

Universal Obstructions of Graph Parameters*

Christophe Paul[†] Evangelos Protopapas[†] Dimitrios M. Thilikos[†]

April 28, 2023

Abstract

We introduce a graph-parametric framework for obtaining obstruction characterizations of graph parameters with respect to partial ordering relations. For this, we define the notions of *class obstruction*, *parametric obstruction*, and *universal obstruction* as combinatorial objects that determine the asymptotic behavior of graph parameters. Our framework permits a unified framework for classifying graph parameters. Under this framework, we survey existing graph-theoretic results on most known graph parameters. Also we provide some unifying results on their classification.

Keywords: Graph parameter; Partial orderings on graphs; Well-quasi-ordering; Universal obstruction; Obstruction; Asymptotic equivalence of parameters.

1 Introduction

A *graph parameter* is a function \mathfrak{p} mapping graphs to integers. Graph parameters aim at capturing the combinatorial structure of graphs and, as revealed by the successful development of parameterized complexity theory [34], are central to the design and complexity analysis of algorithms. A large variety of graph parameters can be defined, ranging from the most natural ones, including the number of vertices or edges, to more elaborate ones such as width parameters [51] that are associated to diverse types of graph decompositions. Some parameters capture local properties of graphs, as for example the maximum degree of a graph, while some others express global properties, as for example the size of a maximum matching of a graph. Graph parameters may be designed to measure the resemblance or the distance to some combinatorial structure which allows to efficiently tackle problems that are NP-hard in general. Among the wide zoo of graph parameters, one may wonder what makes a parameter important or why a parameter is more significant than another one. To answer this legitimate and natural question, we need tools to compare graph parameters. In turn, comparing graph parameters heavily relies on the parameter descriptions/definitions, that may vary significantly. These questions – *evaluating a parameter*, *comparing parameters*, and *characterizing a parameter* – are central to the understanding of graph parameters and certainly do not admit a simple nor a single answer (see [36] for such an attempt, on branch decomposition based parameters).

*Research supported by the French-German Collaboration ANR/DFG Project UTMA (ANR-20-CE92-0027).

[†]LIRMM, Univ Montpellier, CNRS, Montpellier, France.

Importance of a parameter. Following [38], the importance of a parameter can be appreciated by considering: 1) its algorithmic utility; and 2) its combinatorial properties. Typically, being algorithmically useful for a given parameter means that a broad set of NP-hard problems are fixed parameter tractable with respect to this parameter. Having nice structural properties can be reflected by the central role a parameter plays in proving structural theorems. Under this setting, treewidth [6, 87] can be considered as an important parameter for both criteria (see Section 2 and Section 3 for definitions). On the one hand, Courcelle’s theorem [15, 16, 17] establishes that every graph property that is expressible in monadic second order logic can be checked in linear time on graphs of bounded treewidth. On the other hand, treewidth has been a cornerstone parameter of the Graph Minors series of Robertson and Seymour towards proving Wagner’s conjecture [98, 83]: *the minor relation is a well-quasi-ordering (wqo) in the class of all graphs* (now known as the Robertson and Seymour theorem).

A common trait of many graph parameters that are considered as being “important”, is to be *monotone* with respect to some partial ordering relation \leq on graphs. We say that a parameter \mathfrak{p} is *\leq -monotone* if, for every pair of graphs H and G , $H \leq G$ implies that $\mathfrak{p}(H) \leq \mathfrak{p}(G)$. For instance, treewidth is known to be minor-monotone (see Section 3) and *cutwidth* is immersion-monotone (see Section 4). Since both the minor and the immersion relations are well-quasi-orderings (wqo) on the set \mathcal{G}_{all} of all graphs [83, 84], this implies that for every minor/immersion closed parameter \mathfrak{p} and every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the class $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{p},k} = \{G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{all}} \mid \mathfrak{p}(G) \leq k\}$ is minor/immersion-closed and therefore it is characterized by a *finite set* of obstructions (minor-minimal, respectively immersion-minimal, graphs that do not belong to $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{p},k}$). Moreover, if checking whether a graph G contains some fixed graph as a minor/immersion can be done in polynomial time, then being a wqo automatically implies a polynomial membership decision algorithm for $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{p},k}$. This is the case for both the minor and the immersion relation [100, 46, 81, 58]. Whether or when such an approach can lead to the proof of the existence of polynomial time decision algorithms for other parameters (by choosing appropriately the relation \leq) is a running open project in algorithmic graph theory.

Comparing graph parameters. Given two graph parameters \mathfrak{p} and \mathfrak{p}' , we say that \mathfrak{p} is *asymptotically smaller* than \mathfrak{p}' , which we denote $\mathfrak{p} \preceq \mathfrak{p}'$, if there exists a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that for every graph G , $\mathfrak{p}(G) \leq f(\mathfrak{p}'(G))$. Observe that if $\mathfrak{p} \preceq \mathfrak{p}'$, then the graph classes where \mathfrak{p} is bounded are “asymptotically more general” than those where \mathfrak{p}' is bounded, in the sense that $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{p}',k} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{p},f(k)}$, for some $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. This means that, if some problem can be solved efficiently when \mathfrak{p}' is bounded, then it can also be solved efficiently when \mathfrak{p} is bounded. In that sense, the algorithmic applicability of \mathfrak{p} is wider than the one of \mathfrak{p}' (for this particular problem). On the other side, one may expect (and it is frequently the case) that more problems can be solved efficiently when \mathfrak{p} is bounded: while \mathfrak{p} -bounded graphs are more restricted, they may also be “more structured” than the class of \mathfrak{p}' -bounded graphs, which may give rise to more algorithmic applications.

We say that \mathfrak{p} and \mathfrak{p}' are *asymptotically equivalent* if $\mathfrak{p} \preceq \mathfrak{p}'$ and $\mathfrak{p}' \preceq \mathfrak{p}$. Consider the following example. The *cliquewidth* [19] is known to be monotone under the induced subgraph relation. Unfortunately, the induced subgraph relation do not share properties such as those discussed above for the minor or immersion relation. In fact, for now, no efficient algorithm is known to compute the cliquewidth of a graph. This motivated the introduction of the *rankwidth* parameter [76], that is asymptotically equivalent to cliquewidth and is monotone under the *vertex minor* relation (see Section 5 for the definitions). That way, rankwidth offered an alternative to cliquewidth that, in

many aspects, enjoys better combinatorial and algorithmic properties [52].

From the above discussion, we conclude that comparing graph parameters is important. However, this is not always a trivial task. For example, while it is clear from their respective definitions that treewidth is an asymptotically smaller parameter than pathwidth, proving that rankwidth and cliquewidth are asymptotically equivalent parameters is not obvious [76] (see §3.2.2 for a definition of pathwidth). The question is then to identify conditions under which parameters can be described in a common framework to facilitate their comparison and understand their relative relationships.

Parameter description. Again, the case of treewidth is very interesting to discuss. First of all there are many ways to define it, including graph decompositions, graph layouts, extremal graphs, and obstructions. In [49], no less than 15 parameters are identified to be either equal or asymptotically equivalent to treewidth. Each of the above definitions is putting light on different aspects of the treewidth parameter and its relatives. Some of them, such as *branchwidth* [79] may be preferred to treewidth for the sake of algorithm design [33], some others, such as the (*strict*) *bramble number* [68, 90, 5, 27] or the *biggest grid-minor number* [14, 47], are more convenient to certify large treewidth. A similar situation holds for pathwidth: it enjoys many alternative definitions and there are many parameters that are asymptotically equivalent to it [61, 73, 62]. This plethora of viewpoints for the same parameter is a strong sign of importance and certainly ease the comparison with other parameters. However, such a diversity of definitions is not the case for other parameters. For this reason, it is important to have a *universal* framework for dealing with the asymptotic behavior of parameters.

Our first step to this direction is to group parameters together with respect to the partial orderings under which they are monotone. When focussing on \leq -monotone parameters, one can observe that many results in the literature fulfill the following pattern:

Let \mathfrak{p} be a graph parameter that is \leq -monotone for some partial ordering relation \leq . There exists a set $\mathbf{cobs}_{\leq}(\mathfrak{p}) = \{\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_r\}$ of graph classes¹ such that, for every graph collection $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, \dots, H_r\}$ where $H_i \in \mathcal{C}_i, i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, there exists an integer $c_{\mathcal{H}}$ such that, for every graph G with $\mathfrak{p}(G) \geq c_{\mathcal{H}}$, there exists some $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ such that $H_i \leq G$.

Hereafter, we will call $\mathbf{cobs}_{\leq}(\mathfrak{p})$ the *class \leq -obstruction* of \mathfrak{p} (formally defined in Section 2). Let us review a few such results. First consider the minor relation, which we denote by \leq_m . It follows that for treewidth, $\mathbf{cobs}_{\leq_m}(\text{tw})$ is composed of the class of planar graphs [88, 85], while for pathwidth, $\mathbf{cobs}_{\leq_m}(\text{pw})$ contains the class of forests [78, 7], and for treedepth [75], $\mathbf{cobs}_{\leq_m}(\text{td})$ is the set containing the class of linear forests². In these first three examples, the class obstruction contains a *unique* class of graphs. This is not always the case. According to [54], for the *biconnected pathwidth*, $\mathbf{cobs}_{\leq_m}(\text{bi-pw})$ contains two graph classes, namely the apex-forests and the outerplanar graphs (see §3.5.1). If we now consider the immersion relation, denoted \leq_i , and the cutwidth parameter, it holds that $\mathbf{cobs}_{\leq_i}(\text{cw})$ is formed by three classes of graphs (see §4.2.5). In the context of the vertex-minor relation, denoted by \leq_{vm} , it has recently been proved that the class obstruction of rankwidth $\mathbf{cobs}_{\leq_{\text{vm}}}(\text{rw})$ consists of the set of circle graphs [43], while it is conjectured that for linear

¹The reason we define $\mathbf{cobs}_{\leq}(\mathfrak{p})$ as a set of graph classes will become clear in the Section 2.

²A linear forest is the disjoint union of paths.

rankwidth, $\mathbf{cobs}_{\leq m}(\text{lrw})$ consists of the set of trees [57]. As we will see in this survey, the above statement pattern holds for many other monotone parameters.

Capturing the asymptotic behavior of monotone parameters. Interestingly, the relationship between the obstruction classes of \leq -monotone parameters is telling something about the relationship of these parameters. The fact that forests are planar graphs clearly indicates that pathwidth is (asymptotically) bigger than treewidth. It is worth to observe that in every known result fulfilling the above pattern, the class obstruction contains a finite (typically small) number of graph classes. But still, these classes are containing an infinite number of graphs. Moreover, class obstructions do not constitute “universal patterns” of the the asymptotic behavior of the relative parameters. As proposed in [77], using the concepts of \leq -parametric obstructions and \leq -universal obstructions, it is possible to resolve these two issues.

Let \mathbf{p} be a \leq -monotone parameter having a class obstruction $\mathbf{cobs}_{\leq}(\mathbf{p})$. We observe that every class of graph $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbf{cobs}_{\leq}(\mathbf{p})$ is \leq -closed. This implies that if \leq is a wqo, \mathcal{G} admits a *finite* number of obstructions, denoted by $\mathbf{obs}_{\leq}(\mathcal{G})$, that are the \leq -minimal graphs not belonging to \mathcal{G} . We can then define the notion of \leq -parametric obstruction of \mathbf{p} , denoted by $\mathbf{pobs}_{\leq}(\mathbf{p})$, as the set $\{\mathbf{obs}_{\leq}(\mathcal{G}) \mid \mathcal{G} \in \mathbf{cobs}_{\leq}(\mathbf{p})\}$.

We proceed with an example: in [7] it was proven that, for every forest F on k vertices, every graph excluding F as a minor has pathwidth at most $k - 2$. As $\{K_3\}$ is the minor-obstruction of forests, this implies that $\mathbf{pobs}_{\leq m}(\text{pw})$ consists of the graph class of forests and that $\mathbf{pobs}_{\leq m}(\text{pw}) = \{\{K_3\}\}$. Similarly, as we see in the coming sections, all the aforementioned examples of monotone parameters (treewidth, treedepth, biconnected pathwidth, cutwidth, rankwidth) and many others enjoy a *finite description* by means of parametric obstructions. However, as noticed in [77], whether such a characterization always exists for \leq -monotone parameters is open and is linked to important conjectures of order theory that go further than the wqo of \leq .

The concept of \leq -universal obstruction of a \leq -monotone parameter \mathbf{p} relies on the notion of \leq -omnivore of the classes $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbf{cobs}_{\leq}(\mathbf{p})$. A \leq -monotone graph sequence is a sequence of graphs $\mathcal{H} = \langle \mathcal{H}_i \rangle_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that for every $i \leq j$, $\mathcal{H}_i \leq \mathcal{H}_j$. We say that \mathcal{H} is a \leq -omnivore of the graph class \mathcal{G} if every graph in \mathcal{H} belongs in \mathcal{G} and, moreover, for every $G \in \mathcal{G}$, there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $G \leq \mathcal{H}_k$. We say that a collection of \leq -monotone graph sequences $\mathfrak{H} = \{\mathcal{H}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{H}^{(r)}\}$ is a \leq -universal obstruction of \mathbf{p} if it contains an \leq -omnivore for every class of graphs contained in $\mathbf{cobs}_{\leq}(\mathbf{p})$. As explained in Section 2, to a \leq -universal obstruction of a parameter \mathbf{p} , one can naturally associate a parameter $\mathbf{p}_{\mathfrak{H}}$ that is asymptotically equivalent to \mathbf{p} .

Let us again illustrate these concepts with pathwidth. It is well-known that every forest is a minor of a complete ternary tree³ (depicted in Figure 2). It follows that the sequence $\mathcal{T} = \langle \mathcal{T}_k \rangle_{k \geq 1}$ of ternary trees is a \leq_m -omnivore of forests. This implies that $\{\mathcal{T}\}$ is a \leq_m -universal obstruction of pathwidth. This, combined with the results of [7], implies that the pathwidth of a graph is asymptotically equivalent to the biggest size of a complete ternary tree minor it contains. Therefore, $\mathbf{p}_{\{\mathcal{T}\}}$ is asymptotically equivalent to pathwidth and the set $\{\mathcal{T}\}$ is a universal obstruction of pathwidth. Notice also that there might be many different universal obstructions for the same

³A *complete ternary tree* is a tree where all internal vertices have degree three and where each leaf belongs in some anti-diametrical path.

parameter. For instance, one may also consider the set consisting of the sequence of “quaternary trees” that is also a universal obstruction for pathwidth.

The value of universal obstructions is that they provide a “common for all” framework yielding “regular” alternative definitions of graph parameters (subject to asymptotic equivalence). We believe that the notions of class obstruction, parametric obstruction and universal obstruction offer a unifying and concise framework to describe, compare, and evaluate \leq -monotone parameters. These concepts were underlying many known results but were only recently formalized in [77] (see also Section 2). They offer a global view on the hierarchy of the \leq -monotone parameters. Moreover, these concepts form a framework that allows to define very natural and not yet explored parameters. As pointed out in [77], under certain circumstances, fixed parameterized approximation algorithms can be automatically derived using this framework. This paper offers a systematic review of known minor-monotone parameters (see Section 3), immersion-monotone parameters (see Section 4) and vertex-minor-monotone parameters (see Section 5) and present them in the unified framework discussed above. Section 2 formally defines all the concepts introduced in the discussion above.

2 Universal obstructions: basic definitions and results

All graphs in this paper are finite and undirected. Unless the opposite is explicitly mentioned (see Section 4 and Subsection 6.2), graphs are assumed to be simple. In this section, we introduce the basic concepts that we use in the rest of the paper. For their better understanding, we accompany them using as a running example the graph parameter of treewidth. For this, we first give its definition.

Clique-sum closure and treewidth. We use \mathcal{G}_{all} for the set containing all graphs and \mathbb{N} for the set of non-negative integers. The *clique-sum* operation applies to two graphs G and G' , each containing a clique of size $c \in \mathbb{N}$, denoted K and K' respectively. Given a bijection $\sigma : V(K) \rightarrow V(K')$, the *clique-sum* operation takes the disjoint union of G and G' ; identifies, each vertex $v \in V(K)$ with the vertex $\sigma(v) \in V(K')$ and, in the resulting graph, possibly removes some of the edges between the identified vertices. Notice that the clique-sum operation is a *one-to-many* operation as the final result depends on the choice of σ and on the choice of the edges that are eventually removed. We say that a graph G is the *clique-sum closure* of a set \mathcal{G} of graphs if G can be constructed, using a sequence of clique-sum operations from the graphs in \mathcal{G} . As we see in Section 3, the clique-sum closure is useful for defining parameters from simpler ones.

The *treewidth* parameter is commonly defined using the concept of tree-decomposition [27, 6, 87] but can be equivalently defined by means of the clique-sum operation. More precisely, for a graph $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{all}}$, $\text{tw}(G)$ is the minimum k for which G is the clique-sum closure of graphs of size at most $k + 1$. For another definition of treewidth, based on vertex layouts, see §3.2.1.

2.1 General concepts

Each ordering relation \leq on graphs that we consider is a partial ordering, that is, it is reflexive, transitive, and antisymmetric. Given a graph class $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{\text{all}}$, we say that \leq is *well-founded* in \mathcal{G} , if for every $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$, \mathcal{H} has a \leq -minimal element. All relations on graphs that we consider are well-founded. A set \mathcal{Z} of graphs is a \leq -*antichain* if its elements are pairwise non \leq -comparable.

Given some graph class $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{\text{all}}$, the partial ordering relation \leq is a *well-quasi-ordering*, in short *wqo*, in \mathcal{G} if \leq is well-founded in \mathcal{G} and all \leq -antichains are finite. We say that a graph class $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{\text{all}}$ is \leq -*closed* if for every graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$, if $H \leq G$, then $H \in \mathcal{G}$. We use the notation $\text{Down}_{\leq}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{all}})$ in order to denote the collection of all \leq -closed graph classes.

Given a graph class $\mathcal{G} \in \text{Down}_{\leq}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{all}})$, we define its \leq -*obstruction set* as the set of \leq -minimal graphs in $\mathcal{G}_{\text{all}} \setminus \mathcal{G}$ and we denote it by $\text{obs}_{\leq}(\mathcal{G})$. Clearly $\text{obs}_{\leq}(\mathcal{G})$ is always an \leq -antichain. Notice that if \leq is a wqo in \mathcal{G}_{all} , then for every $\mathcal{G} \in \text{Down}_{\leq}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{all}})$, $\text{obs}_{\leq}(\mathcal{G})$ is a finite set of graphs. Given a set of graphs $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{\text{all}}$, we define

$$\text{excl}_{\leq}(\mathcal{Z}) = \{G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{all}} \mid \forall Z \in \mathcal{Z} : Z \not\leq G\}.$$

In case \mathcal{Z} is a \leq -antichain, the graphs of \mathcal{Z} are the \leq -*obstructions* of $\text{excl}_{\leq}(\mathcal{Z})$. Clearly, for every $\mathcal{G} \in \text{Down}_{\leq}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{all}})$, it holds that $\text{excl}_{\leq}(\text{obs}_{\leq}(\mathcal{G})) = \mathcal{G}$.

A well-studied partial ordering relation on graphs is the *minor relation*: A graph H is a *minor* of a graph G if H can be obtained from a subgraph of G after contracting edges.⁴ We denote this relation by $H \leq_m G$. According to the Robertson and Seymour theorem [83] the relation \leq_m is a wqo in \mathcal{G}_{all} .

2.2 Graph parameters

A *graph parameter* is a function mapping graphs to non-negative integers and infinity, i.e. $\mathbf{p} : \mathcal{G}_{\text{all}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. We insist that \mathbf{p} is an invariant under graph isomorphism. For a graph parameter \mathbf{p} , we write $\text{dom}(\mathbf{p}) = \{G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{all}} \mid \mathbf{p}(G) \in \mathbb{N}\}$. We say that \mathbf{p} is \leq -*monotone* if, for every graph G and every $H \leq G$, we have that $\mathbf{p}(H) \leq \mathbf{p}(G)$. For instance, we know that tw is a minor-monotone parameter.

Let \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{p}' be two graph parameters. We define $\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{p}'$ (resp. $\max\{\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}'\}$) as the parameter where $(\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{p}')(G) = \mathbf{p}(G) + \mathbf{p}'(G)$ (resp. $(\max\{\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}'\})(G) = \max\{\mathbf{p}(G), \mathbf{p}'(G)\}$). Similarly, for $c \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{p} + c$ is defined so that $(\mathbf{p} + c)(G) = \mathbf{p}(G) + c$.

We write $\mathbf{p} \preceq \mathbf{p}'$ if $\text{dom}(\mathbf{p}') \subseteq \text{dom}(\mathbf{p})$ and there is a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that, for every graph $G \in \text{dom}(\mathbf{p}')$ it holds that $\mathbf{p}(G) \leq f(\mathbf{p}'(G))$. We also say that \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{p}' are *asymptotically equivalent* which we denote by $\mathbf{p} \sim \mathbf{p}'$, if $\mathbf{p} \preceq \mathbf{p}'$ and $\mathbf{p}' \preceq \mathbf{p}$. Notice that $\mathbf{p} \sim \mathbf{p}'$ holds iff $\text{dom}(\mathbf{p}) = \text{dom}(\mathbf{p}')$ and there is a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that for every graph G , $\mathbf{p}(G) \leq f(\mathbf{p}'(G))$ and $\mathbf{p}'(G) \leq f(\mathbf{p}(G))$. We call the function f *the gap function* (or just *the gap*) of the equivalence between \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{p}' . If the gap function f is polynomial (resp. linear), then we say that \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{p}' are *polynomially* (resp. *linearly*) *equivalent* and we denote this fact by $\mathbf{p} \sim_{\text{P}} \mathbf{p}'$ (resp. $\mathbf{p} \sim_{\text{L}} \mathbf{p}'$).

