

On coarse tree decompositions and coarse balanced separators

Tara Abrishami* Jadwiga Czyżewska† Kacper Kluk‡ Marcin Pilipczuk§
 Michał Pilipczuk¶ Paweł Rzażewski||

Abstract

It is known that there is a linear dependence between the treewidth of a graph and its *balanced separator number*: the smallest integer k such that for every weighing of the vertices, the graph admits a balanced separator of size at most k . We investigate whether this connection can be lifted to the setting of coarse graph theory, where both the bags of the considered tree decompositions and the considered separators should be coverable by a bounded number of bounded-radius balls.

As the first result, we prove that if an n -vertex graph G admits balanced separators coverable by k balls of radius r , then G also admits tree decompositions \mathcal{T}_1 and \mathcal{T}_2 such that:

- in \mathcal{T}_1 , every bag can be covered by $\mathcal{O}(k \log n)$ balls of radius r ; and
- in \mathcal{T}_2 , every bag can be covered by $\mathcal{O}(k^2 \log k)$ balls of radius $r(\log k + \log \log n + \mathcal{O}(1))$.

As the second result, we show that if we additionally assume that G has doubling dimension at most m , then the functional equivalence between the existence of small balanced separators and of tree decompositions of small width can be fully lifted to the coarse setting. Precisely, we prove that for a positive integer r and a graph G of doubling dimension at most m , the following conditions are equivalent, with constants $k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4, \Delta_3, \Delta_4$ depending on each other and on m :

- G admits balanced separators consisting of k_1 balls of radius r ;
- G has a tree decomposition with bags coverable by k_2 balls of radius r ;
- G has a tree-partition of maximum degree $\leq \Delta_3$ with bags coverable by k_3 balls of radius r ;
- G is quasi-isometric to a graph of maximum degree $\leq \Delta_4$ and tree-partition width $\leq k_4$.

*University of Hamburg, Germany (tara.abrishami@uni-hamburg.de). Supported by the National Science Foundation Award Number DMS-2303251 and the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.

†University of Warsaw, Poland (j.czyzewska@mimuw.edu.pl). Supported by Polish National Science Centre SONATA BIS-12 grant number 2022/46/E/ST6/00143.

‡University of Warsaw, Poland (k.kluk@mimuw.edu.pl). Supported by Polish National Science Centre SONATA BIS-12 grant number 2022/46/E/ST6/00143.

§University of Warsaw, Poland (m.pilipczuk@mimuw.edu.pl). Supported by Polish National Science Centre SONATA BIS-12 grant number 2022/46/E/ST6/00143.

¶University of Warsaw, Poland (michal.pilipczuk@uw.edu.pl). Supported by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme, grant agreement no 948057 (BOBR).

||Warsaw University of Technology & University of Warsaw, Poland (pawel.rzazewski@pw.edu.pl).

1 Introduction

The main aim of the area of *coarse graph theory* is to study the metric structure in graphs. Recently, Georgakopoulous and Papasoglu [10] have formulated a programme of understanding coarse counterparts of the fundamental tools, techniques, and results from the classic structural graph theory, particularly the theory of Graph Minors. In the analogy between the classic and the coarse settings, it is typical that the requirement of disjointness of objects is replaced with *farness*, and the requirement of intersection is replaced with *closeness*.

Let us illustrate this principle on the example of tree decompositions and treewidth, which will also be the main objects of interest in this work. Classically, in a tree decomposition of a graph G of width k one requires all the bags to consist of at most $k + 1$ vertices; thus, the bags are simply bounded in terms of size. A natural coarse counterpart of this condition is to require the following: every bag can be covered by at most k balls of radius r in G , for some distance parameter $r \in \mathbb{N}$ fixed beforehand. (We will call such vertex sets (k, r) -coverable.) Very recently, Nguyen, Scott, and Seymour [16], and independently Hickingbotham [14], studied graphs admitting such tree decompositions and showed that they are quasi-isometric to graphs of bounded treewidth. Here, a *quasi-isometry* is a mapping between two graphs that roughly preserves distances, which serves as the basic notion of equivalence in the coarse theory; see Section 2 for a precise definition. The works of Nguyen et al. [16] and of Hickingbotham [14] extend the previously known result of Berger and Seymour [1] that admitting a tree decomposition where every bag has bounded diameter, i.e., is $(1, r)$ -coverable for a constant r , is equivalent to being quasi-isometric to a tree.

