D$ , at most finitely many of the  $P_i$  terminating at  $w$  comprise a single edge. If, on the other hand, only finitely many  $P_i$  terminate at each  $w \in N(D)$ , then we can choose an infinite subset of pairwise disjoint  $P_i$ , extend each of them by one edge to reach  $D$ , and find an  $s \in D$  at which infinitely many of these  $P_i$  terminate. We thus obtain the desired 2-star, centred at  $s$ .

Case ii: Some component  $C$  of  $G - \overline{N}(D)$  has infinite intersection with  $U'$ . In this case we apply the star-comb lemma to the pair  $C, (U' \cap C)$ . Since  $C \cap D = \emptyset$ , this yields that one of (i), (ii) holds.

Thus in every case we have obtained one of the desired sub-structures.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 6.1.* Suppose  $G \notin \mathcal{F}_{/E}$ . If  $G \notin \mathcal{F}_V$ , then by Proposition 3.4 we deduce that  $G$  has a  $\omega \cdot K_3$  minor, and we are done. Thus we may assume that  $G \in \mathcal{F}_V$ . Choose a finite  $W \subset V(G)$  such that  $G - W \in \mathcal{F}$ . Assume that  $G$  is connected. Thus we can find a finite subtree  $T$  of  $G$  containing  $W$ . Let  $G' := G/T$  be the minor of  $G$  obtained by contracting  $T$  onto a vertex  $v$ . Then  $G' \notin \mathcal{F}_{/E}$  since  $G \notin \mathcal{F}_{/E}$  and  $T$  is finite. Moreover,  $F := G' - v \in \mathcal{F}$ . We will prove that  $G'$ , and hence  $G$ , has a  $\vee K_3$  minor.

If there is an infinite set  $\{C_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of components of  $F$  such that  $v$  sends at least two edges  $e_n, f_n$  to  $C_n$ , then by appending an  $e_n - f_n$  path through  $C_n$  for each  $n$  we obtain a  $\vee K_3$  minor in  $\{v\} \cup \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} C_n$ . Thus we may assume that there is a finite set  $\{C_1, \dots, C_k\}$  of components of  $F$  sending at least two edges to  $v$ , and all other components of  $F$  send at most one edge to  $v$ . Note that  $G' - (C_1 \cup \dots \cup C_k)$  is a forest.

For each  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , we let  $G'_i$  be the subgraph of  $G'$  induced by  $C_i \cup \{v\}$ , and let  $U_i$  be the set of vertices of  $C_i$  sending an edge to  $v$ . We apply Lemma 6.2 to  $G'_i, U_i$ , and obtain a  $U_i$ -comb, or a 2-star with leaves in  $U_i$ , or a finite set  $W_i$  of vertices dominating  $U_i$ . If this yields a  $U_i$ -comb  $C$ , then we easily obtain a subdivision of  $\vee K_3$  in  $C \cup \{v\}$ . If instead we obtain a 2-star  $S$ , with centre  $s$  and leaves in  $U_i$ , then by contracting a  $v-s$  path we obtain a subdivision of  $\vee K_3$  in  $S \cup \{v\}$ , centred at the contracted path. Finally, if Lemma 6.2 returns a finite dominating set  $W_i$ , then we let  $T_i$  be the minimal (finite) subtree of  $C_i$  containing  $W_i$ . Note that  $G'_i/T_i$  is a tree. To summarize, either we have obtained a  $\vee K_3$  minor in  $G$ , or a finite  $T_i \subset C_i$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq k$  such that  $G'_i/T_i$  is a tree. But the latter implies that contracting each  $T_i$  turns  $G'$  into a forest, contradicting the fact that  $G' \notin \mathcal{F}_{/E}$ .

It remains to handle the case where  $G$  is disconnected. In this case we apply the same reasoning to one of the components of  $G$  intersecting  $W$ , and find a  $\vee K_3$  minor there.