For an example, consider the graph parameter $\text{bg} : \mathcal{G}_{\text{all}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, where $\text{bg}(G)$ is the maximum k for which G contains a $(k \times k)$ -grid⁵ Γ_k as a minor. According to [14], $\text{tw} \sim_{\text{P}} \text{bg}$, while it is known that $\text{tw} \not\sim_{\text{L}} \text{bg}$ (see e.g., [85, 94, 24]).

Class obstruction and parametric obstruction. We say that a collection of graph classes $\mathbb{W} \subseteq \text{Down}_{\leq}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{all}})$ is *upward-closed*, if for every $\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{W}$ and $\mathcal{G} \in \text{Down}_{\leq}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{all}})$, $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ implies that

⁴The action of *contracting* an edge is the identification of its vertices. If multiple edges appear after this operation, then we reduce their multiplicity to one.

⁵The $(k \times k')$ -grid is the Cartesian product of a path on k vertices and a path on k' vertices.

$\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{W}$. Let $\mathcal{G} \in \text{Down}_{\leq}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{all}})$. We say that a \leq -monotone parameter \mathfrak{p} is *unbounded* in \mathcal{G} if there is no $c \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathfrak{p}(G) \leq c$ for every $G \in \mathcal{G}$. For each \leq -monotone parameter \mathfrak{p} , we define

$$\mathbb{U}_{\leq}(\mathfrak{p}) := \{\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{\text{all}} \mid \mathcal{G} \text{ is a } \leq\text{-closed graph class such that } \mathfrak{p} \text{ is unbounded in } \mathcal{G}\}.$$

Observe that, by definition, if \mathfrak{p} is unbounded in \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{H} is a \leq -closed class where $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$, then \mathfrak{p} is also unbounded in \mathcal{H} . This implies that $\mathbb{U}_{\leq}(\mathfrak{p})$ is upward-closed.

Definition 1 (Class obstruction). *Let $\mathfrak{p} : \mathcal{G}_{\text{all}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a \leq -monotone parameter. If the set of the \subseteq -minimal elements of $\mathbb{U}_{\leq}(\mathfrak{p})$ exists, then we say that it is the \leq -class obstruction of \mathfrak{p} and we denote it as $\text{cobs}_{\leq}(\mathfrak{p})$.*

Definition 2 (Parametric obstruction). *Let \mathfrak{p} be a \leq -monotone parameter having a class obstruction. We define the \leq -parametric obstruction of \mathfrak{p} as the set of obstruction sets $\{\text{obs}(\mathcal{G}) \mid \mathcal{G} \in \text{cobs}_{\leq}(\mathfrak{p})\}$ and we denote it as $\text{pobs}_{\leq}(\mathfrak{p})$.*

In the case of treewidth, because $\text{tw} \sim \text{bg}$ and the fact that every planar graph is a minor of a grid, it follows that $\mathbb{U}_{\leq_m}(\text{tw})$ contains exactly those minor-closed graph classes that do not exclude a planar graph as a minor. Notice that there is only one \subseteq -minimal class in $\mathbb{U}_{\leq_m}(\text{tw})$, that is the class $\mathcal{G}_{\text{planar}}$ of planar graphs. This implies that $\text{cobs}_{\leq_m}(\text{tw}) = \{\mathcal{G}_{\text{planar}}\}$. Finally, by the Kuratowski-Wagner theorem, it holds that $\text{pobs}_{\leq_m}(\text{tw}) = \{\{K_5, K_{3,3}\}\}$. The next proposition follows easily from the definitions (see [77]).

Proposition 1. *If a partial ordering on graphs \leq is wqo in \mathcal{G}_{all} , then for every \leq -monotone parameter, the set $\text{cobs}_{\leq}(\mathfrak{p})$ (and therefore also $\text{pobs}_{\leq}(\mathfrak{p})$) exists.*

Notice that wqo does not imply that $\text{pobs}_{\leq}(\mathfrak{p})$ is a finite set. However it indeed implies that each of the sets it contains is a finite set of graphs.

2.3 Parametric graphs

A *graph sequence* or a *parametric graph* is a sequence of graphs $\mathcal{H} := \langle \mathcal{H}_i \rangle_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, indexed by non-negative integers. Given a partial ordering \leq , we say that \mathcal{H} is \leq -*monotone* if for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds that $\mathcal{H}_i \leq \mathcal{H}_{i+1}$. We also define

$$\downarrow_{\leq} \mathcal{H} = \{G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{all}} \mid \exists k \in \mathbb{N} : G \leq \mathcal{H}_k\}.$$

In what follows, when we introduce some graph sequence, it is frequently convenient to start the indexing from numbers bigger than 0. In these cases, we may assume that the omitted graphs are all the empty graph.

We define the \leq -*width* of a graph sequence, denoted by $w_{\leq}(\mathcal{H})$, as the maximum size of a \leq -antichain of elements of \mathcal{H} . If such a bound does not exist then we say that \mathcal{H} has infinite \leq -width. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $\mathcal{H}_{>k}$ for the sequence obtained from \mathcal{H} after removing all graphs with index smaller than k . A graph sequence \mathcal{H} is \leq -*rational* if $w_{\leq}(\mathcal{H}) \in \mathbb{N}$. We say that \mathcal{H} is \leq -*prime* if $w_{\leq}(\mathcal{H}) = 1$. For \leq -monotone sequences \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{F} , we write $\mathcal{H} \lesssim \mathcal{F}$ if there exists a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{H}_k \leq \mathcal{F}_{f(k)}$ and $\mathcal{H} \approx \mathcal{F}$ if $\mathcal{H} \lesssim \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F} \lesssim \mathcal{H}$. As we did for \sim , we call *the gap* of the equivalence \approx and we define relations $\mathcal{H} \approx_{\mathfrak{p}} \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{H} \approx_{\perp} \mathcal{F}$ analogously to the way

we defined $\sim_{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\sim_{\mathcal{L}}$. Keep in mind that the interpretation of the symbols of \lesssim and \approx is always determined by the choice of \leq .

For a \leq -prime graph sequence \mathcal{H} , we define the \leq -monotone parameter $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{H}}$, so that:

$$\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{H},\leq}(G) = \max\{k \in \mathbb{N} \mid \mathcal{H}_k \leq G\}.$$

In this paper, as the relation \leq will always be clear from the context, we use the simpler notation $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{H}}$ instead of $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{H},\leq}$.

Notice that every \leq -monotone sequence of graphs is \leq -prime. In [77], it is shown that every \leq -prime sequence is equivalent to a \leq -monotone one, in the sense that their corresponding parameters are asymptotically equivalent. This permits us, in this paper, to “agree” that all \leq -prime sequences are also \leq -monotone and that all parametric graphs that we consider are \leq -monotone for some partial ordering \leq .

Definition 3. Let \mathcal{G} be a \leq -closed graph class. A \leq -prime sequence \mathcal{H} is an \leq -omnivore of \mathcal{G} if $\mathcal{G} = \downarrow_{\leq} \mathcal{H}$.

We let $\mathcal{A} = \langle \mathcal{A}_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}}$ denote the sequence of graphs such that for every $k \geq 2$, \mathcal{A}_k is the $(k \times 4k)$ -annulus grid (see Figure 1). Let also $\Gamma = \langle \Gamma_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence of $(k \times k)$ -grids. It is easy to verify that both \mathcal{A} and Γ are \leq_m -monotone and that $\mathcal{A} \approx_{\mathcal{L}} \Gamma$. As we already observed, both grids $\Gamma = \langle \Gamma_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and annulus grids $\mathcal{A} = \langle \mathcal{A}_k \rangle_{k \geq 2}$ are \leq_m -omnivores of $\mathcal{G}_{\text{planar}}$.




Figure 1: The graph sequence of annulus grids $\mathcal{A} = \langle \mathcal{A}_2, \mathcal{A}_3, \mathcal{A}_4, \mathcal{A}_5, \mathcal{A}_6 \dots \rangle$.

A countable set of graph sequences \mathfrak{H} is a \leq -prime collection if every $\mathcal{H} \in \mathfrak{H}$ is \leq -prime and the elements of \mathfrak{H} are pairwise \lesssim -non-comparable. Let \mathfrak{H} and \mathfrak{F} be \leq -prime collections. We write $\mathfrak{H} \equiv \mathfrak{F}$ if there is a bijection $\sigma : \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \mathfrak{F}$ such that for every $\mathcal{H} \in \mathfrak{H}$ it holds that $\mathcal{H} \approx \sigma(\mathcal{H})$ (we stress that the interpretation of \equiv depends on the choice of the partial ordering \leq). We define the \leq -monotone parameter $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{H}}$, so that:

$$\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{H},\leq}(G) = \max_{\mathcal{H} \in \mathfrak{H}} \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{H}}(G).$$

As before, we use $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{H}}$, instead of the heavier notation $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{H},\leq}$. Notice that $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{H}}(G) \sim \sum_{\mathcal{H} \in \mathfrak{H}} \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{H}}(G)$, which means that, from the point of view of asymptotic equivalence, the sum of two parameters is the same as taking the maximum of them.

Definition 4 (Universal obstruction). We say that a \leq -prime collection \mathfrak{H} is a \leq -universal obstruction for the graph parameter \mathbf{p} if $\mathbf{p}_{\mathfrak{H}} \sim \mathbf{p}$.

Notice that $\{\Gamma\}$ is a \leq_m -prime collection and $\mathbf{bg} = \mathbf{p}_{\{\Gamma\}}$. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{A} \approx_{\perp} \Gamma$ implies $\mathbf{p}_{\{\Gamma\}} \sim \mathbf{p}_{\{\mathcal{A}\}}$. As $\mathbf{bg} \sim \mathbf{tw}$, we have that the set containing the grids Γ is a \leq_m -universal obstruction for treewidth and the same holds for the set containing the grid annuli \mathcal{A} .

Theorem 1 ([77]). A \leq -monotone parameter \mathbf{p} has a \leq -universal obstruction if and only if $\mathbf{cobs}_{\leq}(\mathbf{p})$ exists. Moreover, if \mathfrak{H} is a \leq -universal obstruction for \mathbf{p} , then there is a bijection $\sigma : \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \mathbf{cobs}_{\leq}(\mathbf{p})$ such that every $\mathcal{A} \in \mathfrak{H}$ is an \leq -omnivore of $\sigma(\mathcal{A})$.

We can now present the equivalence between the four concepts that we defined so far. We say that a \leq -monotone parameter \mathbf{p} is *bounded* in some \leq -closed graph class \mathcal{G} if there exists a $c \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathbf{p}(G) \leq c$, for every $G \in \mathcal{G}$.

Theorem 2 ([77]). Let \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{p}' be \leq -monotone parameters such that $\mathbf{cobs}_{\leq}(\mathbf{p})$ and $\mathbf{cobs}_{\leq}(\mathbf{p}')$ exist. The following statements are equivalent:

1. $\mathbf{p} \sim \mathbf{p}'$,
2. $\mathbf{cobs}_{\leq}(\mathbf{p}) = \mathbf{cobs}_{\leq}(\mathbf{p}')$,
3. $\mathbf{pobs}_{\leq}(\mathbf{p}) = \mathbf{pobs}_{\leq}(\mathbf{p}')$,
4. for any \leq -universal obstruction \mathfrak{H} of \mathbf{p} (resp. \mathfrak{H}' of \mathbf{p}'), $\mathfrak{H} \equiv \mathfrak{H}'$, and
5. for every \leq -closed class \mathcal{G} , \mathbf{p} is bounded in \mathcal{G} iff \mathbf{p}' is bounded in \mathcal{G} .

2.4 General remarks and conventions

Comparing parameters using Smyth extensions. Let \leq be a partial ordering relation on some set \mathbf{A} . The *Smyth extension* of \leq (see e.g., [55]) is the partial ordering relation \leq^* defined on $2^{\mathbf{A}}$ such that, for $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y} \in 2^{\mathbf{A}}$, $\mathbf{X} \leq^* \mathbf{Y}$ iff $\forall y \in \mathbf{Y}, \exists x \in \mathbf{X}$ such that $x \leq y$.

The proof of Theorem 2 follows from the fact, shown in [77], that the following statements are equivalent:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{p} &\succeq \mathbf{p}' & (1) \\ \mathbf{cobs}_{\leq}(\mathbf{p}) &\subseteq^* \mathbf{cobs}_{\leq}(\mathbf{p}'), & (2) \\ \mathbf{pobs}_{\leq}(\mathbf{p}) &\leq^{**} \mathbf{pobs}_{\leq}(\mathbf{p}'), & (3) \\ \mathfrak{H} &\lesssim^* \mathfrak{H}'. & (4) \end{aligned}$$

Also observe that $\mathbf{pobs}_{\leq}(\mathbf{p})$, when it exists, is a \leq^* -antichain and that each $\mathcal{O} \in \mathbf{pobs}_{\leq}(\mathbf{p})$ is a \leq -antichain. Similarly, $\mathbf{cobs}_{\leq}(\mathbf{p})$, when it exists, is a \subseteq -antichain. Finally if \mathfrak{H} is a universal obstruction for \mathbf{p} , then \mathfrak{H} is a \lesssim -antichain.

In the next sections, for each of the parameters that we deal with, we provide all equivalent descriptions corresponding to Theorem 2. The relations (1), (2), (3), and (4) may serve as useful tools for making asymptotic comparisons between parameters.

Conventions. In each of the following sections we deal with a different partial ordering \leq . In particular, in Section 3 we consider the minor relation \leq_m , in Section 4 we consider the immersion relation \leq_i , and Section 5 we consider the vertex-minor relation \leq_v . Also, in Section 6 we consider the topological minor relation \leq_{tp} and the weak topological minor relation \leq_{wtp} . As in each case the context relation is clearly declared, we always use the simpler notation \leq instead. Also, for the same reason, we omit \leq where we refer to the notions \leq -prime, \leq -rational, \leq -monotone, \leq -omnivore, \leq -universal obstruction, \leq -class obstruction, \leq -parametric obstruction, obs_{\leq} , excl_{\leq} , cobs_{\leq} , pobs_{\leq} . We also use the simpler term $\downarrow\mathcal{H}$ instead of $\downarrow_{\leq}\mathcal{H}$.

2.5 Basic definitions

Given $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote the set $\{z \in \mathbb{N} \mid a \leq z \leq b\}$ by $[a, b]$. In case $a > b$ the set $[a, b]$ is empty. For an integer $p \geq 1$, we set $[p] = [1, p]$ and $\mathbb{N}_{\geq p} = \mathbb{N} \setminus [0, p-1]$. Given that \mathbf{A} is a set of objects where the operation \cup is defined, we denote $\mathbf{UA} = \bigcup_{A \in \mathbf{A}} A$.

Given a graph G , we use $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ for the vertex and the edge set of G , respectively. We also denote $|G| = |V(G)|$. Given a set $S \subseteq V(G)$ (resp. $F \subseteq E(G)$), we denote by $G - S$ (resp. $G - F$) the graph obtained if we remove the vertices of S (resp. of F) from G . If $a \in V(G) \cup E(G)$ we write $G - a$ instead of $G - \{a\}$. Also the *subgraph of G induced by $S \subseteq V(G)$* is defined by $G[S] = G - (V(G) \setminus S)$. Given two graphs G_1 and G_2 we define $G_1 \cup G_2 = (V(G_1) \cup V(G_2), E(G_1) \cup E(G_2))$. Given a $v \in V(G)$ we define the *neighborhood* of v in G as the set $N_G(v) = \{u \mid \{v, u\} \in E(G)\}$. The *degree* of a vertex $v \in V(G)$ is the cardinality of the set $N_G(v)$. In case G is a multigraph, we define the *edge degree* of a vertex v to be the number of edges that are incident to v .

Let $e = \{x, y\}$ be an edge in a graph G . The result of the *subdivision* of e in G is the graph obtained from the graph $G - e$ if we add to it a new vertex $v_{x,y}$ and the two edges $\{x, v_{x,y}\}$ and $\{v_{x,y}, y\}$. A *subdivision* of a graph H is any graph that is obtained from H after a (possibly empty) sequence of subdivisions. We say that a graph H is a *topological minor* of a graph G if G contains as a subgraph some subdivision of H and we denote this by \leq_{tp} . Notice that if H is a topological minor of G then H is also a minor of G . However, the inverse is not correct. We also stress that, contrary to \leq_m , the partial ordering \leq_{tp} is not a wqo in \mathcal{G}_{all} .

3 Obstructions of minor-monotone parameters

3.1 Warm up

To get used to the concepts introduced in the previous section, let us start by discussing some elementary minor-monotone parameters. The first interesting parameter to consider is the number of vertices of a graph, which we denote size , that is for $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{all}}$, $\text{size}(G) = |G|$. Observe that a universal obstruction for size is $\{\mathcal{K}^{\text{d}}\}$ where $\mathcal{K}^{\text{d}} = \langle k \cdot K_1 \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ consists of the edgeless graphs. Notice also that $\text{cobs}(\text{size}) = \{\text{excl}\{K_2\}\}$ and $\text{pobs}(\text{size}) = \{\{K_2\}\}$.

We may next consider the parameter counting the number of edges of a graph, which we denote esize , that is for $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{all}}$, $\text{esize}(G) = |E(G)|$. A universal obstruction for esize is $\{\mathcal{K}^{\text{m}}, \mathcal{K}^{\text{s}}\}$ where $\mathcal{K}^{\text{m}} = \langle k \cdot K_2 \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathcal{K}^{\text{s}} = \langle K_{1,k} \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. Indeed, a graph has many edges if and only if it either contains a large matching as a minor, or a star with many leaves. Let \mathcal{C}^{M} be the set of forests of maximum degree 1 and \mathcal{C}^{S} be the set of star forests, that is the forests whose connected components contain

at most one vertex of degree larger than 1. It is easy to verify that $\text{cobs}(\text{esize}) = \{\mathcal{C}^M, \mathcal{C}^S\}$. As a consequence, $\text{pobs}(\text{esize}) = \{\{P_3\}, \{K_3, 2 \cdot K_2\}\}$.

So, as we just discussed, esize is a parameter characterized by a universal obstruction containing two parametric graphs. It is natural to ask for each of these two graph sequences to which parameter it corresponds. As a preliminary remark, let us observe that since $\text{pobs}(\text{esize}) \leq^* \{\{P_3\}\}$ and $\text{pobs}(\text{esize}) \leq^* \{\{K_3, 2 \cdot K_2\}\}$, we have that $\mathfrak{p}_{\{\mathcal{K}^S\}} \preceq \text{esize}$ and $\mathfrak{p}_{\{\mathcal{K}^M\}} \preceq \text{esize}$. Let us first consider the parameter $\mathfrak{p}_{\{\mathcal{K}^S\}}$. As discussed above, we have that $\text{cobs}(\mathfrak{p}_{\{\mathcal{K}^S\}}) = \{\mathcal{C}^S\}$ and $\text{pobs}(\mathfrak{p}_{\{\mathcal{K}^S\}}) = \{\{K_3, 2 \cdot K_2\}\}$. Observe now that for a graph G , $\mathfrak{p}_{\{\mathcal{K}^S\}}(G)$ is the maximum number of leaves of a tree subgraph of G and we denote this parameter by $\text{maxstar}(G)$ ⁶. We now turn to $\mathfrak{p}_{\{\mathcal{K}^M\}}$, which captures the maximum size of a matching of a graph. Again, by the above discussion, we have that $\text{cobs}(\mathfrak{p}_{\{\mathcal{K}^M\}}) = \{\mathcal{C}^M\}$ and $\text{pobs}(\mathfrak{p}_{\{\mathcal{K}^M\}}) = \{\{P_3\}\}$. For a graph G , let $\text{vc}(G)$ denote the vertex cover of G , that is the minimum size of a vertex subset S such that $G - S$ is an edgeless graph. It is well known that $\mathfrak{p}_{\{\mathcal{K}^M\}}$ and vc are equivalent parameters.

Last but not least, one can wonder about the following very elementary parameter⁷ denoted by \mathfrak{p}_∞ and such that, for every non-empty graph G , $\mathfrak{p}_\infty(G) = \infty$. To understand what are the class obstruction and the parametric obstruction of \mathfrak{p}_∞ , we consider the empty clique K_0 and define the graph sequence $\mathcal{K}^\emptyset = \langle k \cdot K_0 \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. One can observe that, for every graph G , $\mathfrak{p}_{\{\mathcal{K}^\emptyset\}}(G) = \infty$. It follows that $\{\mathcal{K}^\emptyset\}$ is a universal obstruction for \mathfrak{p}_∞ , $\text{cobs}(\mathfrak{p}_\infty) = \{\{K_0\}\}$, and $\text{pobs}(\mathfrak{p}_\infty) = \{\{K_1\}\}$.

The discussion above on these few simple parameters reveals the versatility of the concepts we introduced in the previous section and their relationship. As we saw, this allows for different viewpoints or approaches to define relevant parameters. In the next subsection, we examine some classic minor-monotone graph parameters as well as some very natural but less investigated parameters. This will lead us to define a very rich hierarchy of parameters which, we believe, deserves more systematic attention.

3.2 The celebrities: treewidth, pathwidth, and treedepth

We proceed with our presentation of minor-monotone parameters by the three most famous ones. These are treewidth, pathwidth, and treedepth.