In the classic theory, there are a number of notions that are equivalent to treewidth, either exactly or functionally. To name just a few, there is the *bramble number*, the *tangle number*, or the *largest size of a grid minor*; see the survey of Harvey and Wood for an extensive discussion [11]. It is unclear if any of these notions has a suitable coarse counterpart that would be equivalent to “coarse treewidth”; the coarse analogue of the Grid Minor Theorem is at this point only a far-reaching conjecture [10]. The goal of this work is to explore whether the probably simplest connection between treewidth and another notion — *balanced separators* — can be lifted to the coarse setting.

We need a few definitions. Suppose G is a graph and $\mu: V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is a weight function that assigns each vertex of G a nonnegative weight. We say that a set X of vertices of G is a *balanced separator* for μ if for every connected component C of $G - X$, the total weight of vertices within C is at most half of the total weight of G . On one hand, it is not hard to see that if G admits a tree decomposition \mathcal{T} of width at most k , then there is a bag of \mathcal{T} that is a balanced separator for μ ; hence any weight function μ admits a balanced separator of size at most $k + 1$. On the other hand, using standard approaches to approximating treewidth (see e.g. [4, Section 7.6]) one can argue that if any weight function μ on a graph G admits a balanced separator of size ℓ , then the treewidth of G is at most 3ℓ . Thus, treewidth and the *balanced separator number* (the smallest ℓ such that every weight function admits a balanced separator of size at most ℓ) are bounded by linear functions of each other; see Lemma 2.2.

There is a natural coarse analogue of balanced separators of bounded size: these would be just separators that are coverable by a bounded number of bounded-radius balls. Let us remark that the special case that the radius of each ball is 1, i.e., each separator can be covered by a bounded number of neighborhoods of vertices, has received significant attention due to its strong connections to the complexity of certain problems in induced-minor-closed classes of graphs [6, 3, 9, 8].

As our main motivation, we postulate the following coarse analogue of the connection between treewidth and the balanced separator number.

Conjecture 1.1. *For all $k, r \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist $\ell, d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds. Suppose G is a graph such that every weight function $\mu: V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ admits a balanced separator that is (k, r) -coverable. Then G admits a tree decomposition whose every bag is (ℓ, d) -coverable.*

The converse implication is easy: if G admits a tree decomposition \mathcal{T} whose bags are (ℓ, d) -coverable and μ is a weight function on G , then again there is a bag of \mathcal{T} that is a balanced separator

for μ , hence μ has an (ℓ, d) -coverable balanced separator.

We do not resolve Conjecture 1.1 in this work; in fact, even the resolution of case $r = 1$ would be very interesting. Our contribution consists of the following:

- We settle Conjecture 1.1 under the additional assumption that the graph has *bounded doubling dimension*: every ball of some radius can be covered by a bounded number of balls of twice smaller radius. This holds even in the following strong sense: $d = r$ and ℓ depends only on k and on the doubling dimension.
- We prove two weaker statements where either the number of balls to cover every bag, or the radii of the balls, may moderately depend on n – the vertex count of the graph. Precisely, we prove that the existence of (k, r) -coverable balanced separators implies the existence of a tree decomposition with $(\mathcal{O}(k \log n), r)$ -coverable bags (this is very easy), and also the existence of a tree decomposition with $(\mathcal{O}(k^2 \log k), r(\log k + \log \log n + \mathcal{O}(1)))$ -coverable bags (this is quite involved).

We now discuss these statements in more details. In what follows, we say that G has *distance- r balanced separator number* at most k if every weight function $\mu: V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ admits a (k, r) -coverable balanced separator.

Doubling dimension. We say that a metric space (X, δ) has *doubling dimension* at most m if for every $r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, every ball of radius r in (X, δ) can be covered by 2^m balls of radius $r/2$. This definition can be applied to (unweighted) graphs by considering the shortest-path distance metric. The assumption of the boundedness of doubling dimension is well-established in the area of approximation algorithms for metric problems. In a nutshell, it is an abstract property inspired by the setting of Euclidean spaces of fixed dimension, in which multiple natural decompositional techniques can be applied; see e.g. the fundamental work of Talwar [17]. In the context of Conjecture 1.1, we prove the following; see Section 2 for undefined terms.