To deduce that  $\mathcal{F}_{/E} = \mathcal{F}_{E/E}$ , note that  $\mathcal{F}_{/E} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{E/E}$ , and that none of the excluded minors  $\omega \cdot K_3, \vee K_3$  of the former lies in the latter. Thus  $\mathcal{F}_{E/E} \setminus \mathcal{F}_{/E}$  is empty.  $\square$

## 7 A star-comb lemma for 2-connected graphs

While trying to prove Theorem 1.1 I came up with the following strengthening of the star-comb lemma for 2-connected graphs. Although it is not used for any of our proofs, I decided to include as it might become useful elsewhere. The star-comb lemma is one of the most useful tools in infinite graph theory. Some

other strengthenings were obtained in a recent series of 4 papers by Bürger & Kurkofka [4]–[5].

In analogy with  $U$ -stars and  $U$ -combs as in the statement of the star-comb lemma, we introduce the following structures. A *double-star* is a subdivision of  $K_{2,\omega}$ . A *ladder* consists of two disjoint rays  $R, L$  and an infinite collection of pairwise disjoint  $R$ – $L$  paths. A *fan* consists of a ray  $R$ , a vertex  $d \notin V(R)$ , and an infinite collection of  $d$ – $R$  paths having only  $d$  in common. For each of these three terms, adding the prefix  $U$ - means that the structure has infinitely many of its vertices in  $U$ . With this terminology, Theorem 1.2 from the introduction can be formulated as follows.

**Theorem 7.1.** *Let  $G$  be a countable, 2-connected, graph, and  $U \subseteq V(G)$  infinite. Then  $G$  contains a  $U$ -double-star, or a  $U$ -ladder, or a  $U$ -fan.*

The following follows from the statement of Theorem 7.1, but we need to prove it first as a first step towards the proof of the latter.

**Lemma 7.2.** *Let  $G$  be a countable, 2-connected, locally finite, graph, and  $U \subseteq V(G)$  infinite. Then  $G$  has a ray containing an infinite subset of  $U$ .*

In this section we assume that the reader is familiar with the basics about the end-compactification of a graph, and normal spanning trees; we refer to [8] therefor.

*Proof.* Let  $\chi$  be an accumulation point of  $U$  in the end-compactification of  $G$ , and choose  $U' \subseteq U$  converging to  $\chi$ . Let  $R$  be a ray converging to  $\chi$ , such that each component of  $G - R$  sends only finitely many edges to  $R$ ; we could for example choose  $R$  inside a normal spanning tree of  $G$ ; see [8, Exercise 8.27] or [13, Lemma 11]. If  $R \cap U'$  is infinite then we are done, so assume this is not the case.

Note that no component of  $G - R$  can contain an infinite subset of  $U'$ . Thus there is an infinite set  $(C_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of components of  $G - R$  each intersecting  $U'$ . For each  $C_n$ , pick  $u_n \in C_n \cap U'$ , and two disjoint  $u_n$ – $R$  paths. The union of these two paths is a path  $P_n$  through  $C_n$  with end-vertices  $x_n, y_n$  on  $R$ . Since  $G$  is locally finite, we can easily choose an infinite subset  $(C'_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that the subpaths  $R_n$  of  $R$  from  $x_n$  to  $y_n$  are pairwise disjoint. By replacing each  $R_n$  with  $P_n$  we thus transform  $R$  into a ray  $R'$  containing infinitely many elements of  $U'$ . □

*Proof of Theorem 7.1.* Suppose first that  $G$  is locally finite. By Lemma 7.2,  $G$  has a ray  $R$  with  $R \cap U$  infinite. Let  $\chi$  be the end of  $G$  containing  $R$ . Halin [15] proved that we can find two disjoint rays belonging to  $\chi$ . It is proved in [13, Lemma 10] that we can choose these two rays  $X, Y$  so that they intersect every ray of  $\chi$  infinitely often. In particular,  $R \cap (X \cup Y)$  is infinite. Since  $X, Y$  belong to the same end, we can find a sequence  $(P_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of pairwise disjoint  $X$ – $Y$  paths such that  $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} P_n \cup X \cup Y$  forms a ladder  $L$ . By replacing some subpaths of

$L$  by subpaths of  $R$  we can easily obtain a ladder  $L'$  containing infinitely many elements of  $U$ . This settles the case where  $G$  is locally finite.