3.2.1 Treewidth

Our first guest is treewidth that we already introduced and discussed in Section 2. Treewidth can be seen as a measure of the topological resemblance of a graph to a tree and is perhaps the most universal graph parameter, due to its numerous applications both in combinatorics and in algorithms [8]. The definition of treewidth that we gave in Section 2 was based on clique-sum closures. An alternative definition is based on layouts. A *layout* of a graph is a linear ordering of its vertex set and is denoted $L = \langle v_1, \dots, v_n \rangle$. The treewidth of a graph G is the minimum k for which $V(G)$ has a layout $L = \langle v_1, \dots, v_n \rangle$ such that, for each $i \in [n]$, there are at most k vertices in $\{v_1, \dots, v_{i-1}\}$ that are adjacent with vertices in the connected component of $G[\{v_i, \dots, v_n\}]$ that contains v_i (see [25]). Treewidth is important in algorithmic graph theory due to the fact that many problems on

⁶If G is connected then $\text{maxstar}(G)$ corresponds to the maxleaf parameter [40, 37]

⁷Formally, we may consider as the “outmostly elementary” parameter the empty function $\mathfrak{p}_\emptyset = \emptyset$ that is undefined for all inputs. It follows that $\text{cobs}(\mathfrak{p}_\emptyset) = \{\emptyset\}$, and $\text{pobs}(\mathfrak{p}_\emptyset) = \{\{K_0\}\}$.

graphs can be solved efficiently when restricted to graphs of bounded treewidth. This fact has been formalized by the celebrated Courcelle’s theorem stating that every problem on graphs that is expressible in Monadic Second Order Logic (MSOL) can be solved in linear time on graphs with bounded treewidth [15, 17, 16].

The next proposition summarizes the discussion on treewidth from Section 2. It indicates the asymptotic behaviour of tw in terms of universal obstructions, class obstructions, and parametric obstructions. Its proof, being the first of its kind in this paper, is presented in full detail.

Theorem 3. *The set $\{\mathcal{A}\}$ containing the annulus grid sequence \mathcal{A} is a universal obstruction for tw , with polynomial gap. Moreover, $\text{cobs}(\text{tw}) = \{\mathcal{G}_{\text{planar}}\}$ and $\text{pobs}(\text{tw}) = \{\{K_5, K_{3,3}\}\}$.*

Proof. Let us prove that $\text{tw} \sim_{\text{p}} \text{p}_{\mathcal{A}}$, implying that \mathcal{A} is a universal obstruction for tw . By definition, if a graph G satisfies $\text{p}_{\mathcal{A}}(G) \geq k$, then \mathcal{A}_k , and therefore also Γ_k , is a minor of G . As $\text{tw}(\Gamma_k) \geq k$ (see e.g., [8, Lemma 88]), this implies that $\text{tw}(G) \geq k$ and so $\text{p}_{\mathcal{A}} \preceq \text{tw}$. The fact that $\text{tw} \preceq \text{p}_{\mathcal{A}}$ follows from the grid exclusion theorem [88] stating that there exists a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, such that for every positive integer k , every graph of treewidth at least $f(k)$ contains Γ_k as a minor. Since $\mathcal{A}_k \leq \Gamma_{3k}$, it follows that $\text{tw} \preceq \text{p}_{\mathcal{A}}$. Therefore, $\{\mathcal{A}\}$ is a universal obstruction for tw . Moreover, it has been shown in [12, 14] that the gap function f is polynomial, in particular $f(k) = O(k^9(\log k)^{O(1)})$. Therefore, $\text{tw} \sim_{\text{p}} \text{p}_{\mathcal{A}}$.

It is easy to observe, see e.g., [85, (1.5)], that grids are planar and that every planar graph is a minor of some large enough grid. As $\mathcal{A}_k \leq \Gamma_{3k} \leq \mathcal{A}_{3k}$, it follows that the sequence $\mathcal{A} = \langle \mathcal{A}_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 3}}$ is an omnivore of $\mathcal{G}_{\text{planar}}$. As $\{\mathcal{A}\}$ is a universal obstruction for tw , Theorem 1 implies that $\text{cobs}(\text{tw})$ exists and that $\text{cobs}(\text{tw}) = \{\mathcal{G}_{\text{planar}}\}$. Finally, as $\{K_5, K_{3,3}\}$ is the set of minor obstructions of planar graphs [98], we have $\text{pobs}(\text{tw}) = \{\{K_5, K_{3,3}\}\}$. \square

An interesting question is to what point the $O(k^9(\log k)^{O(1)})$ parametric gap, implied by the result of Chuzhoy and Tan in [14], can be improved. By considering expander graphs one may easily prove that this gap cannot become better than $O(k^2 \log k)$ (see e.g., [85, 94, 24]).

Concluding the presentation of treewidth, we should mention an interesting generalization of treewidth that was given in [42]. Given a $t \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the t -treewidth of a graph by using the clique-sum oriented definition of treewidth in Section 2 with the difference that now all clique-sums concern cliques of at most t vertices. The main result of [42] can be reformulated as a universal obstruction for t -treewidth, for every possible value of t whose size is bounded by a function of t .

3.2.2 Pathwidth

Pathwidth serves as a measure of the path-like structure of a graph. It has several equivalent definitions. The most classic definition is the one given by Robertson and Seymour in [78] that uses path decompositions. A *path decomposition* of a graph G is a sequence $\mathcal{P} = \{X_1, \dots, X_q\}$ of subsets of $V(G)$ where $\bigcup \{G[X_1], \dots, G[X_q]\} = G$ and such that for every $1 \leq i \leq j \leq h \leq q$, it holds that $X_j \subseteq X_i \cap X_h$. The *width* of \mathcal{P} is the maximum size of a set in \mathcal{P} minus one. The *pathwidth* of G , denoted by $\text{pw}(G)$, is the minimum k for which G has a path decomposition of width at most k . Alternatively, the pathwidth of a graph G can be defined as the minimum k for which $V(G)$ has a linear layout $L = \langle v_1, \dots, v_n \rangle$ such that for each $i \in [n]$ there are at most k vertices in $\{v_1, \dots, v_{i-1}\}$ that are adjacent with vertices in $\{v_i, \dots, v_n\}$ (see also [61, 73, 62]).

We define $\mathcal{T} = \langle \mathcal{T}_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}}$ as the sequence of complete ternary trees of depth k (see Figure 2). We also denote by $\mathcal{G}_{\text{forest}}$ the set of all acyclic graphs.




Figure 2: The sequence $\mathcal{T} = \langle \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_3, \mathcal{T}_4, \dots \rangle$ of complete ternary trees.

Theorem 4. *The set $\{\mathcal{T}\}$ containing the complete ternary tree sequence \mathcal{T} is a universal obstruction for pw . Moreover, $\text{cobs}(\text{pw}) = \{\mathcal{G}_{\text{forest}}\}$ and $\text{pobs}(\text{pw}) = \{\{K_3\}\}$.*

Proof. It is easy to see that $\text{pw}(\mathcal{T}_k) = \Omega(k)$ (see e.g., [63, Proposition 3.2]), therefore $\text{p}_{\{\mathcal{T}\}} \preceq \text{pw}$. The direction $\text{pw} \preceq \text{p}_{\{\mathcal{T}\}}$ follows from the fact that for every forest F every graph in $\text{excl}(\{F\})$ has pathwidth at most $|F| - 2$, as proven in [7] (see also [78]). As \mathcal{T} is an omnivore of $\mathcal{G}_{\text{forest}}$ and $\text{obs}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{forest}}) = \{K_3\}$, from Theorem 1, we obtain that $\text{cobs}(\text{pw}) = \{\mathcal{G}_{\text{forest}}\}$ and $\text{pobs}(\text{pw}) = \{\{K_3\}\}$. \square

3.2.3 Treedepth.

The *treedepth* of a graph G , denoted $\text{td}(G)$, is the minimum height of a rooted forest F whose transitive closure contains G as a subgraph [75]. There are several equivalent definitions of treedepth. An alternative definition is using vertex colorings. The treedepth of a graph is the minimum k for which there is a proper coloring $\chi : V(G) \rightarrow [k]$ such that every path whose endpoints have the same color contains a vertex of greater color.

A *linear forest* is a graph for which every connected component is a path. We use $\mathcal{G}_{\text{linear forest}}$ in order to denote the set of all linear forests. Let $\mathcal{P} = \langle \mathcal{P}_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}}$ denote the sequence of paths of length k (see Figure 3).




Figure 3: The sequence $\mathcal{P} = \langle \mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4, \mathcal{P}_5, \dots \rangle$ of paths.

Theorem 5. *The set $\{\mathcal{P}\}$ containing the sequence \mathcal{P} of paths is a universal obstruction for td . Moreover, $\text{cobs}(\text{td}) = \{\mathcal{G}_{\text{linear forest}}\}$ and $\text{pobs}(\text{td}) = \{\{K_3, K_{1,3}\}\}$.*

Proof. Notice that $\text{td}(P_k) \geq \text{td}(P_{\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil}) + 1$. This immediately implies that $\text{p}_{\mathcal{P}} \preceq \text{td}$. To see that $\text{td} \preceq \text{p}_{\mathcal{P}}$ assume that G does not have any path of length $> k$ and observe that any BFS-tree in G

certifies that $\text{td}(G) \leq k$. We conclude that $\text{td} \sim \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{P}}$. As \mathcal{P} is an omnivore of $\mathcal{G}_{\text{linear forest}}$, we have that $\text{cobs}(\text{td}) = \{\mathcal{G}_{\text{linear forest}}\}$ and it is easy to see that $\text{obs}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{linear forest}}) = \{K_3, K_{1,3}\}$. \square

We stress that the statement of Theorem 5 can be rephrased for the subgraph relation \leq_{sg} instead of the minor one. The difference is that $\text{pobs}_{\leq_{\text{sg}}}(\text{td}) = \{\{K_{1,3} \cup \{C_k \mid k \geq 3\}\}\}$, where C_k is the cycle on k vertices. The reason is that containing a path as a minor is the same as containing it as a subgraph. Observe that the \leq_{sg} -parametric obstruction of td is a finite set containing only one (infinite) \leq_{sg} -antichain.

Notice that the above proof does not provide any polynomial gap function as $\text{td}(P_k) = \Theta(\log(k))$. Actually this is unavoidable when considering any universal obstruction consisting of a single sequence $\mathcal{H} = \langle \mathcal{H}_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, because \mathcal{H}_k , being an omnivore of $\mathcal{G}_{\text{linear forest}}$, has to consist of linear forests. Interestingly, (as shown by the next theorem), if we tolerate that a universal obstruction is not a \lesssim -antichain, then a polynomial gap can be achieved, i.e., there is a \mathfrak{P}' , containing three parametric graphs, where $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{P}'} \sim_{\mathfrak{P}} \text{td}$.

Theorem 6 ([60]). *There exists a constant c such that every graph of treedepth at least k^c has one or more of the following minors:*

- the $(k \times k)$ -grid;
- the complete ternary tree of height k ;
- the path of order 2^k .

3.2.4 Parameter hierarchy

Notice that the parameters described so far are ordered using the \preceq relation as follows

$$\text{tw} \preceq \text{pw} \preceq \text{td} \preceq \text{vc} \preceq \text{esize} \preceq \text{size} \preceq \mathfrak{p}_{\infty}, \quad (5)$$

The above hierarchy, according to the equivalence between (1) and (3), can be translated to the following hierarchy of parametric obstructions:

$$\{\{K_5, K_{3,3}\}\} \geq^* \{\{K_3\}\} \geq^* \{\{K_3, K_{1,3}\}\} \geq^* \{\{P_3\}\} \geq^* \{\{P_3\}, \{K_3, 2 \cdot K_2\}\} \geq^* \{\{K_2\}\} \geq^* \{\{K_1\}\}.$$

3.3 Parameters asymptotically smaller than treewidth

A natural question is what resides on “the left” of this hierarchy, i.e., whether there are parameters that are *asymptotically smaller* than treewidth. This subsection is devoted to such kind of parameters.

3.3.1 Singly-crossing treewidth

Given a parameter \mathfrak{p} and some $r \in \mathbb{N}$, we define its *clique-sum closure* \mathfrak{p}^* , so that $\mathfrak{p}^*(G)$ is equal to the minimum k for which G can be obtained using clique-sums and starting from graphs where the value of \mathfrak{p} is at most k . The clique-sum operation is useful for defining new parameters. Clearly, $\text{size}^* \sim \text{tw}$.

Let psize be the graph parameter where, if G is non-planar, then $\text{psize}(G)$ is $|G|$, otherwise $\text{psize}(G) = 0$. The *singly-crossing treewidth*, is defined so that

$$\text{sc-tw} = \text{psize}^*.$$

In other words $\text{sc-tw}(G)$ is the minimum k for which G is the clique-sum closure of planar graphs and graphs on at most k vertices.

Singly-crossing treewidth has been considered in algorithmic applications where it is possible to combine the structure of a planar graph with the tree decomposition formed by the clique-sums of the bounded-size non-planar parts. For instance, in [56] Kamiński proved that there is a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that MAX-CUT can be solved in time $O(|G|^{f(\text{sc-tw}(G))})$, which gives a polynomial time algorithm for every graph class where $\text{sc-tw}(G)$ is bounded. For other algorithmic applications of sc-tw , see [23, 22].




Figure 4: The sequence of singly-crossing grids $\mathcal{S} = \langle \mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{S}_3, \mathcal{S}_4, \mathcal{S}_5, \mathcal{S}_6 \dots \rangle$.

We define the parametric graph $\mathcal{S} = \langle \mathcal{S}_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}}$ where \mathcal{S}_k is the *singly-crossing grid* depicted in Figure 4. We also define $\mathcal{G}_{\text{singly-crossing}}$ to be the class of *singly-crossing graphs* that are graphs that can be drawn in the sphere so that at most one edge e is intersecting at most once the drawing of $G - e$. In [80], Robertson and Seymour proved that there is a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that if a graph excludes a singly-crossing graph H on k vertices as a minor, then it is the 3-clique-sum closure of planar graphs and graphs of treewidth at most $f(k)$, or equivalently, the clique-sum closure of planar graphs and of graphs of size at most $f(k) + 1$. Notice also that \mathcal{S} is an omnivore of singly-crossing graphs. Moreover, according to Robertson and Seymour [80], $\text{obs}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{singly-crossing}}) = \mathcal{O}_1 \cup \mathcal{O}_2$ where \mathcal{O}_1 is the minor-obstruction set of the class of graphs that are embeddable in the projective plane and \mathcal{O}_2 is the minor-obstruction set of the class of linklessly embeddable graphs⁸. According to [4, 3, 45], \mathcal{O}_1 contains 35 graphs and, according to [86], \mathcal{O}_2 contains the 7 graphs of the *Petersen family* and contains all graphs that can be obtained from K_6 by applying combinations of Δ - Y or Y - Δ transformations (see Figure 5). As $\mathcal{O}_1 \cap \mathcal{O}_2 = \{K_{4,4}^-\}$ (were $K_{4,4}^-$ is $K_{4,4}$ minus an edge) it follows that $\mathcal{O}_1 \cup \mathcal{O}_2$ contains 41 graphs. We summarize the above facts to the following:

Theorem 7. *The set $\{\mathcal{S}\}$ containing the sequence \mathcal{S} of singly-crossing grids is a universal obstruction for sc-tw . Moreover, $\text{cobs}(\text{sc-tw}) = \{\mathcal{G}_{\text{singly-crossing}}\}$ and $\text{pobs}(\text{sc-tw}) = \{\mathcal{O}_1 \cup \mathcal{O}_2\}$.*

⁸A graph is linklessly embeddable if it has an embedding in the 3-dimensional space so that no two cycles of this embedding are linked.




Figure 5: The Petersen family (image taken from Wikipedia).

3.3.2 Shallow-vortex treewidth

The *shallow-vortex treewidth*, which we denote by sv-tw is defined as follows: $\text{sv-tw}(G)$ is the minimum k for which G is the clique-sum closure of every graph G containing a set X where $|X| \leq k$ and such that $G - X$ is embeddable in a surface of Euler genus at most k . In other words,

$$\text{sv-tw} = \left(\min \{k \in \mathbb{N} \mid \exists X : |X| \leq k \text{ and } G - X \in \mathcal{E}_k\} \right)^*. \quad (6)$$

Notice that the above definition adopts the *modulator vs target* scheme of graph modification problems. The set X is the modulator that, when removed, we obtain a graph in the target class \mathcal{E}_k . Moreover, the (annotated) parameter **size** acts as the measure of the modulator, that in (6) is $|X|$.

The parameter, sv-tw has been introduced in [95] in the context of the study of the problem $\#\text{PERFECT MATCHING}$ asking for the number of perfect matchings in a graph. The main result of [95] is that there is a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $\#\text{PERFECT MATCHING}$ can be solved in time $O(|G|^{f(\text{sc-tw}(G))})$. This makes $\#\text{PERFECT MATCHING}$ polynomially solvable on any minor-closed graph class where sc-tw is bounded. Moreover, it was proved in [95] that for minor-closed graph classes where sc-tw is unbounded, $\#\text{PERFECT MATCHING}$ is $\#\text{P}$ -complete. This means that sc-tw precisely captures the transition in the counting complexity of $\#\text{PERFECT MATCHING}$.

We define the *shallow-vortex grids* $\mathcal{V} = \langle \mathcal{V}_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}}$ so that \mathcal{V}_k is the graph obtained from a $(k \times 4k)$ -annulus grid by adding a matching M of size $2k$ in its inner cycle, as indicated in Figure 6. The class of *shallow-vortex minors* is defined as $\mathcal{G}_{\text{svminors}} = \downarrow \mathcal{V}$.

Using our terminology, the main result of [95] is the following.

Theorem 8 ([95]). *The set $\{\mathcal{V}\}$ containing the sequence \mathcal{V} of shallow-vortex annulus grids is a universal obstruction for sv-tw . It holds that $\text{cobs}(\text{sc-tw}) = \{\mathcal{G}_{\text{svminors}}\}$ and $\text{pobs}(\text{sc-tw}) = \{\text{obs}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{svminors}})\}$.*

The obstruction set $\text{obs}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{svminors}})$ is unknown and, most probably, not easy to identify.




Figure 6: The sequence of shallow-vortex grids $\mathcal{V} = \langle \mathcal{V}_2, \mathcal{V}_3, \mathcal{V}_4, \mathcal{V}_5, \mathcal{V}_6 \dots \rangle$.

3.3.3 Hadwiger number

The *Hadwiger number* of a graph G , denoted $\text{hw}(G)$, is the size of the largest clique that is a minor of G [48]. This means that hw is the parameter generated by the parametric graph $\langle K_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. We may alternatively replace cliques by an equivalent parametric graph drawn as an enhancement of the $(k \times 4k)$ -annulus grid. Let $\mathcal{K} = \langle \mathcal{K}_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the graph sequence of *clique grids* defined as in Figure 7. It is easy to verify that $\mathcal{K} \approx_{\mathbb{L}} \langle K_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, therefore $\text{hw} \sim \mathbf{p}_{\{\mathcal{K}\}}$. A min-max analogue of the Hadwiger number is given by the Graph Minors Structure Theorem, proven by Robertson and Seymour in [82]. As every graph is a minor of a big enough clique, the following holds.




Figure 7: The graph sequence of clique grids $\mathcal{K} = \langle \mathcal{K}_2, \mathcal{K}_3, \mathcal{K}_4, \mathcal{K}_5, \mathcal{K}_6 \dots \rangle$.

Theorem 9. *The set $\{\mathcal{K}\}$ containing the sequence \mathcal{K} of clique grids is a universal obstruction for hw . Moreover, $\text{cobs}(\text{hw}) = \{\mathcal{G}_{\text{all}}\}$ and $\text{pobs}(\text{hw}) = \{\emptyset\}$.*

3.3.4 Parameter hierarchy

Let \mathbf{p}_0 be the graph parameter where $\mathbf{p}_0(G) = 0$, for every graph G . Notice that $\text{cobs}(\mathbf{p}_0) = \emptyset$ and $\text{pobs}(\mathbf{p}_0) = \emptyset$. We are now in position to complement the part of (5) that is to the “left of treewidth” as follows.

$$\mathbf{p}_0 \preceq \text{hw} \preceq \text{sv-tw} \preceq \text{sc-tw} \preceq \text{tw}. \quad (7)$$

Moreover, the corresponding parametric obstructions are

$$\{\} \geq^* \{\{\}\} \geq^* \{\text{obs}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{svminors}})\} \geq^* \{\{\mathcal{O}_1 \cup \mathcal{O}_2\}\} \geq^* \{\{K_5, K_{3,3}\}\}.$$

3.4 Elimination distance parameters

In this section, we present several parameters whose definitions is based on some vertex elimination procedure. We introduce a general scheme of including several such parameters in one definition.

3.4.1 Variants of elimination

Let $c \in [0, 2]$. A c -connected component of a graph is a maximal set C of vertices such that $G[C]$ is c -connected, that is it contains at least c internally vertex-disjoint paths between every pair of vertices of C (notice that all graphs are 0-connected). A subgraph B of G is a c -block of G if it is a c -connected component or an isolated vertex of G or, in case $c = 2$, it is a bridge⁹ of G . Using this notion, we can define the c -elimination distance to a graph class.

Let $c \in [0, 2]$ and let \mathcal{Z} be a finite set of graphs where each graph in \mathcal{Z} is c -connected. We define the c -elimination distance of a graph G to the class $\text{excl}(\mathcal{Z})$, denoted by $(c, \mathcal{Z})\text{-ed}(G)$, as follows: If $G \in \text{excl}(\mathcal{Z})$, then $(c, \mathcal{Z})\text{-ed}(G) = 0$, otherwise $(c, \mathcal{Z})\text{-ed}(G) \leq k$ if there exists a vertex $x \in V(G)$ such that, for every c -block B of $G - x$, $(c, \mathcal{Z})\text{-ed}(B) \leq k - 1$. In other words:

$$(c, \mathcal{Z})\text{-ed}(G) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } G \in \text{excl}(\mathcal{Z}) \\ \min \{ \max \{ (c, \mathcal{Z})\text{-ed}(B) \mid B \text{ is a } c\text{-block of } G - v \} \mid v \in V(G) \} & \text{if } G \notin \text{excl}(\mathcal{Z}) \end{cases}$$

Certainly, by definition, $(2, \mathcal{Z})\text{-ed} \preceq (1, \mathcal{Z})\text{-ed} \preceq (0, \mathcal{Z})\text{-ed}$. Depending on the choice of c and \mathcal{Z} , $(c, \mathcal{Z})\text{-ed}$ can express several graph modification parameters. Notice that $(c, \mathcal{Z})\text{-ed}$ expresses a graph modification modulator/target scheme where the eliminated vertices are the modulator and the class $\text{excl}(\mathcal{Z})$ is the target graph class.

