

<Note>
**Various Properties of Various Ultrafilters, Various Graph Width Parameters,
and Various Connectivity Systems
(Detailed Version)**
Takaaki Fujita

Abstract:

Filters are collections of sets that are closed under supersets and finite intersections, serving as fundamental tools in topology and set theory. An ultrafilter, a maximal filter on a set, plays a crucial role in these fields by rigorously handling limits, convergence, and compactness. A connectivity system is defined as a pair (X, f) , where X is a finite set and f is a symmetric submodular function. Understanding the duality in these parameters elucidates the relationship between different decompositions and measures of a graph's complexity. In this paper, we delve into ultrafilters on connectivity systems, applying Tukey's Lemma to these systems. Additionally, we explore prefilters, ultra-prefilters, and subbases within the context of connectivity systems. Furthermore, we introduce and investigate new parameters related to width, length, and depth, enhancing our understanding of these mathematical structures (we investigate an investigation and a comparison of various graph width parameters and their related parameters).

Keyword: Ultrafilter, Filter, Connectivity System, Prefilter, Branch-width

Mathematics Subject Classification (MSC2020): 05B35 matroids • 05C65 Hypergraphs

1. Introduction

1.1 Filter and Graph width parameters

Filters are essential collections of sets in topology and set theory, characterized by their closure under supersets and finite intersections. They can be viewed as a way to "focus" on certain subsets of a space, much like a lens that sharpens specific details while filtering out others. An ultrafilter, being a maximal filter on a set, is particularly significant for addressing fundamental concepts such as limits, convergence, and compactness. Its unique properties render it indispensable in various fields, including non-standard analysis, model theory, social choice theory (social judgments), group theory, boolean algebra, geometry, probability theory, vector theory, semigroup theory, abstract algebra, topology, set theory, infinite combinatorics, fuzzy theory, graph theory, matroid theory, lattice theory, and first-order logic, where it provides powerful tools for both mathematical and logical applications [16, 73-75, 79-86, 93].

Graph theory, a key branch of mathematics, delves into the study of networks consisting of nodes and edges, with a focus on their paths, structures, and properties [236-238]. Among the critical metrics in this field is the "graph width parameter," which measures the maximum width across all cuts or layers within a hierarchical decomposition of the graph. This metric is crucial for analyzing a graph's complexity and structure, serving as a primary factor in transforming computationally hard graph problems into more tractable ones when the graph class is restricted to having bounded width. Various width parameters have been rigorously explored and are widely recognized in the literature [9, 10, 16, 47, 65, 66, 144, 165, 167, 344, 345]. For further information, see Appendix A, "Various Width Parameters," and Appendix C, "Comparing Various Graph Parameters (Over 70 Parameters)."

Branch-width is an important graph width parameter, defined through branch decomposition where the leaves correspond to the graph's edges [9, 10, 213]. It is closely related to tree-width, another significant graph width parameter. Tree-width is determined by a tree decomposition, which represents the graph as a tree structure, grouping vertices into "bags," with the tree-width being the size of the largest bag minus one [47, 214]. Conversely, branch-width involves a branch decomposition where the graph is segmented into a tree-like structure, with the branch-width representing the maximum size of the minimum cut between two parts of the graph. The relationship between branch-width ($bw(G)$) and tree-width ($tw(G)$) is given by the inequalities: $bw(G) \leq tw(G) + 1 \leq 3/2 \cdot bw(G)$ for a graph G with $bw(G) \geq 2$ [213]. This relationship shows that both parameters are linked, with tree-width generally being larger, but not excessively so. Extending tree-width to the connectivity system framework leads to the concept of

branch-width, highlighting their conceptual connection.

Graph width parameters offer several significant advantages in both theoretical and practical contexts:

1. **Foundational Role in Theoretical Graph Theory:** Graph width parameters play a critical role in the Graph Minors project serving as a fundamental combinatorial tool [9,10]. This project, which is pivotal in the structure theory of graphs, uses graph width parameters to explore graph properties and their relationships through a series of influential theorems and algorithms.
2. **Algorithmic Efficiency:** Graph width parameters are conducive to algorithmic applications, particularly in the field of fixed-parameter tractable (FPT) algorithms [287-290]. Algorithms that are parameterized by Graph width parameters often demonstrate superior efficiency and are widely utilized in computational graph theory. This aspect is particularly valuable in optimizing complex computations and in the development of algorithms that can efficiently solve problems considered intractable by other means.
3. **Practical Applicability:** In real-world applications, graphs derived from various domains such as programming language syntax trees, road networks, and organizational structures often exhibit small width. This characteristic simplifies complex problems, making them more manageable and allowing for the application of advanced graph algorithms. As a result, studying graph width parameters can directly impact the effectiveness and efficiency of practical solutions in engineering, software development, and logistics.

A pair (X, f) , consisting of a finite set X and a symmetric submodular function f , is recognized as a connectivity system [9]. This concept is widely employed in the analysis of graph structures, particularly concerning graph width parameters such as branch-width and tree-width [9, 10, 16]. Investigating the duality within these parameters enhances our understanding of the relationships among various graph decompositions and measures of graph complexity. In this context, "duality" refers to a theorem or relationship in which the presence (or absence) of one entity implies the absence (or presence) of a corresponding dual entity. Ultrafilters on connectivity systems are known to demonstrate such a dual relationship with branch-width [16]. Concepts like ultrafilters, referred to as obstructions, are known to be instrumental in determining the values of graph width parameters.

1.2 Our Contribution

This paper outlines our contributions as follows:

- Section 2: We primarily explain the basic concepts of ultrafilters on connectivity systems and graph-width parameters, along with previously known concepts. We discuss the relationship between ultrafilters on connectivity systems and well-known concepts like Tangle from Graph Minor theory and Matroid commonly used in optimization theory.
- Section 3: We delve into ultrafilters on connectivity systems, considering Tukey's Lemma for these systems. Tukey's Lemma asserts that every non-empty collection of sets, closed under supersets, contains a maximal element. This fundamental result in set theory is often used to prove the existence of ultrafilters and related concepts [73-75]. Additionally, we explore chains and antichains on connectivity systems.
- Section 4: We discuss prefilters, ultra-prefilters, and subbases on connectivity systems. Prefilters, ultra-prefilters, and subbases are known concepts used to generate filters and are studied in various fields. This exploration enhances our understanding of these concepts in Set Theory and their significance in different mathematical and logical contexts.
- Section 5: We examine the connectivity system discussed for finite sets from the perspective of infinite connectivity systems and countable connectivity systems. We analyze the properties of ultrafilters on these connectivity systems.
- Section 6: We investigate new parameters such as width, length, and depth, as well as the Ultrafilter game on connectivity systems, ultraproduct on connectivity systems, and the Axiom of Choice on connectivity systems. Also we consider about a Small Set Expansion [303-308].
- Appendix: This section presents an investigation and comparison of various graph width parameters and their related parameters.

2. Definitions and Notations in this paper

This section provides mathematical definitions for each concept. Before delving into specific definitions, let's outline the basic mathematical concepts used in this text.

2.1. Notation in this paper

We explain about notation in this paper.

In set theory, a set is a collection of distinct elements or objects, considered as an entity and often denoted with curly braces. A subset is a set where all elements are also contained within another set. Boolean algebra (X, \cup, \cap) is a mathematical structure with a set X , union (\cup) , and intersection (\cap) , satisfying specific axioms for operations. In this paper, we consider about finite set (Except Section 5).

In this paper, we use expressions like $A \subseteq X$ to indicate that A is a subset of X , $A \cup B$ to represent the union of two subsets A and B (both of which are subsets of X), and $A = \emptyset$ to signify an empty set. Specifically, $A \cap B$ denotes the intersection of subsets A and B . Similarly, $A \setminus B$ represents the difference between subsets A and B . The powerset of a set A , denoted as 2^A , is the set of all possible subsets of A , including the empty set and A itself. In set theory, a partition of a set is a way of dividing the set into non-overlapping, non-empty subsets, such that every element of the original set is included in exactly one subset. These subsets are called the "blocks" or "parts" of the partition.

Additionally, we adopt the following notation from graph theory: V denotes the set of vertices in a graph, E represents the set of edges, and $G=(V,E)$ refers to a graph G defined by its vertices V and edges E . A tree is a connected, acyclic graph where any two vertices are connected by exactly one path, symbolizing hierarchical relationships. The root of a tree is the topmost node from which all other nodes descend. In a tree, vertices with a degree of 1 are called leaf, while all other vertices are referred to as inner vertices. A ternary tree is a specific type of tree where all inner vertices have a degree of 3. A subgraph is a graph formed from a subset of a graph's vertices and edges. A path is a sequence of distinct edges and vertices that traces a route through the graph. A subpath is a continuous segment of a path, consisting of consecutive edges and vertices from the original path, and is useful for analyzing specific portions of larger paths. The distance between two vertices in a graph is defined as the number of edges in the shortest path connecting them, indicating how far apart they are. A directed graph consists of vertices connected by directed edges, indicating a one-way relationship, while an undirected graph features edges without direction, representing mutual connections.

2.2 Symmetric Submodular Function and Connectivity System

The definition of a symmetric submodular function is presented below. This concept is extensively used and discussed in numerous scholarly articles [76-78].

While symmetric submodular functions are generally defined over real numbers, this paper specifically considers those restricted to natural numbers. This submodular function is also sometimes referred to as the connectivity function [9]. Additionally, a variant of submodular function known as the submodular partition function is also well-known [109, 110]. Also k -Submodular [284-286], two-dimensional submodular [291], monotone-submodular [292], and maximum-submodular [283] are also known.

Definition 2.1: Let X be a finite set. A function $f: X \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ is called symmetric submodular if it satisfies the following conditions:

- $\forall A \subseteq X, f(A) = f(X \setminus A)$.
- $\forall A, B \subseteq X, f(A) + f(B) \geq f(A \cap B) + f(A \cup B)$.

In this short paper, a pair (X, f) of a finite set X and a symmetric submodular function f is called a connectivity system. This concept is frequently used in discussions of graph width parameters, such as branch-width and tree-width, to analyze graph structures (e.g., [2,3,4,9]).

The following is an example illustrating the concept of a symmetric submodular function.

Example 2.2: Consider a simple undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ where V is the set of vertices and E is the

set of edges. Let $V = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and the edges $E = \{(1, 2), (2, 3), (3, 4), (4, 1)\}$, forming a cycle.

Define a function $f: 2^V \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ as follows:

$$f(A) = |E(A, V \setminus A)|$$

where $E(A, V \setminus A)$ is the set of edges with one endpoint in A and the other endpoint in $V \setminus A$.

Symmetric submodularity condition is satisfied.

Example 2.3: For a set of random variables X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n , the entropy function $H(S)$ for a subset $S \subseteq \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n\}$ is defined as the joint entropy of the variables in S . This function is known to be submodular and symmetric. Note that entropy, in information theory, measures the uncertainty or randomness of a random variable's outcomes. It quantifies the average amount of information produced by a stochastic source of data.

Example 2.4: In the context of network flow, the cut-value function $f(S)$ for a subset $S \subseteq V$ (where V is the set of vertices) is the total capacity of edges crossing from S to $V \setminus S$. This is example of a symmetric submodular function.

It is known that a symmetric submodular function f satisfies the following useful properties:

Lemma 2.5[9]: Let X be a finite set. A symmetric submodular function f satisfies:

1. $\forall A \subseteq X, f(A) \geq f(\emptyset) = f(X) = 0$.
2. $\forall A, B \subseteq X, f(A) + f(B) \geq f(A \setminus B) + f(B \setminus A)$.

Proof. The following results can be obtained.

$$(1): f(A) + f(A) = f(A) + f(A) \geq f(A \cup A) + f(A \cap A) = f(X) + f(\emptyset) = f(\emptyset) + f(\emptyset).$$

$$(2): f(A) + f(B) = f(A) + f(B) \geq f(A \cup B) + f(A \cap B) = f(B \setminus A) + f(A \setminus B) = f(B \setminus A) + f(A \setminus B).$$

So, this proof is completed. ■

2.3. Ultrafilter on Connectivity System

We introduce some properties of the ultrafilter on the connectivity system (X, f) as an extension of the Ultrafilter on Boolean Algebras. First, we introduce definitions of a filter and an ultrafilter on a connectivity system [16]. These concepts extend the traditional notions of filter and ultrafilter from set theory by incorporating the condition of symmetric submodularity. Also an ultrafilter on the connectivity system (X, f) is co-Maximal ideal [49] on the connectivity system (X, f) .

Definition 2.6[16]: Let X be a finite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. In a connectivity system, the set family $F \subseteq 2^X$ is called a filter of order $k+1$ if the following axioms hold true:

- (Q0) $\forall A \in F, f(A) \leq k$
- (Q1) $A \in F, B \in F, f(A \cap B) \leq k \Rightarrow A \cap B \in F$
- (Q2) $A \in F, A \subseteq B \subseteq X, f(B) \leq k \Rightarrow B \in F$
- (Q3) \emptyset is not belong to Q .

An Ultrafilter on a connectivity system is a filter on a connectivity system that satisfies the following condition (Q4). The Ultrafilter on a Connectivity System has a dual relationship with branch-width, a graph width parameter [16]. Note that an ultrafilter on a connectivity system is a non-empty and proper (i.e. \emptyset is not belong to Q) family.

$$(Q4) \forall A \subseteq X, f(A) \leq k \Rightarrow \text{either } A \in Q \text{ or } X/A \in Q.$$

And filter is principal if the filter satisfies following axiom (QP5) [16]:

$$(QP5) A \in F \text{ for all } A \subseteq X \text{ with } |A| = 1 \text{ and } f(A) \leq k.$$

Also filter is non-principal if the filter satisfies following axiom (Q5) [16]:

$$(Q5) A \notin F \text{ for all } A \subseteq X \text{ with } |A| = 1.$$

Non-principal refers to a filter or ideal that does not contain any singletons (i.e., sets with exactly one element). It is not generated by any finite set.

If filter is weak [15, 81, 111], the following axiom (QW1') holds instead of axiom (Q1). Note that weak filter aims of interpreting defaults via a generalized 'most' quantifier in first-order logic [81, 111, 243, 224]. Weak filter on a connectivity system is co-Weak Ideal on a connectivity system. :

(QW1') $A \in F, B \in F, f(A \cap B) \leq k \Rightarrow A \cap B \neq \emptyset$

If filter is quasi[14,112], the following axiom (QQ1') holds instead of axiom (Q1). Note that a quasi-Ultrafilter is to do an axiomatic analysis of incomplete social judgments [112]. :

(QQ1') $A \subseteq X, B \subseteq X, A \notin F, B \notin F \Rightarrow A \cup B \notin F$

If filter is single[4], the following axiom (QS1) holds instead of axiom (Q1):

(QS1) For any $A \in F, e \in X$, if $f(\{e\}) \leq k$ and $f(A \cap (X \setminus \{e\})) \leq k$, then $A \cap (X \setminus \{e\}) \in F$.

In fact, by replacing the axiom (QS1) with the following (QSD1) [4]. This axiom aligns perfectly with the concept of single-element deletion [134-136] (co-operation of single-element extension [245-249]) in matroid theory:

(QSD1) For $A \in F, e \in X$, if $f(A \setminus \{e\}) \leq k$, then $A \setminus \{e\} \in F$.

Note that an equivalent form of a given ultrafilter $U \subseteq 2^X$ on a connectivity system is manifested as a two-valued morphism. This relationship is defined through a function m where $m(A)=1$ if A is an element of U , and $m(A)=0$ otherwise. Additionally, the function m holds the value 1 for subsets where the value of the submodular function is at most k . This suggests that ultrafilters are well-suited for use in two-player games [254,255], such as Cops and Robbers. Indeed, in literature [16], an ultrafilter on a connectivity system is employed as a winning strategy.

A concept closely related to ultrafilters on a connectivity system is the tangle. Tangles are known to be dual to the concepts of tree-decomposition and branch-decomposition, and they are extensively used in the study of graph width parameters [9, 10, 47]. Tangles have played a significant role in algorithms across various fields, including graph minors, width parameters, and graph isomorphism problems. The definition of a tangle on a connectivity system is provided below.

Definition 2.7[9]: Let X be a finite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. A family $T \subseteq 2^X$ is a tangle of order $k + 1$ on a connectivity system (X, f) if T satisfies the following axioms.

(T1) $\forall A \in T, f(A) \leq k$,

(T2) $A \subseteq X, f(A) \leq k \Rightarrow$ either $(A \in T)$ or $(A \in T)$,

(T3) $A, B, C \in T \Rightarrow A \cup B \cup C = X$,

(T4) $\forall e \in X, X \setminus \{e\} \notin T$.

A family F on a connectivity system (X, f) is a co-tangle if there is a tangle T such that $A \in F$ if and only if $X \setminus A \in T$.

Filter on a connectivity system is co-tangle on connectivity system. Filter on a connectivity system also satisfies following conditions [16]:

(FT1) $A, B, C \in F \Rightarrow A \cap B \cap C \neq \emptyset$

Single-Filter on a connectivity system is co-linear-tangle on connectivity system. Single-Filter on a connectivity system also satisfies following conditions [4]:

(FLT1) $A, B \in F, e \in X, f(\{e\}) \leq k \Rightarrow A \cap B \cap (X \setminus \{e\}) \neq \emptyset$.

If single-filter is restricted [7], the following axiom (FLTR1) holds instead of axiom (FLT1):

(FLTR1) $A, B \in F, |A| \neq |B|, e \in X, f(\{e\}) \leq k \Rightarrow A \cap B \cap (X \setminus \{e\}) \neq \emptyset$.

Additionally, concepts such as Directed Ultrafilter [12] defined on directed graphs, Edge-Ultrafilter [8], and Ultrafilter Tangle [144-147] on the Abstract separation system, which abstracts the Connectivity system, have also been studied. It is fascinating to see the connection between seemingly unrelated concepts of Ultrafilter and Tangle when the condition of symmetric submodularity is applied.

In an ultrafilter on a connectivity system, the following properties hold.

Theorem 2.8: Let (X, f) be a connectivity system. An ultrafilter of order $k + 1$ on a connectivity system (X, f) is also an ultrafilter of order k on a connectivity system (X, f)

Proof: An ultrafilter of order $k + 1$ on a connectivity system (X, f) obviously holds axioms of an ultrafilter of order k on a connectivity system (X, f) . ■

It is known that a Bramble can be constructed using a concept essentially equivalent to an Ultrafilter on separation [2], called an Ultrafilter on (X, f) . A Bramble is recognized in graph game theory, particularly in the Cops and Robbers game, as an obstruction to well-known graph width parameters such as escape routes and tree-width [143].

2.4 Branch width on Connectivity System

Branch width is a significant graph width parameter that involves a branch decomposition where the leaves correspond to the graph's edges. Each edge is assigned a value from a symmetric submodular function, measuring connectivity. Branch width generalizes the width of symmetric submodular functions on graphs, making it crucial in graph theory (e.g., [9, 16]).

Definition of Branch width is following. Note that a bijection is a one-to-one correspondence between two sets, where each element of one set is paired with a unique element of the other set, and vice versa, ensuring no elements are left unpaired.

Definition 2.9: Let X be a finite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. And let (X, f) be a connectivity system. The pair (T, μ) is a branch decomposition tree of (X, f) if T is a ternary tree such that $|L(T)| = |X|$ and μ is a bijection from $L(T)$ to X , where $L(T)$ denotes the leaves in T . For each $e \in E(T)$, we define $bw(T, \mu, e)$ as $f(\cup_{v \in L(T_1)} \mu(v))$, where T_1 is a tree obtained by removing e from T (taking into account the symmetry property of f). The width of (T, μ) is defined as the maximum value among $bw(T, \mu, e)$ for all $e \in E(T)$. The branch-width of X , denoted by $bw(X)$, is defined as the minimum width among all possible branch decomposition trees of X .

The following is an example of a branch decomposition tree of (X, f) .

Example 2.10: Consider the connectivity system (X, f) where $X = \{a, b, c, d\}$ and f is defined as follows: for any subset $S \subseteq X$, $f(S)$ equals the number of elements in S .

We construct a branch decomposition tree T as follows:

- T is a ternary tree with leaves $L(T) = \{v_a, v_b, v_c, v_d\}$.
- The bijection μ maps v_a to a , v_b to b , v_c to c , and v_d to d .

To define the width of this branch decomposition tree, we consider each edge $e \in E(T)$ and the corresponding tree T_1 obtained by removing e from T . For instance, Remove an edge e that splits T into subtrees T_1 and T_2 where T_1 contains leaves $\{v_a, v_b\}$ and T_2 contains leaves $\{v_c, v_d\}$.

In this case, $\mu(\{v_a, v_b\}) = \{a, b\}$ and $\mu(\{v_c, v_d\}) = \{c, d\}$. The width $bw(T, \mu, e)$ is then calculated as:
 $bw(T, \mu, e) = f(\{a, b\}) = 2$

Repeating this process for all edges e in T , we determine the maximum width among all these values. In this simple example, the width $bw(T, \mu)$ is the maximum value of $f(S)$ for any partition S of X , which is 2. Finally, the branch-width $bw(X)$ of the connectivity system (X, f) is the minimum width among all possible branch decomposition trees of X . Here, the minimum width is achieved by our constructed tree T , and thus $bw(X) = 2$.

In graph theory, the duality theorem for width parameters, such as tree-width and branch-width, is discussed, highlighting their dual concepts like tangles and branch decompositions. Additionally, obstructions are minimal structures or subgraphs that prevent a graph from having a width parameter below a certain threshold, providing insight into the graph's complexity. The following duality theorem is known for branch-width of the connectivity system (X, f) and ultrafilter of the connectivity system (X, f) .

Theorem 2.11[16]: Let X be a finite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. Branch-width of the connectivity system (X, f) is at most k if and only if no (non-principal) Ultrafilter of order $k+1$ exists.

Also the following duality theorem is known for branch-width of the connectivity system (X, f) and tangle of the connectivity system (X, f) .

Theorem 2.12[9]: Let X be a finite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. Branch-width of the connectivity system (X, f) is at most k if and only if no tangle of order $k+1$ exists.

Here, we introduce the concept of linear decomposition, which is a linear version of branch decomposition. Like branch decomposition, linear branch decomposition has been the subject of extensive research [39, 51, 52]. Focusing on linear structures often facilitates deriving results for both general width parameters and linear width parameters.

Definition 2.13: Let X be a finite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. And let C be a caterpillar, defined as a tree where interior vertices have a degree of 3 and leaves have a degree of 1. Consider C as the path $(l_1, b_2, b_3, \dots, b_{n-1}, l_n)$. For $2 \leq i \leq n-1$, the subgraph of C induced by $\{b_{i-1}, b_i, b_{i+1}\}$ forms a connectivity system (X, f) . The Linear Decomposition of C is a process that partitions the elements of X into the sets $\{e_1\}, \{e_2\}, \dots, \{e_{n-1}\}, \{e_n\}$. For each $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, define $w_i := f(\{e_1, \dots, e_i\})$. The width of the Linear Decomposition is given by $\max\{w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}, f(e_1), \dots, f(e_{n-1}), f(e_n)\}$. The linear width of (X, f) is the smallest width among all Linear Decompositions of (X, f) .

The following is an example of a linear branch decomposition tree of (X, f) .