If  $G$  is not locally finite, then let  $T$  be a normal spanning tree of  $G$ . Let  $r$  be the root of  $T$ , and define the *height*  $h(v)$  of each  $v \in V(G) = V(T)$  to be the distance between  $v$  and  $r$  in  $T$ . Apply the star-comb lemma to  $T, U$  to obtain a subgraph  $Z$  which is either a  $U$ -star or a  $U$ -comb.

If  $Z$  is a  $U$ -star, let  $c$  be its centre. We claim that  $G$  contains a  $U$ -double-star, with  $c$  being one of its two infinite degree vertices. To prove this claim we introduce the following terms. Given an edge  $e \in E(T)$ , define the *branch of  $e$*  to be the subgraph  $B_e$  of  $G$  induced by the vertices in the component of  $T - e$  that does not contain  $r$ . Note that all neighbours of  $B_e$  lie on a subpath  $I_e$  of  $T$  because  $T$  is normal, and the top end-vertex  $I_e^t$  of  $I_e$  lies in  $e$ . Define the *closed branch*  $\overline{B_e}$  as the subgraph of  $G$  induced by  $B_e \cup I_e$ . Easily,  $\overline{B_e}$  is 2-connected since  $G$  is. A  *$U$ -ear* of  $B_e$  is a path  $E_e$  in  $\overline{B_e}$  joining  $I_e^t$  to some other vertex of  $I_e$ , such that  $E_e$  is otherwise disjoint from  $I_e$  and contains a vertex of  $U \cap B_e$ . It is easy to find a  $U$ -ear for each branch  $B_e$  intersecting  $U$  using the 2-connectedness of  $\overline{B_e}$ .

To prove our claim, note that there are infinitely many such branches  $B_e$  with  $e$  incident with  $c$ , and these branches are pairwise disjoint. Since there are only finitely many vertices below  $c$  in  $T$ , we can find an infinite subset of those branches with  $U$ -ears (starting at  $c$  and) ending at the same vertex  $c'$ . The union of those  $U$ -ears is the desired  $U$ -double-star.

This completes the case where  $Z$  is a  $U$ -star, and we now proceed to the case where  $Z$  is a  $U$ -comb. We further distinguish two cases according to whether the spine  $R$  of  $Z$  is dominated in  $G$  or not.

Suppose first that  $R$  is dominated, by a vertex  $d$  say. By extending or shortening  $R$  as needed, we may assume that  $R$  starts at  $r$ . (It follows that  $d \in V(R)$ , but we will not need this.) If  $R \cap U$  is infinite then we immediately obtain a  $U$ -fan, with  $d$  being the infinite degree vertex, and we are done. So assume  $R \cap U$  is finite, and note that this means that there is an infinite set  $\{B_{e_n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of pairwise disjoint branches each containing a tooth of  $C$ ; indeed, we can choose  $e_n$  to be the  $n$ th edge of  $C$  incident with  $R$  but not contained in it. Recall from above that each  $\overline{B_{e_n}}$  contains a  $U$ -ear  $E_{e_n}$ , and note that each  $E_{e_n}$  has both end-vertices on  $R$ . We distinguish two cases according to how these end-vertices are distributed along  $R$ :