Observe that $(0, \mathcal{Z})\text{-ed}$ defines what is known as the *apex number* of a graph G to the class $\text{excl}(\mathcal{Z})$, denoted by $\mathcal{Z}\text{-apex}(G)$ that is the minimum size of a set S of vertices to remove such that $G - S \in \text{excl}(\mathcal{Z})$. Moreover, $(1, \mathcal{Z})\text{-ed}$ defines the *elimination distance* of a graph G to the class $\text{excl}(\mathcal{Z})$, denoted by $\mathcal{Z}\text{-ed}(G)$ and $(2, \mathcal{Z})\text{-ed}$ defines the *block elimination distance* of a graph G to the class $\text{excl}(\mathcal{Z})$, denoted by $\mathcal{Z}\text{-bed}(G)$.

Notice that the parameter of vertex cover (resp. treedepth), already examined in Subsection 3.1 (resp. §3.2.3), is a variant of $(c, \mathcal{Z})\text{-ed}$ as $\text{vc} = (0, \{K_2\})\text{-ed}$ (resp. $\text{td} = (1, \{K_2\})\text{-ed}$).

3.4.2 Obstructions for apex parameters

Given a graph Z , we define the sequence $\mathcal{H}^Z = \langle k \cdot Z \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. We also define $\text{max}(Z)$ as the graph obtained if we remove from Z every connected component that is a proper minor of some (other) connected component. Moreover, we define $\text{conn}(Z)$ to be the set of all connected graphs that minimally contain Z as a subgraph. Clearly, if Z is connected, $\text{conn}(Z) = \{Z\}$. For a set of graphs

⁹A *bridge* of a graph G is a subgraph of G on two vertices and one edge, whose removal increases the number of 1-connected components of G .

\mathcal{Z} we define $\text{conn}(\mathcal{Z})$ as the minor-minimal graphs in $\mathbf{U}\{\text{conn}(Z) \mid Z \in \mathcal{Z}\}$. For a finite set of graphs \mathcal{Z} , we define the parameter \mathcal{Z} -pack as follows:

$$\mathcal{Z}\text{-pack}(G) = \max \{k \mid \exists Z \in \mathcal{Z} : k \cdot Z \leq G\}.$$

Trivially, for every graph G , $\mathcal{Z}\text{-pack}(G) \leq \mathcal{Z}\text{-apex}(G)$, i.e. $\mathcal{Z}\text{-pack} \preceq \mathcal{Z}\text{-apex}$. Moreover, we say that \mathcal{Z} has the *Erdős-Pósa property* if there exists a function f , such that $\mathcal{Z}\text{-apex}(G) \leq f(\mathcal{Z}\text{-pack}(G))$, i.e. if $\mathcal{Z}\text{-apex} \preceq \mathcal{Z}\text{-pack}$. For $\mathcal{Z} = \{Z\}$, we know that the Erdős-Pósa property for minors holds if and only if Z is a planar graph (see [88]). This can be easily extended to a family \mathcal{Z} that contains at least one planar graph. Moreover:

Proposition 2 ([97]). *Let \mathcal{Z} be a finite set of graphs containing at least one planar graph. For every graph G , if $\mathcal{Z}\text{-pack}(G) \leq k$, then $\mathcal{Z}\text{-apex}(G) = O(k \log k)$.*

Let \mathcal{G} be a minor-closed class. By $\mathbf{C}(\mathcal{G})$ we denote the closure of \mathcal{G} under disjoint union, that is $\mathbf{C}(\mathcal{G})$ contains every graph whose connected components are graphs belonging to \mathcal{G} .

Proposition 3 ([11]). *For a minor-closed class \mathcal{G} , $\text{obs}(\mathbf{C}(\mathcal{G})) = \text{conn}(\text{obs}(\mathcal{G}))$.*

Let \mathcal{Z} be finite set of graphs containing at least one planar graph. We define:

$$\mathfrak{H}^{\mathcal{Z}} = \{\mathcal{H}^{\max(Z)} \mid Z \in \mathcal{Z}\}.$$

Theorem 10. *If $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{\text{all}}$ is a (finite) minor-antichain containing at least one planar graph, then the set $\mathfrak{H}^{\mathcal{Z}}$ is a universal obstruction for $\mathcal{Z}\text{-apex}$, with (polynomial) gap $O(k \log k)$. Moreover,*

$$\text{cobs}(\mathcal{Z}\text{-apex}) = \{\downarrow \mathcal{H} \mid \mathcal{H} \in \mathfrak{H}^{\mathcal{Z}}\} \text{ and}$$

$$\text{pobs}(\mathcal{Z}\text{-apex}) = \{\text{conn}(\text{obs}(\downarrow \{\max(Z)\})) \mid Z \in \mathcal{Z}\}.$$

Proof. Assume first that \mathcal{Z} contains only connected graphs. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{Z}\text{-pack} = \text{p}_{\mathfrak{H}^{\mathcal{Z}}}$. Then, the fact that $\mathfrak{H}^{\mathcal{Z}}$ is a universal obstruction for $\mathcal{Z}\text{-apex}$ follows from the fact that \mathcal{Z} has the Erdős-Pósa property for minors. By Proposition 2, it follows that the gap is $O(k \log k)$. By Theorem 1, $\text{cobs}(\mathcal{Z}\text{-apex}) = \{\downarrow \mathcal{H} \mid \mathcal{H} \in \mathfrak{H}^{\mathcal{Z}}\}$. Moreover, it is easy to observe that for every $\mathcal{H}^{\max(Z)} \in \mathfrak{H}^{\mathcal{Z}}$, $\downarrow \mathcal{H}^{\max(Z)}$ contains all graphs whose connected components are minors of $\max(Z)$, i.e. $\mathbf{C}(\downarrow \{\max(Z)\})$. Then, by definition and Proposition 3, $\text{pobs}(\mathcal{Z}\text{-apex}) = \{\text{conn}(\text{obs}(\downarrow \{\max(Z)\})) \mid Z \in \mathcal{Z}\}$. In the case that \mathcal{Z} contains a disconnected graph Z , it is easy to observe that $\mathcal{H}^Z \approx \mathcal{H}^{\max(Z)}$. Hence, we can equivalently consider $\max(Z)$ for all $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$. \square

We now give some examples of the most known apex parameters and, for each of them, we give the corresponding universal obstructions, by applying Theorem 10.

Feedback vertex set. The *feedback vertex set* parameter, denoted by fvs , is defined so that $\text{fvs}(G)$ is the minimum size of a set $X \subseteq V(G)$ such that $G - X$ is acyclic. The parameter fvs , as well as vc (already considered in Subsection 2.5), are two (very) special cases of $\mathcal{Z}\text{-apex}$. Indeed, we have that $\text{fvs}(G) = \{K_3\}\text{-apex}(G)$ and $\text{vc}(G) = \{K_2\}\text{-apex}(G)$. We define the parametric graph $\mathcal{K}^{(K_3)} = \langle k \cdot K_3 \rangle_{k \geq 1}$. Let $\mathcal{G}_{\text{triangle minors}} = \downarrow \mathcal{K}^{(K_3)}$ be the class whose connected components have at most three vertices. Notice that, from Proposition 3, $\text{obs}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{triangle minors}}) = \text{conn}(\{4 \cdot K_1\}) = \{P_4, K_{1,3}\}$. Applying Theorem 10, we have the following.

Theorem 11. *$\{\mathcal{K}^{(K_3)}\}$ is a universal obstruction for fvs with gap $O(k \log k)$. Moreover, it holds that $\text{cobs}(\text{fvs}) = \{\mathcal{G}_{\text{triangle minors}}\}$ and $\text{pobs}(\text{fvs}) = \{\{P_4, K_{1,3}\}\}$.*

Apex to outerplanarity. Another example that is illustrative of the applicability of Theorem 10 is $\text{apexouter} := \{K_4, K_{2,3}\}$ -apex, that is $\text{apexouter}(G)$ is the minimum size of a set $X \subseteq V(G)$ such that $G - X$ is outerplanar. For a study of the obstructions of $\mathcal{G}_{\text{apexouter},1}$, see [29].

We define the parametric graphs $\mathcal{K}^{(K_4)} = \langle k \cdot K_4 \rangle_{k \geq 1}$ and $\mathcal{K}^{(K_{2,3})} = \langle k \cdot K_{2,3} \rangle_{k \geq 1}$. Clearly $\downarrow \mathcal{K}^{(K_4)}$ is the class of graphs whose connected components have at most four vertices and $\downarrow \mathcal{K}^{(K_{2,3})}$ is the class whose connected components are minors of $K_{2,3}$. Notice that, from Proposition 3, $\text{obs}(\downarrow \mathcal{K}^{(K_4)}) = \text{conn}(\{5 \cdot K_1\})$, therefore $\text{obs}(\downarrow \mathcal{K}^{(K_4)}) = \{P_5, K_{1,4}, K_{1,3}^s\}$, where $K_{1,3}^s$ is obtained from $K_{1,3}$ after subdividing one of its edges once.

Notice also that, from Proposition 3, $\text{obs}(\downarrow \mathcal{K}^{(K_{2,3})}) = \text{conn}(\{K_{2,3} + K_1, K_4^s, K_{2,3}^+, K_{2,3}^s\})$, where K_4^s (resp. $K_{2,3}^s$) is obtained from K_4 (resp. $K_{2,3}$) after subdividing one of its edges once and $K_{2,3}^+$ obtained from $K_{2,3}$ after adding an edge between the two vertices of degree 3. Observe also that $\text{conn}(\{K_{2,3} + K_1, K_4^s, K_{2,3}^+, K_{2,3}^s\}) = \{K_{2,3}'^s, K_{2,3}''^s, K_4^s, K_{2,3}^+, K_{2,3}^s\}$ where $K_{2,3}'^s$ (resp. $K_{2,3}''^s$) is obtained from $K_{2,3} + K_1$ after connecting its isolated vertex with the vertex of $K_{2,3}$ of degree two (resp. three). See Figure 8 for the defined graphs. Applying Theorem 10, we have the following.




Figure 8: The graphs $P_5, K_{1,4}, K_{1,3}^s, K_{2,3}'^s, K_{2,3}''^s, K_4^s, K_{2,3}'^+, K_{2,3}^s$.

Theorem 12. *The set $\{\mathcal{K}^{(K_4)}, \mathcal{K}^{(K_{2,3})}\}$ is a universal obstruction for apexouter , where the gap is $O(k \log k)$. Moreover, it holds that $\text{cobs}(\text{apexouter}) = \{\downarrow \mathcal{K}^{(K_4)}, \downarrow \mathcal{K}^{(K_{2,3})}\}$ and $\text{pobs}(\text{apexouter}) = \{\{P_5, K_{1,4}, K_{1,3}^s\}, \{K_{2,3}'^s, K_{2,3}''^s, K_4^s, K_{2,3}^+, K_{2,3}^s\}\}$.*

3.4.3 Obstructions for elimination in blocks

Given a minor-monotone parameter $\mathbf{p} : \mathcal{G}_{\text{all}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, and a $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{p},k} = \{G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{all}} \mid \mathbf{p}(G) \leq k\}$. Clearly $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{p},k}$ is a minor-closed graph class.

By $\mathbf{A}(\mathcal{G})$ we denote the class of all apex graphs of \mathcal{G} (i.e. $\mathcal{G}_{\text{obs}(\mathcal{G})\text{-apex},1}$). Bulian and Dawar in [11] gave the following alternative definition for \mathcal{Z} -ed:

Proposition 4 ([11]). *Let $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{\text{all}}$ be a (finite) minor-antichain consisting of connected graphs. Let $\mathcal{C}_0 := \text{excl}(\mathcal{Z})$ and $\mathcal{C}_{i+1} := \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{A}(\mathcal{C}_i))$. Then, $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{Z}\text{-ed},k} = \mathcal{C}_k$.*

A *2-rooted-graph* is a triple $\mathbf{Z} = (Z, v, u)$ where G is a graph and $v, u \in V(Z)$. We say that two 2-rooted-graphs $\mathbf{Z} = (Z, v, u)$ and $\mathbf{Z}' = (Z', v', u')$ are *isomorphic* if there is an isomorphism $\sigma : V(Z) \rightarrow V(Z')$ such that $\sigma(v) = v'$ and $\sigma(u) = u'$. We define $\mathcal{R}(Z)$ as the set of all pairwise non-isomorphic 2-rooted-graphs whose graph is Z . For every 2-rooted graph $\mathbf{Z} = (Z, v, u) \in \mathcal{R}(Z)$, we define the parametric graph $\mathcal{G}^{\mathbf{Z}} = \langle \mathcal{G}_k^{\mathbf{Z}} \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ where $\mathcal{G}_k^{\mathbf{Z}}$ is obtained as follows: consider a sequence $\{(Z^1, v^1, u^1), \dots, (Z^k, v^k, u^k)\}$ of k disjoint copies of (Z, v, u) , then take the disjoint union of their

graphs, and finally add the edges in $\{\{u^i, v^{i+1}\} \mid i \in [k-1]\}$. Then, for $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{\text{all}}$, we define $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathcal{Z}}$ as follows: from $\bigcup_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}} \{\mathcal{G}^Z \mid \mathbf{Z} \in \mathcal{R}(Z)\}$, choose a single representative between equivalent (\approx) parametric graphs; and then keep only the \preceq -minimal parametric graphs among them. Notice that $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathcal{Z}}$ is not defined in a unique way. The next theorem indicates that, no matter the choice of the representative in its construction, $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathcal{Z}}$ may serve as a universal obstruction for \mathcal{Z} -ed.

Theorem 13. *If $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{\text{all}}$ is a (finite) minor-antichain consisting of connected graphs and at least one planar graph, then the set $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathcal{Z}}$ is a universal obstruction for \mathcal{Z} -ed.*

Proof. We first show that $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{G}^{\mathcal{Z}}} \preceq \mathcal{Z}$ -ed. Let $h_1(k) := 2^k$. We show that for every graph G , if there exists $\mathcal{G} \in \mathfrak{G}^{\mathcal{Z}}$ such that $\mathcal{G}_{h_1(k)} \leq G$ then \mathcal{Z} -ed(G) $> k$. It is easy to see that a vertex from $\mathcal{G}_{h_1(k)}$ covers one copy of the corresponding graph $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and its removal breaks the graph in at most two connected components. Thus, inductively, the minimum elimination distance is obtained by removing vertices so as to balance the number of copies of Z in each connected component. This gives an elimination tree of height at least $\log(h_1(k)) = \Omega(k)$.

We continue with the proof of \mathcal{Z} -ed $\preceq \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{G}^{\mathcal{Z}}}$. We denote by $\mathcal{Z}\text{-}\mathcal{P}_k$ the set of graphs defined as follows: for every $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$, for every k -permutation, with repetitions, of $\mathcal{R}(Z)$, say $(Z, u_1, v_1), \dots, (Z, u_k, v_k)$, take the disjoint union of (Z, u_i, v_i) and add the edges $\{\{v_i, u_{i+1}\} \mid i \in [k-1]\}$. We call a graph in $\mathcal{Z}\text{-}\mathcal{P}_k$ a Z -path of length k for the corresponding $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$. We prove the the following:

Claim 1. *There exists a function $h : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that, for every graph G , if \mathcal{Z} -ed(G) $> h(k)$ then there exists $P_Z \in \mathcal{Z}\text{-}\mathcal{P}_k$ such that $P_Z \leq G$.*

Proof of claim. We define the following graph classes: $\mathcal{G}_0 = \mathbf{C}(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{Z}\text{-pack},1})$ and, for $i \geq 0$, $\mathcal{G}_{i+1} = \mathbf{C}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{obs}(\mathcal{G}_i)\text{-pack},1})$. By definition of \mathcal{Z} -pack, $\text{obs}(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{Z}\text{-pack},1}) = \{2 \cdot Z \mid Z \in \mathcal{Z}\}$. We first argue that for every $i \geq 0$:

- (1) $\text{obs}(\mathcal{G}_i)$ contains a planar graph;
- (2) Every graph $H \in \text{obs}(\mathcal{G}_i)$ contains a Z -path of length at least $i+2$ as a minor.

For $i=0$, (1) holds trivially. For (2), Proposition 3 implies that $\text{obs}(\mathbf{C}(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{Z}\text{-pack},1}))$ contains the minor-minimal graphs in $\mathcal{Z}\text{-}\mathcal{P}_2$. Assume that (1) and (2) hold for some $i \geq 0$. Let $H \in \text{obs}(\mathcal{G}_i)$. By Proposition 3, there exists $H' \in \text{obs}(\mathcal{G}_{i-1})$ such that H consists of $2 \cdot H'$ plus a single edge $e = \{x, y\}$ between the two copies of H' .

For (1), assume that H' is planar. We can draw each H' such that the outer faces contain the vertices x and y respectively. Then clearly, H is planar.

For (2), fix $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ such that H' contains a Z -path, say P_Z , of length at least $i+1$ as a minor and let A (resp. B) be the graph induced by one (resp. the other) copy of H' in H . Let $\mathcal{X} = \{X_u : u \in V(P_Z)\}$ (resp. $\mathcal{X}' = \{X'_u : u \in V(P_Z)\}$) be an \emptyset -minor model of P_Z in A (resp. in B). Also consider a $u-v$ path P in H such that $u \in X_{u'}$ for some $X_{u'} \in \mathcal{X}$ (resp. $v \in X_{v'}$ for some $X_{v'} \in \mathcal{X}'$) that is internally disjoint from any set in \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{X}' . It is easy to verify that the graph induced by $\bigcup \mathcal{X} \cup \bigcup \mathcal{X}' \cup P$ contains a Z -path of length at least $i+2$ as a minor.

Then, for every i , $\text{obs}(\mathcal{G}_i)$ has the Erdős-Pósa property for minors with gap f_i . Let $h(k) := \sum_{i \in [k]} f_i(1)$. Let $\mathcal{H} := \text{excl}(\mathcal{Z})$. For a minor-closed class \mathcal{G} , let $\mathcal{C}_0(\mathcal{G}) := \mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{i+1}(\mathcal{G}) := \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{A}(\mathcal{C}_i(\mathcal{G})))$. Let G be a graph such that \mathcal{Z} -ed(G) $> h(k)$. By Proposition 4, $G \notin \mathcal{C}_{h(k)}(\mathcal{H})$. Since for every integer k , $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{Z}\text{-apex},k} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{Z}\text{-ed},k}$ and for any minor-closed class \mathcal{G} , $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathbf{C}(\mathcal{G})$, it also

holds that $G \notin \mathcal{C}_{h(k)-\alpha}(\mathbf{C}(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{Z}\text{-apex},\alpha}))$ for any constant $\alpha \leq h(k)$. Moreover, by Proposition 2, for every k , $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{Z}\text{-pack},k} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{Z}\text{-apex},f_0(k)}$ where $f_0(k) = O(k \log k)$. Hence, $G \notin \mathcal{C}_{h(k)-\alpha}(\mathbf{C}(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{Z}\text{-pack},\beta}))$, where $f_0(\beta) = \alpha$. Set $\beta = 1$. Then $G \notin \mathcal{C}_{h(k)-f_0(1)}(\mathbf{C}(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{Z}\text{-pack},1}))$ or equivalently $G \notin \mathcal{C}_{h(k)-f_0(1)}(\mathcal{G}_0)$. Inductively repeating this argument $h(k)$ times, implies $G \notin \mathcal{C}_0(\mathbf{C}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{obs}(\mathcal{G}_{h(k)-1}\text{-pack},1}))$. Hence, $G \notin \mathcal{G}_{h(k)}$. Then, by (2), our claim follows. \diamond

Finally let $c := \max_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}} |\mathcal{R}(Z)|$. Then, let $h_2(k) = c \cdot k$. By definition, every $\mathcal{G}_k^{\mathbf{Z}}$ is a Z -path of length k where $\mathbf{Z} = (Z, u, v)$. Moreover, it is easy to see that for every Z -path of length at least $h_2(k)$ there exists a $\mathbf{Z} = (Z, u, v) \in \mathcal{R}(Z)$ that repeats at least k times, i.e. it contains as a minor $\mathcal{G}_k^{\mathbf{Z}}$. Then, by Claim 1 we have that if $\mathcal{Z}\text{-ed}(G) > h \circ h_2(k)$ then there exists $\mathcal{G} \in \mathfrak{G}^{\mathcal{Z}}$ such that $\mathcal{G}_k \leq G$, hence $\mathcal{Z}\text{-ed} \preceq \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{G}^{\mathcal{Z}}}$. \square

We now give some examples of elimination distance parameters and, for each of them, we give the corresponding universal obstructions, by applying Theorem 13.