Example 2.14: Consider a finite set $X = \{a, b, c, d\}$ and a symmetric submodular function f defined on 2^X . Suppose C is a caterpillar tree, where the path is represented by vertices l_1, b_2, b_3, l_n with edges between them. Let's assume the caterpillar has 4 vertices with the structure $l_1 - b_2 - b_3 - l_n$, where l_1 and l_n are leaves, and b_2 and b_3 are interior vertices.

In this scenario, we define a Linear Decomposition of X by partitioning it into individual elements $\{a\}, \{b\}, \{c\}, \{d\}$. For each partition step i , where $1 \leq i \leq 3$, the width w_i is calculated using the submodular function f .


For example, $w_1 = f(\{a\})$, $w_2 = f(\{a, b\})$, $w_3 = f(\{a, b, c\})$. If the subgraph of C induced by $\{b_2, b_3\}$ forms the connectivity system with the function $f(\{b_2\}) = 2$, $f(\{b_3\}) = 3$, and $f(\{b_2, b_3\}) = 2$, then the width of this Linear Decomposition would be the maximum value among these: $\max\{w_1, w_2, w_3, f(\{b_2\}), f(\{b_3\})\}$.

Finally, the linear branch width of (X, f) is the smallest width obtained by considering all possible Linear Decompositions of (X, f) . In this case, the linear width would be determined by minimizing the maximum width w_i across different decompositions of the caterpillar tree.

Theorem 2.15 [4]: Let X be a finite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. Linear-branch-width of the connectivity system (X, f) is at most k if and only if no (non-principal) Single-Ultrafilter of order $k+1$ exists.

Based on the above, the relationships shown in the following diagram become clear.

Figure 2.1: Relation about Width Parameter and Obstruction on Connectivity system



3. Tukey's Lemma and Chain for Connectivity Systems

In this section, we explain about Some Property of Ultrafilter on a Connectivity Systems.

3.1. Chain for Connectivity Systems

First, let consider about chain on a Connectivity Systems. Note that a chain in mathematics is crucial because it represents a totally ordered sequence of elements, which is fundamental in studying hierarchical structures, lattice theory, and optimization problems [261-267].

Definition 3.1: Let X be a finite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. A chain of order $k + 1$ on a Connectivity Systems is a sequence of subsets $\{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m\}$ of X such that:

1. $A_1 \subseteq A_2 \subseteq \dots \subseteq A_m$.
2. For each i ($1 \leq i \leq m$), the symmetric submodular function f evaluated at A_i satisfies $f(A_i) \leq k$.

3.2. Tukey's Lemma for Connectivity System

We demonstrate the Theorem (Tukey's Lemma for Connectivity Systems) by using a chain of order $k + 1$ on a Connectivity Systems. Tukey's Lemma states that in any non-empty collection of sets closed under taking supersets, there exists a maximal set within that collection. Intuitively, this means you can always find the largest possible set that cannot be expanded further while staying within the collection. Additionally, in set theory, Tukey's Lemma is known to be closely related to Zorn's Lemma (e.g., [148-150]). These lemmas are also widely recognized for their broad range of applications.

Theorem 3.2: Let X be a finite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. Any filter on a Connectivity System (X, f) , where f is a symmetric submodular function and X is a non-empty finite set, can be extended to an ultrafilter. Specifically, for any k -efficient subset $A \subseteq X$ (i.e., $f(A) \leq k$), there exists an ultrafilter containing the filter.

Proof: Let X be a finite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. Here, we consider chains composed of k -efficient subsets.

First, we define the Initial Filter. Let Q_0 be a filter on the Connectivity System (X, f) where f is a symmetric submodular function and X is a non-empty finite set that satisfies the axioms Q_0 through Q_3 .

Next, define the collection F as the set of all filters on (X, f) that contain Q_0 . This means F is the set of all sets Q such that:

- $Q_0 \subseteq Q$
- Q satisfies axioms Q_0 through Q_3

F is partially ordered by inclusion. We need to show that every chain on (X, f) (totally ordered subset on (X, f)) in F has an upper bound in F .

Let $C \subseteq F$ be a chain in F , where each element of C is a filter that respects the k -efficiency condition, meaning $f(A) \leq k$ for every A in the filter.

Define $Q_C = \bigcup Q$. We need to show that Q_C is a filter and an element of F .

Axiom (Q0): This axiom obviously holds.

Axiom (Q2): For any $A, B \in Q_C$, there exist $Q_A, Q_B \in C$ such that $A \in Q_A$ and $B \in Q_B$. Since C is a chain on the connectivity system, one of these filters contains the other; assume without loss of generality that $Q_A \subseteq Q_B$. Thus, $A, B \in Q_B$, and because Q_B is a filter, $A \cap B \in Q_B \subseteq Q_C$. Additionally, since both A and B are in Q_C , $f(A) \leq k$ and $f(B) \leq k$ by Axiom (Q0). Therefore, $f(A \cap B) \leq k$ must hold because if it did not, $A \cap B$ would not be in Q_B , contradicting the closure under intersection in Axiom (Q1).

Axiom (Q1): For any $A \in Q_C$ and $A \subseteq B \subseteq X$, there exists $Q_A \in C$ such that $A \in Q_A$. Since Q_A is a filter and $f(B) \leq k$, $B \in Q_A \subseteq Q_C$.

Axiom (Q3): Since $\emptyset \notin Q$ for any $Q \in C$, we have $\emptyset \notin Q_C$.

Thus, Q_C is a filter on the connectivity system and $Q_C \in F$.

F contains a maximal element Q . This maximal filter Q satisfies axioms (Q0) through (Q3).

To show Q is an ultrafilter, we need to verify Axiom (Q4):

For any $A \subseteq X$ such that $f(A) \leq k$, suppose $A \notin Q$. We must show $X \setminus A \in Q$.

Assume $A \notin Q$. If $X \setminus A \notin Q$, then we will show that this leads to a contradiction, meaning Q must contain either A or $X \setminus A$.

1. Constructing $Q' = Q \cup \{A\}$: If $A \notin Q$, consider adding A to Q . This new set $Q' = Q \cup \{A\}$ must be checked against the filter axioms.
2. Closed under Intersection: For Q' , consider any $B \in Q$:
 - If A were added to Q , $B \cap A$ might violate the k -efficiency condition. Specifically, since $A \notin Q$ and Q is maximal, there could be an element $B \in Q$ such that $B \cap A$ does not satisfy $f(B \cap A) \leq k$. Since $B \cap A \notin Q$, this would violate Axiom (Q1), meaning Q' cannot be a filter.
3. Constructing $Q'' = Q \cup \{X \setminus A\}$: If $X \setminus A \notin Q$, consider adding $X \setminus A$ to Q . This new set $Q'' = Q \cup \{X \setminus A\}$ must also be checked against the filter axioms.
4. Closed under Intersection: For Q'' , consider any $B \in Q$:
 - If $X \setminus A \notin Q$, then there must exist some $B \in Q$ such that $B \cap (X \setminus A)$ does not satisfy $f(B \cap (X \setminus A)) \leq k$. Since Q is maximal, adding $X \setminus A$ would create a set that fails to be closed under intersection, as $B \cap (X \setminus A) \notin Q$. This violates Axiom (Q1), meaning Q'' cannot be a filter.

Therefore, the assumption that both $A \notin Q$ and $X \setminus A \notin Q$ leads to contradictions. Hence, Q must contain either A or $X \setminus A$. This proof is completed. ■

We gain following property of an ultrafilter on connectivity system.

Theorem 3.3: Let X be a finite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. In any finite non-empty connectivity system (X, f) where f is a symmetric submodular function, there exists at least one ultrafilter.

Proof: Consider the collection F of all filters on (X, f) . This collection is non-empty because the trivial filter $\{X\}$ exists. By Tukey's Lemma for Connectivity Systems, every filter can be extended to an ultrafilter. Thus, there exists at least one maximal element in F under inclusion that satisfies all the filter axioms and the ultrafilter condition (Q4). This proof is completed. ■

3.1. Antichain for Connectivity Systems: Relationship among ultrafilter, chain, and antichain

We consider about an antichain on a connectivity system. An antichain is a collection of elements in a partially ordered set where no element is comparable to another, meaning no element in the set precedes or follows any other element in the ordering (cf. [261-267]).

Definition 3.4: Let X be a finite set and f a symmetric submodular function. An antichain of order $k+1$ on a connectivity system is defined as a collection of subsets $\{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m\}$ of X such that:

1. Antichain Condition: For any two distinct subsets A_i and A_j in the collection, neither is a subset of the other, i.e., $A_i \not\subseteq A_j$ and $A_j \not\subseteq A_i$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq m$ with $i \neq j$.
2. Submodular Condition: For each i ($1 \leq i \leq m$), the symmetric submodular function f evaluated at A_i satisfies $f(A_i) \leq k$.

The relationship between chains and antichains is established by the following theorem. In this paper, the following theorem is called Dilworth's Theorem [271-274] on a Connectivity System.

Theorem 3.5: Let (X, f) be a connectivity system with a symmetric submodular function f and let $A \subseteq 2^X$ be a family of subsets of X such that $f(A) \leq k$ for all $A \in A$. Then, the size of the largest antichain in A is equal to the minimum number of chains of order $k+1$ needed to cover A .

Proof: Let X be a finite set and f a symmetric submodular function. We proceed by induction on the number of elements in X .

For $|X|=1$, the statement trivially holds because any non-empty subset A of X is both a chain and an antichain.

Assume the statement holds for all connectivity systems with less than $|X|$ elements. Consider a connectivity system (X, f) with $|X|$ elements. Let A be a family of subsets of X such that $f(A) \leq k$ for all $A \in A$. We need to prove that the size of the largest antichain in A is equal to the minimum number of chains required to cover A .

- Let A be an antichain such that no element in A is a subset of any other. Due to the submodularity

condition, the maximum value of $f(A \cap B)$ for any $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ is less than or equal to k , ensuring the sets in the antichain are maximally disconnected.

- Given any partition of X into chains, by the pigeonhole principle, there is at least one element A in \mathcal{A} that intersects every chain. Each of these chains has an associated subset A that satisfies $f(A) \leq k$, ensuring that the number of chains required to cover \mathcal{A} is equal to the largest antichain.

By induction, the theorem holds for all finite connectivity systems. This proof is completed. ■

The relationship between ultrafilters and antichains is established by the following theorem.

Theorem 3.6: Let X be a finite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. A maximal antichain on a connectivity system (X, f) intersects with every ultrafilter of order $k+1$.

Proof: Let X be a finite set and f a symmetric submodular function. Suppose $\{B_1, B_2, \dots, B_n\}$ is a maximal antichain of order $k+1$ on the connectivity system (X, f) . Let U be an ultrafilter of order $k+1$ on (X, f) . Note that by definition, an ultrafilter U satisfies: For any $A \subseteq X$ such that $f(A) \leq k$, either $A \in U$ or $X \setminus A \in U$ (this is the defining property of an ultrafilter on a connectivity system).

Now, consider each set B_i in the antichain. Since B_i are mutually incomparable and $f(B_i) \leq k$ for all i , at least one of the sets B_i must belong to the ultrafilter U , otherwise, the union $X \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^n B_i$ would belong to U , which contradicts the maximality of the antichain (since U would then not intersect with any B_i).

Hence, every ultrafilter of order $k+1$ intersects with the maximal antichain $\{B_1, B_2, \dots, B_n\}$. This proof is completed. ■

The relationship between ultrafilters and chains is established by the following theorem.

Theorem 3.7: Let X be a finite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. In a chain of order $k+1$ on a connectivity system (X, f) , every ultrafilter of order $k+1$ contains exactly one set from the chain.

Proof: Let X be a finite set and f a symmetric submodular function. And Let $\{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m\}$ be a chain of order $k+1$ on the connectivity system (X, f) , and let U be an ultrafilter of order $k+1$ on (X, f) .

By the properties of the chain, we have $A_1 \subseteq A_2 \subseteq \dots \subseteq A_m$ with $f(A_i) \leq k$ for each i . By the properties of the ultrafilter, for each set A_i , either $A_i \in U$ or $X \setminus A_i \in U$.

Since the sets in the chain are nested, the ultrafilter cannot contain two different sets A_i and A_j with $i \neq j$ without violating the ultrafilter condition. Therefore, there must be a unique A_j such that $A_j \in U$ and for all $i < j$, $A_i \notin U$. This proof is completed. ■

Theorem 3.8: Let (X, f) be a connectivity system with X as a finite set and f as a symmetric submodular function. The following holds:

1. Chain Extension: Every chain in the set of subsets of X , where $f(A) \leq k$ for all A in the chain, can be extended to an ultrafilter on the connectivity system (X, f) .

2. Ultrafilter Inducing a Chain: Conversely, every ultrafilter on the connectivity system (X, f) induces a maximal chain in the set of subsets of X .

Proof: 1. Chain Extension to Ultrafilter: Let X be a finite set and f a symmetric submodular function. Given a chain $C = \{A_1 \subseteq A_2 \subseteq \dots \subseteq A_m\}$ where $f(A_i) \leq k$ for each i , we want to show that this chain can be extended to an ultrafilter on the connectivity system (X, f) .

Consider the filter F generated by the chain C . This filter includes all supersets of elements in C that satisfy $f(A) \leq k$. The symmetric submodular condition ensures that the intersection of any two sets in F also belongs to F , maintaining the filter structure.

By theorem 3.2, this filter F can be extended to a maximal filter, which is an ultrafilter U . This ultrafilter U satisfies the condition that for any set $B \subseteq X$, either $B \in U$ or $X \setminus B \in U$, ensuring that $f(B) \leq k$ for all $B \in U$.

Therefore, every chain C in the set of subsets of X can be extended to an ultrafilter U on the connectivity system (X, f) .

2. Ultrafilter Inducing a Maximal Chain: Let X be a finite set and f a symmetric submodular function. Given an ultrafilter U on the connectivity system (X, f) , we aim to show that U induces a maximal chain in the set of subsets of X .

For any set $A \in U$, consider the collection of subsets of A that are also in U . This collection forms a chain because U is a maximal filter, meaning that for any subset $A \subseteq B \subseteq X$, $B \in U$ if $A \in U$ and $f(B) \leq k$.

The ultrafilter U ensures that for any set $B \subseteq X$, either $B \in U$ or $X \setminus B \in U$, which means that the chain induced by U cannot be extended further within U . This guarantees that the chain is maximal.

Thus, every ultrafilter on the connectivity system (X, f) induces a maximal chain in the set of subsets of X . This proof is completed. ■

Theorem 3.9: Let X be a finite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. In a chain of order $k+1$ on a connectivity system (X, f) , every ultrafilter of order k does not contain a maximal set from the chain of order $k+1$.

Proof: Consider a chain $\{A_1 \subseteq A_2 \subseteq \dots \subseteq A_m\}$ in the connectivity system (X, f) , where $f(A_i) \leq k$ for all i . This chain is said to be of order $k+1$ if $f(A_i) \leq k$ for all sets in the chain. An ultrafilter of order k on (X, f) is a maximal filter where $f(A) < k$ for all A in the ultrafilter.

Suppose there exists an ultrafilter U of order k that contains the maximal set A_m from the chain $\{A_1 \subseteq A_2 \subseteq \dots \subseteq A_m\}$. Since f is symmetric and submodular, $f(A_m) \leq k$ holds because the chain is of order $k+1$. However, if $f(A_m) = k$, then A_m cannot belong to the ultrafilter U of order k , because by definition, U only contains sets where $f(A) < k$.

This contradiction implies that the ultrafilter U of order k cannot contain the maximal set A_m . Therefore, every ultrafilter of order k does not contain a maximal set from a chain of order $k+1$.

Theorem 3.10: Let X be a finite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. In a chain of order k on a connectivity system (X, f) , if no chain of order $k+1$ exists, then no ultrafilter of order $k+1$ exists.

Proof: Let $\{A_1 \subseteq A_2 \subseteq \dots \subseteq A_m\}$ be a chain of order k in the connectivity system (X, f) , where $f(A_i) \leq k$ for all i . Suppose no chain of order $k+1$ exists, meaning there is no set $A \subseteq X$ such that $f(A) \leq k$.

Assume there exists an ultrafilter U of order $k+1$ on (X, f) . By definition, an ultrafilter of order $k+1$ contains sets $B \subseteq X$ where $f(B) \leq k$. If such a set B exists in U , then B should be part of a chain of order $k+1$.

However, since we assumed that no chain of order $k+1$ exists, no set $B \subseteq X$ can satisfy $f(B) \leq k$. This proof is completed. ■

In the future, we will consider about relationship between a chain on a connectivity system and a branch-width on a connectivity system.

4. Prefilter and Filter Subbase on a connectivity system

We explain about Prefilter and Filter Subbase on a connectivity system (X, f) .

Prefilters and filter subbases, like ultrafilters, are crucial in set theory and topology for studying limits, convergence, and compactness. Prefilters are non-empty collections of sets closed under finite intersections, forming the basis for constructing filters. Filter subbases are non-empty collections of sets that generate filters by taking finite intersections, aiding in the study of convergence, limits, and compactness [94-96].

In this section, we add the condition of symmetric submodularity to prefilters and Filter Subbases and then perform verification.

4.1. Prefilter on a connectivity system

First, we explain about definition of prefilter and ultra-prefilter on a connectivity system (X, f) .

Definition 4.1: Let X be a finite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. A prefilter of order $k+1$ on a connectivity system (X, f) is a non-empty proper set family $P \subseteq 2^X$ that satisfies:

(P1) $\emptyset \notin P$ (Proper)

(P2) For any $A \in P$, $f(A) \leq k$ (k -efficiency)

(P3) For any $B, C \in P$, there exists some $A \in P$ such that $A \subseteq B \cap C$ and $f(A) \leq k$.

(Downward Directed under k -efficiency)

Definition 4.2: Let X be a finite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. An ultra-prefilter $P \subseteq 2^X$ on a connectivity system (X, f) is a prefilter of order $k+1$ that satisfies the following additional property:

(P4) $\forall A \subseteq X, f(A) \leq k \Rightarrow \exists B \in P$ such that $B \subseteq A$ or $B \subseteq X \setminus A$ and $f(B) \leq k$.

Next, we demonstrate that a filter on a connectivity system can be considered a prefilter on that system. This concept extends the notions of prefilters and ultra-prefilters from set theory by incorporating the condition of symmetric submodularity.

Theorem 4.3: Let X be a finite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. Any filter of order $k+1$ on a connectivity system (X, f) is also a prefilter of order $k+1$ on the same connectivity system (X, f) .

Proof: To prove that a filter Q on a connectivity system is also a prefilter, we need to show that Q satisfies all the conditions of a prefilter.

1. Axiom (P1): By definition, a filter Q is non-empty because it contains subsets of X that satisfy the given conditions. And by Axiom (Q3), $\emptyset \notin Q$. Therefore, Q is a proper set family.
2. Axiom (P2): By Axiom (Q0), $\forall A \in Q, f(A) \leq k$. Therefore, every element in Q satisfies the k -efficiency condition.
3. Axiom (P3): For any $B, C \in Q$ such that $f(B) \leq k$ and $f(C) \leq k$, we need to show there exists some $A \in Q$ such that $A \subseteq B \cap C$ and $f(A) \leq k$.
 - o Given $B, C \in Q$, by Axiom (Q1), $f(B \cap C) \leq k \Rightarrow B \cap C \in Q$.
 - o Since $B \cap C \in Q$ and by the definition of Q , $f(B \cap C) \leq k$, we can choose $A = B \cap C$.
 - o Therefore, $A \in Q$, $A \subseteq B \cap C$, and $f(A) \leq k$.

Hence, Q satisfies all the conditions of a prefilter. This proof is completed. ■

Next, we show that ultrafilter on a connectivity system is ultra-prefilter on a connectivity system.

Theorem 4.4: Let X be a finite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. Any ultrafilter of order $k+1$ on a connectivity system (X, f) is also an ultra-prefilter of order $k+1$ on the same connectivity system (X, f) .

Proof: Let X be a finite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. To prove that an ultrafilter Q on a connectivity system is also an ultra-prefilter of order $k+1$ on a connectivity system, we need to show that Q satisfies all the conditions of an ultra-prefilter of order $k+1$.

Axiom (P1)-(P3) holds obviously. So we show that axiom (P4) holds.

For any $A \subseteq X$ such that $f(A) \leq k$, we need to show there exists some $B \in Q$ such that $B \subseteq A$ or $B \subseteq X \setminus A$ and $f(B) \leq k$. Given $A \subseteq X$ such that $f(A) \leq k$, by Axiom (Q4), either $A \in Q$ or $X \setminus A \in Q$. If $A \in Q$, then we can choose $B = A$, and $B \subseteq A$ with $f(B) \leq k$. If $X \setminus A \in Q$, then we can choose $B = X \setminus A$, and $B \subseteq X \setminus A$ with $f(B) \leq k$. Hence, Q satisfies all the conditions of an ultra-prefilter. This proof is completed. ■

4.2. Filter subbase on a connectivity system

Next, we introduce the definitions of filter subbase and ultrafilter subbase. These concepts extend the traditional notions of filter subbases and ultrafilter subbases from set theory by incorporating the condition of symmetric submodularity.

Definition 4.5: Let X be a finite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. In a connectivity system (X, f) , a set family $S \subseteq 2^X$ is called a filter subbase of order $k+1$ if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (SB1) $S \neq \emptyset$.
- (SB2) $\emptyset \notin S$.
- (SB3) $\forall A \in S, f(A) \leq k$.

Definition 4.6: Let X be a finite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. In a connectivity system (X, f) , a set family $S \subseteq 2^X$ is called an ultrafilter subbase of order $k+1$ if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (SB1) $S \neq \emptyset$.
- (SB2) $\emptyset \notin S$.
- (SB3) $\forall A \in S, f(A) \leq k$.
- (SB4) $\forall A \subseteq X$ such that $f(A) \leq k$, there exists $B \in S$ such that either $B \subseteq A$ or $B \subseteq X \setminus A$ and $f(B) \leq k$.

We relationship between subbase on a connectivity system and filter on a connectivity system. We show following theorem.

Theorem 4.7: Let X be a finite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. Given a filter subbase S of order $k+1$ on a connectivity system (X, f) , we can generate a filter Q of order $k+1$ as follows:

The filter Q of order $k+1$ on a connectivity system (X, f) generated by S is the set of all subsets of X that can be formed by finite intersections of elements of S . Formally, $Q = \{A \subseteq X \mid \exists A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n \in S \text{ such that } A = A_1 \cap A_2 \cap \dots \cap A_n \text{ and } f(A) \leq k\}$.

Proof: To prove that Q is a filter of order $k+1$, we need to show that Q satisfies conditions of filter of order $k+1$.

Axiom (Q0): Obviously holds. By construction, every element in Q is formed by finite intersections of elements in S . Since S is a filter subbase of order $k+1$, all elements A_i in S satisfy $f(A_i) \leq k$. By the submodularity of f , for any intersection $A = A_1 \cap A_2 \cap \dots \cap A_n$, we have: $f(A) = f(A_1 \cap A_2 \cap \dots \cap A_n) \leq \min(f(A_1), f(A_2), \dots, f(A_n)) \leq k$.

Axiom (Q3): Since S is a filter subbase of order $k+1$ on a connectivity system (X, f) , it is non-empty. Suppose $S = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m\}$. Consider any single element $A_i \in S$. Since S is non-empty, A_i exists, and $f(A_i) \leq k$. Therefore, $A_i \in Q$, implying Q is non-empty.