Case 1: No vertex of  $R$  is incident with infinitely many  $E_{e_n}$ 's. In this case we can greedily choose an infinite subsequence  $\{E_{f_n}\}$  of  $\{E_{e_n}\}$  such that the subpaths  $R_n$  of  $R$  between the two end-vertices of each  $E_{f_n}$  are pairwise disjoint. By replacing infinitely many of these subpaths  $R_n$  by  $E_{f_n}$ , we can modify  $R$  into a ray  $R'$  such that  $R' \cap U$  is infinite and  $d$  still dominates  $R'$  (Figure 6), hence obtaining a  $U$ -fan in  $G$ . Indeed, we can greedily alternate between choosing a  $d$ - $R$  path and a  $U$ -ear  $E_{f_n}$  to include in our  $U$ -fan; each time we choose a  $d$ - $R$  path, we delete the finitely many  $U$ -ears it meets, and conversely, each time we choose a  $U$ -ear  $E_{f_n}$ , we replace






Figure 6: Obtaining a  $U$ -fan (bold lines) from a dominated comb  $R$  of  $T$ . The dashed lines represent paths that are not contained in the  $U$ -fan. The grey vertices represent elements of  $U$ .

$R_n$  by  $E_{f_n}$ , and delete the finitely many  $d$ - $R$  paths it meets. Here, we assume that we have pre-selected an infinite family of pairwise independent  $d$ - $R$  paths, which we can since  $d$  dominates  $R$ .

Case 2: Some  $v \in V(R)$  is incident with infinitely many  $E_{e_n}$ 's. Note that  $v$  must be the lower of the two end-vertices of these  $E_{e_n}$ 's, since the top end-vertex lies in  $e_n$  by the definition of  $E_{e_n}$ , with just one possible exception in case  $v$  happens to be an end-vertex of some  $e_n$ . By the same argument, the other end-vertices of the  $E_{e_n}$ 's incident with  $v$  can be assumed to be pairwise distinct. Thus the union of all these  $E_{e_n}$ 's with a sub-ray of  $R$  forms a  $U$ -fan in  $G$ , with  $v$  being the infinite degree vertex.

This completes the case where  $R$  is dominated, and we now proceed to the case where it is not. Again, we may assume that  $R$  starts at the root  $r$ . In this case we claim that

there is a locally finite, 2-connected, subgraph  $H$  of  $G$  containing  $R$  with (2)  
infinite  $H \cap U$ .

To construct  $H$ , for each vertex  $w \neq r \in V(R)$ , let  $P_w$  be a minimal path connecting the two components of  $R-w$ , which exists since  $G$  is 2-connected. We choose  $P_w$  so as to maximise the height of its top end-vertex on  $R$ . This choice allows us to ensure that for  $w \neq w' \in V(R)$ , the paths  $P_w, P_{w'}$  either coincide, or they are disjoint, or the top end-vertex of one of them coincides with the bottom end-vertex of the other; for otherwise we could find a path  $P'$  in  $P_w \cup P_{w'}$  that can serve as both  $P_w$  and  $P_{w'}$ . It follows that  $H' := R \cup \bigcup_{w \in V(R)} P_w$  is locally finite. Easily,  $H'$  is also 2-connected. If  $H' \cap U$  is infinite we set  $H := H'$  and have proved our claim. If it is finite, then similarly to the case where  $R$  is dominated, we can find infinitely many edges  $e$  incident with  $R$  such that their branch  $B_e$  contains a tooth of  $C$  lying in  $U$ . For each such  $B_e$ , we pick a  $U$ -ear  $E_e$ , and add it to  $H'$  to obtain  $H$ . Easily,  $H$  is still 2-connected, and  $H \cap U$  is infinite. To see that it is still locally finite, note that the  $B_e$  are pairwise

disjoint, and that if infinitely many ears  $E_e$  share an end-vertex  $v$  (on  $R$ ), then  $v$  dominates  $R$ , contradicting our assumption. This completes the proof of (2).

We can now reduce our problem to the locally finite case, by replacing  $G$  by  $H$ . But we have handled the locally finite case above, obtaining a  $U$ -ladder.  $\square$

**Problem 7.1.** *Is it possible to generalise Theorem 7.1 to  $k$ -connected graphs, obtaining a finite list of subdivisions of  $k$ -connected graphs as unavoidable structures?*

Results of similar flavour have been obtained by Gollin & Heuer [14].