Elimination distance to a forest. We now consider the parameter *elimination distance to a forest*, that is $\text{edforest} := (1, \{K_3\})\text{-ed}$. In other words, $\text{edforest}(G) \leq k$ iff G has a vertex v where, for each connected component C of $G - v$, it holds that $\text{edforest}(C) \leq k - 1$ and where we agree that, for every acyclic graph F , $\text{edforest}(F) = 0$. The parameter edforest has been considered in [21] in the context of kernelization algorithms. Towards applying Theorem 13, we observe that $\mathfrak{G}^{\{K_3\}} = \{\mathcal{P}^{(1)}, \mathcal{P}^{(2)}\}$, where $\mathcal{P}^{(1)}, \mathcal{P}^{(2)}$ are the parametric graphs depicted in Figure 9. These two




Figure 9: Two graph sequences $\mathcal{P}^{(1)} = \langle \mathcal{P}_2^{(1)}, \mathcal{P}_3^{(1)}, \mathcal{P}_4^{(1)}, \mathcal{P}_5^{(1)}, \dots \rangle$ (on the higher row) and $\mathcal{P}^{(2)} = \langle \mathcal{P}_2^{(2)}, \mathcal{P}_3^{(2)}, \mathcal{P}_4^{(2)}, \mathcal{P}_5^{(2)}, \dots \rangle$ (on the bottom row) corresponding to the two ways triangles can be linearly arranged in a path.

graph sequences are created by the two different ways to linearly arrange triangles along a path and are generated by the two non-isomorphic 2-rooted graphs (K_3, v, u) and (K_3, v, v) , where $v \neq u$. Let $\mathcal{C}^{(1)} = \downarrow \mathcal{P}^{(1)}$ and $\mathcal{C}^{(2)} = \downarrow \mathcal{P}^{(2)}$. Let also $\mathcal{O}^{(1)}$ and $\mathcal{O}^{(2)}$ be the set of graphs respectively depicted in Figure 10 and Figure 11. We need the following two lemmata.




Figure 10: The obstruction set $\mathcal{O}^{(1)} = \{\mathcal{O}_1^{(1)}, \mathcal{O}_2^{(1)}, \mathcal{O}_3^{(1)}\}$.

Lemma 1. $\text{obs}(\mathcal{C}^{(1)}) = \mathcal{O}^{(1)}$.

Proof. It is easy to see that for every $Z \in \mathcal{O}^{(1)}$, $Z \notin \mathcal{C}^{(1)}$ and moreover that $\mathcal{O}^{(1)}$ is a minor-antichain. Let G be a connected graph such that $\mathcal{O}_1^{(1)}, \mathcal{O}_2^{(1)}, \mathcal{O}_3^{(1)} \not\leq G$. Let P be a longest path in G . We claim that for every $C \in \text{cc}(G - P)$, $|C| = 1$. Assume that there exists a connected component $C \in \text{cc}(G - P)$ such that $|C| \geq 2$. It is easy to see that depending on which vertices are contained in $N(V(C)) \cap V(P)$, we either contradict the longest path assumption or we conclude that $\mathcal{O}_1^{(1)} \leq G$.

Now, since $\mathcal{O}_2^{(1)} \not\leq G$ then all cycles in G are triangles. Moreover, since for every $C \in \text{cc}(G - P)$, $|C| = 1$, and $\mathcal{O}_3^{(1)} \not\leq G$, all triangles in G have at least two vertices on P which have to be consecutive. Hence $G \in \mathcal{C}^{(1)}$. If G is not connected we apply the same arguments in each connected component of G . \square




Figure 11: The obstruction set $\mathcal{O}^{(2)} = \{\mathcal{O}_1^{(2)}, \mathcal{O}_2^{(2)}, \mathcal{O}_3^{(2)}, \mathcal{O}_4^{(2)}, \mathcal{O}_5^{(2)}, \mathcal{O}_6^{(2)}\}$.

Lemma 2. $\text{obs}(\mathcal{C}^{(2)}) = \mathcal{O}^{(2)}$.

Proof. It is easy to see that for every $Z \in \mathcal{O}^{(2)}$, $Z \notin \mathcal{C}^{(2)}$ and moreover, that $\mathcal{O}^{(2)}$ is a minor-antichain. Let G be a connected graph such that for every $Z \in \mathcal{O}^{(2)}$, $Z \not\leq G$. First observe that if $|G| \leq 4$ then $G \in \mathcal{C}^{(2)}$. We call $u \in V(G)$ a *spine vertex* if $|\text{cc}(G - u)| \geq 3$ or $\text{cc}(G - u) = \{C, C'\}$ and $|C|, |C'| \geq 2$.

Assume that $|G| \geq 5$. Since $\mathcal{O}_5^{(2)} \not\leq G$, all cycles in G are triangles. Then, G contains at least one cut-vertex. We moreover argue that it contains a spine vertex. Assume it does not. Let $u \in V(G)$ be a cut-vertex. Since u is not a spine vertex, we have that $|\text{cc}(G - u)| = 2$ and one of the two components is trivial. Then, since all cycles in G are triangles and $\mathcal{O}_6^{(2)} \not\leq G$, u has a unique neighbor in the non-trivial component, which must be a spine vertex.

Now, let $u, v \in V(G)$ be two spine vertices at distance at least two. We first claim that every $z \neq u, v$ on a u, v -path P is also a spine vertex. Suppose that z is not a cut-vertex. Since every cycle is a triangle, the two neighbors of z on the path P are adjacent, implying that $\mathcal{O}_6^{(2)} \leq G$, contradiction. So z is a cut-vertex and since u and v are spine vertices, it implies that z is also a spine vertex.

Next, let $u, v \in V(G)$ be spine vertices at maximal distance in G (it might be that $u = v$) and P be a u - v path in G . We prove that every connected component C of $G - P$ has size at most 2 and has a unique neighbor on P . This implies that $G \in \mathcal{C}^{(2)}$. First, suppose that $N(C) \cap P = \{u\}$ (as u is a spine vertex such a connected component exists). If $|C| \geq 3$, then by the same argument as in the second paragraph, either $\mathcal{O}_5^{(1)} \leq G$ or $\mathcal{O}_6^{(1)} \leq G$ or u has a unique neighbor w in C_u that is a spine vertex, contradicting the choice of u and v . So if $u = v$, we can already conclude that $G \in \mathcal{C}^{(2)}$. Suppose that u and v are distinct vertices. First observe that C cannot be adjacent to

two distinct vertices of P . Indeed, if these neighbors are not adjacent, then $\mathcal{O}_5^{(1)} \leq G$, otherwise $\mathcal{O}_6^{(1)} \leq G$. So it remains to consider the case where C is adjacent to a unique internal vertex of P , say z . If $|C| \geq 3$, then we can observe that we get one of $\mathcal{O}_1^{(2)}, \mathcal{O}_2^{(2)}, \mathcal{O}_3^{(2)}, \mathcal{O}_4^{(2)}$ as a minor, where the center vertex is z . It follows, as claimed that every connected component C of $G - P$ has size at most 2 and has a unique neighbor on P . \square

Based on Theorem 13 and Lemmata 1 and 2, we conclude to the following.

Theorem 14. *The set $\{\mathcal{P}^{(1)}, \mathcal{P}^{(2)}\}$ is a universal obstruction for **edforest**. Moreover, $\text{cobs}(\text{edforest}) = \{\mathcal{O}^{(1)}, \mathcal{O}^{(2)}\}$ and $\text{pobs}(\text{edforest}) = \{\mathcal{O}^{(1)}, \mathcal{O}^{(2)}\}$.*

Elimination distance to a forest of paths. Notice that the treedepth parameter is defined as the elimination distance to an edgeless graph, that is $\text{td} = (1, \{K_2\})$ -ed. As we have seen in §3.2.3 the set $\{\mathcal{P}\}$ containing the sequence \mathcal{P} of paths is a universal obstruction for **td**. Moreover, it is easy to see that **edforest** \preceq **td**. Towards detecting some parameter that is between **edforest** and **td** one may just consider the target class of the elimination distance to be the linear forests $\downarrow\mathcal{P}$, i.e. forests of paths. As $\text{obs}(\downarrow\mathcal{P}) = \{K_3, K_{1,3}\}$, we define **edpforest** := $(1, \{K_3, P_{1,3}\})$ -ed. The application of Theorem 13 implies that for every choice of $\mathfrak{G}^{\{K_3, K_{1,3}\}}$ it holds that $\mathfrak{G}^{\{K_3, K_{1,3}\}} \equiv \{\mathcal{Q}\}$, where $\mathcal{Q} = \{\mathcal{Q}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}}$ are the ternary caterpillars depicted in Figure 12. Notice that $\downarrow\mathcal{Q}$ is the class of caterpillars, that is $\mathcal{G}_{\text{caterpillars}} := \text{excl}(\{K_3, K_{1,3}^{3s}\})$, where $K_{1,3}^{3s}$ is obtained from $K_{1,3}$ after subdividing once each of the edges of $K_{1,3}$.




Figure 12: The graph sequence of ternary caterpillars $\mathcal{Q} = \langle \mathcal{Q}_1, \mathcal{Q}_2, \mathcal{Q}_3, \mathcal{Q}_4, \mathcal{Q}_5, \dots \rangle$.

Theorem 15. *The set $\{\mathcal{Q}\}$ is a universal obstruction for **edpforest**. Moreover, $\text{cobs}(\text{edpforest}) = \{\mathcal{G}_{\text{caterpillars}}\}$ and $\text{pobs}(\text{edpforest}) = \{\{K_3, K_{1,3}^{3s}\}\}$.*

3.4.4 Hierarchies of parameters

In this subsection, we have considered two types of parameters, namely apex parameters and elimination distance parameters. This leads to two partial hierarchies of parameters. For the apex parameters, we have:

$$\text{apexouter} \preceq \text{fvs} \preceq \text{vc}$$

and the corresponding parametric obstructions are

$$\{\{P_5, K_{1,4}, K_{1,3}^s\}, \{K_{2,3}'^s, K_{2,3}''^s, K_4^s, K_{2,3}^+, K_{2,3}^s\}\} \geq^* \{\{P_4, K_{1,3}\}\} \geq^* \{\{P_3\}\}.$$

While for the elimination distance parameters, we obtain

$$\text{edforest} \preceq \text{edpforest} \preceq \text{td}$$

and the corresponding parametric obstructions are

$$\{\mathcal{O}^{(1)}, \mathcal{O}^{(2)}\} \geq^* \{\{K_3, K_{1,3}^{3s}\}\} \geq^* \{\{K_3, K_{1,3}\}\}.$$

3.5 Biconnected variants

Our next step is to focus on variants of already known parameters whose decomposition scheme applies to the 2-blocks of the input graph. For simplicity, we use the term *blocks* instead of 2-blocks.

3.5.1 Biconnected pathwidth.

The *biconnected pathwidth*, denoted bi-pw , is defined so that $\text{bi-pw}(G)$ is the minimum k for which all blocks of G have pathwidth at most k .

We define the parametric graph $\mathcal{T}^a = \langle \mathcal{T}_k^a \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}}$, obtained from the complete ternary tree \mathcal{T}_k (defined in §3.2.2) by adding a new vertex and making it adjacent to the leaves of \mathcal{T}_k (see Figure 13). We also define the parametric graph $\mathcal{T}^{a*} = \langle \mathcal{T}_k^{a*} \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}}$ so that \mathcal{T}_k^{a*} is obtained from \mathcal{T}_k^a after taking its dual and, for each pair of double edges that occur, subdividing one of them once (see Figure 14). Notice that $\text{tw}(\mathcal{T}_k^a) = \text{tw}(\mathcal{T}_k^{a*}) = 2$, while for the biconnected graphs \mathcal{T}_k^a and \mathcal{T}_k^{a*} , it holds that $\text{bi-pw}(\mathcal{T}_k^a) = \Omega(k)$ and $\text{bi-pw}(\mathcal{T}_k^{a*}) = \Omega(k)$.




Figure 13: The sequence $\mathcal{T}^a = \langle \mathcal{T}_2^a, \mathcal{T}_3^a, \mathcal{T}_4^a, \mathcal{T}_5^a, \dots \rangle$.

Notice that \mathcal{T}^a is an omnivore of the class of apex forests $\mathcal{G}_{\text{apex forest}}$, i.e., the graphs that have *apex number* at most one to the class $\text{excl}(\{K_3\})$ of acyclic graphs (see e.g., [20, Lemma 2.2]). Also \mathcal{T}^{a*} is an omnivore of the class $\mathcal{G}_{\text{outerplanar}} = \text{excl}(\{K_4, K_{2,3}\})$ of outerplanar graphs (see e.g., [20, Lemma 2.4]). It is easy to prove (see e.g., [20, Lemma 2.1] or [32]), that $\text{obs}(\downarrow \mathcal{T}^a) = \{S_3, 2 \cdot K_3, K_4\}$, where $S_3 = \mathcal{T}_2^{a*}$ is the octahedron $K_{2,2,2}$ minus one triangle (in fact $\downarrow \mathcal{T}^a$ consists of the duals of the outerplanar graphs). See Figure 15. Dang and Thomas in [20] as well as Huynh, Joret, Micek, and Wood in [54], independently proved that there is a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that every 2-connected graph G where $\text{pw}(G) \geq f(k)$ contains as a minor either \mathcal{T}_k^a or \mathcal{T}_k^{a*} . We conclude to the following.

Theorem 16. *The set $\{\mathcal{T}^a, \mathcal{T}^{a*}\}$ is a universal obstruction for bi-pw . Moreover, it holds that $\text{cobs}(\text{bi-pw}) = \{\mathcal{G}_{\text{apex forest}}, \mathcal{G}_{\text{outerplanar}}\}$ and $\text{pobs}(\text{bi-pw}) = \{\{K_4, S_3, 2 \cdot K_3\}, \{K_4, K_{2,3}\}\}$.*




Figure 14: The sequence $\mathcal{T}^{a*} = \langle \mathcal{T}_2^{a*}, \mathcal{T}_3^{a*}, \mathcal{T}_4^{a*}, \mathcal{T}_5^{a*}, \dots \rangle$




Figure 15: The graphs $K_4, S_3, 2 \cdot K_3, K_{2,3}$.

Interestingly, the class obstruction of **bi-pw** consists of two class obstructions that are not \subseteq -comparable. From Theorem 2, it follows that two (prime) sequences of graphs, such as $\mathcal{T}^a, \mathcal{T}^{a*}$, are necessary for defining it. An alternative way to define a parameter that is asymptotically equivalent to **bi-pw** would be to merge the two prime sequences $\mathcal{T}^a, \mathcal{T}^{a*}$ to one –still rational– sequence

$$\hat{\mathcal{T}} = \langle \mathcal{T}_2^a, \mathcal{T}_2^{a*}, \mathcal{T}_3^a, \mathcal{T}_3^{a*}, \mathcal{T}_4^a, \mathcal{T}_4^{a*}, \mathcal{T}_5^a, \mathcal{T}_5^{a*}, \dots \rangle$$

and define $\mathfrak{p}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(G)$ as the minimum k for which G does not contain as a minor any graph that is not one of the first k graphs in $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$. Again it follows that $\mathbf{bi-pw} \sim \mathfrak{p}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}} \sim \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{T}^a} + \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{T}^{a*}}$.

Marshall and Wood in [71] defined the minor-monotone parameter $\mathfrak{g} : \mathcal{G}_{\text{all}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathfrak{g}(G)$ is the minimum k for which there exists a function $h : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that every $\mathfrak{g}(G)$ -connected G -minor-free graph has pathwidth at most $h(G)$. It was conjectured in [71] that $\text{obs}(\{G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{all}} \mid \mathfrak{g}(G) \leq 2\}) = \{K_4, S_3, 2 \cdot K_3, K_4, K_{2,3}\}$. This conjecture was proved in [20, Section 2] as a consequence of the results of [20] and [54]. The proof can be seen as a consequence of the fact that $\text{pobs}(\mathbf{bi-pw}) = \{\{K_4, S_3, 2 \cdot K_3\}, \{K_4, K_{2,3}\}\}$.

3.5.2 Block treedepth

Let \mathcal{Z} be a finite set of 2-connected graphs. In Subsection 2.5 we defined the parameter $\mathcal{Z}\text{-bed} = (2, \mathcal{Z})\text{-ed}$ as the *block elimination distance* of a graph G to the class $\text{excl}(\mathcal{Z})$. The parameter $\mathcal{Z}\text{-bed}(G)$ was first introduced in [28]. In this subsection, we focus on the simplest case where $\mathcal{Z} = \{K_3\}$. We call $\{K_3\}\text{-bed}(G)$ *block treedepth* and we denote it by btd . The parameter btd was considered by Huynh, Joret, Micek, Seweryn, and Wollan in [53].

The graph sequence $\mathcal{L} = \langle \mathcal{L}_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}}$ is the parametric graph where \mathcal{L}_k is the *k-ladder*: the cartesian product of the path $P_k, k \geq 2$ and K_2 (see Figure 16).

According to [53], there is a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that every graph G where $\text{btd}(G) \geq f(k)$ contains \mathcal{L}_k as a minor. Moreover, it is easy to verify that $\text{btd}(\mathcal{L}_k) = \Omega(\log k)$. The graph class




Figure 16: The sequence $\mathcal{L} = \langle \mathcal{L}_2, \mathcal{L}_3, \mathcal{L}_4, \mathcal{L}_5, \dots \rangle$ of ladders.

$\mathcal{G}_{\text{ladder minors}} := \downarrow \mathcal{L}$ naturally arises from different contexts of graph theory. Indeed, it contains all graphs with mixed search number at most 2 (see [93, 92]). These graphs also consist of the graphs with *Cartesian path product number*, or simply *cpp*, at most 2 (following the terminology of [49]). Finally, these are graphs admitting a loose path decomposition of width at most 2 (following the terminology of [72]). Most interestingly, Takahashi, Ueno, and Kajitani identified in [92] the obstructions $\mathcal{O}^L = \text{obs}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{ladder minors}})$ that consists of the 36 graphs depicted in Figure 17. We can now conclude to the following.




Figure 17: The graphs in the obstruction $\mathcal{O}^L = \text{obs}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{ladder minors}})$.

Theorem 17. *The set $\mathcal{L} = \{\mathcal{L}\}$ is a universal obstruction for *btd*. Moreover, $\text{cobs}(\text{btd}) = \{\mathcal{G}_{\text{ladder minors}}\}$ and $\text{pobs}(\text{btd}) = \{\mathcal{O}^L\}$.*

3.5.3 Hierarchy of parameters

Observe that biconnected pathwidth is by definition sandwiched between treewidth and pathwidth, that is:

$$\text{tw} \preceq \text{bi-pw} \preceq \text{pw}$$

and the corresponding parametric obstructions are

$$\{\{K_5, K_{3,3}\}\} \geq^* \{\{K_4, S_3, 2 \cdot K_3\}, \{K_4, K_{2,3}\}\} \geq^* \{\{K_3\}\}.$$

Notice now that the two parameters `bi-pw` and `btd` that we considered in this subsection are not \preceq -comparable. Indeed, this follows easily by observing the universal obstructions of Theorem 15 and Theorem 17. $\{\mathcal{L}\} \not\preceq^* \{\mathcal{T}^a, \mathcal{T}^{a*}\}$ because $\mathcal{L} \not\preceq \mathcal{T}^{a*}$ (we need to delete many vertices from a ladder in order to make it acyclic) and $\{\mathcal{T}^a, \mathcal{T}^{a*}\} \not\preceq^* \{\mathcal{L}\}$ because $\mathcal{T}^a \not\preceq \mathcal{L}$ (not every outerplanar graph is a ladder) and $\mathcal{T}^{a*} \not\preceq \mathcal{L}$ (not every dual of an outerplanar graph is a ladder).

3.6 Hierarchy of minor-monotone parameters

Let us conclude this section with the lattice of all the minor-monotone parameters that we considered, depicted in Figure 18.




Figure 18: The hierarchy of minor-monotone parameters, each accompanied with some universal obstruction.

4 Obstructions of immersion-monotone parameters

In this section, graphs may contain multiple edges but not loops. For this, given a graph G , we see its edge set $E(G)$ as a multiset. We also use $\mathcal{G}_{\text{all}}^e$ in order to denote the class of all graphs with

multiple edges. All parameters that we examine in this section are functions mapping multigraphs in $\mathcal{G}_{\text{all}}^e$ to non-negative integers.

4.1 Definitions on immersion parameters

The *immersion* relation between graphs is defined as follows. Let G be a graph and let $e_1 = \{x, y\}$ and $e_2 = \{y, z\}$ be two edges of G where y is the common endpoint of both. The result of the operation of *lifting the edges e_1 and e_2* in G is the graph obtained from G where we first remove e_1 and e_2 from G and then add an edge between x and z . As we deal with multigraphs, we agree that if any of e_1 and e_2 has multiplicity bigger than two, then its removal is reducing this multiplicity. Also if the edge $\{x, z\}$ already exists, then we just increase its multiplicity by one. We say that a graph H is an *immersion* of a graph G , denoted by $H \leq_i G$, if H can be obtained by a subgraph of G after a (possibly empty) sequence of liftings of pairs of edges sharing a common endpoint. Observe that, if H is a topological minor of G , then H is also an immersion of G (but not vice versa).

As we have already mentioned, Robertson and Seymour proved in [84] that \leq_i is a wqo in $\mathcal{G}_{\text{all}}^e$. This directly implies that for every $\mathcal{G} \in \text{Down}_{\leq_i}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{all}}^e)$, $\text{obs}_{\leq_i}(\mathcal{G})$ is a finite set. In other words, each immersion-closed graph class has a finite \leq_i -obstruction set. Following our general convention, we simply use \leq instead of \leq_i and we omit \leq when this is possible.

4.2 The immersion family

As we did with the minor-monotone parameters, we may start with the trivial cases (which are less “trivial” than in the minor case). We can observe that, by the same arguments as in Subsection 3.1, the minor-universal obstructions for \mathbf{p}_∞ and \mathbf{size} are also universal obstructions with respect to the immersion relation. In particular, $\{\mathcal{K}^\emptyset\}$ is a universal obstruction for \mathbf{p}_∞ and $\{\mathcal{K}^d\}$ is a universal obstruction for \mathbf{size} .