And by the definition of a filter subbase, $\emptyset \notin S$. Since Q is generated by finite intersections of elements of S , and \emptyset cannot be formed by any finite intersection of non-empty sets, $\emptyset \notin Q$. Therefore, Q is proper.

Axiom (Q1): By construction, Q consists of all subsets of X that can be formed by finite intersections of elements of S and satisfy $f(A) \leq k$. Thus, by definition, Q satisfies the k -efficiency condition.

Let $A, B \in Q$. Then there exist $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n \in S$ and $B_1, B_2, \dots, B_m \in S$ such that: $A = A_1 \cap A_2 \cap \dots \cap A_n$ and $f(A) \leq k$, $B = B_1 \cap B_2 \cap \dots \cap B_m$ and $f(B) \leq k$.

Consider the intersection $A \cap B$: $A \cap B = (A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n) \cap (B_1, B_2, \dots, B_m)$.

Since S is a filter subbase and contains A_i and B_j for all i, j , $A \cap B$ is formed by the finite intersection of elements of S . Moreover, because f is submodular and symmetric, $f(A \cap B) \leq \min(f(A), f(B)) \leq k$. Thus, $A \cap B \in Q$.

Axiom (Q2): Let $A \in Q$ and $A \subseteq B \subseteq X$. By definition, there exist $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n \in S$ such that: $A = A_1 \cap A_2 \cap \dots \cap A_n$ and $f(A) \leq k$.

If $f(B) \leq k$, we need to show $B \in Q$. Since $A \subseteq B$ and $f(B) \leq k$, B can be considered as a superset satisfying the condition for being in Q .

Therefore, Q is a filter of order $k+1$ generated by the filter subbase S .

This proof is completed. ■

Theorem 4.8: Let X be a finite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. Given a filter subbase S of order $k+1$ on a connectivity system (X, f) , we can generate a prefilter Q of order $k+1$ as follows:

$Q = \{A \subseteq X \mid \exists A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n \in S \text{ such that } A = A_1 \cap A_2 \cap \dots \cap A_n \text{ and } f(A) \leq k\}$.

Proof: To demonstrate that Q is a prefilter of order $k+1$, we need to verify that Q satisfies the conditions

of a prefilter as defined by axioms (P1) to (P3).

Axiom (P1): Since S is a non-empty filter subbase, by definition, S does not contain \emptyset . Q is formed by finite intersections of elements in S , and because \emptyset cannot be formed by such intersections, $\emptyset \notin Q$.

Therefore, Q is proper and non-empty, satisfying axiom (P1).

Axiom (P2): By construction, each element $A \in Q$ is the intersection of a finite number of sets $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n \in S$ such that $f(A) \leq k$. Since S is a filter subbase of order $k+1$, all elements $A_i \in S$ satisfy $f(A_i) \leq k$. The submodularity of function f ensures that: $f(A_1 \cap A_2 \cap \dots \cap A_n) \leq \min(f(A_1), f(A_2), \dots, f(A_n)) \leq k$. Therefore, every element $A \in Q$ satisfies $f(A) \leq k$, ensuring k -efficiency as required by axiom (P2).

Axiom (P3) : For any $B, C \in Q$, there exist sets $B_1, B_2, \dots, B_m \in S$ and $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_n \in S$ such that: $B = B_1 \cap B_2 \cap \dots \cap B_m$ and $C = C_1 \cap C_2 \cap \dots \cap C_n$, with $f(B) \leq k$ and $f(C) \leq k$. Consider the intersection $A = B \cap C$. Since: $A = (B_1 \cap B_2 \cap \dots \cap B_m) \cap (C_1 \cap C_2 \cap \dots \cap C_n)$, A is formed by a finite intersection of elements in S . The submodularity and symmetry of function f imply that: $f(A) = f(B \cap C) \leq \min(f(B), f(C)) \leq k$. Therefore, $A \in Q$, satisfying axiom (P3).

Given that Q satisfies all the conditions (P1)-(P3) of a prefilter, we conclude that Q is indeed a prefilter of order $k+1$ generated by the filter subbase S . This completes the proof. ■

Theorem 4.9: Let X be a finite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. Given a ultrafilter subbase S of order $k+1$ on a connectivity system (X, f) , we can generate a ultrafilter Q of order $k+1$ as follows:

The filter Q of order $k+1$ on a connectivity system (X, f) generated by S is the set of all subsets of X that can be formed by finite intersections of elements of S . Formally, $Q = \{A \subseteq X / \exists A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n \in S \text{ such that } A = A_1 \cap A_2 \cap \dots \cap A_n \text{ and } f(A) \leq k\}$.

Proof: The proof can be established using a method nearly identical to that used in Theorem 4.7. This completes the proof. ■


Theorem 4.10: Let X be a finite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. Given a ultrafilter subbase S of order $k+1$ on a connectivity system (X, f) , we can generate a ultra-prefilter Q of order $k+1$ as follows:

$Q = \{A \subseteq X / \exists A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n \in S \text{ such that } A = A_1 \cap A_2 \cap \dots \cap A_n \text{ and } f(A) \leq k\}$.

Proof: The proof can be established using a method nearly identical to that used in Theorem 4.8. This completes the proof. ■

Based on the above, the relationships shown in the following diagram become clear.

Figure 4.1: Relation about generating a filter



5. Ultrafilter on Infinite connectivity system and countable connectivity system

5.1. Ultrafilter on Infinite connectivity system

Until now, we have considered ultrafilters on finite sets, but now we turn our attention to ultrafilters on infinite sets. First, let's define what an infinite connectivity system is.

Definition 5.1 [122-124]: Consider an infinite set X equipped with a symmetric submodular function f mapping from the set of subsets of X to $N \cup \{\infty\}$. This function satisfies the following conditions for all subsets A and B of X :

1. Symmetry: $f(A) = f(X \setminus A)$.

2. Submodularity: $f(A) + f(B) \geq f(A \cup B) + f(A \cap B)$.

In the context of infinite sets, we also require f to be k -limit-closed. Specifically, if $k \in N$ and $(A_i)_{i \in I}$ is a chain of subsets of X each with connectivity at most k , then the union $\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i$ also has connectivity at most k . It is important to note that the ground set of a (possibly infinite) matroid, along with its connectivity function, constitutes a connectivity system, and the connectivity function is defined to be k -limit-closed. A pair (X, f) is called infinite connectivity system.

Given the known lemma, it is reasonable to consider a deep relationship between finite sets and infinite sets.

Lemma 5.2 [122]: Let X be an infinite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. And let $k \in N$ and let $A \subseteq X$ be a set such that all finite subsets have connectivity at most k . Then also $f(A) \leq k$.

Following the model of ultrafilters on finite sets, we define ultrafilters on infinite sets as follows.

Definition 5.3(cf. [16]): Let X be an infinite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. In an infinite connectivity system (X, f) , the set family $F \subseteq 2^X$ is called a filter of order $k+1$ if the following axioms hold true:

(Q0) $\forall A \in F, f(A) \leq k$

(Q1) $A \in F, B \in F, f(A \cap B) \leq k \Rightarrow A \cap B \in F$

(Q2) $A \in F, A \subseteq B \subseteq X, f(B) \leq k \Rightarrow B \in F$

(Q3) \emptyset is not belong to F .

Ultrafilter of order $k+1$ on an infinite connectivity system (X, f) is a filter of order $k+1$ on an infinite connectivity system (X, f) which satisfies following additional axiom(Q4):

(Q4) $\forall A \subseteq X, f(A) \leq k \Rightarrow \text{either } A \in F \text{ or } X \setminus A \in F$.

And filter of order $k+1$ on an infinite connectivity system (X, f) is principal if the filter satisfies following axiom (QP5) [16]:

(QP5) $A \in F$ for all $A \subseteq X$ with $|A| = 1$ and $f(A) \leq k$.

Also filter of order $k+1$ on an infinite connectivity system (X, f) is non-principal if the filter satisfies following axiom (Q5) [16]:

(Q5) $A \notin F$ for all $A \subseteq X$ with $|A| = 1$.

Non-principal refers to a filter or ideal that does not contain any singletons (i.e., sets with exactly one element).

If filter on an infinite connectivity system is weak [15, 81, 111], the following axiom (QW1') holds instead of axiom (Q1). Note that weak filter aims of interpreting defaults via a generalized 'most' quantifier in first-order logic [81, 111, 243, 224]. Weak filter on an infinite connectivity system is co-Weak Ideal on an infinite connectivity system. :

(QW1') $A \in F, B \in F, f(A \cap B) \leq k \Rightarrow A \cap B \neq \emptyset$

If filter on an infinite connectivity system is quasi[14, 112], the following axiom (QQ1') holds instead of axiom (Q1). Note that a quasi-Ultrafilter is to do an axiomatic analysis of incomplete social judgments [112]. :

(QQ1') $A \subseteq X, B \subseteq X, A \notin F, B \notin F \Rightarrow A \cup B \notin F$

The following also holds for infinite connectivity systems, just as it does for finite connectivity systems.

Theorem 5.4: Consider an infinite set X equipped with a symmetric submodular function $f: 2^X \rightarrow N \cup \{\infty\}$.

Note that Limit-Closed is that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and any chain $(A_i)_{i \in I}$ of subsets of X each with connectivity at most k , the union $\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i$ also has connectivity at most k . An ultrafilter of order $k + 1$ on an infinite connectivity system (X, f) is also an ultrafilter of order k on an infinite connectivity system (X, f)

Proof: By using symmetric submodular function, an ultrafilter of order $k + 1$ on an infinite connectivity system (X, f) obviously holds axioms of an ultrafilter of order k on an infinite connectivity system (X, f) . This proof is completed. ■

Here are some properties that hold for filters and ultrafilters of order $k+1$ on an infinite connectivity system.

Lemma 5.5: Consider an infinite set X equipped with a symmetric submodular function $f: 2^X \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. And an infinite connectivity system (X, f) satisfies k -Limit-Closed. If a filter of order $k+1$ on an infinite connectivity system (X, f) is maximal, it satisfies following additional axiom (Q4):

(Q4) $\forall A \subseteq X, f(A) \leq k \Rightarrow$ either $A \in F$ or $X \setminus A \in F$.

Proof: Assume that there exists a maximal filter F of order $k+1$ on (X, f) that does not satisfy axiom (Q4). That is, there exists a subset $A \subseteq X$ such that $f(A) \leq k$, but neither $A \in F$ nor $X \setminus A \in F$.

Since F is maximal, the addition of A or $X \setminus A$ to F would result in a filter that still respects the conditions of $f(A) \leq k$. Therefore, $F \cup \{A\}$ or $F \cup \{X \setminus A\}$ would also be a valid filter, contradicting the maximality of F .

Thus, the assumption that F does not satisfy (Q4) leads to a contradiction. Therefore, any maximal filter F of order $k+1$ must satisfy axiom (Q4). This proof is completed. ■

Definition 5.6 (cf. [164]): Consider an infinite set X equipped with a symmetric submodular function $f: 2^X \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. We will say that a family F of order $k+1$ on an infinity connectivity system is nice if it is nonempty, closed under intersections (i.e., if $A, B \in F, f(A \cap B) \leq k$ then $A \cap B \in F$), and $\emptyset \in F$.

Lemma 5.7: Consider an infinite set X equipped with a symmetric submodular function $f: 2^X \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. And an infinite connectivity system (X, f) satisfies k -Limit-Closed. A family of subsets of X is maximal nice of order $k+1$ on an infinity connectivity system if and only if it is an ultrafilter of order $k+1$ on an infinity connectivity system.

Proof: Let's first recall that a family F of order $k+1$ on an infinite connectivity system is called nice if it is nonempty, closed under intersections (i.e., if $A, B \in F$ and $f(A \cap B) \leq k$, then $A \cap B \in F$), and $\emptyset \in F$.

(\Rightarrow Direction)

Assume that F is a maximal nice family of order $k+1$. We want to show that F is an ultrafilter of order $k+1$, i.e., it satisfies the axiom (Q4): $\forall A \subseteq X, f(A) \leq k$, then either $A \in F$ or $X \setminus A \in F$. Suppose F is maximal nice, but there exists a subset $A \subseteq X$ such that $f(A) \leq k$, and neither $A \in F$ nor $X \setminus A \in F$.

Since F is maximal, we can extend F by adding either A or $X \setminus A$ to form a new family F' . But this contradicts the maximality of F , as it can still be extended. Therefore, F must satisfy (Q4), and hence it is an ultrafilter of order $k+1$.

(\Leftarrow Direction)

Now assume F is an ultrafilter of order $k+1$. We need to show that F is maximal nice.

Suppose F is not maximal nice. Then there exists a family F' such that $F \subsetneq F'$ and F' is nice. But since F is an ultrafilter, it cannot be extended by adding more sets without violating the conditions for an ultrafilter.

This contradicts the assumption that F is not maximal nice. Hence, F must be maximal nice. This proof is completed. ■

In this paper, let be $F_r = \{A \subseteq X \mid f(A) \leq k, X \setminus A \text{ is finite}\}$ is Frechet filter of order $k+1$ on an infinite connectivity system (X, f) . We consider about the following lemma.

Lemma 5.8: Consider an infinite set X equipped with a symmetric submodular function $f: 2^X \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. And an infinite connectivity system (X, f) satisfies k -Limit-Closed. If there exists a Frechet filter of order $k+1$ on an infinite connectivity system (X, f) , then there exists a nonprincipal ultrafilter of order $k+1$ on an infinite connectivity system (X, f) .

Proof: Assume that there does not exist a nonprincipal ultrafilter of order $k+1$ on (X, f) . This implies that every ultrafilter on (X, f) must be principal.

If F_r can be extended to an ultrafilter, this ultrafilter would be principal. A principal ultrafilter contains a set $\{x\}$ for some $x \in X$ with $f(\{x\}) \leq k$. However, by definition, in a Frechet filter, $X \setminus \{x\}$ is finite, and thus X cannot have only principal ultrafilters if it contains elements for which $f(\{x\}) \leq k$. This contradicts the assumption that every ultrafilter is principal.

Thus, there must exist a nonprincipal ultrafilter of order $k+1$ on (X, f) . This proof is completed. ■

We consider about the following extended Ramsey's Theorem on an infinite connectivity system. Note that Ramsey's Theorem states that for any given positive integers k and r , there is a minimum number $R(k, r)$ such that any graph with $R(k, r)$ vertices, colored with r colors, contains a monochromatic clique of size k . Note that a monochromatic clique is a subset of vertices where all edges connecting them are the same color. This theorem can also be considered in terms of partitions, ensuring any partition of edges or vertices leads to a monochromatic subset.

Theorem 5.9: Consider an infinite set X equipped with a symmetric submodular function $f: 2^X \rightarrow N \cup \{\infty\}$. And an infinite connectivity system (X, f) satisfies k -Limit-Closed. Then for any infinite partition $P = \{A_1, A_2, \dots\}$ of X , there exists an infinite subset $Y \subseteq X$ such that all subsets of Y are contained within a single block of the partition and have connectivity at most k .

Proof: Let X be an infinite set with the symmetric submodular function f as defined. Let $P = \{A_1, A_2, \dots\}$ be a partition of X . We want to find an infinite subset $Y \subseteq X$ such that all subsets of Y are contained within a single block of P and have connectivity at most k .

Consider an increasing chain of subsets $(A_i)_{i \in I}$ of X , where each A_i has connectivity at most k . By the limit-closed property of function f , the union $\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i$ also has connectivity at most k .

Using the classical form of Ramsey's Theorem, we know that for any infinite set X and any partition of X into finitely many pieces, there exists an infinite subset $Y \subseteq X$ such that all pairs in Y lie within the same piece of the partition. To apply Ramsey's Theorem in the context of the connectivity system (X, f) , we need to ensure that the infinite subset Y not only lies within a single block of the partition but also maintains the connectivity condition $f(Y) \leq k$.

Start with an infinite subset $Y_0 \subseteq X$. Partition Y_0 into blocks A_i according to the given partition P . Select a block A_j that contains an infinite subset $Y_1 \subseteq A_j$. By symmetry and submodularity of function f , ensure $f(Y_1) \leq k$.

By iterating the process, we can construct a nested sequence of infinite subsets $Y_0 \supseteq Y_1 \supseteq Y_2 \supseteq \dots$, each lying within a single block of the partition and maintaining the connectivity condition $f(Y_i) \leq k$.

Let $Y = \bigcap_{i=0}^{\infty} Y_i$. Since each Y_i is infinite and lies within a single block of the partition, Y is also infinite and lies within a single block of the partition. Moreover, by the limit-closed property of infinite connectivity system, we obtain $f(Y) \leq k$.

Thus, we have shown that for any infinite partition P of X , there exists an infinite subset $Y \subseteq X$ such that all subsets of Y lie within a single block of the partition and have connectivity at most k . This completes the proof of the extended Ramsey's Theorem on an infinite connectivity system. ■

Theorem 5.10: Let (X, f) be an infinite connectivity system with f a symmetric submodular function satisfying k -Limit-Closed. A set family $U \subseteq 2^X$ is a weak ultrafilter of order $k+1$ if and only if it is a maximal weak filter of order $k+1$ on (X, f) .

Proof: (\Rightarrow) Assume that U satisfies the definition of a weak ultrafilter but is not maximal. This means there exists a weak filter G such that $U \subset G$ and G contains an additional set $A \subset X$ where $A \in G$ but $A \notin U$. Since U is a weak ultrafilter, by its definition, for any subset $A \subseteq X$ with $f(A) \leq k$, it must hold that either $A \in U$ or $X \setminus A \in U$.

Now, because $U \subset G$, every element of U is also an element of G . Specifically, since $X \setminus A \in U$ and $U \subset G$, it follows that $X \setminus A$ must also be in G . However, G already contains A by assumption, and now it also contains $X \setminus A$. For G to be a consistent weak filter, it cannot contain both A and $X \setminus A$ because that would violate the condition of non-empty intersection (which is required for weak filters under the definition QW1'). This leads to a contradiction because if G contains both A and $X \setminus A$, it would mean that G is no longer a valid weak filter due to inconsistency, which contradicts the assumption that G is a weak filter. Hence, U must be maximal because extending U to any larger set G results in an inconsistency, proving that U cannot be properly contained in any larger weak filter.

(\Leftarrow) We need to prove that U is a weak ultrafilter of order $k+1$. Specifically, for any subset $A \subset X$ with $f(A) \leq k$ and $A \notin U$, we must show $X \setminus A \in U$.

Let G be the upward closure of $U \cup \{A\}$, meaning G includes all sets in U as well as any sets that can be formed by taking unions of elements from U and A .

By the assumption that U is maximal, G cannot form a weak filter. If G were a weak filter, it would contradict the maximality of U .

The fact that G cannot be a weak filter means that there must exist some set $Z \subseteq X$ in G such that $Z \supset A$, and for some $Y \in U$, we have $Z \cap Y = \emptyset$. This condition arises because if Z and Y were both in G , it would imply that Z and Y must intersect, which they do not in this scenario.

The existence of such a Z means that the complement $X \setminus A$ must be in U to maintain the weak ultrafilter property (since U must contain the complement if it does not contain the original set).

This confirms that U must contain $X \setminus A$, proving that U behaves like a weak ultrafilter of order $k+1$. This proof is completed. ■

In the future, we plan to more investigate the theorems related to ultrafilters on infinite connectivity systems. For example, we will consider about following definitions of Selective and Weakly Selective Ultrafilters on a Connectivity System (cf. [160-163]).

Definition 5.11: Consider an infinite set X equipped with a symmetric submodular function $f: 2^X \rightarrow N \cup \{\infty\}$. And an infinite connectivity system (X, f) satisfies k -Limit-Closed. Assume that for all $x \in X$, $f(\{x\}) \leq k$. An ultrafilter F on (X, f) is called selective if for every function $g: X \rightarrow X$, there exists a subset $A \in F$ such that g/A is either:

Constant: $g(x) = c$ for all $x \in A$,

One-to-One: $g(x_1) \neq g(x_2)$ for all distinct $x_1, x_2 \in A$.

Definition 5.12: Consider an infinite set X equipped with a symmetric submodular function $f: 2^X \rightarrow N \cup \{\infty\}$. And an infinite connectivity system (X, f) satisfies k -Limit-Closed. An ultrafilter F on (X, f) is called quasi-selective if for every function $g: X \rightarrow X$ with $g(x) \leq x$ for all $x \in X$ where $f(\{x\}) \leq k$, there exists a subset $A \in F$ such that g/A is a non-decreasing function.

5.2. Ultrafilter on Countable connectivity system

We consider about on a countable (infinite) connectivity systems. X is a countable set, which means it can be put into a one-to-one correspondence with the set of natural numbers \mathbb{N} .

In mathematics, some researchers focus on the study of games used to model situations with multiple adversaries who have conflicting interests (ex. [218-225]). We consider the investigation of the Ultrafilter Game [131-133] on a countable connectivity system. This game is an analogy of the well-known ultrafilter game in the context of countable set theory.

Game 5.13: The Ultrafilter Game on a Countable Connectivity System

Let a finite set X and a subset $D \subseteq X^{\mathbb{N}}$. We define a two-player game $G(D)$ as follows:

(1) Players and Moves:

Player I and Player II take turns playing elements from X .

Player I starts by playing $a_0 \in X$.

Player II responds with $a_1 \in X$.

Player I then plays $a_2 \in X$, and the game continues in this alternating fashion.

(2) Rounds:

The game is played for countably many rounds,

resulting in a sequence $a = (a_0, a_1, a_2, \dots) \in X^{\mathbb{N}}$.

(3) Winning Condition:

Player I wins if the sequence a belongs to D and satisfies the condition $f(\{a\}) \leq k$.

Player II wins if either the sequence a does not belong to D or $f(\{a\}) > k$.

(4) Strategies:

Strategy for Player I:

A strategy for Player I is a rule determining Player I's moves based on the history of the game.

A winning strategy guarantees that Player I can always produce a sequence a such that $a \in D$ and

$f(\{a\}) \leq k$, regardless of Player II's moves.

Strategy for Player II:

Similarly, a strategy for Player II is a rule determining Player II's responses based on the history of the game.

A winning strategy for Player II ensures that the resulting sequence either does not belong to D or violates the condition $f(\{a\}) \leq k$.

(5) Determination:

We say that $D \subseteq X^{\mathbb{N}}$ is determined if one of the two players has a winning strategy for the game $G(D)$.

This means there exists a strategy such that either Player I or Player II can always secure a win, ensuring the game is resolved definitively in favor of one player.

We consider about winning strategy and determination.

Lemma 5.14: Let X be a finite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. For the ultrafilter game on a countable connectivity system (X, f) , Player I has a winning strategy by following a linear decomposition strategy.

Proof: Consider a caterpillar tree C as a path $(l_1, b_2, b_3, \dots, b_{n-1}, l_n)$, where the subgraph of C induced by $\{b_{i-1}, b_i, b_{i+1}\}$ forms a connectivity system.

If X has only one element, e_1 , Player I starts by choosing $a_0 = e_1$. Since there are no other elements, $f(\{e_1\}) \leq k$.

Player I wins because the sequence (e_1) belongs to the set D and satisfies $f(\{e_1\}) \leq k$.

Assume that for a caterpillar tree with $n-1$ elements, Player I has a winning strategy by choosing elements according to the linear decomposition.

For a caterpillar tree with n elements, let the linear decomposition partition X into $\{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n\}$.