## 8 Final remarks

It would be interesting to find the excluded minors for the classes  $\Sigma_{/E}$ ,  $\text{Planar}_E$ ,  $\text{Planar}_{/E}$  and  $\text{Planar}_{E/E}$ , and this should be within reach with the above methods and a little bit more work. I suspect that

$$\Sigma_{/E} = \text{Planar}_{/E} = \text{Planar}_{E/E} = \text{Forb}(\omega \cdot K_5, \omega \cdot K_{3,3}, \bigvee K_5, \bigvee K_{3,3}),$$

and  $\text{Planar}_E = \text{Forb}(\text{Ex}(\Sigma) \cup \{K_5^\otimes, K_{3,3}^\otimes\})$ , where  $K^\otimes$  is obtained from a graph  $K$  by replacing each edge  $uv$  by infinitely many  $u$ - $v$  paths of length 2.

Let us say that a minor-closed class  $\mathcal{C}$  of graphs is *good*, if  $\mathcal{C} = \text{Forb}(X)$  for a finite set  $X$  of (possibly infinite) graphs. A well-know conjecture of Thomas [24] postulates that the countable graphs are well-quasi-ordered under the minor relation. A positive answer would imply that all minor-closed classes of countable graphs are good, but as mentioned in the introduction, this seems out of reach at the moment. Still, we could seek to extend the Graph Minor Theorem [23] by finding sufficient conditions for classes of infinite graphs to be good. The following questions suggest a possible direction, and the methods of this paper could be helpful. For further questions in a similar vein see [12].

**Question 8.1.** *Suppose  $\mathcal{C}$  is a good minor-closed class of countable graphs. Must each of  $\mathcal{C}_V, \mathcal{C}_E, \mathcal{C}_{/E}, \mathcal{C}_{E/E}$  be good?*

We say that a class  $\mathcal{C}$  of graphs is *co-finite*, if  $\mathcal{C} = \text{Forb}(S)$  for a set  $S$  of finite graphs (which set can be chosen to be finite by the Graph Minor Theorem [23]). Note that a graph  $G$  belongs to such a class  $\mathcal{C}$  if and only if every finite minor of  $G$  does. Question 8.1 is open in general even if  $\mathcal{C}$  is co-finite, except that  $\mathcal{C}_V$  is covered by Proposition 3.4 in this case. This papers provides some techniques for attacking it.

We say that a class  $\mathcal{C}$  of graphs is *UNCOF* (Union of Nested Co-finite classes), if there is a sequence  $(C_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of co-finite classes such that  $\mathcal{C} = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} C_n$  and  $C_n \subseteq C_{n+1}$  holds for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . The classes studied in this paper ( $\Sigma, \mathcal{F}_E, \mathcal{F}_{/E}, \text{OP}_E$ , etc.) are easily seen to be UNCOF. Our results support

**Conjecture 8.2.** *Every UNCOF class of countable graphs is good.*

Another interesting example of an UNCOF class  $\mathcal{C}$  comprises the graphs  $G$  of finite Colin de Verdière invariant  $\mu(G)$ , whereby for infinite  $G$  we define  $\mu(G)$  to be the supremal  $m$  such that every finite subgraph  $H \subset G$  satisfies  $\mu(H) \leq m$ . Is this  $\mathcal{C}$  good? Can we determine  $\text{Ex}(\mathcal{C})$ ?

Not every proper minor-closed class is UNCOF. For example,  $\text{Forb}(K_\omega)$  is not, because it contains the disjoint union of  $K_n, n \in \mathbb{N}$ , which no proper co-finite class contains. Thus Conjecture 8.2 is weaker than Thomas' conjecture. Beware however that Conjecture 8.2 implies the Graph Minor Theorem: any minor-closed class of finite graphs is shown to be UNCOF by letting  $\mathcal{C}_n$  be its sub-class comprising the elements with at most  $n$  vertices.