4.2.1 Some less trivial cases

Edge-admissibility. The *edge-admissibility* denoted by eadm , is defined so that $\text{eadm}(G)$ is the minimum k for which there exists a layout $L = \langle v_1, \dots, v_n \rangle$ of $V(G)$ such that for every $i \in [n]$ there are at most k edge-disjoint paths, from v_i to $\langle v_1, \dots, v_{i-1} \rangle$ in G . Let $\Theta = \langle \theta_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, where θ_k is the graph on two vertices and k parallel edges (such graphs are also known as *k-pumpkins*) and observe that $\mathcal{C}^\theta = \downarrow \Theta = \{\theta_k \mid k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}\} \cup \{K_1, K_0\}$. It is proved in [69] that if $\text{eadm}(G) \geq 2k$ then $\theta_{k+1} \leq G$. It is also straightforward to see that $\text{eadm}(\theta_{k+1}) \geq k + 1$. It follows that:




Figure 19: The sequence $\Theta = \langle \theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \theta_4, \theta_5 \dots \rangle$ of k -pumpkins.

Theorem 18. *The set $\{\Theta\}$ is a universal obstruction for eadm . Moreover, $\text{cobs}(\text{eadm}) = \{\mathcal{C}^\theta\}$ and $\text{pobs}(\text{eadm}) = \{\{3 \cdot K_1\}\}$.*

Degrees and edge-set size. Consider now the max-degree parameter Δ , that is $\Delta(G)$ is the maximum number of vertices in the neighborhood of a vertex in G . Recall that $\mathcal{K}^s = \langle K_{1,k} \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the graph sequence of stars and that the set \mathcal{C}^S consists of all stars plus the empty graph. Observe that \mathcal{K}^s is a universal obstruction for Δ and that $\text{cobs}(\Delta) = \{\mathcal{C}^S\}$, therefore $\text{pobs}(\Delta) = \{\{\theta_2, 2 \cdot P_3\}\}$.

Another immersion-monotone parameter is the *edge-degree* Δ^e , where $\Delta^e(G)$ is the maximum number of edges incident to a vertex of G . Notice that $\Delta^e \sim \text{eadm} + \Delta$, which implies that the set $\{\Theta, \mathcal{K}^s\}$ is a universal obstruction for Δ^e , $\text{cobs}(\Delta^e) = \{\mathcal{C}^\theta, \mathcal{C}^S\}$ and $\text{pobs}(\Delta^e) = \{\{3 \cdot K_1\}, \{\theta_2, 2 \cdot P_3\}\}$.

Let's now consider the parameter **esize**, already studied in Subsection 3.1. Recall that $\mathcal{K}^m = \langle k \cdot K_2 \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and that $\mathcal{C}^M = \downarrow \mathcal{K}^m$ is the set of all forests of maximum (edge) degree 1. Notice that $\text{obs}(\mathcal{C}^M) = \{P_3, \theta_2\}$. It is now easy to see that $\text{esize} \sim \Delta^e + \text{p}_{\mathcal{K}^m} \sim \text{eadm} + \Delta + \text{p}_{\mathcal{K}^m}$, therefore $\{\Theta, \mathcal{K}^s, \mathcal{K}^m\}$ is a universal obstruction for **esize**. It follows that $\text{cobs}(\text{esize}) = \{\mathcal{C}^\theta, \mathcal{C}^S, \mathcal{C}^M\}$ and $\text{pobs}(\text{esize}) = \{\{3 \cdot K_1\}, \{\theta_2, 2 \cdot P_3\}, \{P_3, \theta_2\}\}$. We stress that **esize** has different parametric obstructions for immersions and minors:

$$\text{pobs}_{\leq i}(\text{esize}) = \{\{3 \cdot K_1\}, \{\theta_2, 2 \cdot P_3\}, \{P_3, \theta_2\}\} \text{ and } \text{pobs}_{\leq m}(\text{esize}) = \{\{P_3\}, \{K_3, 2 \cdot K_2\}\}.$$

The difference between the two above sets is indicative of the different nature of the two partial orderings.

4.2.2 Tree-cutwidth

A *near-partition* of a set X is a family of (possibly empty) subsets X_1, \dots, X_k of X such that $\bigcup_{i=1}^k X_i = X$ and $X_i \cap X_j = \emptyset$ for every $i \neq j$. A *tree-cut decomposition* of a graph G is a pair $\mathcal{T} = (T, \mathcal{X})$ such that T is a forest and $\mathcal{X} = \{X_t : t \in V(T)\}$ is a near-partition of the vertices of $V(G)$. Furthermore, we require that if T_1, \dots, T_r are the connected components of T , then $\bigcup_{t \in V(T_i)} X_t$, for $i \in [r]$, are exactly the vertex sets of connected components of G . We call the elements of $V(T)$ *nodes* of T . For an edge $e = \{u, v\} \in E(T)$ we write E_e for the set of edges of G that have one endpoint in $\bigcup_{t \in V(T_u)} X_t$ and one endpoint in $\bigcup_{t \in V(T_v)} X_t$, where T_u (resp. T_v) is the connected component of $T - e$ that contains u (resp. v). We define the *adhesion* of e to be $\text{adh}_{\mathcal{T}}(e) = |E_e|$. The adhesion of e is *thin* if it has at most two edges, and is *bold* otherwise.

Let G be a graph with a tree-cut decomposition $\mathcal{T} = (T, \mathcal{X})$. For every $t \in V(T)$, we define

$$w(t) = |X_t| + |\{t' \in N_T(t) \mid \text{adh}_{\mathcal{T}}(\{t, t'\}) \text{ is bold}\}|. \quad (8)$$

We then set

$$\text{width}(\mathcal{T}) = \max \left\{ \max_{e \in E(T)} |\text{adh}(e)|, \max_{t \in V(T)} w(t) \right\} \quad (9)$$

and define the *tree-cutwidth* of G , denoted by $\text{tcw}(G)$ as the minimum of $\text{width}(\mathcal{T})$ over all tree-cut decompositions \mathcal{T} of G . We remark that in [10] a bi-parametric extension of tcw was proposed, based on the two quantities maximized in (9).




Figure 20: The sequence $\mathcal{W} = \langle \mathcal{W}_3, \mathcal{W}_4, \mathcal{W}_5, \mathcal{W}_6, \dots \rangle$ of walls.

Let $\mathcal{W} = \langle \mathcal{W}_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the wall of height k , that is the graph obtained by a $(k \times 2k)$ grid after removing a perfect matching laying between its “horizontal paths” and then removing all occurring vertices of degree 1 (see Figure 20).

In [99] Wollan proved that there is a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that every graph G where $\text{tcw}(G) \geq f(k)$ contains \mathcal{W}_k as an immersion, therefore $\text{tcw} \preceq \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{W}}$. Moreover, it is known that $\text{tw} \preceq \text{tcw}$ (see e.g., [99]). As already mentioned, if a graph contains \mathcal{W}_k as an immersion, it also contains it as a topological minor and therefore also as a minor. This implies that $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{W}} \preceq \text{tw}$ and therefore $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{W}} \preceq \text{tcw}$. We conclude that $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{W}} \sim \text{tcw}$. Notice that if a graph is an immersion of the wall \mathcal{W}_k , then it is planar and has maximum degree three, in other words, it belongs in the class $\mathcal{P}^{(\leq 3)}$ of *planar subcubic* graphs. Notice also that every graph in $\mathcal{P}^{(\leq 3)}$ is a topological minor of some wall in \mathcal{W} , therefore \mathcal{W} is an omnivore of $\mathcal{P}^{(\leq 3)}$. Let $P_3^{2,2}$ be the graph obtained if we duplicate the two edges of P_3 and let $K_{1,3}^2$ be the graph obtained if we duplicate one of the edges of $K_{1,3}$ (see Figure 21).

Suppose now that a graph G does not belong in $\mathcal{P}^{(\leq 3)}$, then either it has a vertex of edge-degree bigger than four or is non-planar. In the first case, one of $K_{1,4}, K_{1,3}^2, P_3^{2,2}, \theta_4$ is an immersion of G . In the second case G contains one of $K_{3,3}, K_5$ as a topological minor. As a subcubic graph cannot contain K_5 as a topological minor, we conclude that, in case G is non-planar, it contains $K_{3,3}$ as a topological minor and therefore also as an immersion. We conclude that one of $K_{3,3}, K_{1,4}, K_{1,3}^2, P_3^{2,2}, \theta_4$ is an immersion of G . We summarize our observations to the following.




Figure 21: The graphs $K_{3,3}, K_{1,4}, K_{1,3}^2, P_3^{2,2}, \theta_4$.

Theorem 19. *The set $\{\mathcal{W}\}$ is a universal obstruction for tcw . Moreover, $\text{cobs}(\text{tcw}) = \{\mathcal{P}^{(\leq 3)}\}$ and $\text{pobs}(\text{tcw}) = \{\{K_{3,3}, K_{1,4}, K_{1,3}^2, P_3^{2,2}, \theta_4\}\}$.*

4.2.3 Slim tree-cutwidth

Notice that an important feature in the definition of tree-cutwidth in §4.2.2 was the concept of a *bold* adhesion. Bold adhesions are those that “essentially count” in the definition of tree-cutwidth in (8) and (9). But what if we slightly relax the notion of bold adhesions so that they are those that have size at least two? This variant of tree-cutwidth was considered by Ganian and Korchemna in

[39] under the name *slim tree-cutwidth*. Following [39], we abbreviate this parameter by *stcw*. It appears that this relaxation of the boldness definition adds one more universal obstruction. It was proven in [39] that there is a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that every graph G where $\text{stcw}(G) \geq f(k)$ contains either \mathcal{W}_k or $K_{1,k}^2$ as an immersion, where $K_{1,k}^2$ is the *double-edge star*, obtained by the star $K_{1,k}^2$ after duplicating all its edges¹⁰. Let $\mathcal{K}^{\text{ds}} = \langle K_{1,k}^2 \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. We also denote $\mathcal{C}^{DS} = \downarrow \mathcal{K}^{\text{ds}}$. Let us observe that every subdivision of $K_{1,k}^2$ belongs to \mathcal{C}^{DS} . To see this, one have to lift pairs of edges that are incident to distinct degree two vertices. We need to identify $\text{obs}(\mathcal{C}^{DS})$. For this, let \mathcal{O}^{ds} be the set of graphs in Figure 23.




Figure 22: The sequence $\mathcal{K}^{\text{ds}} = \langle \mathcal{K}_1^{\text{ds}}, \mathcal{K}_2^{\text{ds}}, \mathcal{K}_3^{\text{ds}}, \mathcal{K}_4^{\text{ds}}, \dots \rangle$ of double-edge stars.

Lemma 3. $\text{obs}(\mathcal{C}^{DS}) = \mathcal{O}^{\text{ds}}$.

Proof. It is easy to see that for every $Z \in \mathcal{O}^{\text{ds}}$, $Z \notin \mathcal{C}^{DS}$ and moreover, that \mathcal{O}^{ds} is an immersion antichain. Let $G \in \mathcal{C}^{DS}$ be a graph such that $\mathcal{O}_1^{\text{ds}}, \mathcal{O}_2^{\text{ds}}, \mathcal{O}_3^{\text{ds}}, \mathcal{O}_4^{\text{ds}}, \mathcal{O}_5^{\text{ds}}, \mathcal{O}_6^{\text{ds}}, \mathcal{O}_7^{\text{ds}}, \mathcal{O}_8^{\text{ds}} \not\leq G$. Assume that there exist at least two vertices of edge-degree at least three. Let u, v be vertices of edge-degree at least three that are within minimum distance in G . First, observe that since $\mathcal{O}_1^{\text{ds}} \not\leq G$, no edge incident to either u or v can be of multiplicity three.




Figure 23: The obstruction set \mathcal{O}^{ds} .

Assume that u and v are at distance one, i.e. $e = \{u, v\} \in E(G)$. If e has multiplicity two and u and v have a common neighbour then $\mathcal{O}_1^{\text{ds}} \leq G$. Otherwise they each have a private neighbour and then $\mathcal{O}_2^{\text{ds}} \leq G$. Suppose that e has multiplicity and u and v have a common neighbour, say w . If at least one of the edges $\{u, w\}$ and $\{v, w\}$ has multiplicity 2, then $\mathcal{O}_1^{\text{ds}} \leq G$. Otherwise both $\{u, w\}$ and $\{v, w\}$ are of multiplicity one which implies that both u and v have at least one more neighbour. If it is a common neighbour then $\mathcal{O}_1^{\text{ds}} \leq G$. Otherwise $\mathcal{O}_2^{\text{ds}} \leq G$. It remains to examine the case when u and v have no common neighbour. Then both u and v have private neighbours. If both have a private neighbour where the incident edges have multiplicity two, then $\mathcal{O}_3^{\text{ds}} \leq G$. If one of the two has multiplicity one, then $\mathcal{O}_4^{\text{ds}} \leq G$. Otherwise, if both have multiplicity one then both u and v have a second private neighbour and then $\mathcal{O}_5^{\text{ds}} \leq G$.

¹⁰The result in [39] is stated in terms of simple graphs. Here we give an interpretation of the universal obstruction of [39] on multigraphs.

Next, assume that u and v are at distance two, i.e. u and v are not adjacent but have a common neighbour $w \in V(G)$. Let $\{u, w\}$ and $\{v, w\}$ be the incident edges. Observe that neither $\{u, v\}$ or $\{v, w\}$ can be of multiplicity two, since this would contradicting the minimum distance assumption. Then both u and v have at least two more neighbours. If both are common then $\mathcal{O}_1^{\text{ds}} \leq G$. If one is common then $\mathcal{O}_2^{\text{ds}} \leq G$. If none is common then $\mathcal{O}_5^{\text{ds}} \leq G$.

Finally, assume that u and v are at distance at least three. In this case the graphs induced by vertices of distance up to two from u and v are disjoint. Then it is easy to see that one of $\mathcal{O}_6^{\text{ds}} \leq G$, $\mathcal{O}_7^{\text{ds}} \leq G$ or $\mathcal{O}_8^{\text{ds}} \leq G$ holds.

Hence, there exists at most one vertex of degree at least three in G . It is not difficult to observe that removing that vertex (if it exists) yields a graph whose connected components are paths of cycles. In other words, G is the disjoint union of a set of paths, cycles and a subdivision of $K_{1,k}^2$. It follows that $G \in \mathcal{C}^{\text{DS}}$. \square

Based on Lemma 3 and the results of [39] we can conclude to the following.

Theorem 20. *The set $\{\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{K}^{\text{ds}}\}$ is a universal obstruction for stcw. Moreover, $\text{cobs}(\text{stcw}) = \{\mathcal{P}^{(\leq 3)}, \mathcal{C}^{\text{DS}}\}$ and $\text{pobs}(\text{stcw}) = \{\{K_{3,3}, K_{1,4}, K_{1,3}^2, P_3^{2,2}, \theta_4\}, \mathcal{O}^{\text{ds}}\}$.*

4.2.4 Carving width

A *carving decomposition* of a graph is a pair (T, σ) where T is a ternary tree¹¹ whose set of leaves is L and σ is a bijection $\sigma : L \rightarrow V(G)$. For every edge $e = \{x, y\} \in E(T)$, we denote by L_1^e, L_2^e the leaves of the two connected components of $T - e$ and we define E_e as the set of all edges that have one endpoint in $\sigma(L_1^e)$ and the other in $\sigma(L_2^e)$. the *width* of the carving decomposition (T, σ) is the maximum $|E_e|$ over all edges of T . The *carving width* of G , denoted by $\text{cvw}(G)$ is the minimum width over all carving decompositions of G . Carving width was defined by Seymour and Thomas in [91] and can be seen as the “edge”-analogue of the parameter of branchwidth. (Branchwidth was defined in [79] and is asymptotically equivalent to treewidth). It is easy to prove (see e.g., [74]) that

$$\text{tw} \preceq \text{cvw} \preceq \Delta^e + \text{tw} \sim \text{eadm} + \Delta + \text{tw} \quad (10)$$

Observe that, as $\Delta(\mathcal{W}_k) \leq 3$ and \mathcal{W}_k is planar, if a graph excludes the wall \mathcal{W}_k as an immersion, then it also excludes it as a topological minor and therefore also as a minor. This implies that $\text{tw}(\mathcal{W}_k) = O(k^9(\log k)^{O(1)})$, because of the grid exclusion theorem in [14]. We deduce that $\text{tw} \preceq \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{W}}$ and this, combined with (10), implies that $\text{cvw} \preceq \text{eadm} + \Delta + \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{W}}$. Moreover, as $k \leq \text{tw}(\mathcal{W}_k)$ and $\text{tw} \preceq \text{cvw}$ (because of the left part of (10)), it follows that $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{W}} \preceq \text{cvw}$. It is also easy to see that $\Delta \preceq_{\mathfrak{P}} \text{cvw}$ and that $\text{eadm} \preceq_{\mathfrak{P}} \text{cvw}$. All these together imply that $\text{eadm} + \Delta + \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{W}} \preceq_{\mathfrak{P}} \text{cvw}$. We conclude that $\text{eadm} + \Delta + \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{W}} \sim_{\mathfrak{P}} \text{cvw}$. This last equivalence implies the following.

Theorem 21. *The set $\{\Theta, \mathcal{K}^s, \mathcal{W}\}$ is a universal obstruction for cvw with polynomial gap. Moreover, $\text{cobs}(\text{cvw}) = \{\mathcal{C}^\theta, \mathcal{C}^S, \mathcal{P}^{(\leq 3)}\}$ and $\text{pobs}(\text{cvw}) = \{\{3 \cdot K_1\}, \{\theta_2, 2 \cdot P_3\}, \{K_{3,3}, K_{1,4}, K_{1,3}^2, P_3^{2,2}, \theta_4\}\}$.*

¹¹A *ternary tree* is a tree where all internal vertices have degree three.

4.2.5 Cutwidth

The *cutwidth*, denoted by cw , is defined so that $\text{cw}(G)$ is the minimum k such that there exists a layout $L = \langle v_1, \dots, v_n \rangle$ of $V(G)$ such that for every $i \in [n]$ there are at most k edges in G with one endpoint in $\langle v_1, \dots, v_{i-1} \rangle$ and the other in $\langle v_1, \dots, v_{i-1} \rangle$. Using the definition of pathwidth in §3.2.2, it follows easily that

$$\text{pw} \preceq \text{cw} \preceq \Delta^e + \text{pw} \sim \text{eadm} + \Delta + \text{pw}. \quad (11)$$

Recall that $\mathcal{T} = \langle \mathcal{T}_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}}$ is the sequence of complete ternary trees. As $\Delta(\mathcal{T}_k) \leq 3$, we may follow a similar reasoning to the one of cww . If a graph excludes \mathcal{T}_k as an immersion, then it also excludes it as a topological minor and therefore also as a minor. This implies that $\text{pw} \preceq \text{p}_{\mathcal{T}}$ and this, combined with (11), implies that $\text{cw} \preceq \text{eadm} + \Delta + \text{p}_{\mathcal{T}}$. Moreover, it easily follows that $\text{p}_{\mathcal{T}} \preceq \text{pw}$ (see e.g., [63, Proposition 3.2] or [13]) and $\text{pw} \preceq \text{cw}$ (because of the left part of (11)). Therefore $\text{p}_{\mathcal{T}} \preceq \text{cww}$. It is also easy to see that $\Delta + \text{eadm} \preceq_{\text{p}} \text{cw}$. We conclude that $\text{eadm} + \Delta + \text{p}_{\mathcal{T}} \sim \text{cw}$. We define $\mathcal{G}_{\text{subcubic forest}}$ to be the class of all forests of maximum degree at most 3 and notice that $\downarrow \mathcal{T} = \mathcal{G}_{\text{subcubic forest}}$ and that $\text{obs}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{subcubic forest}}) = \{\theta_2, K_{1,4}\}$. We sum up the above observations to the following.

Theorem 22. *The set $\{\Theta, \mathcal{K}^s, \mathcal{T}\}$ is a universal obstruction for cw . Moreover, it holds that $\text{cobs}(\text{cw}) = \{\mathcal{C}^\theta, \mathcal{C}^S, \mathcal{G}_{\text{subcubic forest}}\}$ and $\text{pobs}(\text{cw}) = \{\{3 \cdot K_1\}, \{\theta_2, 2 \cdot P_3\}, \{\theta_2, K_{1,4}\}\}$.*

4.2.6 Excluding any graph as an immersion

In the case of graph minors, cliques serve as the graphs that, if big enough, may contain any other graph as a minor. What is the analogous concept for immersions? Of course, we may consider cliques where both number of vertices and multiplicities of edges are increasing. Instead, we define a somehow more normalized (immersion) omnivore of all graphs as follows. Let $\mathcal{J} = \langle \mathcal{J}_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}}$ be the graph sequence where \mathcal{J}_k is the graph obtained from $K_{1,k}$ if we set the multiplicity of its edges to be k (notice that the definition of \mathcal{J}_k has two “degrees of freedom”, contrary to the definitions of \mathcal{K}^s and \mathcal{K}^{ds}). Notice that every clique on k vertices is an immersion of \mathcal{J}_k . A graph decomposition analogue of $\text{p}_{\mathcal{J}}$ has been proposed by Wollan in [99]. In order to describe it, we use tree-cut decompositions and we need to additionally define the notion of a torso of such a decomposition.




Figure 24: The sequence $\mathcal{J} = \langle \mathcal{J}_1, \mathcal{J}_2, \mathcal{J}_3, \mathcal{J}_4, \dots \rangle$.