At each turn i , Player I chooses $a_i = e_{i+1}$. This ensures that the partial sequence (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_i) satisfies $f(\{a_0, a_1, \dots, a_i\}) \leq k$.

Since the linear decomposition ensures the sequence adheres to the symmetric submodular condition, and Player I can choose elements to keep $f(\{a_0, a_1, \dots, a_i\}) \leq k$, the sequence a will belong to the set D .

By induction, Player I has a winning strategy for any n elements by following the linear decomposition.

Therefore, Player I can systematically choose elements according to the linear decomposition strategy, ensuring the sequence meets the conditions required for victory. This proof is completed. ■

Lemma 5.15: Let X be a finite set and f be a symmetric submodular function. For the ultrafilter game on a countable connectivity system (X, f) , a non-principal ultrafilter does not result in a determined game.

Proof:

If X has only one element, it cannot form a non-principal ultrafilter since the ultrafilter would include singletons, which contradicts the non-principal property.

Assume that for any set of size $n-1$, the non-principal ultrafilter does not lead to a determined game. For a set X with n elements, the non-principal ultrafilter excludes all singletons, making it impossible for Player I to use single elements to form a winning strategy.

Player II also cannot formulate a winning strategy because the non-principal nature prevents clear counteractions based on singletons or small subsets.

The lack of singletons in the ultrafilter means that neither player can systematically form a winning sequence based on single elements or small subsets.

Both players are left without a structured method to guarantee victory, leading to a non-determined game.

By induction, the non-principal ultrafilter does not lead to a determined game for any finite n . The exclusion of singletons and the lack of structured strategies ensure that neither player can develop a definitive winning strategy. This proof is completed. ■

We consider about the another game called "elimination games" (cf. [97]). We propose definition of the elimination Games with an Invisible Robber on a Countable Connectivity System.

Game 5.16 [166]: Let (X, f) be a countable connectivity system equipped with a symmetric submodular function f , and let k be an integer. The elimination game on this system is a pursuit-evasion game between a cop and a robber, with the following rules:

(1) Players and Pieces

The cop controls one or more tokens (representing cops).

The robber controls a single token (representing the robber).
Both the cops and the robber move on the elements of X .

(2) Initial Setup

Initially, no tokens occupy any elements of X .

The game begins with the cop placing some tokens on the elements of X according to the function f .

The robber then chooses an initial position $r \in X$ without being seen by the cop, ensuring that $f(\{r\}) \leq k$.

(3) Moves:

In each round, the cop announces a new position C_i by moving the tokens to a set of elements $C_{i+1} \subseteq X$, ensuring that $f(C_{i+1}) \leq k$.

The robber, while invisible to the cop, can move from their current position r along or against a directed path not containing any element of C_{i+1} to a new position r' , ensuring $f(\{r'\}) \leq k$.

(4) Movement Rules:

The robber can move to any element r' within the connected component of $X \setminus C_{i+1}$ containing r , under the condition that $f(\{r'\}) \leq k$.

The cop cannot see the robber's moves, so their strategy must account for all possible positions the robber might occupy, taking into account the submodularity condition: $f(A) + f(B) \geq f(A \cup B) + f(A \cap B)$ for any subsets $A, B \subseteq X$.

(5) Winning Conditions:

The cop wins if they place a token on the element currently occupied by the robber, and the robber is unable to escape to a safe place within the connectivity constraints f .

The robber wins if they can always elude capture, continuously finding a path r' that satisfies the connectivity condition $f(\{r'\}) \leq k$ within the connected components of $X \setminus C_{i+1}$.

We can represent a cop's strategy on a connectivity system (X, f) by a finite or infinite sequence S of cop positions: $S := \{C_0, C_1, C_2, \dots\}$ where C_i denotes the set of elements occupied by the cops at the i -th move.

Conjecture 5.17: The robber's winning strategy can be characterized as a (non-principal) single ultrafilter if the robber can always find a path to escape from the cops' positions within the connected components of $X \setminus C_{i+1}$.

In the future, we plan to more investigate the theorems related to ultrafilters on countable connectivity systems.

5.3. Ultrafilter on maximum-connectivity system

We introduce a property similar to submodularity, which supports the development of corresponding theories for connectivity functions.

Definition 5.18 [283]: A set function κ on a finite underlying set X is defined as maximum-submodular if, for all subsets $A, B \subseteq X$, $\max(\kappa(A), \kappa(B)) \geq \max(\kappa(A \cap B), \kappa(A \cup B))$.

According to Reference [283], a set function that is normalized, symmetric, and maximum-submodular is referred to as a maximum-submodular connectivity function. A maximum-connectivity system consists of a pair (U, κ) , where U is a finite set and κ is a maximum-submodular connectivity function.

We plan to define an ultrafilter on a maximum-connectivity system and explore its relationship with tangles on maximum-connectivity systems in future research.

6. Future tasks

This section outlines future perspectives for this study and related research.

6.1. New width/length/depth parameter and obstructions

In this paper, we discussed an ultrafilter which serves as an obstruction to branch-width and linear branch-width. In the future, we will consider the following width parameters (Definitions 16, 22, 23). As noted in the Appendix A, various width parameters are well-known. Our goal is to examine these width parameters from multiple perspectives, including their corresponding decompositions, related length [87-89] and depth parameters [90-92, Appendix D], linear concepts, directed graph concepts, and their extensions from graphs to connectivity systems [9] and abstract separation systems [6]. For a detailed discussion on length, refer to Appendix B. Additionally, we plan to define and explore the characteristics of directed branch depth, similar to directed tree depth [169], and Directed Rank-depth, similar to Rank-depth [168, 175, 176, 177]. Furthermore, we aim to investigate the relationships with ultrafilters and related definitions.

6.1.1. Consideration about a branch distance decomposition

First, let's consider the concept of a branch distance decomposition. Intuitively, this is a branch decomposition that integrates the concept of distance. This idea originates from exploring how extending tree-distance-width [57] and path-distance-width [57] to branch decompositions might work.

Definition 6.1: A branch distance decomposition is a branch decomposition with an additional distance function and a root.

A branch decomposition of a graph $G=(V,E)$ is a pair $B=(T,\mu)$, where T is a tree and μ is a bijection from the edges of G to the leaves of T .

In a branch distance decomposition, we add a distance function $d:E(T)\rightarrow\mathbb{N}$, which assigns a distance to each edge in T , and a root $r\in V(T)$.

For an edge $e\in E(T)$, let T_1 and T_2 be the two subtrees obtained by deleting e from T . Let G_1 and G_2 be the subgraphs of G induced by the edges mapped by μ to the leaves of T_1 and T_2 , respectively. The vertices $V(G_1)\cap V(G_2)$ are denoted by $midB(e)$.

The branch distance width of B is $\max_{e\in E(T)}(|midB(e)|+d(e))$. The branch distance width of G , denoted by $BDW(G)$, is the minimum width over all branch distance decompositions of G .

And a linear distance decomposition of a graph $G=(V,E)$ is a triple (P,μ,d) , where:

- $P=(v_1,v_2,\dots,v_n)$ is a path graph, represented as a sequence of vertices.
- μ is a bijection from the edges of G to the vertices of P .
- $d:V(P)\rightarrow\mathbb{N}$ is a function assigning a distance to each vertex in P .

For a vertex $v_i\in V(P)$, let P_i be the subpath consisting of vertices v_{i-1},v_i,v_{i+1} . Let G_i be the subgraph of G induced by the edges mapped by μ to the vertices in P_i . The set of vertices $V(G_i)$ is denoted by $midL(v_i)$.

The width of a linear distance decomposition is defined as: $ldw(P,\mu,d)=\max_{v_i\in V(P)}(|midL(v_i)|+d(v_i))$.

The linear distance width of G , denoted by $LDW(G)$, is the minimum width over all linear distance decompositions of G : $LDW(G)=\min(P,\mu,d)ldw(P,\mu,d)$.

Lemma 6.2: For any connected graph G with branch-width $bw(G)\geq 2$, $TDW(G)\geq BDW(G)$.

Proof: By definition, a branch decomposition can be considered a special case of a tree distance decomposition where the tree T is a binary tree. Therefore, every branch distance decomposition can be viewed as a tree distance decomposition with a specific structure. Hence, the constraints and requirements of a tree distance decomposition are inherently satisfied by a branch distance decomposition.

The condition $bw(G)\geq 2$ ensures that the graph G has a certain level of complexity. Specifically, it means that any branch decomposition of G must involve subgraphs whose intersection has at least 2 vertices. Given that a branch distance decomposition is a specific type of tree distance decomposition, the width of the optimal branch distance decomposition (BDW) can never exceed the width of the optimal tree distance decomposition (TDW). Formally: $BDW(G)\leq TDW(G)$ Therefore, the lemma is proved. ■

Conjecture 6.3: For any connected graph G with branch-width $bw(G) \geq 2$, $TDW(G) = BDW(G)$. Also for any connected graph G with linear-branch-width $lw(G) \geq 2$, $PDW(G) = LDW(G)$.

Next, we consider about algorithm for Constructing Branch Distance Decomposition. The following algorithm has significant room for improvement, and we plan to continue refining it.

Algorithm 6.4: Algorithm for Constructing Branch Distance Decomposition

Input: A graph $G=(V,E)$.

Output: A branch distance decomposition $(T, \{X_i\})$.

1. Initialization:
 - o Let T be a tree with a single node r (the root).
 - o Initialize $X_r = V(G)$.
2. Iterative Decomposition:
 - o While $|X_r| > 1$:
 1. Select a vertex $v \in X_r$.
 2. Find the shortest path P in G that includes v and other vertices in X_r .
 3. Partition X_r into two sets X_1 and X_2 based on the vertices on either side of P such that:
 - $X_1 \cup X_2 = X_r$,
 - $X_1 \cap X_2$ contains the vertices on P .
 4. Add two new nodes i and j to T as children of r , and set:
 - $X_i = X_1$,
 - $X_j = X_2$.
 5. Update T and the corresponding sets X_i and X_j .
3. Ensuring Distance Constraints:
 - o For each vertex $v \in V(G)$, ensure that if $v \in X_i$, then $dist_G(X_r, v) = dist_T(r, i)$.
 - o Adjust X_i and X_j to meet this distance constraint by reassigning vertices if necessary.
4. Repeat: Continue decomposing each subset X_i recursively, applying the above steps until each X_i contains a single vertex or a base case is met.
5. Output the Decomposition: Once the tree T and the subsets $\{X_i\}$ satisfy all the constraints, output the branch distance decomposition $(T, \{X_i\})$.

Lemma 6.5: Algorithm 6.4 is corrected.

Proof: 1. The decomposition process ensures that T remains a tree, as new nodes are added as children to existing nodes, maintaining the tree structure.

2. Each vertex $v \in V(G)$ is included in at least one subset X_i throughout the decomposition, ensuring $\bigcup_{i \in V(T)} X_i = V(G)$.

3. For each edge $\{u, v\} \in E(G)$, the decomposition ensures there are nodes $i, j \in V(T)$ such that $u \in X_i$ and $v \in X_j$, and either $i=j$ or $\{i, j\} \in E(T)$.

4. The algorithm maintains the distance constraint by ensuring $dist_G(X_r, v) = dist_T(r, i)$ for each vertex $v \in V(G)$, adjusting subsets as necessary to maintain this property.

5. The iterative and recursive nature of the algorithm ensures that the decomposition process will terminate, as each step reduces the size of the subsets until the base case is reached.

Therefore, the lemma is proved. ■

Lemma 6.6: The total time complexity of algorithm 6.4 is $O((V+E) \log V)$.

Proof: Initialization: The initialization step takes $O(1)$ time.

Iterative Decomposition: Each iteration involves selecting a vertex $v \in X_r$ and finding a shortest path P . Finding a shortest path can be done in $O(V+E)$ time using breadth-first search (BFS) or depth-first search (DFS). Partitioning X_r into X_1 and X_2 based on the shortest path takes $O(V)$ time. Adding new nodes to the tree T and updating the corresponding sets X_i and X_j takes $O(1)$ time.

Ensuring Distance Constraints: Adjusting subsets X_i and X_j to meet distance constraints might involve checking distances for all vertices, which can be done in $O(V)$ time.

Recursive Decomposition: The recursive decomposition process continues until each subset X_i contains a single vertex, resulting in a tree of height $O(\log V)$.

Total Time Complexity: The total time complexity for the entire algorithm can be expressed as a sum of

the time complexities of the individual steps. Each step involves $O(V+E)$ time for finding the shortest path, and there are $O(\log V)$ levels of recursion. Therefore, the lemma is proved. ■

And we will consider about game called Cops and Robbers with Speed d . Definition of the game is following.

Game 6.7: Cops and Robbers with Speed d

In the "cops and robbers with speed d " game, the graph $G=(V,E)$ is endowed with a distance function that affects movement capabilities. Players consist of a single robber and multiple cops.

- **Players:** One robber and k cops.
- **Positions:** Defined by a tuple (r,C) , where $r \in V$ is the robber's position and $C \subseteq V$ with $|C| \leq k$ represents the positions of the cops.
- **Initial Position:** The robber chooses an initial position $r_0 \in V$, and the cops collectively choose their initial positions as a set C where $|C| \leq k$.
- **Movement:** Each round consists of the cops moving to a new set of positions C' followed by the robber moving to a new position r' . The robber can move to any vertex r' that is reachable from r within distance d in $G \setminus (C \cap C')$, reflecting the robber's speed and the obstruction caused by cops.
- **Winning Conditions:** The cops win if they can move into the robber's position, i.e., if a situation (r,C) with $r \in C$ is achieved; otherwise, the robber wins if he remains uncaught indefinitely.

Conjecture 6.8: Branch-distance-decomposition is a winning strategy of Cops and Robbers with Speed d .

6.1.2. Consideration about a directed tree distance decomposition.

And we will consider about a directed tree distance decomposition. This idea also originates from exploring how extending tree-distance-width [57] and path-distance-width [57] to branch decompositions might work.

Definition 6.9: Let a directed graph $D=(V,E)$. A directed tree distance decomposition of a directed graph $D=(V,E)$ is a triple $(R, \{X_i / i \in V(R)\}, r)$, where:

- R is an arborescence (a directed tree with a designated root r such that there is a unique directed path from r to any vertex in $V(R)$).

- $\{X_i / i \in V(R)\}$ is a family of subsets of $V(D)$ satisfying the following properties:

(Partition Property): $\bigcup_{i \in V(R)} X_i = V(D)$ and $X_i \cap X_j = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$.

(Distance Property): For each vertex $v \in V(D)$, if $v \in X_i$, then the directed distance from X_r (the set associated with the root r) to v in D is equal to the directed distance from r to i in R . Formally, $d_D(X_r, v) = d_R(r, i)$.

(Edge Coverage Property): For each edge $(u, v) \in E(D)$, there exist vertices $i, j \in V(R)$ such that $u \in X_i$, $v \in X_j$, and either $i=j$ or $(i, j) \in E(R)$.

The width of the directed tree distance decomposition is defined as $\max_{i \in V(R)} |X_i|$. The directed tree distance width of a directed graph D , denoted by $DTDW(D)$, is the minimum width over all possible directed tree distance decompositions of D .

In the future, we will investigate the relationships with ultrafilters and these distance width.

6.1.3 New Linear Width Parameter

As discussed in Appendix A, various graph width parameters have been defined and extensively studied. Our goal is to introduce new linear versions of some of these width parameters and explore their relationships with other graph parameters. Specifically, we plan to define Linear-Amalgam-Decomposition, the linear version of Amalgam-Decomposition [30], Linear-Modular-Decomposition, the linear version of Modular-Decomposition [42], Linear-Tree-Cut-Decomposition, the linear version of Tree-Cut Decomposition, and Direct Linear-Branch-Decomposition, the linear version of Direct Branch-

Decomposition, and analyze their interconnections. It's important to note that for any general width parameter, it holds that (general width parameter) \leq (linear width parameter); for instance, Amalgam-width \leq Linear-Amalgam-width.

These restrictions to underlying path-structures are often beneficial in proving results for the general parameters. Moreover, these linear parameters offer valuable insights from a structural perspective, especially in the study of special graph classes. Additionally, we aim to explore potential connections between these widths and ultrafilters, further enriching the theoretical framework.

6.2 Consideration about property of an Ultrafilter

We will explore additional properties of an ultrafilter on a connectivity system, including game-theoretical interpretations of ultrafilters and ultraproducts within such systems.

6.2.1 Simple Game on a connectivity system

A simple game is a mathematical model of voting systems where a coalition of agents wins if it belongs to a specified set of "winning" coalitions, adhering to certain conditions like monotonicity (cf. [98-101]). This simple game is a model for voting power that provides a generalized interpretation of the notion of what is "majority". And this game is well-known to be closely related to ultrafilters.

A simple game on a connectivity system can be modeled similarly to the simple game in the context of voting systems, but within the framework of connectivity systems, incorporating the constraint $f(A) \leq k$. In the future, we consider about a simple Game on a connectivity system.

Game 6.10: Simple Game on a connectivity system

Let X be a finite set, f be a symmetric submodular function, and $W \subseteq 2^X$ be any collection that satisfies the following monotonicity condition (M1). The triple (X, W, f) is called a simple game on a connectivity system if for every $A \in W$, $f(A) \leq k$.

Basic Definitions of a Simple Game:

1. Connectivity System:
 - o A connectivity system is defined as a pair (X, f) , where X is a finite set and $f: 2^X \rightarrow N$ is a symmetric submodular function.
2. Winning Coalition:
 - o Let X be a set of agents and $W \subseteq 2^X$ be a collection of subsets that we think of as the majorities or winning coalitions of X .

Conditions of a Simple Game:

1. Monotonicity Condition (M1) on a connectivity system:
 - o The collection W is closed under supersets: If $A \in W$ and $A \subseteq B \subseteq X$ with $f(B) \leq k$, then $B \in W$.
2. Proper Simple Game on a connectivity system:
 - o A simple game is called proper if it satisfies: $A \in W$ implies $X \setminus A \notin W$, provided $f(A) \leq k$.
3. Strong Simple Game on a connectivity system:
 - o A simple game is called strong if it satisfies: $A \notin W$ implies $X \setminus A \in W$, provided $f(A) \leq k$.

Conjecture 6.11: An ultrafilter on a connectivity system is a simple game on a connectivity system.

6.2.2 The Axiom of Choice in the Context of Connectivity Systems

The Axiom of Choice states that for any set of nonempty sets, there exists a function selecting one element from each set, ensuring the product is nonempty. The Axiom of Choice is widely used in real-world applications, such as in optimization, decision theory, and economics, where selecting elements from sets is essential for solving complex problems [102-108].

In the future, we will consider about the Axiom of Choice. To consider the Axiom of Choice within a connectivity system, we need to translate the concepts into the framework of connectivity systems. :

1. **Set of Nonempty Subsets:**
 - Let $\{S_\alpha: \alpha \in A\}$ be a collection of nonempty subsets of X within the connectivity system (X, f) .
 - Each S_α is a nonempty subset of X , and $f(S_\alpha) \leq k$ for some k .
2. **Product of Sets:**
 - The product $\prod_{\alpha \in A} S_\alpha$ represents the Cartesian product of the sets S_α .
 - In the context of a connectivity system, this product can be interpreted as a selection of one element from each S_α .
3. **Nonemptiness of the Product:**
 - The Axiom of Choice asserts that there exists a function $g: A \rightarrow X$ such that $g(\alpha) \in S_\alpha$ for all $\alpha \in A$.
 - This means there is a way to select one element from each subset S_α while maintaining the constraints imposed by the connectivity system.

Also, we will consider about selective (Ramsey) ultrafilter and P -ultrafilter on a connectivity system [113-116].

6.2.3 Ultraproducts and Ultrapowers on connectivity system

Ultraproducts combine structures using ultrafilters, allowing the creation of a new structure that retains properties from the original structures, often used in model theory to study logical consistency [125-130]. We will extend the construction of ultraproducts to the context of a symmetric submodular function f . Although it is still in the conceptual stage, the ultraproduct on a connectivity system is as follows. Let $\{M_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a collection of sets indexed by I , and let U be an ultrafilter on a connectivity system on I . We consider the direct product $\prod_{i \in I} M_i$, which consists of all possible combinations of elements from each M_i . Instead of simply considering the direct product, we now define a set of subsets $A \subseteq \prod_{i \in I} M_i$ such that $f(A) \leq k$. This ensures that the subsets considered in the product adhere to the submodular constraints. Using the ultrafilter U on the connectivity system, we select subsets of $\prod_{i \in I} M_i$ that are included in the ultrafilter. This step filters the product to only include elements in subsets dictated by U . Finally, we take the direct limit: $\lim_{j \in U} \{A \subseteq \prod_{i \in J} M_i \mid f(A) \leq k\}$. This limit considers the stable elements in the context of the ultrafilter U , yielding the ultraproduct $(\prod_{i \in J} M_i) / U$.

6.2.4 Algorithm of constructing an Ultrafilter on a connectivity system

We will consider about Algorithm of constructing an Ultrafilter on a connectivity system. The algorithm is following.

Algorithm 6.12: Algorithm of constructing an Ultrafilter on a connectivity system

Input: A finite set X with $|X|=n$. A symmetric submodular function $f: 2^X \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$.

Output: An ultrafilter U of order $k+1$ on the connectivity system (X, f) .

Algorithm:

Initialization: Start with an empty set collection $U = \emptyset$.

Let L be the list of all subsets $A \subseteq X$ such that $f(A) \leq k$.

Step 1: Generate Candidate Sets:

Enumerate all subsets $A \subseteq X$ such that $f(A) \leq k$. Store these subsets in L .

Note: The condition $f(A) \leq k$ ensures that the function values are bounded, adhering to the order $k+1$.

Step 2: Construct the Filter:

Select the first non-empty subset A_0 from L and include it in U , i.e., $U = \{A_0\}$.

For each subsequent subset $A_i \in L$, do the following:

Intersection Check: Check whether for all sets $B \in U$, the intersection $A_i \cap B$ satisfies $f(A_i \cap B) \leq k$.

If the condition is met, include A_i in U ; otherwise, discard A_i .

Step 3: Extend to an Ultrafilter:

For each subset $A \subseteq X$ not yet in U with $f(A) \leq k$, perform the following:

If adding A maintains the properties of U , include A in U .
 If adding A violates the properties of U , include $X \setminus A$ instead, ensuring the maximality of U .

Termination:

Continue the above steps until every subset $A \subseteq X$ with $f(A) \leq k$ is either in U or its complement $X \setminus A$ is in U . The process ends when L is exhausted, ensuring that U is maximal and satisfies the ultrafilter conditions. Return the collection U , which is the desired ultrafilter of order $k+1$.

Lemma 6.13: Algorithm 6.12 is corrected.

Proof: We show that Output allows axioms of Ultrafilters.

By construction, U begins with a non-empty set A_0 , ensuring that U is non-empty. Additionally, $f(A_0) \leq k$ guarantees the initial set satisfies the k -efficiency condition.

Every subset A included in U is selected based on the condition $f(A) \leq k$. Therefore, U inherently satisfies the k -efficiency condition.

Closed under Finite Intersections: For each new set A_i considered, it is included in U only if $A_i \cap B$ for all $B \in U$ also satisfies $f(A_i \cap B) \leq k$. This ensures closure under finite intersections.