## References

- [1] T. Andreae. Über eine Eigenschaft lokalfiniten, unendlicher Bäume (in german). *J. Combin. Theory (Series B)*, 27(2):202–215, 1979.
- [2] J. Battle, F. Harary, Y. Kodama, and J. W. T. Youngs. Additivity of the genus of a graph. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 68:565–568, 1962.
- [3] T. Böhme, K. Kawarabayashi, J. Maharry, and B. Mohar.  $K_{3,k}$ -minors in large 7-connected graphs. 2008. Unpublished, preprint available on-line, 2008.
- [4] C. Bürger and J. Kurkofka. Duality theorems for stars and combs I: Arbitrary stars and combs. *J. Graph Theory*, 99(4):525–554, 2022.
- [5] C. Bürger and J. Kurkofka. Duality theorems for stars and combs IV: Undominating stars. *J. Graph Theory*, 100(1):140–162, 2022.
- [6] R. Christian, R. B. Richter, and G. Salazar. Embedding a Graph-Like Continuum in Some Surface. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 79(2):159–165, 2015.
- [7] S. Claytor. Peanian Continua Not Imbeddable in a Spherical Surface. *Annals of Mathematics*, 38(3):631–646, 1937.
- [8] Reinhard Diestel. *Graph Theory* (3rd edition). Springer-Verlag, 2005. Electronic edition available at: <http://www.math.uni-hamburg.de/home/diestel/books/graph.theory>.
- [9] G.A. Dirac and S. Schuster. A theorem of Kuratowski. *Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser. A*, 57:343–348, 1954.
- [10] P. Erdős and L. Pósa. On Independent Circuits Contained in a Graph. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 17:347–352, 1965.
- [11] R. Fulek and J. Kynčl. The  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -Genus of Kuratowski Minors. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 68(2):425–447, 2022.

- [12] A. Georgakopoulos. On graph classes with minor-universal elements. arXiv:2212.05498.
- [13] A. Georgakopoulos. Infinite Hamilton cycles in squares of locally finite graphs. *Advances in Mathematics*, 220:670–705, 2009.
- [14] J. P. Gollin and K. Heuer. Characterising  $k$ -connected sets in infinite graphs. *J. Combin. Theory (Series B)*, 157:451–499, 2022.
- [15] R. Halin. A note on Menger’s theorem for infinite locally finite graphs. *Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg*, 40:111–114, 1974.
- [16] R. Halin. Some topics concerning infinite graphs. In *Problèmes combinatoires et théorie des graphes (Colloq. Internat. CNRS, Univ. Orsay, 1976)*, volume 260, pages 211–213, 1978.
- [17] G. L. Miller. An additivity theorem for the genus of a graph. *J. Combin. Theory (Series B)*, 43(1):25–47, 1987.
- [18] B. Mohar. Embeddings of infinite graphs. *J. Combin. Theory (Series B)*, 44:29–43, 1988.
- [19] R. B. Richter and J. Širáň. The crossing number of  $K_{3,n}$  in a surface. *J. Graph Theory*, 21(1):51–54, 1996.
- [20] N. Robertson, P. Seymour, and R. Thomas. Excluding infinite minors. *Discrete Mathematics*, 95(1):303–319, 1991.
- [21] N. Robertson, P. D. Seymour, and R. Thomas. Excluding Infinite Clique Minors. *Memoirs of the AMS*, 566, 1995.
- [22] N. Robertson and P.D. Seymour. Graph minors. V. Excluding a planar graph. *J. Combin. Theory (Series B)*, 41:92–114, 1986.
- [23] N. Robertson and P.D. Seymour. Graph Minors. XX. Wagner’s Conjecture. *J. Combin. Theory (Series B)*, 92(2):325–357, 2004.
- [24] R. Thomas. Well-Quasi-Ordering Infinite Graphs with Forbidden Finite Planar Minor. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.*, 312(1):279–313, 1989.