Theorem 1.2. *Let \mathcal{C} be a class of graphs of doubling dimension bounded by m , for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the following conditions are equivalent for any $r \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$:*

- (1) *There exist $k_1, \Delta_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that every member of \mathcal{C} has a tree-partition of spread r , maximum degree at most Δ_1 , and with (k_1, r) -coverable bags.*
- (2) *There exists $k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that every member of \mathcal{C} has a tree decomposition with (k_2, r) -coverable bags.*
- (3) *There exists $k_3 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that every member of \mathcal{C} has distance- r balanced separator number at most k_3 .*
- (4) *There exist $k_4, \Delta_4 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that every member of \mathcal{C} is $(3, 3r)$ -quasi-isometric with an edge-weighted graph of tree-partition width at most k_4 , maximum degree at most Δ_4 , and every edge of weight $3r$.*
- (5) *There exist $k_5, \Delta_5 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that every member of \mathcal{C} is $(\alpha, \beta r)$ -quasi-isometric with an edge-weighted graph of tree-partition width at most k_5 , maximum degree at most Δ_5 , and every edge of weight at least γr .*

Let us stress that in Theorem 1.2, the constants $k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4, k_5, \Delta_1, \Delta_4, \Delta_5, \alpha, \beta, \gamma$ can be bounded by functions of each other and of the doubling dimension m , but are independent of r . Thus, the equivalence holds at every possible choice of the “scale” r .

The key to the proof of Theorem 1.2 lies in observing that a generic construction of a graph that is quasi-isometric to a given graph G at a given “scale” r yields a graph H of degree bounded in terms of the doubling dimension of G , regardless of the choice of r . (This construction is discussed in Section 3.) This allows us to essentially work on a graph of bounded degree, where separators can be conveniently “fattened” by including their neighborhoods, and treewidth is functionally equivalent to the parameter *tree-partition width* [5]. Tree-partition width is defined similarly to treewidth, except that the underlying notion of decomposition – called a *tree-partition* – consists of a tree of bags that form a *partition* of the vertex set of the graph, and adjacent vertices must lie in the same bag or in adjacent bags. Importantly, tree-partitions have the following “spreading” property: if u and v belong

to bags that are at least d apart in a tree-partition, then u and v must be also at least d apart in the graph. This property, notoriously lacking in classic tree decompositions, appears very useful in the coarse setting.

More generally, it seems that in coarse graph theory, the assumption of having bounded doubling dimension can be interpreted as the assumption of having bounded degree “on every possible scale of distances”. Given that several fundamental statements in the theory of induced minors benefit from the assumption of having bounded degree, see [2, 7, 13, 15], one could be hopeful that doubling dimension might prove insightful in the coarse theory.

General setting. The following statements describe the relaxations of Conjecture 1.1 that we prove.

Theorem 1.3. *Let G be an n -vertex graph ($n \geq 2$) whose distance- r balanced separator number is at most $k \geq 2$, for some positive integer r . Then G has a tree decomposition whose every bag is $(k(\log n + 2), r)$ -coverable.*

Theorem 1.4. *There is a constant $c \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds. Let G be an n -vertex graph ($n \geq 2$) whose distance- r balanced separator number is at most $k \geq 2$, for some positive integer r . Then G has a tree decomposition whose every bag is $(ck^2 \log k, r(\log k + \log \log n + c))$ -coverable.*

As mentioned, Theorem 1.3 is very simple: we decompose the graph in a recursive way, always breaking the set of remaining vertices using a balanced separator. This yields a recursion of depth bounded by $\log n$, and the bags of the resulting tree decomposition are obtained by as the union of the balanced separators accumulated along every branch of the recursion.

Theorem 1.4 is more involved. On a high level, we emulate a recursive algorithm from the classic proof of the connection between treewidth and balanced separators. In this algorithm, the part of a graph that is left to decompose is separated from the rest of the graph by a separator S , which classically is bounded in size. In our recursion, we keep the invariant that S can be covered by $\mathcal{O}(k^2 \log k)$ balls, but for technical reasons we need to allow the radii of those balls to slowly grow in consecutive calls. To control the growth of the balls, we apply careful bookkeeping using a potential function that grows exponentially with the radius.

2 Preliminaries

By $\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N}_{>0}, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ we denote the sets of nonnegative integers, positive integers, nonnegative reals, and positive reals, respectively. All logarithms are base-2.