Maximality: The final step in the algorithm ensures that for every subset $A \subseteq X$, either A or $X \setminus A$ is included in U . This guarantees the ultrafilter's maximality, as no additional subsets can be added without violating the ultrafilter conditions. Therefore, the lemma is proved. ■

Lemma 6.14: The total time complexity of algorithm 6.12 is $O(2^{2n})$.

Proof: The algorithm must consider every possible subset of the finite set X to construct the ultrafilter U . Since X contains n elements, the power set 2^X consists of 2^n subsets.

Therefore, generating all subsets of X requires $O(2^n)$ operations.

For each subset A_i in 2^X , the algorithm checks its intersection with every other subset B already included in U to ensure that the submodular condition $f(A_i \cap B) \leq k$ is satisfied.

In the worst-case scenario, this operation could involve checking intersections with up to 2^n subsets, which adds another factor of $O(2^n)$ to the time complexity.

Therefore, for each subset A_i , the total time complexity for evaluating all intersection properties is $O(2^n) \times O(2^n) = O(2^{2n})$.

Considering both the generation of subsets and the intersection evaluation, the overall time complexity of the algorithm is $O(2^{2n})$. Therefore, the lemma is proved. ■

Lemma 6.15: The space complexity of algorithm 6.12 is $O(2^n)$.

Proof: The filter U and the list L both store collections of subsets of X . Since there are 2^n possible subsets, the space required to store either U or L is $O(2^n)$.

The total space complexity is thus $O(2^n)$. Therefore, the lemma is proved. ■

We believe there is still room for improvement in the aforementioned algorithm. Additionally, we plan to investigate efficient algorithms tailored specifically to certain graphs, such as planar graphs, in the future.

6.2.5. Ultrafilter Width under Small Set Connectivity Expansion Hypothesis

In computational complexity theory, a computational hardness assumption posits that a specific problem cannot be solved efficiently. One such pivotal assumption is the Small Set Expansion Hypothesis (SSEH), introduced by Raghavendra and Steurer, which plays a critical role in understanding the hardness of approximation algorithms [302]. The SSEH asserts that it is NP-hard to differentiate between small sets of vertices in a graph with low edge expansion (few edges leaving the set) and those with high edge expansion (many edges leaving the set). This hypothesis has become fundamental in analyzing the complexity of various graph algorithms. Since its inception, SSEH has led to numerous inapproximability results, including those documented in [303-308].

We will consider about Ultrafilter Width. Ultrafilter Width of Graph G is the maximum order of an Ultrafilter in G . Also ultrafilter Width of Connectivity system is the maximum order of an Ultrafilter in Connectivity system.

Conjecture 6.16: Under the Small Set Expansion Hypothesis (SSEH), it is NP-hard to approximate the Ultrafilter width of a graph within a constant factor in polynomial time.

And we will consider about new notion called “Small set Connectivity Expansion (SSCE)”. The definition is following. The transformation of the SSEH to apply to connectivity systems rather than simple graphs extends its applicability to more complex and abstract structures, allowing for the examination of expansion properties beyond traditional vertex-edge models.

Definition 6.17(Small set Connectivity Expansion): Let (X, f) be a connectivity system, with X a finite set and f a symmetric submodular function as defined. Consider the analogy of edge expansion in a graph to the concept of "boundary" in a connectivity system:

Connectivity Expansion for a subset $S \subseteq X$, define the connectivity expansion, $\Psi_f(S)$, as:

$$\Psi_f(S) = \min\{vol_f(S), vol_f(X \setminus S)\} f(S)$$

where $f(S)$ quantifies the "connectivity boundary" of S , and $vol_f(S) = \sum_{x \in S} f(\{x\})$ represents the volume of S in terms of connectivity, analogous to the sum of degrees in graph theory. And for any given small constant $\epsilon > 0$, it is computationally challenging to find a non-trivial subset $S \subseteq X$ of the connectivity system such that: $\Psi_f(S) < \epsilon$.

Question 6.18: Is it NP-hard to approximate the Ultrafilter width of a graph within a constant factor in polynomial time, under the Small Set Connectivity Expansion Hypothesis (SSCEH)?

6.2.6 Various Ultrafilter on a connectivity system

Ultrafilters are of interest due to their practical applications and mathematical properties, prompting the proposal of various similar concepts across different fields. Going forward, we aim to define concepts such as Partition-filter [293], uniform-ultrafilters[294], weak normal-ultrafilter[295], gw-ultrafilters[81], subuniform ultrafilters[296], Regular-ultrafilters[297], Good-ultrafilters[298], OK-ultrafilters[299], complete-ultrafilters[300], Ramsey-ultrafilters[301], and Selective-ultrafilters[301] within the frameworks of Connectivity Systems and Infinite Connectivity Systems. Additionally, we plan to explore their relationships with graph width parameters.

7. Acknowledgments

I humbly express my sincere gratitude to all those who have extended their invaluable support, enabling me to successfully accomplish this paper.

8. Conflict of Interest Statement

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

9. Disclaimer (Artificial Intelligence)

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc) and text-to-image generators have been used during writing or editing of manuscripts.

10. Reference

- [1] Takaaki Fujita, "Reconsideration of Tangle and Ultrafilter using Separation and Partition," *International Journal of Mathematics Trends and Technology (IJMTT)*, vol. 70, no. 7, pp. 5-12, 2024. Crossref, <https://doi.org/10.14445/22315373/IJMTT-V70I7P102>
- [2] Diestel, Reinhard, and Sang-il Oum. "Tangle-tree duality: in graphs, matroids and beyond." *Combinatorica* 39.4 (2019): 879-910.
- [3] Fujita, Takaaki. "Proving Maximal Linear Loose Tangle as a Linear Tangle." *Asian Research Journal of Mathematics* 20.2 (2024): 48-54.
- [4] Takaaki Fujita, "Matroid, Ideal, Ultrafilter, Tangle, and so on :Reconsideration of Obstruction to Linear Decomposition," *International Journal of Mathematics Trends and Technology (IJMTT)*, vol. 70, no. 7, pp. 18-29, 2024. Crossref, <https://doi.org/10.14445/22315373/IJMTT-V70I7P104>.
- [5] Gajarský, Jakub, et al. "Twin-width and types." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.08248* (2022).
- [6] Diestel, Reinhard, and Sang-il Oum. "Tangle-tree duality in abstract separation systems." *Advances in Mathematics* 377 (2021): 107470.
- [7] Fujita, Takaaki. Relation between ultra matroid and Linear decomposition. *Italian Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Accepted.
- [8] Fujita, Takaaki. "Novel Idea on Edge-Ultrafilter and Edge-Tangle." *Asian Research Journal of Mathematics* 20.4 (2024): 18-22.
- [9] Geelen, J., et al. (2006). Obstructions to branch-decomposition of matroids. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 96(4), 560-570.
- [10] Oum, S.-I., & Seymour, P. (2007). Testing branch-width. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 97(3), 385-393.
- [11] Diestel, Reinhard, Fabian Hundertmark, and Sahar Lemanczyk. "Profiles of separations: in graphs, matroids, and beyond." *Combinatorica* 39 (2019): 37-75.
- [12] Fujita, Takaaki (2024) Ultrafilter in Digraph: Directed Tangle and Directed Ultrafilter. *Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science*, 39 (3). pp. 37-42. ISSN 2456-9968.
- [13] Grohe, Martin, and Dániel Marx. "On tree width, bramble size, and expansion." *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 99.1 (2009): 218-228.
- [14] Takaaki Fujita, "Quasi-Ultrafilter on the Connectivity System: Its Relationship to Branch-Decomposition," *International Journal of Mathematics Trends and Technology (IJMTT)*, vol. 70, no. 3, pp. 13-16, 2024. Crossref, <https://doi.org/10.14445/22315373/IJMTT-V70I3P102>.
- [15] Fujita, Takaaki. "Exploring two concepts: branch decomposition and weak ultrafilter on connectivity system." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.14147* (2023).
- [16] Fujita, Takaaki, and Koichi Yamazaki. "Tangle and ultrafilter: Game theoretical interpretation." *Graphs and Combinatorics* 36.2 (2020): 319-330.
- [17] Ganian, Robert, and Viktoriia Korchemna. "Slim tree-cut width." *Algorithmica* (2024): 1-25.
- [18] Ganian, Robert, Eun Jung Kim, and Stefan Szeider. "Algorithmic applications of tree-cut width." *International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2015.
- [19] Chang, Yeonsu, O-joung Kwon, and Myounghwan Lee. "A New Width Parameter of Graphs Based on Edge Cuts:-Edge-Crossing Width." *International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science*. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2023.
- [20] Brand, Cornelius, et al. "Edge-cut width: An algorithmically driven analogue of treewidth based on edge cuts." *International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2022.
- [21] Atserias, Albert, and Víctor Dalmau. "A combinatorial characterization of resolution width." *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* 74.3 (2008): 323-334.
- [22] Bonnet, Édouard, et al. "Twin-width II: small classes." *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2021.
- [23] Bonnet, Édouard, et al. "Twin-width IV: ordered graphs and matrices." *Journal of the ACM* 71.3 (2024): 1-45.
- [24] Bonnet, Édouard, et al. "Twin-width VII: groups." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.12330* (2022).
- [25] Bonnet, Édouard, et al. "Twin-width VIII: delineation and win-wins." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.00722* (2022).

- [26] Bonnet, Édouard, et al. "Twin-width VI: the lens of contraction sequences*." *Proceedings of the 2022 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2022.
- [27] Di Lavore, Elena, and Paweł Sobociński. "Monoidal width." *Logical Methods in Computer Science* 19 (2023).
- [28] Meister, Daniel, Jan Arne Telle, and Martin Vatshelle. "Recognizing digraphs of Kelly-width 2." *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 158.7 (2010): 741-746.
- [29] Kintali, Shiva, and Qiuyi Zhang. "Forbidden directed minors and Kelly-width." *Theoretical Computer Science* 662 (2017): 40-47.
- [30] Mach, Lukáš, and Tomáš Toufar. "Amalgam width of matroids." *Parameterized and Exact Computation: 8th International Symposium, IPEC 2013, Sophia Antipolis, France, September 4-6, 2013, Revised Selected Papers 8*. Springer International Publishing, 2013.
- [31] Jaffke, Lars, O-joung Kwon, and Jan Arne Telle. "Mim-width I. Induced path problems." *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 278 (2020): 153-168.
- [32] Jaffke, Lars, O-joung Kwon, and Jan Arne Telle. "Mim-width II. The feedback vertex set problem." *Algorithmica* 82.1 (2020): 118-145.
- [33] Bergougnoux, Benjamin, Tuukka Korhonen, and Igor Razgon. "New width parameters for independent set: One-sided-mim-width and neighbor-depth." *International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science*. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2023.
- [34] Kang, Dong Yeup, et al. "Sim-width and induced minors (Full Version)."
- [35] Bui-Xuan, Binh-Minh, Jan Arne Telle, and Martin Vatshelle. "Boolean-width of graphs." *Theoretical Computer Science* 412.39 (2011): 5187-5204.
- [36] Otachi, Yota, and Koichi Yamazaki. "A lower bound for the vertex boundary-width of complete k -ary trees." *Discrete mathematics* 308.12 (2008): 2389-2395.
- [37] Oum, Sang-il. "Rank-width and vertex-minors." *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 95.1 (2005): 79-100.
- [38] Oum, Sang-il, and Paul Seymour. "Approximating clique-width and branch-width." *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 96.4 (2006): 514-528.
- [39] Gurski, Frank, and Egon Wanke. "On the relationship between NLC-width and linear NLC-width." *Theoretical Computer Science* 347.1-2 (2005): 76-89.
- [40] Adler, Isolde, Georg Gottlob, and Martin Grohe. "Hypertree width and related hypergraph invariants." *European Journal of Combinatorics* 28.8 (2007): 2167-2181.
- [41] Marx, Dániel. "Approximating fractional hypertree width." *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)* 6.2 (2010): 1-17.
- [42] Abu-Khzam, Faisal N., et al. "Modular-width: An auxiliary parameter for parameterized parallel complexity." *Frontiers in Algorithmics: 11th International Workshop, FAW 2017, Chengdu, China, June 23-25, 2017, Proceedings 11*. Springer International Publishing, 2017.
- [43] Gottlob, Georg, Gianluigi Greco, and Francesco Scarcello. "Treewidth and hypertree width." *Tractability: Practical Approaches to Hard Problems* 1 (2014): 20.
- [44] Safari, MohammadAli. "Hyper-T-width and hyper-D-width: Stable connectivity measures for hypergraphs." *Theoretical Computer Science* 463 (2012): 26-34.
- [45] Grohe, Martin. "Local tree-width, excluded minors, and approximation algorithms." *arXiv preprint math/0001128* (2000).
- [46] Bienstock, Daniel, et al. "Quickly excluding a forest." *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B* 52.2 (1991): 274-283.
- [47] Robertson, Neil, and Paul D. Seymour. "Graph minors. X. Obstructions to tree-decomposition." *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 52.2 (1991): 153-190.
- [48] Fujita, Takaaki. "Ultrafilter in Graph Theory: Relationship to Tree-decomposition." Priprint.
- [49] Yamazaki, Koichi. "Tangle and maximal ideal." *WALCOM: Algorithms and Computation: 11th International Conference and Workshops, WALCOM 2017, Hsinchu, Taiwan, March 29-31, 2017, Proceedings 11*. Springer International Publishing, 2017.
- [50] Fomin, Fedor V., and Dimitrios M. Thilikos. "On the monotonicity of games generated by symmetric submodular functions." *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 131.2 (2003): 323-335.
- [51] Fujita, Takaaki, and Koichi Yamazaki. "Equivalence between Linear Tangle and Single Ideal." *Open Journal of Discrete Mathematics* 9.01 (2018): 7.
- [52] Fujita, Takaaki, and Koichi Yamazaki. "Linear width and Single ideal." *IEICE Technical Report; IEICE Tech. Rep.* 117.269 (2017): 21-27.

- [53] Oum, Sang-il. "Introduction to rank-width." *Third workshop on graph classes, optimization, and width parameters, Eugene*. 2007.
- [54] Král', Daniel. "Decomposition width of matroids." *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 160.6 (2012): 913-923.
- [55] Yolov, Nikola. "Minor-matching hypertree width." *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2018.
- [56] Aronis, Chris. "The algorithmic complexity of tree-clique width." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.02200* (2021).
- [57] Yamazaki, Koichi, et al. "Isomorphism for graphs of bounded distance width." *Algorithmica* 24 (1999): 105-127.
- [58] Wood, David R. "On tree-partition-width." *European Journal of Combinatorics* 30.5 (2009): 1245-1253.
- [59] Oztok, Umut, and Adnan Darwiche. "CV-width: A new complexity parameter for CNFs." *ECAI 2014*. IOS Press, 2014. 675-680.
- [60] Meuwese, Ruben Henri. *A Search for the Dominating-Set-Width*. MS thesis. 2020.
- [61] Carbonnel, Clément, Miguel Romero, and Stanislav Živný. "Point-width and max-csps." *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)* 16.4 (2020): 1-28.
- [62] Gurski, Frank, Stefan Neidig, and Eda Yilmaz. "Neighbourhood-width of trees." *Discrete Mathematics* 339.1 (2016): 222-226.
- [63] Gurski, Frank. "Linear layouts measuring neighbourhoods in graphs." *Discrete Mathematics* 306.15 (2006): 1637-1650.
- [64] Fürer, Martin. "A Natural Generalization of Bounded Tree-Width and Bounded Clique-Width." *LATIN 2014: Theoretical Informatics LNCS 8392*: 72.
- [65] Gurski, Frank, Egon Wanke, and Eda Yilmaz. "Directed NLC-width." *Theoretical Computer Science* 616 (2016): 1-17.
- [66] Johnson, Thor, et al. "Directed tree-width." *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 82.1 (2001): 138-154.
- [67] Barát, János. "Directed path-width and monotonicity in digraph searching." *Graphs and Combinatorics* 22.2 (2006): 161-172.
- [68] Bumpus, Benjamin Merlin, Kitty Meeks, and William Pettersson. "Directed branch-width: A directed analogue of tree-width." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.08903* (2020).
- [69] Gurski, Frank, and Carolin Rehs. "Comparing linear width parameters for directed graphs." *Theory of Computing Systems* 63 (2019): 1358-1387.
- [70] Gurski, Frank, Carolin Rehs, and Jochen Rethmann. "Characterizations and Directed Path-Width of Sequence Digraphs." *Theory of Computing Systems* 67.2 (2023): 310-347.
- [71] Kanté, Mamadou Moustapha, and Michaël Rao. "Directed rank-width and displit decomposition." *International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2009.
- [72] Giannopoulou, Archontia C., et al. "Directed tangle tree-decompositions and applications*." *Proceedings of the 2022 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2022.
- [73] SUN, Tian-yu, and Wen-sheng YU. "A mechanized proof of equivalence between the axiom of choice and Tukey's lemma." *Journal of Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications* 42.5 (2019): 1.
- [74] Herbelin, Hugo. "On the logical structure of some maximality and well-foundedness principles equivalent to choice principles." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.09946* (2024).
- [75] Adamson, Iain T., and Iain T. Adamson. "Equivalents of the Axiom of Choice." *A Set Theory Workbook* (1998): 59-62.
- [76] Krause, Andreas, and Daniel Golovin. "Submodular function maximization." *Tractability* 3.71-104 (2014): 3.
- [77] Iwata, Satoru, and Kiyohito Nagano. "Submodular function minimization under covering constraints." *2009 50th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. IEEE, 2009.
- [78] Balkanski, Eric, and Yaron Singer. "The adaptive complexity of maximizing a submodular function." *Proceedings of the 50th annual ACM SIGACT symposium on theory of computing*. 2018.

- [79] Comfort, William Wistar, and Stylianos Negrepontis. *The theory of ultrafilters*. Vol. 211. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [80] Goldbring, Isaac. *Ultrafilters throughout mathematics*. Vol. 220. American Mathematical Society, 2022.
- [81] Koutras, Costas D., et al. "On weak filters and ultrafilters: Set theory from (and for) knowledge representation." *Logic Journal of the IGPL* 31.1 (2023): 68-95.
- [82] Sochor, Antonín, and Petr Vopěnka. "Ultrafilters of sets." *Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae* 22.4 (1981): 689-699.
- [83] Blass, Andreas, et al. "Ultrafilters and set theory." *Ultrafilters across mathematics* (2010).
- [84] Cato, Susumu. "Social choice, the strong Pareto principle, and conditional decisiveness." *Theory and decision* 75 (2013): 563-579.
- [85] Fujita, Takaaki. "Reevaluating the Complementary Relationship between Single Ultrafilters and Linear Obstacles in Connectivity Systems." *Asian Research Journal of Mathematics* 20.8 (2024): 69-75.
- [86] Cato, Susumu. "Quasi-decisiveness, quasi-ultrafilter, and social quasi-orderings." *Social Choice and Welfare* 41.1 (2013): 169-202.
- [87] Umezawa, Kaori, and Koichi Yamazaki. "Tree-length equals branch-length." *Discrete Mathematics* 309.13 (2009): 4656-4660.
- [88] Dissaux, Thomas, et al. "Treelength of series-parallel graphs." *Procedia Computer Science* 195 (2021): 30-38.
- [89] Dieng, Youssou, and Cyril Gavoille. "On the tree-width of planar graphs." *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics* 34 (2009): 593-596.
- [90] Dvorač, Zdenek, Martin Kupec, and Vojtech Tuma. "Dynamic data structure for tree-depth decomposition." *arXiv preprint arXiv:1307.2863* (2013).
- [91] DeVos, Matt, O-joung Kwon, and Sang-il Oum. "Branch-depth: Generalizing tree-depth of graphs." *European Journal of Combinatorics* 90 (2020): 103186.
- [92] Nešetřil, Jaroslav, and P. Ossona de Mendez. "A distributed low tree-depth decomposition algorithm for bounded expansion classes." *Distributed Computing* 29.1 (2016): 39-49.
- [93] Takaaki Fujita, "A Short Note of the Relationship between Loose Tangles and Filters," *International Journal of Mathematics Trends and Technology (IJMTT)*, vol. 70, no. 7, pp. 1-4, 2024. Crossref, <https://doi.org/10.14445/22315373/IJMTT-V70I7P101>
- [94] Turner, Jason. "Ultrafilters as Propositional Theories." (2021).
- [95] Muraleetharan, Murugiah. *Generalisations of filters and uniform spaces*. Diss. Rhodes University, 1997.
- [96] Fletcher, Peter, and William F. Lindgren. "Orthocompactness and strong Čech completeness in Moore spaces." (1972): 753-766.
- [97] Fernau, Henning, and Daniel Meister. "Digraphs of bounded elimination width." *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 168 (2014): 78-87.
- [98] Freixas, Josep, and Xavier Molinero. "Simple games and weighted games: a theoretical and computational viewpoint." *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 157.7 (2009): 1496-1508.
- [99] Monjardet, Bernard. "On the use of ultrafilters in social choice theory." *Social choice and welfare* 5 (1983): 73-78.
- [100] Daniëls, Tijmen R. "Social Choice and Logic via Simple Games." (2007).
- [101] Taylor, A. D., and Zwicker, W. S. *Simple Games. Desirability Relations, Trading and Pseudoweightings*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.
- [102] Jech, Thomas J. *The axiom of choice*. Courier Corporation, 2008.
- [103] Gödel, Kurt. *The consistency of the axiom of choice and of the generalized continuum-hypothesis with the axioms of set theory*. No. 3. Princeton University Press, 1940.
- [104] Jech, Thomas J. "About the axiom of choice." *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. Vol. 90. Elsevier, 1977. 345-370.
- [105] Freyd, Peter. "The axiom of choice." *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* 19 (1980): 103-125.
- [106] Herrlich, Horst. *Axiom of choice*. Vol. 1876. Berlin: Springer, 2006.
- [107] Hickman, J. L. "The construction of groups in models of set theory that fail the Axiom of Choice." *Bulletin of the Australian Mathematical Society* 14.2 (1976): 199-232.
- [108] Brunner, Norbert. "The axiom of choice in topology." *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 24.3 (1983): 305-317.