Let $\mathcal{T} = (T, \mathcal{X})$ be a tree-cut decomposition of a graph G . The *torso* at a node t of T is the graph H_t defined as follows. We first assume that G is connected, otherwise we apply the definition to each of the connected components of G . Let T_1, T_2, \dots, T_p be the connected components of $T' - t$. We set $X_{T_i} = \bigcup_{t' \in V(T_i)} X_{t'}$ and observe that $\{X_t, X_{T_1}, \dots, X_{T_p}\}$ is a near-partition of $G - X_t$, where

each $G[X_{T_i}]$ is connected. The *torso* H_t is the graph obtained from G by identifying the vertices of X_{T_i} into a single vertex z_i , for each $i \in [p]$, removing all the resulting loops, and keeping multiple edges that may appear.

Let wn be the graph parameter so that $\text{wn}(G)$ is the minimum k for which G has a tree-cut decomposition $\mathcal{T} = (T, \mathcal{X})$ where each edge has adhesion at most k and each torso has at most k vertices whose degree is more than k . According to [99], $\text{wn} \sim \mathbf{p}_7$. This implies the following.

Theorem 23. *The set $\{\mathcal{J}\}$ is a universal obstruction for wn . Moreover, $\text{cobs}(\text{wn}) = \{\mathcal{G}_{\text{all}}^e\}$ and $\text{pobs}(\text{wn}) = \{\emptyset\}$.*

4.2.7 Hierarchy of immersion-monotone parameters

We conclude this section with the lattice of all immersion-monotone parameters that we have considered, depicted in Figure 25.




Figure 25: The hierarchy of immersion-monotone parameters.

5 Obstructions of vertex-minor-monotone parameters

Let G be a graph and let $v \in V(G)$. The result of the *local complementation at v* in G is the graph obtained if we remove from G all edges in $G[N_G(v)]$ and then add all edges that are not present in $G[N_G(v)]$, that is we replace the induced subgraph $G[N_G(v)]$ in G by its complement. A graph H is a *vertex-minor* of G , denoted by $H \leq_v G$ if H can be obtained from an induced subgraph of G by a (possibly empty) sequence of local complementations.

If H can be obtained from G by local complementations only, then we say that H and G are *locally equivalent*. Note that, if a graph H is a vertex-minor of a graph G , then there exists a graph locally equivalent to G that has H as an induced subgraph.

It is an open problem whether \leq_v is a wqo in \mathcal{G}_{all} , therefore we have no guarantee that, given a vertex-minor-monotone parameter \mathbf{p} , the class obstruction or the parametric obstruction exists.

5.1 The two extreme cases

We start by studying the two extremal points in the lattice of vertex-minor-monotone parameters. The first is the parameter *size*. Notice that, by Ramsey’s theorem, every big enough graph contains either a independent set or a clique on $k + 1$ vertices. By applying a vertex complementation on a vertex of a complete graph on $k + 1$ vertices we obtain $K_{1,k}$ that contains an independent set of k vertices. This implies that, similarly to the case of minors or immersions, $\mathcal{K}^d = \langle k \cdot K_1 \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a universal obstruction for *size* and that $\text{cobs}(\text{size}) = \{\text{excl}\{K_2\}\}$. Observe that no graph that is locally equivalent to a graph containing an edge can be edgeless. This implies that $\text{pobs}(\text{size}) = \{\{K_2\}\}$.

In the other extreme of the lattice, we need a parameter that is bounded for every vertex-minor-closed graph class. For this consider the graph sequence $\mathcal{K}^s = \langle K_k^s \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 4}}$ where K_k^s is obtained from the clique K_k after subdividing once all of its edges. Notice that we can obtain every graph H as a vertex-minor of $K_{|H|}^s$. Therefore \mathcal{K}^s is an omnivore of \mathcal{G}_{all} . We conclude that the class obstruction of the parameter $\text{p}_{\mathcal{K}^s}$ is $\{\mathcal{G}_{\text{all}}\}$ and $\text{pobs}(\text{p}_{\mathcal{K}^s}) = \{\emptyset\}$. Clearly, $\text{p}_{\mathcal{K}^s}$ is a max-min parameter, defined by the exclusion of subdivided cliques. To find a decomposition based min-max analogue of $\text{p}_{\mathcal{K}^s}$ is a central open problem in the study of vertex-minors.

5.2 Two vertex-minor-monotone parameters

The study of parameters that are monotone under vertex-minors is more restricted than the immersion-monotone or the minor-monotone ones. However it has attracted considerable attention, mostly due to the parameter of rankwidth.

5.2.1 Rankwidth

The rankwidth parameter was introduced by Oum and Seymour [76] and it is defined using carving decompositions (already introduced in §4.2.4). Let (T, σ) be a carving decomposition of a graph G and let $e \in E(T)$. Recall that L_1^e, L_2^e are the leaves of the two connected components of $T - e$ which defines the partition $\{\sigma(L_1^e), \sigma(L_2^e)\}$ of $V(G)$. Consider a numbering $\{x_1^1, \dots, x_{r_1}^1\}$ of the vertices of $\sigma(L_1^e)$ and numbering $\{x_1^2, \dots, x_{r_2}^2\}$ of the vertices of $\sigma(L_2^e)$. We define $M_G(e)$ as the binary matrix such that the entry at the i -th row and the j -th column has value 1 if $\{x_i^1, x_j^2\} \in E(G)$, otherwise the value is 0. The *rankwidth* of (T, σ) is the rank of the matrix $M_G(e)$ and the *rankwidth* of G , denoted by $\text{rw}(G)$ is the minimum rankwidth over all branch decompositions of G (see Figure 26) for an example).

The importance of rankwidth emerged from the fact that it is asymptotically equivalent to the parameter of cliquewidth. Here we avoid giving the definition of cliquewidth. It has been introduced by Courcelle, Engelfriet, and Rozenberg in [18]. Courcelle, Makowsky, and Rotics in [19] proved that problems on graphs that are expressible in MSOL_1 ¹² can be decided in linear time for graphs with bounded cliquewidth. Clearly, this algorithmic meta-theorem applies also to rankwidth due to its asymptotic equivalent with cliquewidth. Interestingly, cliquewidth is not monotone under any partial ordering except from the one of taking induced subgraphs and this makes its study from a “structural” point of view more complicated. Rankwidth offers a way out for this as it is monotone under vertex-minors which, in turn, made it possible to find obstruction characterizations that we describe below.

¹² MSOL_1 is the restriction of MSOL where we are not allowed to quantify on sets of edges.




Figure 26: A graph G on the left and a carving (T, ρ) of G . The partition $\{\sigma(L_1^e), \sigma(L_2^e)\}$ corresponding to the thick horizontal tree-edge e is $\{\{2, 4\}, \{1, 5, 3\}\}$ and the corresponding matrix $M_G(e)$ has rankwidth two. The graph G is a circle graph, as witnessed by its chord diagram on the right.

A graph G is a *circle graph* if and only if it is the intersection graph of a set of chords in a circle: the chords represent the vertices and two vertices are adjacent if and only if their corresponding chords intersect (see Figure 26). We use $\mathcal{G}_{\text{circle}}$ for the class of circle graphs.

For a positive integer k , the $(k \times k)$ -*comparability grid* is the graph \mathcal{G}_k^c where $V(\mathcal{G}_k^c) = [k]^2$ and

$$E(\mathcal{G}_k^c) = \{\{(i, j), (i', j')\} \mid (i \leq i' \wedge j \leq j') \vee (i \geq i' \wedge j \geq j')\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{G}^c = \langle \mathcal{G}_k^c \rangle_{k \geq 2}$ denote the sequence of graphs such that for every $k \geq 2$, \mathcal{G}_k^c is the $(k \times k)$ -comparability grid (see Figure 27).




Figure 27: The $(3, 3)$ -comparability grid and its circle graph representation.

Geelen, Kwon, McCarty, and Wollan proved in [43] that there is a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ so that for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, every graph of rankwidth at least $f(k)$ contains as a vertex-minor the $(k \times k)$ -comparability grid \mathcal{G}_k^c . In the same paper, it was observed that every circle graph is a vertex-minor of a comparability grid. As every comparability grid is also a circle graph, we have $\mathcal{G}_{\text{circle}} = \downarrow \mathcal{G}^c$, i.e., the graph sequence of comparability grids is an omnivore of circle graphs. Moreover, it was proved by Bouchet in [9] that $\text{obs}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{circle}}) = \{W_5, W_7, W_3^{3s}\}$ where W_r is the wheel on $r + 1$ vertices and W_3^{3s} is obtained after subdividing once the edges of a triangle of K_4 (see Figure 28). We conclude to the following.

Theorem 24. *The set \mathcal{G}^c is a universal obstruction for rw . Moreover, $\text{cobs}(\text{cvw}) = \{\mathcal{G}_{\text{circle}}\}$ and $\text{pobs}(\text{btd}) = \{W_5, W_7, W_3^{3s}\}$.*




Figure 28: The vertex-minor obstruction set of circle graphs.

Notice that, according to Theorem 24, the parameter pw_c can be seen as the max-min analogue of cliquewidth (in terms of asymptotic equivalence). This means that even if cliquewidth is not monotone under vertex-minors, graphs excluding some comparability grid as a vertex-minor are expected to have bounded cliquewidth.

5.2.2 Linear rankwidth

A natural step to make is to define the “path-analogue” of rankwidth. The *linear rankwidth* of a graph G , denoted $\text{lrw}(G)$, is obtained by restricting the tree T of a carving decomposition (T, ρ) to be a ternary caterpillar (defined in §3.4.3, see also Figure 12). In [57] Kanté and Kwon conjectured that there is a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ so that for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, every graph of linear rankwidth at least $f(k)$ contains a tree T on k vertices as a vertex-minor. Resolving this conjecture would be an important step towards identifying the parametric obstruction of linear rankwidth.

5.2.3 Rankdepth

Our last step is to consider the analogue of treedepth for the case of vertex-minors. This was done by DeVos, Kwon, and Oum in [26] (in a more abstract setting). The corresponding parameter is the *rankdepth* whose definitions is again using carving decompositions.

The *radius* of a tree T is r if it contains a vertex v such that every vertex of T is at distance at most r from v . Let G be a graph and let (T, σ) be a carving decomposition of G . Suppose that t is an internal vertex of $V(T)$. Let e_1, \dots, e_r be the edges of T that are incident to t . We define the *width* of v as the maximum rank of the matrices in $\{M_G(e_i) \mid i \in [r]\}$. We say that (T, σ) is a (k, r) -*carving decomposition* if all its internal vertices have width at most k and the radius of T is at most r . The *rankdepth* of G , denoted by $\text{rkd}(G)$, is the minimum k such that G has a (k, k) -carving decomposition. In the special case where $|V(G)| \leq 2$, we say that $\text{rkd}(G) = 0$. As observed in [26], rankdepth is vertex-minor-monotone. Similarly to what we did for treedepth in §3.2.3, we consider the graph sequence $\mathcal{P} = \langle \mathcal{P}_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}}$ of paths of length k . We denote by $\mathcal{G}_{\text{path v minors}}$ the set of all vertex-minors of paths. It is easy to see that rkd is unbounded in $\mathcal{G}_{\text{path v minors}}$ and that \mathcal{P} is an omnivore of $\mathcal{G}_{\text{path v minors}}$. Moreover, Kwon, McCarthy, Oum, and Wollan proved in [64] that there is a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ so that for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, every graph of rankdepth at least $f(k)$ contains \mathcal{P}_k as a vertex-minor. Also, according to [65] and [1], $\text{obs}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{path v minors}}) = \{C_5, K_3^{3p}, C_4^{2p}\}$ where K_3^{3p} is obtained if we make adjacent the three vertices of K_3 with three new vertices and

C_4^{2p} is obtained if we make adjacent two non-adjacent vertices of C_4 with two new vertices (see Figure 29). We summarize as follows.




Figure 29: The vertex-minor obstructions for paths.

Proposition 5. *The set $\{\mathcal{P}\}$ is a universal obstruction for rkd. Moreover, $\text{cobs}(\text{rkd}) = \{\mathcal{G}_{\text{path vminors}}\}$ and $\text{pobs}(\text{rkd}) = \{\{C_5, K_3^{3p}, C_4^{2p}\}\}$.*

5.3 Hierarchy of vertex-minor-monotone parameters

We conclude this section with the lattice of all vertex-minor-monotone parameters that we have considered, depicted in Figure 30.




Figure 30: The hierarchy of vertex minor monotone parameters.

6 Obstructions of other parameters

In this last section we present two graph parameters that are not monotone under any of the partial ordering relations that we considered in the previous sections.

6.1 Tree-partition width

A *tree-partition decomposition* of a graph G is a tree-cut decomposition $\mathcal{T} = (T, \mathcal{X} = \{X_t : t \in V(T)\})$ where, for every edge $e = \{x, y\}$ of T , if $x \in X_t$ and $y \in X_{t'}$, then either $\{t, t'\} \in E(T)$ or $t = t'$. The *width* of a tree-partition decomposition (T, \mathcal{X}) is $\max\{|\mathcal{X}(t)| \mid t \in V(T)\}$. The *tree-partition width* of a graph G , denoted by $\text{tpw}(G)$ is the minimum width over all tree-partition decompositions of G . Tree-partition width was introduced by Ding and Oporowski in [30] and was later studied in [31, 101, 35, 30] (see also [44] for an extension of tpw on multigraphs). It is easy to see that tpw is subgraph-monotone. On the negative side, we do not know any other partial relation for which tpw has some closeness property. For instance, in [31], Ding and Oporowski gave examples of graphs of maximum degree 3 where subdividing edges may result to graph with bigger tree-partition width and this implies that tpw is not monotone under minors, topological minors,

or immersions. According to [31], $\text{tpw} \sim_{\mathfrak{P}} \Delta + \text{tw}$ (see also [101]). Interestingly, it appears that tpw has a universal obstruction with respect to the topological minor relation. Let $\mathcal{F} = \langle \mathcal{F}_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 4}}$ where \mathcal{F}_k is the k -fan, that is the graph obtained by taking a path on k vertices and making all of its vertices adjacent with a new vertex. Let also $\mathcal{J}^s = \langle \mathcal{J}_k^s \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}}$ where \mathcal{J}_k^s is obtained by \mathcal{J}_k (depicted in Figure 24) after subdividing all its edges once. Finally, let $\mathcal{P}^{\text{ms}} = \langle \mathcal{P}_k^{\text{ms}} \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}}$ be the graph obtained from a path on $k + 1$ vertices if we increase the multiplicity of each edge to k and then subdivide once each resulting edge (see Figure 31 for examples of the defined graphs). Recall also that $\mathcal{W} = \langle \mathcal{W}_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ where \mathcal{W}_k is the wall of height k depicted in Figure 20.

Ding and Oporowski in [31] proved that there is a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that every graph G where $\text{tpw}(G) \geq f(k)$ contains as a topological minor one of the graphs \mathcal{F}_k , \mathcal{J}_k^s , $\mathcal{P}_k^{\text{ms}}$, or \mathcal{W}_k . This means that the result of [31] can be restated as follows.

Theorem 25. *The set $\{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{J}^s, \mathcal{P}^{\text{ms}}, \mathcal{W}\}$ is a \leq_{tp} -universal obstruction for tpw .*

Notice that Theorem 25 gives a max-min analogue of tree-partition width for a relation (that is topological minors) under which tree-partition width is not monotone. We find it an interesting problem to find some partial ordering for which tree-partition is monotone and for which a universal obstruction characterization as the one of Theorem 25 exists.




Figure 31: Examples of the universal obstructions for tree-partition width.

6.2 Edge-treewidth

As we already mentioned, it is a challenge for a graph parameter \mathfrak{p} to find a partial ordering relation under which \mathfrak{p} is monotone. Edge-treewidth is a typical example for this that we wish to present here. Let G be a graph that may contain multiple edges (but not loops). The *edge-treewidth* of G , denoted by $\text{etw}(G)$ is the minimum k for which $V(G)$ has a linear layout $L = \langle v_1, \dots, v_n \rangle$ such that for each $i \in [n]$ there are at most k edges with one endpoint in $\{v_1, \dots, v_{i-1}\}$ and the other in the connected component of $G[\{v_i, \dots, v_n\}]$ that contains v_i . Edge-treewidth was defined in [70] as a tree-like analogue of cutwidth. We define the *block-edge-degree* of a graph as the maximum edge-degree of its blocks and we denoted it by Δ^{be} . According to [70], $\text{etw} \sim_{\mathfrak{P}} \text{tw} + \Delta^{\text{be}}$. Also there are counterexamples, described in [70], showing that etw is not monotone under topological minors, immersions, or minors (however it is subgraph-monotone). For the study of etw , a new partial ordering relation was defined in [70], as follows. A graph H is a *weak topological minor* of a graph G , denoted by $H \leq_{\text{wtp}} G$, if H is obtained from a subgraph of G by contracting edges whose both



Figure 32: The path P_3 is a weak topological minor of the path P_4 . The double edge graph θ_2 is a weak topological minor of the cycle C_3 .

endpoints have edge-degree two and vertex-degree two (see Figure 32). We observe that the 2-cycle is a weak topological minor of the 3-cycle (and henceforth of every chordless cycle).

It was proved in [70] that etw is monotone under weak topological minors. Moreover, [70] gave a universal obstruction for etw with respect to weak topological minors as follows. In §4.2.1 we defined $\Theta = \langle \theta_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, so that θ_k is the graph on two vertices and k parallel edges. We also define $\Theta^s = \langle \theta_k^s \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, so that $\theta_k^s = K_{2,k}$. Next we define $\mathcal{F}^s = \langle \mathcal{F}_k^s \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 4}}$ where \mathcal{F}_k^s is the graph obtained from a k -fan \mathcal{F}_k if we subdivide once all edges with both endpoints of degree 3. Also consider $\mathcal{F}^{ss} = \langle \mathcal{F}_k^{ss} \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 4}}$ where \mathcal{F}_k^{ss} is the graph obtained from a \mathcal{F}_k^s if we subdivide once all edges with both endpoints of degree ≥ 3 . Finally let $\mathcal{W}^s = \langle \mathcal{W}_k^s \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ where \mathcal{W}_k^s is obtained by the wall of height k , subdivide all edges whose both endpoints have degree 3, and then replace every path of length ≥ 3 , whose both endpoints have degree 3 by a path of length 2. (see Figure 33).




Figure 33: From left to right, the graphs θ_5 , θ_5^s , \mathcal{F}_5^s , \mathcal{F}_5^{ss} , and \mathcal{W}_6^s .

We are now in position to restate the results of [70] as follows.

Theorem 26. *The set $\{\Theta, \Theta^s, \mathcal{F}^s, \mathcal{F}^{ss}, \mathcal{W}^s\}$ is a \leq_{wtp} -universal obstruction for etw .*

7 Conclusion and open directions

Clearly the list of parameters that we examined in this survey is far from being complete. We expect that more results are known or will appear that can be stated in terms of the unified framework of universal obstructions. We conclude with some open problems and directions of research on universal obstructions.

According to [77], given that \leq is a wqo in all graphs, we know that $\text{pobs}_{\leq}(\mathbf{p})$ exists for every \leq -monotone parameter \mathbf{p} . However, wqo does not imply that $\text{pobs}_{\leq}(\mathbf{p})$ is finite. As observed in [77], this is linked to a more powerful order theoretic condition, namely that \leq is a ω^2 -wqo on graphs. While this has been conjectured for the minor and the immersion relation, a proof appears to be still far from reach (see [96] for the best result in this direction). It is an interesting question whether the finiteness of $\text{pobs}_{\leq}(\mathbf{p})$ can be proved for particular families of graph parameters using constructive arguments. This was already possible using the Erdős-Pósa duality of [97, 88] for vertex removal parameters in §3.4.2 (Theorem 10) and for elimination distance parameters in §3.4.3 (Theorem 13).

Is it possible to prove similar results about the existence of finite universal obstructions for other families of parameters? Such kind of general conditions have been investigated for bounding the size of obstructions of minor-closed graph classes (see e.g., [89, 67, 66, 2] and it is a challenge up to which point they may be used to derive bounds on parametric obstructions.

Notice that all definitions of this survey are based on the general asymptotic equivalence between parameters. What about more refined notions of equivalence, such as polynomial equivalence or linear equivalence (defined in Subsection 2.2)? The natural question is the following: Suppose that \mathfrak{p} is a \leq -monotone parameter. Is there a universal obstruction \mathfrak{h} such that $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{h}} \sim_{\mathfrak{p}} \mathfrak{p}$? As we already observed in §3.2.1, grids or annuli give a positive answer to this question for the case of treewidth, however if we ask for a linear dependence, i.e., $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{h}} \sim_{\perp} \mathfrak{p}$, we know that the answer is negative. However as we have seen in §3.2.3, the answer to this question is negative for td , even when we ask for a polynomial dependence. As we have seen in Theorem 6 such a polynomial dependence for td is possible when we do not demand universal obstructions to be a \lesssim -antichain. A running challenge is to build a theory revealing when universal obstructions of polynomial/linear dependence may exist (and when not). What would be the algorithmic implications of such a theory?

All universal obstructions that we presented (grids, complete ternary trees, paths, etc) enjoy some sort of regularity in their definition. Is there a way to further formalize this so to obtain characterizations of parameters in terms of *finite descriptions* of their universal obstructions, instead of parametric obstructions?

Universal/Parametric/Class obstructions provide a convenient way to compare (in the asymptotic sense) graph parameters, via the relations \subseteq^* , \leq^{**} , \lesssim^* , displayed in Subsection 2.4. This also permits us to define hierarchies of families of graph parameters by fixing first their obstructions. For instance, we may ask what is the parameter whose class obstruction consists of the set of all caterpillars. As we have seen in Theorem 15, this corresponds to the elimination distance to a forest of paths. Such a guess was possible by observing that caterpillars is a path-like structure, which indicates that the corresponding graph parameter should have an elimination ordering definition. Similar guesses can be done for other (non depicted) parameters in the lattice of Figure 18. An interesting question would be to find general schemes of elimination distance or tree/path decompositions (or combinations of them) that automatically can be derived by the corresponding universal/parametric/class obstructions. This research direction becomes much more challenging when dealing with parameters that, in Figure 18, are “on the left of tw ” as there, the derived decomposition theorems are essentially extensions of the Graph Minors Structure Theorem, by Robertson and Seymour in [82].