Graphs. We use standard graph notation. All graphs considered in this paper are finite, simple, and unweighted, unless explicitly stated. The set of vertices of graph G is denoted as $V(G)$ and the set of edges as $E(G)$. The maximum degree of a graph G is denoted as $\Delta(G)$.

The distance metric of a graph G is denoted by $\text{dist}_G(\cdot, \cdot)$: for two vertices $u, v \in V(G)$, their distance, denoted by $\text{dist}_G(u, v)$, is the length (i.e., the number of edges) of a shortest path connecting u and v , or $+\infty$ if no such path exists. For a vertex u and a nonnegative real r , the *radius- r ball* around u is the set $\text{Ball}_G(u, r) := \{v \in V(G) \mid \text{dist}_G(u, v) \leq r\}$. We say that a set of vertices A in a graph G is *(k, r) -coverable* if one can choose k radius- r balls in G whose union contains A . We emphasize that the distances here are measured in G and the balls do not have to be contained in A . A *distance- r independent set* in G is a set of vertices $I \subseteq V(G)$ such that for all distinct $u, v \in I$, we have $\text{dist}_G(u, v) > r$.

An *edge-weighted graph* is a graph G equipped with a weight function $w_G: E(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ on edges. We can naturally lift the notation for distances, balls, etc. to edge-weighted graphs by considering the length of a path to be the sum of the weights of its edges.

In all of the notation above, we may omit the graph in the subscript if it is clear from the context.

Graph decompositions. A *tree decomposition* of a graph G is a pair $\mathcal{T} = (T, \text{bag})$, where T is a tree and bag is a function assigning every node x a subset $\text{bag}(x)$ of vertices of G (called the *bag* of x) such that following conditions are fulfilled:

- for each edge $vu \in E(G)$, there is a node x of T such that $\text{bag}(x)$ contains both u and v ; and
- for each vertex u of G , the set of nodes of T whose bags contain u induces a connected non-empty subtree of T .

The *width* of a tree decomposition is equal to $\max_{x \in V(T)} |\text{bag}(x)| - 1$. The minimum width over all tree decompositions of a graph G is called the *treewidth* of G and is denoted as $\text{tw}(G)$.

A *tree-partition* of a graph is a similar notion to a tree decomposition, with the main difference that here the bags should form a partition of the vertex set. A *tree-partition* of a graph G is again a pair $\mathcal{T} = (T, \text{bag})$, where T is a tree and bag is a function mapping nodes of T to subsets of vertices of G (called *bags*). This time, we require the following properties:

- each vertex u of G belongs to exactly one set $\text{bag}(x)$ for some $x \in V(T)$; and
- for every edge $uv \in E(G)$ either there exists $x \in V(T)$ such that $u, v \in \text{bag}(x)$ or there exists an edge $xy \in E(T)$ such that $u \in \text{bag}(x)$ and $v \in \text{bag}(y)$.

The *width* of a tree-partition decomposition is the size of the largest bag. The *tree-partition width* of a graph G is the minimum width over all tree-partitions of G and is denoted as $\text{tpw}(G)$.

It is straightforward to see that $\text{tw}(G) \leq 2 \text{tpw}(G) - 1$ for every graph G : given a tree-partition decomposition (T, bag) of G of width k , we may obtain a tree decomposition of width at most $2k - 1$ by subdividing every edge of T once and assigning the vertex subdividing any edge, say xy , the bag $\text{bag}(x) \cup \text{bag}(y)$. While there is no relation between the two parameters in the other direction (consider a long path with a universal vertex added), they turn out to be functionally equivalent assuming the graph in question has bounded maximum degree. The following result with a worse bound was observed by an anonymous reviewer and reported in the work of Ding and Oporowski [5]; the improved bound is due to Wood [18].