- [109] Amini, Omid, et al. "Submodular partition functions." *Discrete Mathematics* 309.20 (2009): 6000-6008.
- [110] Škoda, Petr. "Computability of width of submodular partition functions." *International Workshop on Combinatorial Algorithms*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2009.
- [111] Askounis, Dimitris, Costas D. Koutras, and Yorgos Zikos. "Knowledge means 'all', belief means 'most'." *Journal of Applied Non-Classical Logics* 26.3 (2016): 173-192.
- [112] Cato, Susumu. "Quasi-decisiveness, quasi-ultrafilter, and social quasi-orderings." *Social Choice and Welfare* 41.1 (2013): 169-202.
- [113] Trujillo, Timothy. "Selective but not Ramsey." *Topology and its Applications* 202 (2016): 61-69.
- [114] Mijares, José G. "A notion of selective ultrafilter corresponding to topological Ramsey spaces." *Mathematical Logic Quarterly* 53.3 (2007): 255-267.
- [115] Petrenko, Oleksandr, and Igor Protasov. "Selective and Ramsey ultrafilters on G-spaces." (2017): 453-459.
- [116] Forti, Marco. "Quasi-selective and weakly Ramsey ultrafilters." *arXiv preprint arXiv:1012.4338* (2010).
- [117] Bonato, Anthony, Ehsan Chiniforooshan, and Paweł Prałat. "Cops and robbers from a distance." *Theoretical Computer Science* 411.43 (2010): 3834-3844.
- [118] Bonnet, Édouard, and Julien Duron. "Stretch-width." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.12023* (2023).
- [119] Hickingbotham, Robert. "Cop-width, flip-width and strong colouring numbers." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.05874* (2023).
- [120] Abraham, Ittai, et al. "Cops, robbers, and threatening skeletons: Padded decomposition for minor-free graphs." *Proceedings of the forty-sixth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*. 2014.
- [121] Adler, Isolde. "Marshals, monotone marshals, and hypertree - width." *Journal of Graph Theory* 47.4 (2004): 275-296.
- [122] Bruhn, Henning, and Paul Wollan. "Finite connectivity in infinite matroids." *European Journal of Combinatorics* 33.8 (2012): 1900-1912.
- [123] Elm, Ann-Kathrin. "Pseudoflowers in infinite connectivity systems." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.01852* (2023).
- [124] Clark, Ben, and Geoff Whittle. "Tangles, trees, and flowers." *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 103.3 (2013): 385-407.
- [125] Kochen, Simon. "Ultraproducts in the theory of models." *Annals of mathematics* 74.2 (1961): 221-261.
- [126] Henson, C. Ward, and José Iovino. *Ultraproducts in analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- [127] Heinrich, Stefan. "Ultraproducts in Banach space theory." (1980): 72-104.
- [128] Schoutens, Hans. *The use of ultraproducts in commutative algebra*. Springer, 2010.
- [129] Eklof, Paul C. "Ultraproducts for algebraists." *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. Vol. 90. Elsevier, 1977. 105-137.
- [130] Jarosz, Krzysztof. "Ultraproducts and small bound perturbations." *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* 148.1 (1991): 81-88.
- [131] Brendle, Jörg, Michael Hrušák, and Víctor Torres-Pérez. "Construction with opposition: cardinal invariants and games." *Archive for Mathematical Logic* 58.7 (2019): 943-963.
- [132] Csirmaz, László, and Zsolt Gyenis. "Mathematical Logic." *Lecture Notes (in hungarian)* (1993).
- [133] Beck, József, and László Csirmaz. "Variations on a game." *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A* 33.3 (1982): 297-315.
- [134] Apte, Jayant, Congduan Li, and John MacLaren Walsh. "Algorithms for computing network coding rate regions via single element extensions of matroids." *2014 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*. IEEE, 2014.
- [135] Wu, Zhaoyang. "On extremal connectivity properties of unavoidable matroids." *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 75.1 (1999): 19-45.
- [136] Wu, Zhaoyang. *Spikes in matroid theory*. Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College, 1998.
- [137] Kanté, Mamadou Moustapha, and Michael Rao. "The rank-width of edge-coloured graphs." *Theory of Computing Systems* 52.4 (2013): 599-644.

- [138] Jégou, Philippe, and Cyril Terrioux. "Bag-Connected Tree-Width: A New Parameter for Graph Decomposition." *ISAAC*. 2014.
- [139] Hliněný, Petr, and Jan Jedelský. "H-Clique-Width and a Hereditary Analogue of Product Structure." arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.16789 (2024).
- [140] Magne, Loïc, et al. "Edge-treewidth: Algorithmic and combinatorial properties." *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 341 (2023): 40-54.
- [141] Kasahara, Shoji, et al. "DAG-pathwidth: graph algorithmic analyses of DAG-type blockchain networks." *IEICE TRANSACTIONS on Information and Systems* 106.3 (2023): 272-283.
- [142] Giannopoulou, Archontia C., Stephan Kreutzer, and Sebastian Wiederrecht. "Matching Connectivity: On the Structure of Graphs with Perfect Matchings." *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics* 61 (2017): 505-511.
- [143] Harvey, Daniel J., and David R. Wood. "Parameters tied to treewidth." *Journal of Graph Theory* 84.4 (2017): 364-385.
- [144] Kurkofka, Jan. *Ends and tangles, stars and combs, minors and the Farey graph*. Diss. Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg Carl von Ossietzky, 2020.
- [145] Kurkofka, Jan. "On the tangle compactification of infinite graphs." *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.10212* (2019).
- [146] Kurkofka, Jan, and Max Pitz. "Tangles and the Stone-Čech compactification of infinite graphs." *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 146 (2021): 34-60.
- [147] Elbracht, Christian, Jakob Kneip, and Maximilian Teegen. "Trees of tangles in infinite separation systems." *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*. Vol. 173. No. 2. Cambridge University Press, 2022.
- [148] Lewin, Jonathan. "A simple proof of Zorn's lemma." *The American mathematical monthly* 98.4 (1991): 353-354.
- [149] Campbell, Paul J. "The origin of "Zorn's Lemma"." *Historia Mathematica* 5.1 (1978): 77-89.
- [150] Bell, John L. "Zorn's lemma and complete Boolean algebras in intuitionistic type theories." *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* 62.4 (1997): 1265-1279.
- [151] Van Bevern, René, et al. "On the parameterized complexity of computing graph bisections." *Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science: 39th International Workshop, WG 2013, Lübeck, Germany, June 19-21, 2013, Revised Papers* 39. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2013.
- [152] Soumyanath, K., and Jitender S. Deogun. "On the bisection width of partial k-trees." *Congressus Numerantium* 74 (1990): 45-51.
- [153] Jeong, Jisu, Sigve Hortemo Sæther, and Jan Arne Telle. "Maximum matching width: New characterizations and a fast algorithm for dominating set." *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 248 (2018): 114-124.
- [154] Nishimura, N., Ragde, P., Szeider, S.: Solving #SAT using vertex covers. *Acta Informatica* 44(7–8), 509–523 (2007)
- [155] Szeider, S.: On fixed-parameter tractable parameterizations of SAT. In: Giunchiglia, E., Tacchella, A. (eds.) SAT 2003. LNCS, vol. 2919, pp. 188–202. Springer, Heidelberg (2004). doi:10.1007/978-3-540-24605-3_15
- [156] Ganian, R., Hliněný, P., Obdržálek, J.: Better algorithms for satisfiability problems for formulas of bounded rank-width. *Fund. Inform.* 123(1), 59–76 (2013).
- [157] Bose, Prosenjit, et al. "Separating layered treewidth and row treewidth." *Discrete Mathematics & Theoretical Computer Science* 24.Graph Theory (2022).
- [158] VIDA DUJMOVIC, GWENAEL, JORET, PIOTR MICEK, PAT MORIN, TORSTEN UECKERDT, AND DAVID R. WOOD. Planar graphs have bounded queue-number. *J. ACM*, 67(4):22, 2020.
- [159] VIDA DUJMOVIC, PAT MORIN, AND DAVID R. WOOD. Layered separators in minor-closed graph classes with applications. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 127:111–147, 2017.
- [160] Blass, Andreas, Mauro Di Nasso, and Marco Forti. "Quasi-selective ultrafilters and asymptotic numerosities." *Advances in Mathematics* 231.3-4 (2012): 1462-1486.
- [161] Blass, Andreas. "Selective ultrafilters and homogeneity." *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 38.3 (1988): 215-255.
- [162] Forti, Marco. "Quasi-selective and weakly Ramsey ultrafilters." *arXiv preprint arXiv:1012.4338* (2010).
- [163] Canjar, R. Michael. "On the generic existence of special ultrafilters." *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 110.1 (1990): 233-241.

- [164] Fernández-Bretón, David J. "Using ultrafilters to prove Ramsey-type theorems." *The American Mathematical Monthly* 129.2 (2022): 116-131.
- [165] Oum, Sang-il. "Rank-width: Algorithmic and structural results." *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 231 (2017): 15-24.
- [166] Takaaki Fujita. "Algorithm and Game of Ultra Matroid and Linear tangle on Connectivity System." Preprint.
- [167] Takaaki Fujita. Short Note: Exploring Ideals in Graph Theory. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies*. Volume 4, Issue 4, 2024.
- [168] Kwon, O-joung, et al. "Obstructions for bounded shrub-depth and rank-depth." *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 149 (2021): 76-91.
- [169] Kreuzer, Stephan, et al. "Algorithmic Properties of Sparse Digraphs." *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.01701* (2017).
- [170] Ganian, Robert, et al. "Shrub-depth: Capturing height of dense graphs." *Logical Methods in Computer Science* 15 (2019).
- [171] Gajarský, Jakub, Michał Pilipczuk, and Szymon Toruńczyk. "Stable graphs of bounded twin-width." *Proceedings of the 37th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*. 2022.
- [172] Grohe, Martin. "Counting bounded tree depth homomorphisms." *Proceedings of the 35th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*. 2020.
- [173] Hliněný, Petr, et al. "Tree-depth and vertex-minors." *European Journal of Combinatorics* 56 (2016): 46-56.
- [174] Chan, Timothy F., et al. "Matrices of optimal tree-depth and a row-invariant parameterized algorithm for integer programming." *SIAM Journal on Computing* 51.3 (2022): 664-700.
- [175] Novotný, Tomáš. "Obstructions for graphs of low rank - depth." *Bachelor's Thesis, Masaryk University* (2016).
- [176] Kim, Donggyu, and Sang-il Oum. "Vertex-minors of graphs." (2023).
- [177] Kwon, O-joung, and Sang-il Oum. "Scattered classes of graphs." *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* 34.1 (2020): 972-999.
- [178] Kardoš, František, Anita Liebenau, and Lukáš Mach. "First order convergence of matroids." *European Journal of Combinatorics* 59 (2017): 150-168.
- [179] Broering, Elizabeth, and Satyanarayana V. Lokam. "Width-based algorithms for SAT and CIRCUIT-SAT." *Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing: 6th International Conference, SAT 2003, Santa Margherita Ligure, Italy, May 5-8, 2003, Selected Revised Papers* 6. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2004.
- [180] Broering, Elizabeth, and Satyanarayana V. Lokam. "CIRCUIT-SAT." *Edited by G. Goos, J. Hartmanis, and J. van Leeuwen*: 162.
- [181] Diestel, Reinhard, and Malte Müller. "Connected tree-width." *Combinatorica* 38 (2018): 381-398.
- [182] Hamann, Matthias, and Daniel Weißauer. "Bounding connected tree-width." *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* 30.3 (2016): 1391-1400.
- [183] Müller, Malte. *Connected Tree-width and Infinite Gammoids*. Diss. Staats-und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg Carl von Ossietzky, 2014.
- [184] Meer, Klaus. "An extended tree-width notion for directed graphs related to the computation of permanents." *Theory of Computing Systems* 55 (2014): 330-346.
- [185] Courcelle, Bruno. "Special tree-width and the verification of monadic second-order graph properties." *IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science (FSTTCS 2010)*. Schloss-Dagstuhl-Leibniz Zentrum für Informatik, 2010.
- [186] Fürer, Martin. "Multi-clique-width." *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.04479* (2015).
- [187] H.L. Bodlaender. A linear-time algorithm for finding tree-decompositions of small treewidth. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 25:1305–1317.
- [188] Flum, Jörg, Markus Frick, and Martin Grohe. "Query evaluation via tree-decompositions." *International Conference on Database Theory*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2001.
- [189] Keeler, Chris, and Kai Salmaa. "Alternating finite automata with limited universal branching." *International Conference on Language and Automata Theory and Applications*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020.

- [190] Keeler, Chris, and Kai Salomaa. "Check for updates Alternating Finite Automata." *Language and Automata Theory and Applications: 14th International Conference, LATA 2020, Milan, Italy, March 4–6, 2020, Proceedings*. Vol. 12038. Springer Nature, 2020.
- [191] Jantsch, Simon, Jakob Piribauer, and Christel Baier. "Witnessing subsystems for probabilistic systems with low tree width." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.08070* (2021).
- [192] Keeler, Casey, and Kai Salomaa. "Maximal Existential and Universal Width." *Scientific Annals of Computer Science* 33.1 (2023).
- [193] Duarte, Gabriel, Mateus De Oliveira Oliveira, and Uéverton S. Souza. "Co-degeneracy and co-treewidth: using the complement to solve dense instances." (2021).
- [194] Arnborg, S., Lagergren, J., and Seese, D. (1991). Easy problems for tree-decomposable graphs. *J. Algorithms* 12, 308–340. doi:10.1016/0196-6774(91)90006-k.
- [195] Bodlaender, H. L. (1997). "Treewidth: algorithmic techniques and results," in International symposium on mathematical foundations of computer science (Springer), 19–36.
- [196] Brejová, Broňa, et al. "Maximum-scoring path sets on pangenome graphs of constant treewidth." *Frontiers in Bioinformatics* 4 (2024): 1391086.
- [197] Josh Alman, Matthias Mnich, and Virginia Vassilevska Williams. Dynamic parameterized problems and algorithms. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 16(4):45:1–45:46, 2020.
- [198] Zdenek Dvořák, Martin Kupec, and Vojtech Tůma. A dynamic data structure for MSO properties in graphs with bounded tree-depth. In 22th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms, ESA 2014, volume 8737 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 334–345. Springer, 2014.
- [199] Jiehua Chen, Wojciech Czerwiński, Yann Disser, Andreas Emil Feldmann, Danny Hermelin, Wojciech Nadara, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michał Pilipczuk, Manuel Sorge, Bartłomiej Wróblewski, and Anna Zych-Pawlewicz. Ecient fully dynamic elimination forests with applications to detecting long paths and cycles. In 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2021, pages 796–809. SIAM, 2021.
- [200] Korhonen, Tuukka, et al. "Dynamic treewidth." *2023 IEEE 64th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*. IEEE, 2023.
- [201] Razgon, Igor. "The splitting power of branching programs of bounded repetition and CNFs of bounded width." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.02173* (2022).
- [202] Dudek, Jeffrey M., Vu HN Phan, and Moshe Y. Vardi. "Procount: Weighted projected model counting with graded project-join trees." *Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing–SAT 2021: 24th International Conference, Barcelona, Spain, July 5-9, 2021, Proceedings 24*. Springer International Publishing, 2021.
- [203] Ganian, Robert, et al. "Weighted model counting with twin-width." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.01706* (2022).
- [204] Keeler, Chris, and Kai Salomaa. "Combining limited parallelism and nondeterminism in alternating finite automata." *International Conference on Descriptive Complexity of Formal Systems*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020.
- [205] Han, Yo-Sub, et al. "Existential and universal width of alternating finite automata." *International Conference on Descriptive Complexity of Formal Systems*. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2023.
- [206] Figueira, Diego, and Rémi Morvan. "Semantic Tree-Width and Path-Width of Conjunctive Regular Path Queries." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.01679* (2022).
- [207] C. Aiswarya, Paul Gastin, and K. Narayan Kumar. Verifying communicating multipushdown systems via split-width. In Automated Technology for Verification and Analysis - 12th International Symposium, ATVA 2014, volume 8837 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 1–17. Springer, 2014.
- [208] Aiswarya Cyriac, Paul Gastin, and K. Narayan Kumar. MSO decidability of multipushdown systems via split-width. In Maciej Koutny and Irek Ulidowski, editors, CONCUR 2012 - Concurrency Theory - 23rd International Conference, CONCUR 2012, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK, September 4-7, 2012. Proceedings, volume 7454 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 547–561. Springer, 2012.
- [209] Villescás, Martín Roa, et al. "Scaling probabilistic inference through message contraction optimization." *2023 Congress in Computer Science, Computer Engineering, & Applied Computing (CSCE)*. IEEE, 2023.
- [210] A. Durand and S. Mengel. Structural tractability of counting of solutions to conjunctive queries. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 57(4):1202–1249, 2015.

- [211] A. Bonifati, S. Dumbrava, G. Fletcher, J. Hidders, M. Hofer, W. Martens, F. Murlak, J. Shinaiev, S. Staworko, and D. Tomaszuk. Threshold queries in theory and in the wild. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 15(5):1105–1118, 2022.
- [212] Bonifati, Angela, et al. "Threshold Queries." *ACM SIGMOD Record* 52.1 (2023): 64-73.
- [213] Bodlaender, Hans L. "A partial k-arboretum of graphs with bounded treewidth." *Theoretical computer science* 209.1-2 (1998): 1-45.
- [214] N. Robertson and P. Seymour: Graph minors. ii. algorithmic aspects of tree-width, *Journal of Algorithms* 7 (1986), 309–322.
- [215] N. Robertson and P. Seymour: Graph minors. iv. tree-width and well-quasi-ordering, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 48 (1990), 227–254.
- [216] P. Seymour and R. Thomas: Graph searching and a min-max theorem for tree-width, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 58 (1993), 22–33.
- [217] Eriksson, Leif, and Victor Lagerkvist. "A multivariate complexity analysis of qualitative reasoning problems." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.15275* (2022).
- [218] Chalopin, Jérémie, et al. "Cop and robber games when the robber can hide and ride." *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* 25.1 (2011): 333-359.
- [219] Clarke, Nancy E., and Richard J. Nowakowski. "Cops, robber and traps." *Utilitas Mathematica* (2001): 91-98.
- [220] Wang, Lusheng, and Boting Yang. "The one-cop-moves game on graphs with some special structures." *Theoretical Computer Science* 847 (2020): 17-26.
- [221] Konstantinidis, Georgios, and Ath Kehagias. "Simultaneously moving cops and robbers." *Theoretical Computer Science* 645 (2016): 48-59.
- [222] Ellison, David. "Cops, Robbers and Firefighters on Graphs." (2018).
- [223] Bonato, Anthony, and Ehsan Chiniforooshan. "Pursuit and evasion from a distance: algorithms and bounds." *2009 Proceedings of the Sixth Workshop on Analytic Algorithmics and Combinatorics (ANALCO)*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2009.
- [224] Fudenberg, Drew, and Jean Tirole. *Game theory*. MIT press, 1991.
- [225] Osborne, Martin J. *An introduction to game theory*. Vol. 3. No. 3. New York: Oxford university press, 2004.
- [226] Kreuzen, V. J. C. *Kernelization Rules for Special Treewidth and Spaghetti Treewidth*. MS thesis. 2012.
- [227] Jaffke, Lars, et al. "Mim-width III. Graph powers and generalized distance domination problems." *Theoretical Computer Science* 796 (2019): 216-236.
- [228] Oxley, James G. *Matroid theory*. Vol. 3. Oxford University Press, USA, 2006.
- [229] Welsh, Dominic JA. *Matroid theory*. Courier Corporation, 2010.
- [230] Wilson, Robin J. "An introduction to matroid theory." *The American Mathematical Monthly* 80.5 (1973): 500-525.
- [231] Ganian, Robert, and Stefan Szeider. "New width parameters for model counting." *International Conference on Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2017.
- [232] Ganian, Robert, et al. "Weighted model counting with twin-width." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.01706* (2022).
- [233] Ganian, Robert, Petr Hliněný, and Jan Obdržálek. "Better algorithms for satisfiability problems for formulas of bounded rank-width." *Fundamenta Informaticae* 123.1 (2013): 59-76.
- [234] E. Wanke, k-NLC graphs and polynomial algorithms, *Discrete Appl. Math.* 54 (1994) 251–266.
- [235] Hammack, Richard H., et al. *Handbook of product graphs*. Vol. 2. Boca Raton: CRC press, 2011.
- [236] West, Douglas Brent. *Introduction to graph theory*. Vol. 2. Upper Saddle River: Prentice hall, 2001.
- [237] Diestel, Reinhard. *Graph theory*. Springer (print edition); Reinhard Diestel (eBooks), 2024.
- [238] Bollobás, Béla. *Modern graph theory*. Vol. 184. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [239] Chapelle, Mathieu, Frédéric Mazoit, and Ioan Todinca. "Constructing brambles." *International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2009.
- [240] Bodlaender, Hans L., Alexander Grigoriev, and Arie MCA Koster. "Treewidth lower bounds with brambles." *Algorithmica* 51.1 (2008): 81-98.

- [241] Bodlaender, Hans L., Alexander Grigoriev, and Arie MCA Koster. "Treewidth lower bounds with brambles." *Algorithms—ESA 2005: 13th Annual European Symposium, Palma de Mallorca, Spain, October 3-6, 2005. Proceedings 13*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2005.
- [242] Lardas, Emmanouil, et al. "On Strict Brambles." *Graphs and Combinatorics* 39.2 (2023): 24.
- [243] Schlechta, Karl. "A reduction of the theory of confirmation to the notions of distance and measure." *Logic Journal of IGPL* 5.1 (1997): 49-64.
- [244] Schlechta, Karl. *Coherent systems*. Elsevier, 2004.
- [245] Crapo, Henry H. "Single-element extensions of matroids." *J. Res. Nat. Bur. Standards Sect. B* 69.1-2 (1965): 55-65.
- [246] Apte, Jayant, Congduan Li, and John MacLaren Walsh. "Algorithms for computing network coding rate regions via single element extensions of matroids." *2014 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*. IEEE, 2014.
- [247] Slilaty, Daniel, and Thomas Zaslavsky. "Cobiased graphs: Single-element extensions and elementary quotients of graphic matroids." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.17616* (2024).
- [248] Su, Ting. "Extensions of weak matroids over skew tracts and strong matroids over stringent skew hyperfields." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.05683* (2020).
- [249] Nakamura, Masataka. "A single-element extension of antimatroids." *Discrete applied mathematics* 120.1-3 (2002): 159-164.
- [250] Adler, Isolde, Georg Gottlob, and Martin Grohe. "Hypertree width and related hypergraph invariants." *European Journal of Combinatorics* 28.8 (2007): 2167-2181.
- [251] Myounghwan Lee. *α -edge-crossing width and its applications*. Diss. 2023.
- [252] Bonnet, Edouard, et al. "Twin-width." *Algebras, Graphs and Ordered Sets (ALGOS 2020)* (2020): 219.
- [253] Liu, Chun-Hung, and David R. Wood. "Quasi-tree-partitions of graphs with an excluded subgraph." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00983* (2024).
- [254] Asano, Masanari, Masanori Ohya, and Andrei Khrennikov. "Quantum-like model for decision making process in two players game: a non-kolmogorovian model." *Foundations of physics* 41 (2011): 538-548.
- [255] Satoh, Atsuhito, and Yasuhito Tanaka. "Maximin and minimax strategies in two-players game with two strategic variables." *International Game Theory Review* 20.01 (2018): 1750030.
- [256] Seymour, Paul D., and Robin Thomas. "Call routing and the ratcatcher." *Combinatorica* 14 (1994): 217-241.
- [257] Thilikos, Dimitrios M., Maria J. Serna, and Hans L. Bodlaender. "Constructive linear time algorithms for small cutwidth and carving-width." *International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2000.
- [258] Da Lozzo, Giordano, et al. "C-planarity testing of embedded clustered graphs with bounded dual carving-width." *Algorithmica* 83.8 (2021): 2471-2502.
- [259] Chinn, Phyllis Z., et al. "The bandwidth problem for graphs and matrices—a survey." *Journal of Graph Theory* 6.3 (1982): 223-254.
- [260] Unger, Walter. "The complexity of the approximation of the bandwidth problem." *Proceedings 39th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (Cat. No. 98CB36280)*. IEEE, 1998.
- [261] Baumgartner, James E. "Chains and antichains in." *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* 45.1 (1980): 85-92.
- [262] Lonc, Zbigniew. "On complexity of some chain and antichain partition problems." *Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science: 17th International Workshop, WG'91 Fischbachau, Germany, June 17–19 1991 Proceedings 17*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1992.
- [263] Duffus, Dwight, Bill Sands, and Peter Winkler. "Maximal chains and antichains in Boolean lattices." *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* 3.2 (1990): 197-205.
- [264] Lonc, Zbigniew, and Ivan Rival. "Chains, antichains, and fibres." *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A* 44.2 (1987): 207-228.
- [265] Harizanov, Valentina S., Carl G. Jockusch Jr, and Julia F. Knight. "Chains and antichains in partial orderings." *Archive for Mathematical Logic* 48.1 (2009): 39-53.
- [266] Ginsburg, J., I. Rival, and B. Sands. "Antichains and finite sets that meet all maximal chains." *Canadian Journal of Mathematics* 38.3 (1986): 619-632.
- [267] Frank, András. "On chain and antichain families of a partially ordered set." *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 29.2 (1980): 176-184.