We conclude with the remark that all the parameters we presented are parameters on graphs. Certainly the same concepts of obstructions can be defined also on parameters on other combinatorial structures such as matroids, directed graphs, graphs with matchings (see [50, 59, 41] for some of such results concerning extensions of treewidth). However their exposition escapes the objectives of the present work.

Acknowledgement: We are thankful to thank Sebastian Wiederrecht for fruitful discussions on the topics of this work.

References

- [1] Isolde Adler, Arthur M. Farley, and Andrzej Proskurowski. Obstructions for linear rank-width at most 1. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 168:3–13, 2014. doi:10.1016/j.dam.2013.05.001.
- [2] Isolde Adler, Martin Grohe, and Stephan Kreutzer. Computing excluded minors. In *Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 641–650, 2008. URL: portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1347082.1347153.
- [3] Dan Archdeacon. A kuratowski theorem for the projective plane. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 5(3):243–246, 1981. doi:10.1002/jgt.3190050305.
- [4] Dan Archdeacon and Phil Huneke. A kuratowski theorem for nonorientable surfaces. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 46(2):173–231, 1989. doi:10.1016/0095-8956(89)90043-9.
- [5] Patrick Bellenbaum and Reinhard Diestel. Two short proofs concerning tree-decompositions. *Combinatorics, Probability & Computing*, 11(6):541–547, 2002. doi:10.1017/S0963548302005369.
- [6] Umberto Bertelé and Francesco Brioschi. *Nonserial dynamic programming*. Academic Press, 1972.
- [7] Dan Bienstock, Neil Robertson, Paul D. Seymour, and Robin Thomas. Quickly excluding a forest. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 52(2):274–283, 1991. doi:10.1016/0095-8956(91)90068-U.
- [8] Hans L. Bodlaender. A partial k -arboretum of graphs with bounded treewidth. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 209(1-2):1–45, 1998. doi:10.1016/S0304-3975(97)00228-4.
- [9] André Bouchet. Circle graph obstructions. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory Series B*, 60:107–144, 1994. doi:10.1006/jctb.1994.1008.
- [10] Lukasz Bozyk, Oscar Defrain, Karolina Okrasa, and Michal Pilipczuk. On objects dual to tree-cut decompositions. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 157:401–428, 2022. doi:10.1016/j.jctb.2022.07.009.
- [11] Jannis Bulian and Anuj Dawar. Fixed-parameter tractable distances to sparse graph classes. *Algorithmica*, 79(1):139–158, 2017. doi:10.1007/s00453-016-0235-7.
- [12] Chandra Chekuri and Julia Chuzhoy. Polynomial bounds for the grid-minor theorem. *Journal of ACM*, 63(5):40:1–40:65, 2016. doi:10.1145/2820609.
- [13] Fan R. K. Chung and Paul D. Seymour. Graphs with small bandwidth and cutwidth. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 75(1-3):113–119, 1989. doi:10.1016/0012-365X(89)90083-6.
- [14] Julia Chuzhoy and Zihan Tan. Towards tight(er) bounds for the excluded grid theorem. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory Series B*, 146:219–265, 2021. doi:10.1016/j.jctb.2020.09.010.

- [15] Bruno Courcelle. The monadic second-order logic of graphs. I. recognizable sets of finite graphs. *Information and Computation*, 85(1):12–75, 1990. doi:10.1016/0890-5401(90)90043-H.
- [16] Bruno Courcelle. The monadic second-order logic of graphs III: tree-decompositions, minor and complexity issues. *RAIRO - Theoretical Informatics and Applications*, 26:257–286, 1992. doi:10.1051/ita/1992260302571.
- [17] Bruno Courcelle. The expression of graph properties and graph transformations in monadic second-order logic. In *Handbook of Graph Grammars and Computing by Graph Transformations, Volume 1: Foundations*, pages 313–400. World Scientific, 1997.
- [18] Bruno Courcelle, Joost Engelfriet, and Grzegorz Rozenberg. Handle-rewriting hypergraph grammars. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 46(2):218–270, 1993. doi:10.1016/0022-0000(93)90004-G.
- [19] Bruno Courcelle, Johann A. Makowsky, and Udi Rotics. Linear time solvable optimization problems on graphs of bounded clique-width. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 33(2):125–150, 2000. doi:10.1007/s002249910009.
- [20] Thanh N. Dang and Robin Thomas. Minors of two-connected graphs of large path-width, 2018. arXiv:1712.04549.
- [21] David Dekker and Bart M. P. Jansen. Kernelization for feedback vertex set via elimination distance to a forest. In *International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science (WG)*, volume 13453 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 158–172, 2022. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-15914-5_12.
- [22] Erik D. Demaine, Mohammad Taghi Hajiaghayi, Naomi Nishimura, Prabhakar Ragde, and Dimitrios M. Thilikos. Approximation algorithms for classes of graphs excluding single-crossing graphs as minors. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 69(2):166–195, 2004. doi:10.1016/j.jcss.2003.12.001.
- [23] Erik D. Demaine, Mohammad Taghi Hajiaghayi, and Dimitrios M. Thilikos. Exponential speedup of fixed-parameter algorithms for classes of graphs excluding single-crossing graphs as minors. *Algorithmica*, 41(4):245–267, 2005. doi:10.1007/s00453-004-1125-y.
- [24] Erik D. Demaine, Mohammad Taghi Hajiaghayi, and Ken-ichi Kawarabayashi. Algorithmic graph minor theory: improved grid minor bounds and Wagner’s contraction. *Algorithmica*, 54(2):142–180, 2009. doi:10.1007/s00453-007-9138-y.
- [25] Nick D. Dendris, Lefteris M. Kirousis, and Dimitrios M. Thilikos. Fugitive-search games on graphs and related parameters. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 172(1-2):233–254, 1997. doi:10.1016/S0304-3975(96)00177-6.
- [26] Matt DeVos, O-joung Kwon, and Sang-il Oum. Branch-depth: generalizing tree-depth of graphs. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 90:103186, 2020. doi:10.1016/j.ejc.2020.103186.

- [27] Reinhard Diestel. *Graph Theory*, volume 173. Springer-Verlag, 5th edition, 2017. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-53622-3.
- [28] Öznur Yasar Diner, Archontia C. Giannopoulou, Giannos Stamoulis, and Dimitrios M. Thilikos. Block elimination distance. *Graphs and Combinatorics*, 38(5):133, 2022. doi:10.1007/s00373-022-02513-y.
- [29] Guoli Ding and Stan Dziobiak. Excluded-minor characterization of apex-outerplanar graphs. *Graphs and Combinatorics*, 32(2):583–627, 2016. doi:10.1007/s00373-015-1611-9.
- [30] Guoli Ding and Bogdan Oporowski. Some results on tree decomposition of graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 20(4):481–499, 1995. doi:10.1002/jgt.3190200412.
- [31] Guoli Ding and Bogdan Oporowski. On tree-partitions of graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 149(1-3):45–58, 1996. doi:10.1016/0012-365X(94)00337-I.
- [32] Michael J. Dinneen, Kevin Cattell, and Michael R. Fellows. Forbidden minors to graphs with small feedback sets. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 230(1-3):215–252, 2001. doi:10.1016/S0012-365X(00)00083-2.
- [33] Frederic Dorn and Jan Arne Telle. Semi-nice tree-decompositions: The best of branchwidth, treewidth and pathwidth with one algorithm. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 157(12):2737–2746, 2009. doi:10.1016/j.dam.2008.08.023.
- [34] Rod G. Downey and Michael R. Fellows. *Parameterized complexity*. Springer, 1999.
- [35] Vida Dujmovic, Pat Morin, and David R. Wood. Layout of graphs with bounded tree-width. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 34(3):553–579, 2005. doi:10.1137/S0097539702416141.
- [36] Eduard Eiben, Robert Ganian, Thekla Hamm, Lars Jaffke, and O-joong Kwon. A Unifying Framework for Characterizing and Computing Width Measures. In *Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS)*, volume 215 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 63:1–63:23, 2022. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.ITCS.2022.63.
- [37] Michael R. Fellows and Micheal A. Langston. On well-partial-order theory and its application to combinatorial problems of VLSI design. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 5(1):117–126, 1992. doi:10.1137/0405010.
- [38] Robert Ganian, Petr Hliněný, Joachim Kneis, Daniel Meister, Jan Obdržálek, Peter Rossmanith, and Somnath Sikdar. Are there any good digraph width measures? *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 116:250–286, 2016. doi:10.1016/j.jctb.2015.09.001.
- [39] Robert Ganian and Viktoriia Korchemna. Slim tree-cut width. In *International Symposium on Parameterized and Exact Computation (IPEC)*, volume 249 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 15:1–15:18, 2022. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.IPEC.2022.15.
- [40] Micheal R. Garey and David S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. W.H. Freeman, 1979.

- [41] Jim Geelen, Bert Gerards, and Geoff Whittle. Tangles, tree-decompositions and grids in matroids. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 99(4):657–667, 2009. doi:10.1016/j.jctb.2007.10.008.
- [42] Jim Geelen and Benson Joeris. A generalization of the grid theorem, 2016. arXiv:1609.09098.
- [43] Jim Geelen, O-joung Kwon, Rose McCarthy, and Paul Wollan. The grid theorem for vertex-minors. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 2023. doi:10.1016/j.jctb.2020.08.004.
- [44] Archontia C. Giannopoulou, O-joung Kwon, Jean-Florent Raymond, and Dimitrios M. Thilikos. Packing and covering immersion-expansions of planar sub-cubic graphs. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 65:154–167, 2017. doi:10.1016/j.ejc.2017.05.009.
- [45] Henry H. Glover, John P. Huneke, and Chin San Wang. 103 graphs that are irreducible for the projective plane. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 27(3):332–370, 1979. doi:10.1016/0095-8956(79)90022-4.
- [46] Martin Grohe, Ken-ichi Kawarabayashi, Dániel Marx, and Paul Wollan. Finding topological subgraphs is fixed-parameter tractable. In *Annual ACM on Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 479–488, 2011. doi:10.1145/1993636.1993700.
- [47] Qian-Ping Gu and Hisao Tamaki. Improved bounds on the planar branchwidth with respect to the largest grid minor size. *Algorithmica*, 64(3):416–453, 2012. doi:10.1007/s00453-012-9627-5.
- [48] Hugo Hadwiger. Über eine Klassifikation der Streckenkomplex. *Vierteljschr. Naturforsch. Ges. Zürich*, 88:133–143, 1943.
- [49] Daniel J. Harvey and David R. Wood. Parameters tied to treewidth. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 84(4):364–385, 2017. doi:10.1002/jgt.22030.
- [50] Meike Hatzel, Roman Rabinovich, and Sebastian Wiederrecht. Cyclewidth and the grid theorem for perfect matching width of bipartite graphs. *CoRR*, abs/1902.01322, 2019. URL: arxiv.org/abs/1902.01322, arXiv:1902.01322.
- [51] Peter Hliněný, Sang il Oum, Detlef Seese, and Georg Gotlob. Width parameters beyond tree-width and their applications. *The Computer Journal*, 51(3):326–362, 2008.
- [52] Petr Hliněný and Sang-il Oum. Finding branch-decompositions and rank-decompositions. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 38(3):1012–1032, 2008. doi:10.1137/070685920.
- [53] Tony Huynh, Gwenaël Joret, Piotr Micek, Michal T. Seweryn, and Paul Wollan. Excluding a ladder. *CoRR*, abs/2002.00496, 2020. arXiv:2002.00496.
- [54] Tony Huynh, Gwenaël Joret, Piotr Micek, and David R. Wood. Seymour’s conjecture on 2-connected graphs of large pathwidth. *Combinatorica*, 40:839–868, 2020. doi:10.1007/s00493-020-3941-3.

- [55] Petr Jancar. A note on well quasi-orderings for powersets. *Information Processing Letters*, 72(5-6):155–160, 1999. doi:10.1016/S0020-0190(99)00149-0.
- [56] Marcin Kaminski. Max-cut and containment relations in graphs. In *International Workshop on Graph Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science (WG)*, volume 6410 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 15–26, 2010. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-16926-7_4.
- [57] Mamadou Moustapha Kanté and O-joung Kwon. Linear rank-width of distance-hereditary graphs II. vertex-minor obstructions. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 74:110–139, 2018. doi:10.1016/j.ejc.2018.07.009.
- [58] Ken-ichi Kawarabayashi, Yusuke Kobayashi, and Bruce A. Reed. The disjoint paths problem in quadratic time. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 102(2):424–435, 2012. doi:10.1016/j.jctb.2011.07.004.
- [59] Ken-ichi Kawarabayashi and Stephan Kreutzer. The directed grid theorem. In *Annual ACM on Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 655–664. ACM, 2015. doi:10.1145/2746539.2746586.
- [60] Ken-Ichi Kawarabayashi and Benjamin Rossman. A polynomial excluded-minor approximation of tree-depth. In *Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Mathematics (SODA)*, pages 234–246, 2018. doi:10.1137/1.9781611975031.17.
- [61] Nancy G. Kinnarsley. The vertex separation number of a graph equals its path-width. *Information Processing Letters*, 42(6):345–350, 1992. doi:10.1016/0020-0190(92)90234-M.
- [62] Lefteris M. Kirousis and Christos H. Papadimitriou. Interval graphs and searching. *Discrete Mathematics*, 55(2):181–184, 1985. doi:10.1016/0012-365X(85)90046-9.
- [63] Lefteris M. Kirousis and Christos H. Papadimitriou. Searching and pebbling. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 47(2):205–212, 1986. doi:10.1016/0304-3975(86)90146-5.
- [64] O-joung Kwon, Rose McCarthy, Sang-il Oum, and Paul Wollan. Obstructions for bounded shrub-depth and rank-depth. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 149:76–91, 2021. doi:10.1016/j.jctb.2021.01.005.
- [65] O-joung Kwon and Sang-il Oum. Graphs of small rank-width are pivot-minors of graphs of small tree-width. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 168:108–118, 2014. doi:10.1016/j.dam.2013.01.007.
- [66] Jens Lagergren. Upper bounds on the size of obstructions and intertwiners. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 73:7–40, 1998. doi:10.1006/jctb.1997.1788.
- [67] Jens Lagergren and Stefan Arnborg. Finding minimal forbidden minors using a finite congruence. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP)*, volume 510 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 532–543, 1991. doi:10.1007/3-540-54233-7_161.

- [68] Emmanouil Lardas, Evangelos Protopapas, Dimitrios M. Thilikos, and Dimitris Zoros. On strict brambles. *Graphs and Combinatorics*, 39(2):24, 2023. doi:10.1007/s00373-023-02618-y.
- [69] Stratis Limnios, Christophe Paul, Joanny Perret, and Dimitrios M. Thilikos. Edge degeneracy: Algorithmic and structural results. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 839:164–175, 2020. doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2020.06.006.
- [70] Loïc Magne, Christophe Paul, Abhijat Sharma, and Dimitrios M. Thilikos. Edge-treewidth: Algorithmic and combinatorial properties. *CoRR*, abs/2112.07524, 2021. arXiv:2112.07524.
- [71] Emily Abernethy Marshall and David R. Wood. Circumference and pathwidth of highly connected graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 79(3):222–232, 2015. doi:10.1002/jgt.21825.
- [72] Guillaume Mescoff, Christophe Paul, and Dimitrios M. Thilikos. The mixed search game against an agile and visible fugitive is monotone. *Discrete Mathematics*, 346(4):113345, 2023. doi:10.1016/j.disc.2023.113345.
- [73] Rolf H. Möhring. Graph problems related to gate matrix layout and PLA folding. In *Computational graph theory*, volume 7 of *Computing Supplementum*, pages 17–51. Springer, 1990. doi:10.1007/978-3-7091-9076-0_2.
- [74] Nestor V. Nestoridis and Dimitrios M. Thilikos. Square roots of minor closed graph classes. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 168:34–39, 2014. doi:10.1016/j.dam.2013.05.026.
- [75] Jaroslav Nešetřil and Patrice Ossona de Mendez. Tree-depth, subgraph coloring and homomorphism bounds. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 27:1022–1041, 2006. doi:10.1016/j.ejc.2005.01.010.
- [76] Sang-il Oum and Paul D. Seymour. Approximating rank-width and branch-width. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 96(4):514–528, 2006. doi:10.1016/j.jctb.2005.10.006.
- [77] Christophe Paul, Evangelos Protopapas, and Dimitrios M. Thilikos. Graph parameters, universal obstructions, and wqo, 2023. arXiv:2304.03688.
- [78] Neil Robertson and Paul D. Seymour. Graph Minors. I. Excluding a forest. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 35(1):39–61, 1983. doi:10.1016/0095-8956(83)90079-5.
- [79] Neil Robertson and Paul D. Seymour. Graph minors. X. obstructions to tree-decomposition. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 52(2):153–190, 1991. doi:10.1016/0095-8956(91)90061-N.
- [80] Neil Robertson and Paul D. Seymour. Excluding a graph with one crossing. In *Graph structure theory*, volume 147, pages 669–675. American Mathematical Society, 1993. doi:10.1090/conm/147.
- [81] Neil Robertson and Paul D. Seymour. Graph minors. XIII. The disjoint paths problem. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 63(1):65–110, 1995. doi:10.1006/jctb.1995.1006.

- [82] Neil Robertson and Paul D. Seymour. Graph minors. XVI. excluding a non-planar graph. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 89(1):43–76, 2003. doi:10.1016/S0095-8956(03)00042-X.
- [83] Neil Robertson and Paul D. Seymour. Graph minors. XX. wagner’s conjecture. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 92(2):325–357, 2004. doi:10.1016/j.jctb.2004.08.001.
- [84] Neil Robertson and Paul D. Seymour. Graph minors. XXIII. nash-williams’ immersion conjecture. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 100(2):181–205, 2010. doi:10.1016/j.jctb.2009.07.003.
- [85] Neil Robertson, Paul D. Seymour, and Robin Thomas. Quickly excluding a planar graph. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 62(2):323–348, 1994. doi:10.1006/jctb.1994.1073.
- [86] Neil Robertson, Paul D. Seymour, and Robin Thomas. Sachs’ linkless embedding conjecture. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 64(2):185–227, 1995. doi:10.1006/jctb.1995.1032.
- [87] Neil Robertson and Paul D. Seymour. Graph minors. III. planar tree-width. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 36:49–64, 1984. doi:10.1016/0095-8956(84)90013-3.
- [88] Neil Robertson and Paul D. Seymour. Graph minors. V. Excluding a planar graph. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 41(1):92–114, 1986. doi:10.1016/0095-8956(86)90030-4.
- [89] Ignasi Sau, Giannos Stamoulis, and Dimitrios M. Thilikos. k -apices of minor-closed graph classes. i. bounding the obstructions. *CoRR*, abs/2103.00882, 2021. arXiv:2103.00882.
- [90] Paul D. Seymour and Robin Thomas. Graph searching and a min-max theorem for tree-width. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 58(1):22–33, 1993. doi:10.1006/jctb.1993.1027.
- [91] Paul D. Seymour and Robin Thomas. Call routing and the ratcatcher. *Combinatorica*, 14(2):217–241, 1994. doi:10.1007/BF01215352.
- [92] Atsushi Takahashi, Shuichi Ueno, and Yoji Kajitani. Minimal forbidden minors for the family of graphs with proper-path-width at most two. *IEICE Trans. Fundamentals*, E78-A:1828–1839, 1995.
- [93] Atsushi Takahashi, Shuichi Ueno, and Yoji Kajitani. Mixed searching and proper-path-width. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 137:253–268, 1995. doi:10.1016/0304-3975(94)00160-K.
- [94] Dimitrios M. Thilikos. Graph minors and parameterized algorithm design. In Hans L. Bodlaender, Rod Downey, Fedor V. Fomin, and Dániel Marx, editors, *The Multivariate Algorithmic Revolution and Beyond - Essays Dedicated to Michael R. Fellows on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday*, volume 7370 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 228–256. Springer, 2012. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-30891-8_13.

- [95] Dimitrios M. Thilikos and Sebastian Wiederrecht. Killing a vortex. In *IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 1069–1080, 2022. doi: 10.1109/FOCS54457.2022.00104.
- [96] Robin Thomas. Well-quasi-ordering infinite graphs with forbidden finite planar minor. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 312(1):279–313, 1989. URL: www.ams.org/journals/tran/1989-312-01/S0002-9947-1989-0932450-9/S0002-9947-1989-0932450-9.pdf.
- [97] Wouter Cames van Batenburg, Tony Huynh, Gwenaël Joret, and Jean-Florent Raymond. A tight Erdős-Pósa function for planar minors. *Advances in Combinatorics*, 2:33, 2019. doi: 10.19086/aic.10807.
- [98] Klaus Wagner. Über eine eigenschaft der ebenen komplexe. *Mathematische Annalen*, 114:570–590, 1937. doi:10.1007/BF01594196.
- [99] Paul Wollan. The structure of graphs not admitting a fixed immersion. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 110:47–66, 2015. doi:10.1016/j.jctb.2014.07.003.
- [100] Paul Wollan. Finding topological subgraphs. In *Encyclopedia of Algorithms*, pages 749–752. 2016. doi:10.1007/978-1-4939-2864-4_695.
- [101] David R. Wood. On tree-partition-width. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 30(5):1245–1253, 2009. doi:10.1016/j.ejc.2008.11.010.