Theorem 2.1 ([5, 18]). *For every graph G , it holds that $\text{tpw}(G) \leq \frac{35}{4} \Delta(G)(\text{tw}(G) + 1)$.*

By the maximum degree of a tree-partition (T, bag) we mean the maximum degree of T . In the context of coarse graph theory, the following parameter of a tree-partition also seems insightful: For $r \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$, we say that a tree-partition (T, bag) of a graph G has *spread* r if for every pair of vertices u, v with $\text{dist}_G(u, v) \leq r$, there is either a node $x \in V(T)$ with $u, v \in \text{bag}(x)$ or an edge $xy \in E(T)$ with $u \in \text{bag}(x)$ and $v \in \text{bag}(y)$. Thus, the standard condition in the definition of tree-partitions is equivalent to having spread 1, but intuitively, tree-partitions with larger spread break the graph into pieces that are further apart. The tree-partitions that we will construct within the proof of Theorem 1.2 (the formalization of Theorem 1.2) will have spread r , rather than 1. We note that in a follow-up work [12], Hatzel and the fifth author investigate some algorithmic aspects of tree-partitions with spread r and (k, r) -coverable bags.

Balanced separators. Let G be a graph and $\mu: V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a weight function on the vertices of G . For a subset of vertices A we denote $\mu(A) := \sum_{u \in A} \mu(u)$, and for a subgraph H we write $\mu(H) := \mu(V(H))$.

We say that a vertex set $X \subseteq V(G)$ is a *balanced separator* for μ if for every connected component C of $G - X$, we have $\mu(C) \leq \frac{1}{2} \mu(V(G))$. The *balanced separator number* of G , denoted $\text{bsn}(G)$, is the smallest k such that for every weight function μ there is a balanced separator of size at most k . We have the following standard lemma that connects the treewidth with the balanced separator number.

Lemma 2.2 (see e.g. [11, Section 5]). *For any graph G , we have*

$$\text{bsn}(G) - 1 \leq \text{tw}(G) \leq 3 \text{bsn}(G).$$

As mentioned in Section 1, we will work with the following coarse variant of the balanced separator number. For $r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, the *distance- r balanced separator number* of G is the smallest k such that for every weight function $\mu: V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, there is balanced separator for μ that is (k, r) -coverable.

Doubling dimension. The *doubling dimension* of a graph G is the smallest m such that for every nonnegative real r , every radius- $2r$ ball in G can be covered by 2^m radius- r balls. Note that by applying this condition to $r = \frac{1}{2}$ we may conclude that if a graph G has doubling dimension m , then $\Delta(G) < 2^m$.

Quasi-isometries. Let G and H be (possibly edge-weighted) graphs and $\alpha \geq 1, \beta \geq 0$ be reals. A mapping $\varphi: V(G) \rightarrow V(H)$ is called an (α, β) -*quasi-isometry* if it satisfies the following properties:

- for every pair of vertices $u, v \in V(G)$, it holds that

$$\frac{1}{\alpha} \cdot \text{dist}_G(u, v) - \beta \leq \text{dist}_H(\varphi(u), \varphi(v)) \leq \alpha \cdot \text{dist}_G(u, v) + \beta; \text{ and}$$

- for every $w \in V(H)$ there is $u \in V(G)$ such that $\text{dist}_H(w, \varphi(u)) \leq \beta$.

If such a mapping exists, we will also say that G is (α, β) -*quasi-isometric* with H .

3 Distance graphs

In this section we describe a generic construction of a quasi-isometry between a graph and its “coarsening” with respect to some magnitude of distances. The construction can be considered folklore, see e.g. [10, Observation 2.1] and further references mentioned there, but as we will later use its specific properties, we describe it in details.

Let G be a graph and $r \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. Suppose I is an inclusion-maximal distance- r independent set in G . The (I, r) -*distance graph* of G is the edge-weighted graph $H = H(G, I, r)$ defined as follows:

- the vertex set of H is I ; and
- for every two distinct vertices $u, v \in I$ satisfying $\text{dist}(u, v) \leq 3r$, in H we add an edge uv of weight $3r$.

Thus, all edges of H have weight $3r$.

Let us first note that any distance graph derived from a graph of bounded doubling dimension has bounded maximum degree.