- [268] Hliněný, Petr, et al. "Width parameters beyond tree-width and their applications." *The computer journal* 51.3 (2008): 326-362.
- [269] Robertson, Neil, and Paul D. Seymour. "Graph minors. III. Planar tree-width." *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 36.1 (1984): 49-64.
- [270] Adler, Isolde. "Directed tree-width examples." *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 97.5 (2007): 718-725.
- [271] Pach, János, and Jenő Törőcsik. "Some geometric applications of Dilworth's theorem." *Proceedings of the ninth annual symposium on Computational geometry*. 1993.
- [272] Benczúr, András A., Jörg Förster, and Zoltán Király. "Dilworth's Theorem and its application for path systems of a cycle—implementation and analysis." *European Symposium on Algorithms*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1999.
- [273] Galvin, Fred. "A proof of Dilworth's chain decomposition theorem." *The American Mathematical Monthly* 101.4 (1994): 352-353.
- [274] Mirsky, Leon. "A dual of Dilworth's decomposition theorem." *The American Mathematical Monthly* 78.8 (1971): 876-877.
- [275] Kinnersley, Nancy G. "The vertex separation number of a graph equals its path-width." *Information Processing Letters* 42.6 (1992): 345-350.
- [276] Takahashi, Atsushi, Shuichi Ueno, and Yoji Kajitani. "Mixed searching and proper-path-width." *Theoretical Computer Science* 137.2 (1995): 253-268.
- [277] Kinnersley, Nancy G. "The vertex separation number of a graph equals its path-width." *Information Processing Letters* 42.6 (1992): 345-350.
- [278] Gustedt, Jens. "On the Pathwidth of Chordal Graphs." *Discret. Appl. Math.* 45.3 (1993): 233-248.
- [279] Chung, Fan RK, and Paul D. Seymour. "Graphs with small bandwidth and cutwidth." *Discrete Mathematics* 75.1-3 (1989): 113-119.
- [280] Makedon, Fillia, and Ivan Hal Sudborough. "On minimizing width in linear layouts." *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 23.3 (1989): 243-265.
- [281] Makedon, F. S., and Ivan Hal Sudborough. "Minimizing width in linear layouts." *Automata, Languages and Programming: 10th Colloquium Barcelona, Spain, July 18–22, 1983* 10. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1983.
- [282] Bodlaender, Hans L., and Dimitrios M. Thilikos. "Graphs with branchwidth at most three." *Journal of Algorithms* 32.2 (1999): 167-194.
- [283] Fluck, Eva. "Tangles and Hierarchical Clustering." *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* 38.1 (2024): 75-92.
- [284] Huber, Anna, and Vladimir Kolmogorov. "Towards minimizing k-submodular functions." *Combinatorial Optimization: Second International Symposium, ISCO 2012, Athens, Greece, April 19-21, 2012, Revised Selected Papers 2*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2012.
- [285] Ward, Justin, and Stanislav Živný. "Maximizing k-submodular functions and beyond." *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)* 12.4 (2016): 1-26.
- [286] Ward, Justin, and Stanislav Živný. "Maximizing bisubmodular and k-submodular functions." *Proceedings of the twenty-fifth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2014.
- [287] Fomin, Fedor V., and Tuukka Korhonen. "Fast FPT-approximation of branchwidth." *Proceedings of the 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*. 2022.
- [288] Färnqvist, Tommy, and Peter Jonsson. "Bounded tree-width and CSP-related problems." *International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2007.
- [289] Fichte, Johannes K., Markus Hecher, and Andreas Pfandler. "Lower bounds for QBFs of bounded treewidth." *Proceedings of the 35th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*. 2020.
- [290] Slivovsky, Friedrich, and Stefan Szeider. "A faster algorithm for propositional model counting parameterized by incidence treewidth." *International Conference on Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020.
- [291] Medal, Hugh, and Izuwa Ahanor. "A spatial branch-and-bound approach for maximization of non-factorable monotone continuous submodular functions." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.13886* (2022).

- [292] Feige, Uriel, Vahab S. Mirrokni, and Jan Vondrák. "Maximizing non-monotone submodular functions." *SIAM Journal on Computing* 40.4 (2011): 1133-1153.
- [293] Halbeisen, Lorenz. "Ramseyan ultrafilters." *arXiv preprint math/0109102* (2001).
- [294] Negrepointis, Stylianos. "The existence of certain uniform ultrafilters." *Annals of Mathematics* 90.1 (1969): 23-32.
- [295] Kanamori, Akihiro. "Weakly normal filters and irregular ultrafilters." *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 220 (1976): 393-399.
- [296] Negrepointis, S. "The growth of subuniform ultrafilters." *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 175 (1973): 155-165.
- [297] Lipparini, Paolo. "Every (λ^+, κ^+) -regular ultrafilter is (λ, κ) -regular." *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* Vol. 128. 1999.
- [298] Comfort, W. Wistar, et al. "Good Ultrafilters." *The Theory of Ultrafilters* (1974): 233-261.
- [299] Dow, Alan. "Good and OK ultrafilters." *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 290.1 (1985): 145-160.
- [300] Prikry, Karel. "On descendingly complete ultrafilters." *Cambridge Summer School in Mathematical Logic: Held in Cambridge/England, August 1–21, 1971*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2006. 459-488.
- [301] Petrenko, Oleksandr, and Igor Protasov. "Selective and Ramsey ultrafilters on G-spaces." (2017): 453-459.
- [302] Raghavendra, Prasad, and David Steurer. "Graph expansion and the unique games conjecture." *Proceedings of the forty-second ACM symposium on Theory of computing*. 2010.
- [303] Wu, Yu, et al. "Inapproximability of treewidth and related problems." *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 49 (2014): 569-600.
- [304] Austrin, Per, Toniann Pitassi, and Yu Wu. "Inapproximability of treewidth, one-shot pebbling, and related layout problems." *International Workshop on Approximation Algorithms for Combinatorial Optimization*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2012.
- [305] Yamazaki, Koichi. "Inapproximability of rank, clique, boolean, and maximum induced matching-widths under small set expansion hypothesis." *Algorithms* 11.11 (2018): 173.
- [306] Cao, Yixin, and R. B. Sandeep. "Minimum fill-in: Inapproximability and almost tight lower bounds." *Information and Computation* 271 (2020): 104514.
- [307] Feldmann, Andreas Emil, Euiwoong Lee, and Pasin Manurangsi. "A survey on approximation in parameterized complexity: Hardness and algorithms." *Algorithms* 13.6 (2020): 146.
- [308] Biedl, Therese, David Eppstein, and Torsten Ueckerdt. "On the complexity of embedding in graph products." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17028* (2023).
- [309] Lokshantov, Daniel, et al. "Fixed-parameter tractable canonization and isomorphism test for graphs of bounded treewidth." *SIAM Journal on Computing* 46.1 (2017): 161-189.
- [310] Otachi, Yota. "Isomorphism for graphs of bounded connected-path-distance-width." *International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2012.
- [311] Sasak, Robert. *Comparing 17 graph parameters*. MS thesis. The University of Bergen, 2010.
- [312] Ganian, Robert, Eun Jung Kim, and Stefan Szeider. "Algorithmic applications of tree-cut width." *International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2015.
- [313] Adler, I.; Bui-Xuan, B.M.; Rabinovich, Y.; Renault, G.; Telle, J.A.; Vatshelle, M. On the boolean-width of a graph: Structure and applications. In Proceedings of the 36th International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science, Zarós, Greece, 28–30 June 2010; pp. 159–170.
- [314] Gajarský, Jakub, Michał Pilipczuk, and Szymon Toruńczyk. "Stable graphs of bounded twin-width." (2022).
- [315] Bodlaender, Hans L., et al. "Characterizing width two for variants of treewidth." *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 216 (2017): 29-46.
- [316] Dereniowski, Dariusz. "From pathwidth to connected pathwidth." *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* 26.4 (2012): 1709-1732.
- [317] Downey, Rodney G., and Catherine McCartin. "Bounded persistence pathwidth." *Proceedings of the 2005 Australasian symposium on Theory of computing-Volume 41*. 2005.
- [318] Ohtsuki, Tatsuo; Mori, Hajimu; Kuh, Ernest S.; Kashiwabara, Toshinobu; Fujisawa, Toshio (1979), "One-dimensional logic gate assignment and interval graphs", *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems*, **26** (9): 675–684.

- [319] Kirousis, Leferis M.; Papadimitriou, Christos H. (1985), "Interval graphs and searching", *Discrete Mathematics*, 55 (2): 181–184.
- [320] Ellis, J. A.; Sudborough, I. H.; Turner, J. S. (1983), "Graph separation and search number", *Proc. 1983 Allerton Conf. on Communication, Control, and Computing*.
- [321] Korach, Ephraim, and Nir Solel. "Tree-width, path-width, and cutwidth." *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 43.1 (1993): 97-101.
- [322] Fomin, Fedor V. "Helicopter search problems, bandwidth and pathwidth." *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 85.1 (1998): 59-70.
- [323] Adler, Isolde, and Mamadou Moustapha Kanté. "Linear rank-width and linear clique-width of trees." *Theoretical Computer Science* 589 (2015): 87-98.
- [324] Dong Yeap Kang, O-joung Kwon, Torstein J. F. Strømme, and Jan Arne Telle. A width parameter useful for chordal and co-comparability graphs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 704:1–17, 2017.
- [325] Fellows, M.R.; Rosamond, F.A.; Rotics, U.; Szeider, S. Clique-width is NP-complete. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.* **2009**, 23, 909–939.
- [326] Chandran, L.S.; Kavitha, T. The carvingwidth of hypercubes. *Discret. Math.* **2006**, 306, 2270–2274.
- [327] Engelmann, Viktor, Stephan Kreutzer, and Sebastian Siebertz. "First-order and monadic second-order model-checking on ordered structures." *2012 27th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*. IEEE, 2012.
- [328] Brettell, Nick, et al. "Comparing width parameters on graph classes." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.05817* (2023).
- [329] Oláh, Sarolta. "Matroid Parameters."
- [330] Nordstrand, Joakim Alme. *Exploring graph parameters similar to tree-width and path-width*. MS thesis. The University of Bergen, 2017.
- [331] Thilikos, D.M.; Serna, M.J.; Bodlaender, H.L. Constructive Linear Time Algorithms for Small Cutwidth and Carving-Width. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation*, Taipei, Taiwan, 18–20 December 2000; pp. 192–203.
- [332] Biedl, T.; Vatschelle, M. The point-set embeddability problem for plane graphs. In *Proceedings of the 28th Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry*, Chapel Hill, NC, USA, 17–20 June 2012; pp. 41–50.
- [333] Nestoridis, N.V.; Thilikos, D.M. Square roots of minor closed graph classes. *Discret. Appl. Math.* **2014**, 168, 34–39.
- [334] Djidjev, Hristo N.; Vrt'o, Imrich (2003). "Crossing numbers and cutwidths". *Journal of Graph Algorithms and Applications*. 7 (3): 245–251. doi:10.7155/jgaa.00069. MR 2112230.
- [335] Makedon, Fillia; Sudborough, Ivan Hal (1989). "On minimizing width in linear layouts". *Discrete Applied Mathematics*. 23 (3): 243–265.
- [336] Guan, Xiaxia, et al. "A survey on book-embedding of planar graphs." *Frontiers of Mathematics in China* 17.2 (2022): 255-273.
- [337] R. Belmonte, P. van 't Hof, M. Kaminski, D. Paulusma, D.M. Thilikos Characterizing graphs of small carving-width. *Discrete Appl. Math* 161 No.13-14 1888-1893 (2013)
- [338] Binucci, Carla, et al. "Upward book embeddings of st-graphs." *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.07966* (2019).
- [339] Durocher, Stephane, and Debajyoti Mondal. "Relating graph thickness to planar layers and bend complexity." *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* 32.4 (2018): 2703-2719.
- [340] Dujmovic, Vida, and David R. Wood. "Graph treewidth and geometric thickness parameters." *Discrete & Computational Geometry* 37 (2007): 641-670.
- [341] Tran, Duc Long. Expanding the Graph Parameter Hierarchy. Diss. Institute of Software, 2022.
- [342] Dujmović, Vida, Attila Pór, and David R. Wood. "Track layouts of graphs." *Discrete Mathematics & Theoretical Computer Science* 6 (2004).
- [343] Gajarský, Jakub, Michael Lampis, and Sebastian Ordyniak. "Parameterized algorithms for modular-width." *Parameterized and Exact Computation: 8th International Symposium, IPEC 2013, Sophia Antipolis, France, September 4-6, 2013, Revised Selected Papers 8*. Springer International Publishing, 2013.
- [344] Toruńczyk, Szymon. "Flip-width: Cops and robber on dense graphs." *2023 IEEE 64th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*. IEEE, 2023.
- [345] Takaaki Fujita. Short Survey of Obstruction to Rank-width and Linear Rank Width. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies*. Volume 4, Issue 4, 2024.

11. Appendix A: Various Width Parameters

Numerous graph width parameters have been identified and studied extensively. A few examples of these graph width parameters are listed in the table below. As illustrated, many of these parameters have significant applications in real-world scenarios and other fields of research, which suggests that the study of graph width parameters will continue to grow in importance. Examining the relationships among these parameters, such as inequalities, upper bounds, and lower bounds, is a well-established research topic (cf. Appendix C). Additionally, we aim to explore the potential connections between these width parameters and ultrafilters in future studies.

Table 11.1: Various Width Parameters

No.	Width parameter	Explanation
1	Tree-width	<p>Tree-width is a measure of how tree-like a graph is, defined by its minimum tree decomposition width [47,213,214-216,268,269]. Example of obstructions are Tangle [47], Ultrafilter [48], and Bramble [239-242]. Related concepts include maximum order of a grid minor, maximum order of a grid-like-minor, Hadwiger number, fractional Hadwiger number, and following concepts [336].</p> <p>The relationships between tree-width and other parameters are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • $tw(G) \leq pw(G)$ (path-width) [311]. • $bw(G) \leq tw(G)+1 \leq 3/2 \cdot bw(G)$ for a graph G with $bw(G) \geq 2$ (branch-width) [213]. • $tw(G) \leq 2 tcw(G)^2 + 3 tcw(G)$ (Tree-cut-width) [312]. • $boow(G) \leq tw(G)+1$ (Boolean-width) [312]. • If a graph G has bounded tree-width, then it also has bounded sparse twin-width, bounded clique-width and bounded twin-width[313]. • If a graph G has bounded Tree-distance-width, then it also has bounded Tree-width[57]. • If a graph G has bounded tree-width, then it also has bounded degeneracy, bounded Maximum clique number, and chromatic number [311]. • If a graph G has bounded tree-width, then it also has bounded Bramble Number (bn), Tangle Number, Lexicographic Tree Product Number (LTP), Linkedness Number (link), Cartesian Tree Product Number (ctp), and Well-Linked Number (wl). The converse is also true [143]. • $Tree-width(G) \leq Special Tree-width(G) \leq Spaghetti Tree-width(G)$ [315]. • $carw(G) \Delta(G) \leq tw(G) \leq 2 \times carw(G)$ (maximum degree of G and carving width) [331-333]. • Minimal upper bounds for tree-width is distance to outerplanar [213]. • Tree-width is a minimal upper bound for book thickness(page number) and acyclic chromatic number [336, 339, 340, 342] • If a graph G has bounded Vertex-Cover Number, then it also has bounded tree-width. • If a graph G has bounded Tree-width, then it also has bounded Degeneracy, Average Degree, Minimum Degree, Domatic, and Distance to Disconnected [341]. <p>Cf) Local Tree-width [45]: A graph width parameter that</p>

		<p>associates with every natural number r the maximum tree-width of an r-neighborhood in G.</p> <p>Linear Local Tree-width: A linear variation of Local Tree-width.</p> <p>Bag-connected Tree-width [138]: A graph width parameter that considers tree-decompositions where each cluster is connected.</p> <p>Edge-tree Width [140]: A graph width parameter that serves as the tree-like analogue of cutwidth, or as an edge-analogue of tree-width.</p> <p>Layered Treewidth [157,159]: The minimum integer k such that G has a tree-decomposition and layering where each bag has at most k vertices in each layer.</p> <p>Row Treewidth [157,158]: The minimum integer k such that G is isomorphic to a subgraph of some graph H with tree-width at most k and for some path P.</p> <p>Connected Tree-width [181-183]: The minimum width of a tree-decomposition whose parts induce connected subgraphs.</p> <p>Triangular Tree-width [184]: A graph width parameter known for making the computation of permanents of matrices with bounded width efficient.</p> <p>Special Tree-width [185]: A complexity measure of graphs, positioned between path-width and tree-width.</p> <p>Spaghetti Tree-width [226,315]: A graph width parameter similar to Special Tree-width. Related concepts include strongly chordal tree-width and Directed Spaghetti Tree-width [315].</p> <p>Pared Tree Width and Acceptance Width [189, 190]: Graph width parameters relevant to the computation of an alternating finite automaton.</p> <p>Co-treewidth [193]: The tree-width of the complement of the input graph.</p> <p>Constant Treewidth [194-196]: A graph width parameter characteristic of control flow graphs in most programs.</p> <p>Dynamic Treewidth [197-200]: A graph width parameter designed to be computed for a dynamic graph G.</p> <p>Project-join Tree Width [201]: A graph width parameter linked to weighted projected model counting with graded project-join trees.</p> <p>Semantic Tree-width [206]: This parameter determines whether a query is equivalent to a query of tree-width k, applicable to the class of Unions of Conjunctive Regular Path Queries with two-way navigation.</p> <p>Induced Tree Width [209]: A graph width parameter where the complexity of algorithms is dictated by the highest-dimensional factor across computations.</p> <p>Free-connex Tree-width [210,211,212]: A graph width parameter that requires a connected set of nodes, including the root, containing exactly the output variables.</p> <p>Effective Width [217]: A graph width parameter for Partially Ordered Time, positioned between the well-known properties of width and dimension.</p>
2	Path-width	<p>Path-width [275,277,278] quantifies how similar a graph is to a path by determining the minimum width of its path decomposition. An example of an obstruction to low path-width is blockage [46]. Path-width is notably applied in VLSI design [318].</p> <p>The relationships between path-width and other graph parameters are as follows:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The path-width of any graph is equal to one less than the smallest clique number of an interval graph [213]. • If a graph G has bounded Tree-depth, then it also has bounded Path-width [311]. • If a graph G has bounded Path-width, then it also has bounded linear-rank-width [323]. • If a graph G has bounded Path-width, then it also has bounded linear-clique-width and linear NLC-width [39]. • Vertex separation number is equivalent to path-width [320]. • Node search number is also equal to path-width [319]. • Path-width is less than or equal to cut-width [321]. • If a graph G has bounded Path-width, then it also has bounded clique-width [325]. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a graph G has bounded Band-width, then it also has bounded path-width [313] <p>Cf) DAG-path-width [141]: Linear layout parameter of DAG-tree-width, Layered path-width [157,159] :Linear layout parameter of Layered tree-width, Row path-width [157,158] : Linear layout parameter of Row tree-width, D-path-width and clique preserving d-path-width [201] : A graph width parameter which has the splitting power of branching programs of bounded repetition and CNFs of bounded width, Semantic path-width [206] : Linear layout parameter of Semantic tree-width. Proper-path-width [276]: Path-width that relates to mixed search game (A pursuit-evasion game on graphs where a searcher combines edge and node searches to capture a hidden intruder). Connected path-width [316]: Linear layout parameter of Connected tree-width, Persistence path-width [317]: Persistence path-width refers to a graph path decomposition with width k, where each vertex of the graph is contained in at most l nodes of the path.</p>
3	Cut-width	<p>Cut-width, referenced in sources [279-281], measures the minimum number of edges crossing any vertical cut in a linear layout of a graph's vertices. Related concepts include page-width [336].</p> <p>The relationships between cut-width and other graph parameters are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If a graph G has bounded cut-width, it also has bounded carving-width [326]. - The cut-width of a graph can provide a lower bound on another parameter, the crossing number [334]. - In subcubic graphs (graphs with a maximum degree of three), the cut-width equals the path-width plus one [335].

		Cf) Weighted cut-width [179,180]: Cut width which is considered weight of graph.
4	MIM-width	<p>MIM-width (maximum induced matching width) [31,32] measures the largest induced matching in any bipartite graph induced by the cuts in the decomposition.</p> <p>The relationships between MIM-width and other graph parameters are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a graph G has bounded MIM-width, then it also has bounded Sim-width [311]. • If a graph G has bounded Independent set or Dominating Number, then it also has bounded MIM -width [311]. • If a graph G has bounded Boolean-width, then it also has bounded MIM -width [31,32]. • If a graph G has bounded Clique-width, then it also has bounded MIM -width [227]. <p>Cf) One-sided maximum induced matching-width [33]: Graph width parameters which solves maximum independent set problem. Any graph with tree-independence number k has o-mim-width at most k [33].</p> <p>SIM width [34,322]: Graph width parameters which is more useful parameter of MIM-width. Any graph with minor-matching hypertree-width k has sim-width at most k [33].</p>
5	Linear MIM-width	<p>Linear MIM-width [31,32] is the linear restriction of MIM-width. If a graph G has bounded linear-MIM-width, then it also has bounded MIM-width (trivially).</p> <p>Cf) Linear SIM width [34]: Linear layout parameter of SIM width.</p>
6	Boolean-width	<p>Boolean-width [35] measures the width of a graph decomposition based on the number of different unions of neighborhoods across cuts.</p> <p>The relationships between boolean-width and other graph parameters are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a graph G has bounded Tree-width, then it also has bounded Boolean-width [31,32].
7	Linear Boolean-width	<p>Linear Boolean-width [35] is the linear restriction of Boolean-width. If a graph G has bounded Linear Boolean-width, then it also has bounded Boolean-width (trivially).</p>

8	Band-width	<p>Band-width [259,260] measures the minimum width of a band or interval in an optimal linear arrangement of a graph's vertices. It is a width parameter introduced from VLSI design and networking. Related concepts include split-band-width [322].</p> <p>The relationships between band-width and other graph parameters are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • $ppw(G) \leq bw(G) \leq 2 \times ppw(G)$ (path-partition-width) • Max-leaf number is Minimal upper bounds for Band-width [341]. • $bw(G) \leq 2 \times pdw(G)$ (path-distance-width) • If a graph G has bounded Band-width, then it also has bounded Maximum Degree, c-Closure, Acyclic Chromatic , and h-index [341].
9	Vertex-boundary-width	<p>Vertex-boundary-width [36] measures the minimum boundary of vertices in a discrete isoperimetric problem. Note that the discrete isoperimetric problem seeks to determine the minimum "boundary" size of a set of vertices in a graph, given a fixed number of vertices in that set, often relating to optimizing shapes in grid-like structures or networks.</p>
10	Edge-boundary-width	<p>Edge-boundary-width [36] measures the minimum boundary of edges in a discrete isoperimetric problem.</p>
11	Carving-width	<p>Carving-width [256-258] measures a graph's complexity by focusing on edge cuts, similar to tree-width, but with an emphasis on edges rather than vertices. Carving-width is closely related to the concept of congestion in network theory.</p> <p>For example, consider a real-world scenario where a network with low performance is used—this often leads to frequent delays and congestion. The level of congestion experienced in such cases is analogous to the carving-width. Extensive research has been conducted to minimize delays and congestion, making this measure particularly relevant in network optimization studies [256].</p> <p>This graph width parameter is a minimal upper bound for maximum degree and tree-width [311,337].</p>
12	Branch-width	<p>Branch-width [9, 10, 47, 282] measures the smallest width of a branch decomposition of a graph. The width is the minimum number of edges connecting subgraph pairs. This graph width parameter is known to be extendable to matroids and connectivity systems.</p> <p>Example of obstructions are Tangle [9], Ultrafilter [16], Maximal ideal [49], loose tangle [10], Quasi-Ultrafilter [14], Weak-Ultrafilter [15], (k, m)-obstacle [50].</p> <p>Related concepts include sphere-cut width [338].</p> <p>The relationships between branch-width and other graph parameters are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For all matroids M, $bw(M) \leq bd(M)$ (Branch-depth) [329]. • $bw(M) \leq scdd(M) \leq cd(M)$ and $bw(M) \leq cdd(M) \leq dd(M)$ [311] (contraction-deletion-depth, contraction-depth, and deletion-depth).

13	Linear Branch-width	<p>Linear Branch-width is the linear restriction of Branch-width. This graph width parameter is known to be extendable to matroids and connectivity systems.</p> <p>Example of obstructions are Linear Tangle[51], Single ideal[52], linear loose tangle[3], linear-obstacle[50], ultra matroid[7], ultra antimatroid[4], ultra greedoid[4].</p> <p>The relationships between branch-width and other graph parameters are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - $pw(G) \leq lbw(G) \leq 1 + pw(G)$ (path-width) [330] - If a graph G has bounded Linear Branch-width, then it also has bounded Branch-width (trivially).
14	Rank-width	<p>Rank-width [37] measures the complexity of a graph based on the rank of adjacency matrices over cuts, closely linked to Matroid theory [228-230] and the Rank function.</p> <p>Example of obstructions are ρ-Tangle [53].</p> <p>The relationships between rank-width and other graph parameters are as follows:</p> <p>$rw(G) \leq tw(G) + 1 \leq pw(G) + 1$ (tree-width and path-width) [331]</p> <p>Cf) Bi-rank-width [137]: Graph width parameters which discuss about some possible extensions of the notion of rank-width to C-coloured graphs.</p> <p>Signed-rank-width [156,231,232,233]: Rank-width for model counting.</p>
15	Linear Rank-width	<p>Linear Rank-width is the linear restriction of Rank-width. If a graph G has bounded Linear Rank-width, then it also has bounded Rank-width (trivially).</p>
16	Clique-width	<p>Clique-width [38] measures the complexity of a graph based on a composition mechanism using vertex labels. Note that a clique in a graph is a subset of vertices where every pair of distinct vertices is connected by an edge, forming a complete subgraph.</p> <p>The relationships between clique-width and other graph parameters are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If a graph G has bounded Clique-width, then it also has bounded twin-width [314]. - $CW(G) \leq k$ if G given by a k-expression [38]. <p>Cf) H-Clique-Width [139]: Graph width parameter which aims to bridge the gap between classical hereditary width measures and the recently introduced graph product structure theory [235].</p> <p>Signed clique-width [155]: Clique-width for model counting.</p> <p>Multi-clique-width [186]: Graph width parameter which has the advantage of providing a natural extension of tree-width.</p>
17	Linear Clique-width	<p>Linear Clique-width is the linear restriction of Clique-width. If a graph G has bounded linear clique-width, then it also has bounded clique-width (trivially). And if a graph G has bounded shrub-depth, then it also has bounded linear clique-width [31,32].</p>
18	NLC-width and NLCT-width	<p>NLC-width and NLCT-width [39,234] measures the complexity of a graph based on a composition mechanism similar to clique-width.</p>
19	Linear NLC-width	<p>Linear NLC-width is the linear restriction of NLC-width. If a graph G has bounded linear NLC-width, then it also has bounded NLC-width (trivially)</p>

20	Hypertree-width	<p>Hypertree-width[40] measures the complexity of hypergraphs by extending tree-width concepts to cover hyperedges.</p> <p>Cf) Hyperbranch width [250]: A generalized graph width parameter that expands upon hypertree-width. Hyper-T-width and hyper-D-width[44]: Graph width parameters introduced as the first stable connectivity measures for hypergraphs, providing tools for designing algorithms to address various problems in hypergraph theory.</p>
21	Fractional Hypertree-width	Fractional hypertree-width[41] is a hypergraph measure similar to tree-width and hypertree-width.
22	Modular-width	<p>Modular-width [42] is defined using modular decompositions of the graph.</p> <p>The relationships between clique-width and other graph parameters are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a graph G has bounded Modular-width, then it also has bounded Clique-width [343]. • If a graph G has bounded vertex cover (vc) or neighborhood diversity (nd), then it also has bounded Modular-width [343]. • If a graph G has bounded twin-cover, then it also has bounded Modular-width [343].
23	Submodular-width	Submodular-width [43] is defined using the submodular condition property.
24	Amalgam-width	Amalgam-width [30] is a new matroid width parameter based on matroid amalgamation.
25	Kelly-width	Kelly-width [28-29] is a parameter for directed graphs, analogous to tree-width.
26	Monoidal Width	Monoidal Width [27] measures the complexity of morphisms in monoidal categories.
27	Tree-cut width	<p>Tree-cut width [18] is an attempt to create a tree-width analogue for edge cuts. Related concepts include following width parameters and 0-Tree-cut-width [17].</p> <p>Cf) Slim tree-cut width [17]: A graph width parameter that satisfies all structural and algorithmic requirements for an edge-cut-based analogue of tree-width, while being less restrictive than edge-cut width. Edge-crossing width and α-edge-crossing width [19,251]: These parameters are defined by the number of edges crossing a bag in a tree-cut decomposition. \</p> <p>Edge-cut width [20]: An algorithmically driven analogue of tree-width that is based on edge cuts. If a graph G has bounded Feedback edge set number, then it also has bounded Edge-cut width [19]. And related concepts include Edge-Tangle [8].</p>
28	Resolution width	<p>Resolution width [21] measures proof complexity using the existential pebble game in finite model theory.</p> <p>Cf) Linear Resolution width: Linear layout of Resolution width.</p>

29	Twin-width	<p>Twin-width [22-26, 252] is a graph width parameter that measures the complexity of graphs by evaluating their ability to avoid a fixed minor. This includes classes such as planar graphs and graphs with bounded tree-width or clique-width.</p> <p>The relationships between Twin-width and other graph parameters are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Every graph class of bounded Genus has bounded Twin-width [341]. - Every graph class of bounded Distance to Planar, Sparse-Twin-width, or Feedback Edge Set has bounded Twin-width [341]. - If a graph G has bounded Clique-width, then it also has bounded twin-width [314]. - If a graph G has bounded twin-width, then it also has bounded monadically dependent [314]. <p>Cf) Sparse twin-width [171,252]: A graph width parameter that generalizes results for classes with bounded linear clique-width and clique-width. If a graph G has bounded Sparse twin-width, then it also has bounded nowhere dense [314].</p> <p>Signed twin-width [203]: A graph width parameter specifically applied to CNF formulas, demonstrating that BWMC (Bounded Width Monotone Circuits) is fixed-parameter tractable.</p>
30	Decomposition width	Decomposition width [54] is related to matroid theory and second-order logic.
31	Minor-matching Hypertree-width	Minor-matching hypertree width [55] measures the complexity of a tree decomposition for graphs and hypergraphs, ensuring polynomially-sized independent sets in each decomposition bag.
32	Tree-clique width	Tree-clique width [56] extends the algorithmic benefits of tree-width to more structured and dense graphs.
33	Tree distance width	<p>Tree distance width [57] measures the width from a distance perspective, restricted by tree-width. A related concepts are Rooted Tree-distance-width [57] and Connected Tree-distance-width [309,310].</p> <p>The relationships between Tree-distance-width and other graph parameters are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • $\text{Tree-width} \leq 2 \times \text{TDW}(G) - 1$ • $\text{TDW}(G) \leq \text{RTDW}(G)$ (Rooted Tree-distance width) • $\text{TDW}(G) \leq \text{PDW}(G) \leq \text{RPDW}(G)$ (Path-distance-width and Rooted Path Distance width)
34	Path distance width	Path distance width [57] measures the width from a distance perspective, constrained by bandwidth. Related concepts include Rooted Path Distance width [57], Connected Path-distance-width and c -connected Path-distance-width [309,310]. Distance width is particularly useful in problems like Graph Isomorphism, where the goal is to determine if two graphs are identical by checking if there is a one-to-one correspondence between their vertices and edges that preserves the connections.

35	Tree partition width	Tree-partition-width [58] is the minimum width of a tree-partition of a graph. This width also called 0-quasi-tree-partitions-width [253]. Cf) Directed Tree partition width [191]: Tree partition width in Digraph
36	Path partition width	Path-partition-width is the minimum width of a path-partition of a graph. This width also called 0-quasi-path-partitions-width [253]. Cf) Directed Path partition width [191]: Path partition width in Digraph
37	CV width	CV-width [59] is specific to CNFs and dominates the tree-width of the CNF incidence graph.
38	Linear CV width	Linear CV width is the linear restriction of CV width.
39	Dominating-set-width	Dominating-set-width [60] measures the number of different dominating sets on a subgraph.
40	Point width	Point width [61] for hypergraphs provides a condition for the tractability of Max-CSPs, generalizing bounded MIM-width and β -acyclicity.
41	Neighbourhood width	Neighbourhood width [62,63] considers all neighborhoods of the vertices. Neighbourhood width is less than path-width plus one [62,63].
42	Fusion-width	Fusion-width [64] generalizes tree-width and encompasses graphs of bounded tree-width and clique-width.
43	Directed NLC width	Directed NLC width [65] is NLC width on directed graphs.
44	Directed Tree-width	Directed Tree-width [66,270] is Tree-width on directed graphs. Example of obstructions are directed tangle [72], directed ultrafilter [12].
45	Directed Path-width	Directed Path-width [67, 70] is Path-width on directed graphs.
46	Directed Branch-width	Directed Branch-width [68] is Branch-width on directed graphs.
47	Directed Cut-width	Directed Cut-width [69, 70] is Cut-width on directed graphs.
48	Directed Clique-width	Directed Clique-width [65] is clique width on directed graphs.
49	Directed Linear NLC-width	Directed Linear NLC-width [65, 69] is Linear NLC width on directed graphs.
50	Directed Neighbourhood width	Directed Neighbourhood width [69] is Neighbourhood width on directed graphs.
51	Directed Rank-width	Directed Rank-width [71] is Rank-width on directed graphs.
52	Directed Linear Rank-width	Directed Linear Rank-width [69] is Linear rank width on directed graphs.
53	Elimination width	Elimination width as a graph width parameter to address issues with acyclic digraphs [97].

54	Flip-width	<p>The flip-width [117] parameters are defined using variants of the Cops and Robber game. Related concepts include radius-one flip-width [344].</p> <p>The relationships between Flip-width (or radius-one flip-width) and other graph parameters are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Every class of bounded twin-width has bounded flip-width [344]. - If a graph G has bounded radius-one flip-width, then it also has bounded symmetric difference, functionality, and VC-dimension [344].
55	Stretch-width	<p>Stretch-width [118] lies strictly between clique-width and twin-width.</p> <p>The relationships between Stretch-width and other graph parameters are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The stretch-width of any graph is at most twice its clique-width. - There is a constant c such that for every graph G, $tw(G) \leq c\Delta(G)^4 stw(G)^2 \log V(G)$. (Tree-width and maximal degree)
56	Cop-width	<p>The Cop-width [117,119,120] parameters are defined using variants of the Cops and Robber game.</p> <p>The relationships between (radius-)cop-width and other graph parameters are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - $Cop\text{-}width_r(G) = tree\text{-}width(G) + 1$ [117,119,120] - $Cop\text{-}width_1(G) = degeneracy(G) + 1$ [345]. <p>Cf) Marshal width and Monotone marshal width [121]: Graph width parameter related to winning strategy in the robber of the Cops and Robber game.</p> <p>Game-width [216,327]: Graph width parameter of the Cops and Robber game. Game width of a graph equals its tree-width plus 1 [216].</p>
57	Perfect matching width	<p>Perfect matching width [142] is a width parameter for matching covered graphs based on a branch decomposition.</p>
58	Bisection-width	<p>The Bisection problem seeks to partition the vertices of a graph into two equally sized sets while minimizing the cut size. The Bisection Width is a width parameter closely related to this Bisection problem [151-152].</p> <p>If a graph G has bounded Band-width, then it also has bounded bisection-width [341].</p>
59	Maximum matching width	<p>Maximum matching width is a graph width parameter to consider about fast algorithm for dominating set [153].</p> <p>The relationships between Maximum matching width and other graph parameters are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If a graph G has bounded Maximum matching width, then it also has bounded tree-depth [311]. - If a graph G has bounded Maximum matching width, then it also has bounded Maximum induced matching-width [311].

60	Linear Maximum Matching width	<p>Linear Maximum Matching width is the linear restriction of Maximum Matching width.</p> <p>The relationships between Linear MIM-width and other graph parameters are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - $Imm(G) \leq pw(G) \leq 2 \times Imm(G)$. (Path width) [330]. - If a graph G has bounded Linear MIM-width, then it also has bounded MIM-width (trivially).
61	Clustering-width	Clustering-width is graph width parameter of the smallest number of variables whose deletion results in a variable-disjoint union of hitting formulas[154]
62	Query-width	Query-width is graph width parameter of a common generalization of both acyclicity and tree-width [187, 188].
63	Universal width	<p>Universal width [192, 205] is a width parameter for an alternating finite automaton (AFA).</p> <p>Cf) Maximal universal width [192]: Maximal Graph width parameter of universal width, Combined width [204]: Width parameter for an alternating finite automaton (AFA) , Maximal combined width [204]: Maximal Graph width parameter of combined width. Split-width [207,208]: Width parameter for an alternating finite automaton (AFA),</p>

12. Appendix B: Various Length Parameters

We will consider the following length parameters. These are merely suggestions, and we plan to explore them further in the future.

Table 12.1: Various Length Parameters

No.	Length parameter	Explanation
1	Directed tree length	The length of a directed tree decomposition is the largest diameter of the subgraphs induced by the vertex subsets used in the decomposition. The directed tree-length if a graph G is the minimum length over all directed tree decompositions of G .
2	Directed Path length	The length of a directed path decomposition is the largest diameter of the subgraphs induced by the vertex subsets used in the decomposition. The directed path-length if a graph G is the minimum length over all directed tree decompositions of G .
3	Rank length	The length of a rank decomposition is the largest diameter of the subgraphs induced by the vertex subsets used in the decomposition. The Rank length if a graph G is the minimum length over all rank decomposition of G .
4	Linear Rank length	The length of a linear rank decomposition is the largest diameter of the subgraphs induced by the vertex subsets used in the decomposition. The Linear Rank length if a graph G is the minimum length over all linear rank decomposition of G .
5	Boolean length	The length of a boolean decomposition is max the largest diameter of the subgraphs induced by the vertex subsets used in the decomposition. The boolean-length if a graph G is the minimum length over all boolean decomposition of G .
6	Linear Boolean length	The length of a linear boolean decomposition is the largest diameter of the subgraphs induced by the vertex subsets used in the decomposition. The linear boolean-length if a graph G is the minimum length over all linear boolean decomposition of G .
7	Hypertree length	The length of a Hypertree decomposition is the largest diameter of the subgraphs induced by the vertex subsets used in the decomposition. The Hypertree length if a graph G is the minimum length over all Hypertree decomposition of G .
8	Carving length	The length of a Carving decomposition is the largest diameter of the subgraphs induced by the vertex subsets used in the decomposition. The Carving length if a graph G is the minimum length over all Carving decomposition of G .
9	Cut length	The length of a Cut decomposition is the largest diameter of the subgraphs induced by the vertex subsets used in the decomposition. The Cut length if a graph G is the minimum length over all Cut decomposition of G .
10	Tree-cut length	The length of a Tree-Cut decomposition is the largest diameter of the subgraphs induced by the vertex subsets used in the decomposition. The Tree-Cut length if a graph G is the minimum length over all Tree-Cut decomposition of G .
11	Tree distance length	The length of a Tree distance decomposition is the largest diameter of the subgraphs induced by the vertex subsets used in the decomposition. The Tree distance length if a graph G is the minimum length over all Tree distance decomposition of G .

12	Path distance length	The length of a Path distance decomposition is the largest diameter of the subgraphs induced by the vertex subsets used in the decomposition. The Path distance length if a graph G is the minimum length over all Path distance decomposition of G .
13	Clique length	The length of a Clique-decomposition is the largest diameter of the subgraphs induced by the vertex subsets used in the decomposition. The Clique-length if a graph G is the minimum length over all Clique-decomposition of G .
14	Linear Clique length	The length of a Linear Clique-decomposition is the largest diameter of the subgraphs induced by the vertex subsets used in the decomposition. The Linear Clique-length if a graph G is the minimum length over all Linear Clique-decomposition of G .
15	NLC length	The length of a NLC decomposition is the largest diameter of the subgraphs induced by the vertex subsets used in the decomposition. The NLC Clique-length if a graph G is the minimum length over all NLC decomposition of G .
16	Linear NLC length	The length of a Linear NLC decomposition is the largest diameter of the subgraphs induced by the vertex subsets used in the decomposition. The Linear NLC Clique-length if a graph G is the minimum length over all Linear NLC decomposition of G .
17	Modular length	The length of a Modular decomposition is the largest diameter of the subgraphs induced by the vertex subsets used in the decomposition. The Modular length if a graph G is the minimum length over all Modular decomposition of G .

13 Appendix C: Comparing Various Graph Parameters (Over 70 Parameters)

We examine the relationships among various graph parameters. Please refer to the supplemental file “Supplemental Figure: Comparing Graph Width Parameters” for more details. Understanding these relationships is highly beneficial for developing algorithms.

Note: Comparing graph width parameters mathematically means evaluating how different measures of graph complexity, such as treewidth, pathwidth, and clique-width, relate to each other. These comparisons help in determining which parameter is more restrictive or more general, and thus, influence the choice of techniques and tools in algorithm design.

14 Appendix D: Various Graph Depth Parameters


Many graph depth parameters are known. Examining the relationships among these depth parameters, such as inequalities, upper bounds, and lower bounds, is a well-known research topic.

Table 14.1: Various Depth Parameters

No.	Width parameter	Explanation
1	Tree-depth	Tree-depth is a graph depth parameter introduced under several names as a measure of sparsity of a graph. [90,92,172-174]
2	Branch-depth	Branch-depth is a graph depth parameter of generalizing tree-depth of graphs [91]. Cf) deletion-depth[91], contraction-depth[91], contraction-deletion depth[91], contraction* -depth[178], contraction* -deletion depth[178]
3	Rank-depth	Rank depth is a graph depth parameter of Rank depth-decomposition. Note that Rank depth-decomposition of a graph G is a branch-depth-decomposition of the cut-rank function [168,175,176,177].
4	Shrub-depth	Shrub-depth is a graph depth parameter that captures the height of dense graphs [168, 170]. A related parameter is SC-depth [168, 170].
5	Directed tree-depth	Directed Tree-depth is tree-depth on directed graphs [169]

Supplemental Figure: Comparing Graph Width Parameter (Graph Parameter Hierarchy)

The arrow represents "≥". For example, Vertex Cover Number ≥ Twin-cover Number.
(If a graph has bounded Vertex Cover Number, then it also has a Twin-cover Number.)



Reference of Figure

- [1] Sasak, Robert. Comparing 17 graph parameters. MS thesis. The University of Bergen, 2010.
- [2] Chang, Yeonsu, O-joung Kwon, and Myoungwan Lee. "A New Width Parameter of Graphs Based on Edge Cuts: Edge-Crossing Width." International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2023.
- [3] Gałązka, Jakub, Michał Lipiński, and Sebastian Ordyniak. "Parameterized algorithms for modular-width." Parameterized and Exact Computation: 8th International Symposium, IPEC 2013, Sophia Antipolis, France, September 4–8, 2013, Revised Selected Papers 8. Springer International Publishing, 2013.
- [4] Yamazaki, Koichi, et al. "Isomorphism for graphs of bounded distance width." Algorithmica 24 (1999): 105-127.
- [5] Ganian, Robert, and Viktoriya Korchemna. "Slim tree-cut width." Algorithmica (2024): 1-25.
- [6] DeVos, Matt, O-joung Kwon, and Sang-il Oum. "Branch-depth: Generalizing tree-depth of graphs." European Journal of Combinatorics 90 (2020): 103186.
- [7] Yamazaki, Koichi. "Approximability of rank, clique, boolean, and maximum induced matching-widths under small set expansion hypotheses." Algorithmica 11.1 (2018): 173.
- [8] Oum, Sang-il, and Paul Seymour. "Approximating clique-width and branch-width." Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B 96.4 (2008): 514-528.
- [9] Gurski, Frank. "Linear layouts measuring neighbourhoods in graphs." Discrete Mathematics 306.15 (2006): 1637-1650.
- [10] Brettel, Nick, et al. "Comparing width parameters on graph classes." arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.05817 (2023).
- [11] Bergougnoux, Benjamin, Tuukka Kortonen, and Igor Razgon. "New width parameters for independent set: One-sided-nim-width and neighbor-depth." International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2023.
- [12] Korach, Ephraim, and Nir Soled. "Tree-width, path-width, and cutwidth." Discrete Mathematics 43.1 (1993): 97-101.
- [13] Ganian, Robert, et al. "Shrub-depth: Capturing height of dense graphs." Logical Methods in Computer Science 15 (2019).
- [14] Suchan, Karol, and Ioan Todinca. "On powers of graphs of bounded NLC-width (clique-width)." Discrete Applied Mathematics 155.14 (2007): 1885-1893.
- [15] Jafrke, Lars, et al. "Mim-width III: Graph powers and generalized distance domination problems." Theoretical Computer Science 796 (2019): 216-236.
- [16] Wu, Y., Austrin, P., Pitassi, T., Liu, D. Inapproximability of Treewidth and Related Problems. J. Artif. Intell. Res. 2014, 49, 569-600.
- [17] Toruńczyk, Szymon. "Flip-width: Cops and robber on dense graphs." 2023 IEEE 64th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS). IEEE, 2023.
- [18] Vatshelle, Martin. "New width parameters of graphs." (2012).
- [19] Grohe, Martin. "Local tree-width, excluded minors, and approximation algorithms." arXiv preprint math/001128 (2000).
- [20] Gałązka, Jakub, Michał Lipiński, and Szymon Toruńczyk. "Stable graphs of bounded twin-width." Proceedings of the 37th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science. 2022.
- [21] Tran, Duc Long. Expanding the Graph Parameter Hierarchy. Diss. Institute of Software, 2022.