Lemma 3.1. *Let G be a graph of doubling dimension m , I be an inclusion-wise maximal distance- r independent set in G for some $r \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$, and H be the (I, r) -distance graph of G . Then $\Delta(H) < 2^{3m}$.*

Proof. Consider a vertex $u \in I$ and let $N_H[u]$ be the closed neighborhood of u in H , i.e., the set comprising u and all its neighbors. Since two vertices $x, y \in I$ are adjacent in H only if $\text{dist}_G(x, y) \leq 3r$, it follows that $N_H[u] \subseteq \text{Ball}_G(u, 3r)$. Since G has doubling dimension at most m , there are 2^{3m} balls $B_1, \dots, B_{2^{3m}}$ of X , each of radius $3r/8$, such that $\text{Ball}_G(u, 3r) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{2^{3m}} B_i$. Observe that for each B_i , the maximum distance between any two vertices in B_i is at most $6r/8$. Since the vertex set of H is a distance- r independent set in G , we have $\text{dist}_G(x, y) > r$ for any distinct $x, y \in N_H[u]$, so each ball B_i contains at most one vertex of $N_H[u]$. As their union contains every vertex of $N_H[u]$, we conclude that $|N_H[u]| \leq 2^{3m}$, hence the degree of u is strictly smaller than 2^{3m} . \square

We now show that every graph is suitably quasi-isometric to any its distance graph.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that G is a graph, I is an inclusion-wise maximal distance- r independent set in G for some $r \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$, and H is the (I, r) -distance graph of G . For every $u \in V(G)$, let $\varphi(u)$ be an arbitrary vertex of I such that $\text{dist}_G(u, \varphi(u)) \leq r$ (such a vertex exists by the maximality of I). Then φ is a $(3, 3r)$ -quasi-isometry from G to H .*

Proof. For the second condition of quasi-isometry, observe that for every $w \in V(H) = I$, we have $\text{dist}_G(w, \varphi(w)) \leq 3r$. So it remains to show that the first property is also satisfied. We may assume without loss of generality that G is connected.

Consider any $u, v \in V(G)$ and let P be a shortest path connecting u and v . Along P we may choose vertices $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k, x_{k+1}$ in order so that $x_0 = u, x_{k+1} = v$ and

- for each $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$ we have $\text{dist}_G(x_i, x_{i+1}) = r$, and

- $\text{dist}_G(x_k, x_{k+1}) \leq r$.

Note that $\sum_{i=0}^k \text{dist}_G(x_i, x_{i+1}) = \text{dist}_G(u, v)$ and we have $kr < \text{dist}_G(u, v) \leq (k+1)r$.

For each $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, k+1\}$, let $v_i = \varphi(x_i) \in I$. Note that $\text{dist}_G(x_i, v_i) \leq r$ by construction. We claim that for every $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$, the vertices v_i and v_{i+1} are adjacent in the graph H . Indeed, $\text{dist}_G(v_i, v_{i+1}) \leq \text{dist}_G(v_i, x_i) + \text{dist}_G(x_i, x_{i+1}) + \text{dist}_G(x_{i+1}, v_{i+1}) \leq 3r$ by the triangle inequality, so we have $v_i v_{i+1} \in E(H)$. Consequently, v_0, \dots, v_{k+1} is a walk that connects $\phi(u) = v_0$ and $\phi(v) = v_{k+1}$ in H . Recalling that each edge in H has weight $3r$, we may now estimate $\text{dist}_H(\varphi(u), \varphi(v))$ as follows:

$$\text{dist}_H(\varphi(u), \varphi(v)) = \text{dist}_H(v_0, v_{k+1}) \leq \sum_{i=0}^k \text{dist}_H(v_i, v_{i+1}) \leq 3r \cdot (k+1) \leq 3 \cdot \text{dist}_G(u, v) + 3r.$$

Next, since $\text{dist}_G(x, y) \leq 3r$ for each edge $xy \in E(H)$ and every edge of H has weight $3r$, it follows that $\text{dist}_G(x, y) \leq \text{dist}_H(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in I$. Now, we can estimate $\text{dist}_G(u, v)$:

$$\text{dist}_G(u, v) \leq \text{dist}_G(u, \varphi(u)) + \text{dist}_G(\varphi(u), \varphi(v)) + \text{dist}_G(\varphi(v), v) \leq r + \text{dist}_H(\varphi(u), \varphi(v)) + r.$$

Thus, we get the following inequalities:

$$\text{dist}_G(u, v) - 2r \leq \text{dist}_H(\varphi(u), \varphi(v)) \leq 3 \cdot \text{dist}_G(u, v) + 3r,$$

which means that also the following is true

$$\frac{1}{3} \cdot \text{dist}_G(u, v) - 3r \leq \text{dist}_H(\varphi(u), \varphi(v)) \leq 3 \cdot \text{dist}_G(u, v) + 3r.$$

All in all, we conclude that φ is indeed a $(3, 3r)$ -quasi-isometry. \square

4 Bounded doubling dimension

In this section we prove Theorem 1.2. We start with the following lemma that encapsulates the key observation: in the presence of a bound on the doubling dimension, the distance- r balanced separators in G can be translated into balanced separators in the corresponding distance graph.

Lemma 4.1. *Let G be a graph with doubling dimension at most m , for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that for some $r \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$, the graph G has distance- r balanced separator number at most k . Then, for every inclusion-wise maximal distance- r independent set I in G , the distance graph $H(G, I, r)$ has treewidth at most $3k \cdot 2^{6m}$.*

Proof. Denote $H = H(G, I, r)$ for brevity. By Lemma 2.2, it suffices to prove that the balanced separator number of H is bounded by $k \cdot 2^{6m}$. Consider any weight function $\mu_H: V(H) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ on H . Let $\mu_G: V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be the weight function on G defined by setting $\mu_G(u) = \mu_H(u)$ for all $u \in I$, and $\mu_G(u) = 0$ for all $u \notin I$. Since G has distance- r balanced separator number at most k , there exist radius- r balls B_1, B_2, \dots, B_k in G such that denoting $X := \bigcup_{i=1}^k B_i$, every connected component of $G - X$ has weight at most $\frac{1}{2} \mu_G(V(G))$.

Let u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k be the centers of balls B_1, B_2, \dots, B_k , respectively. Since I is an inclusion-wise maximal distance- r independent set, we can find vertices $v_1, \dots, v_r \in I$ such that $\text{dist}_G(u_i, v_i) \leq r$, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. Further, let $N_H^2[v_i]$ be the second neighborhood of v_i in H : the set consisting of v_i , the neighbors of v_i , and the neighbors of those neighbors. We define

$$X_H := \bigcup_{i=1}^k N_H^2[v_i] \subseteq V(H) = I.$$

By Lemma 3.1, $\Delta(H) < 2^{3m}$. It follows that

$$|N_H^2[v_i]| \leq 1 + \Delta(H) + \Delta(H) \cdot (\Delta(H) - 1) = 1 + (\Delta(H))^2 \leq 2^{6m}, \quad \text{for each } i \in \{1, \dots, k\}.$$

Therefore, we have $|X_H| \leq k \cdot 2^{6m}$.

We will show that X_H is a balanced separator for μ_H . Note that since X is a balanced separator for μ_G , it suffices to prove the following claim: every two vertices $u, v \in I \setminus X_H$ that are in different components of $G - X$, are also in different components of $H - X_H$.

Consider any path Q connecting u and v in H . Let P be a walk connecting u and v in G obtained by replacing every edge of Q , say xy , with a path R_{xy} in G of length at most $3r$. Such a path exists by the construction of H as it is the (I, r) -distance graph of G . Since u and v are in different components of $G - X$, the walk P must intersect X . This means that for some edge xy of Q and $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, there exists a vertex $w \in V(R_{xy})$ such that $\text{dist}_G(w, u_i) \leq r$, implying that $\text{dist}_G(w, v_i) \leq 2r$. Since the length of R_{xy} is at most $3r$, we have $\text{dist}_G(w, x) \leq \frac{3}{2}r$ or $\text{dist}_G(w, y) \leq \frac{3}{2}r$, implying that $\text{dist}_G(v_i, x) \leq \frac{7}{2}r$ or $\text{dist}_G(v_i, y) \leq \frac{7}{2}r$. Without loss of generality assume the former. Then on a shortest path between x and v_i we may find a vertex z such that $\text{dist}_G(x, z) \leq 2r$ and $\text{dist}_G(v_i, z) \leq 2r$. Since I is an inclusion-wise maximal distance- r independent set, there exists some $z' \in I$ such that $\text{dist}_G(z, z') \leq r$. In particular we have $\text{dist}_G(x, z') \leq 3r$ and $\text{dist}_G(z', v_i) \leq 3r$, which means that x, z' are equal or adjacent in H , and also z', v_i are equal or adjacent in H . We conclude that $x \in N_H^2[v_i]$, so $x \in X_H$ and therefore Q intersects X_H . As Q was chosen arbitrarily, we conclude that u and v lie in different components of $H - X_H$ and we are done. \square

Theorem 1.2. *Let \mathcal{C} be a class of graphs of doubling dimension bounded by m , for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the following conditions are equivalent for any $r \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$:*

- (1) *There exist $k_1, \Delta_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that every member of \mathcal{C} has a tree-partition of spread r , maximum degree at most Δ_1 , and with (k_1, r) -coverable bags.*
- (2) *There exists $k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that every member of \mathcal{C} has a tree decomposition with (k_2, r) -coverable bags.*
- (3) *There exists $k_3 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that every member of \mathcal{C} has distance- r balanced separator number at most k_3 .*
- (4) *There exist $k_4, \Delta_4 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that every member of \mathcal{C} is $(3, 3r)$ -quasi-isometric with an edge-weighted graph of tree-partition width at most k_4 , maximum degree at most Δ_4 , and every edge of weight $3r$.*
- (5) *There exist $k_5, \Delta_5 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that every member of \mathcal{C} is $(\alpha, \beta r)$ -quasi-isometric with an edge-weighted graph of tree-partition width at most k_5 , maximum degree at most Δ_5 , and every edge of weight at least γr .*

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2). We use the standard construction sketched in Section 2. Consider any $G \in \mathcal{C}$ and let (T, bag) be a tree-partition of G with (k_1, r) -coverable bags (we will not use the assumption about the spread or the maximum degree). We construct a new tree T' by subdividing every edge of T , say xy , with a new vertex z_{xy} . On T' we define a new bag function bag' as follows: $\text{bag}'(x) = \text{bag}(x)$ for each $x \in V(T)$ and $\text{bag}'(z_{xy}) = \text{bag}(x) \cup \text{bag}(y)$ for each $xy \in E(T)$. It is straightforward to see that (T', bag') is a tree decomposition of G , and its bag are (k_2, r) -coverable, where $k_2 := 2k_1$.

(2) \Rightarrow (3). Again, we use the standard argument of finding a balanced bag in a tree decomposition. Consider a graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$ and let (T, bag) be a tree decomposition of G with (k_2, r) -coverable bags. Consider also any weight function $\mu: V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. We orient the edges of T according to μ as follows. Consider an edge xy of T ; then removal of xy from T disconnects T into two subtrees, say T_x containing x and T_y containing y . If $\mu(\bigcup_{x' \in V(T_x)} \text{bag}(x')) < \mu(\bigcup_{y' \in V(T_y)} \text{bag}(y'))$, then orient xy towards y , and if $\mu(\bigcup_{x' \in V(T_x)} \text{bag}(x')) > \mu(\bigcup_{y' \in V(T_y)} \text{bag}(y'))$, then orient xy towards x ; in case of a tie, orient xy in any way. Since every orientation of a tree has a sink, there exists a node $x \in V(T)$ such that all edges incident to x are oriented towards x . Then each component of $G - \text{bag}(x)$ has μ -weight at most $\frac{1}{2}\mu(V(G))$, as otherwise the edge connecting x with the tree of $T - x$ containing this component would need to be oriented outwards from x . Since $\text{bag}(x)$ is (k_2, r) -coverable, we conclude that $\text{bag}(x)$ is a (k_2, r) -coverable balanced separator for μ . And as μ was chosen arbitrarily, G has distance- r separation number bounded by $k_3 := k_2$.

(3) \Rightarrow (4). Consider a graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$. Let I be an inclusion-maximal distance- r independent set in G , and let $H := H(G, I, r)$ be the (I, r) -distance graph of G . Then G is $(3, 3r)$ -quasi-isometric with H (by Lemma 3.2), and H has maximum degree bounded by $\Delta_4 := 2^{3m} - 1$ (by Lemma 3.1) and tree-partition-width bounded by $k_4 := \frac{35}{4}\Delta_4 \cdot (3k_3 \cdot 2^{6m} + 1)$ (by Theorem 2.1 and Lemma 4.1).

(4) \Rightarrow (5). Trivial, take $k_5 := k_4$, $\Delta_5 := \Delta_4$, $\alpha := 3$, $\beta := 3$, and $\gamma := 3$.

(5) \Rightarrow (1). We may assume without loss of generality that $\alpha, \beta \geq 1$. Consider a graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$ and let H be an edge-weighted graph with $\text{tpw}(H) \leq k_5$, $\Delta(H) \leq \Delta_5$, and every edge of weight at least γr , such that there is an $(\alpha, \beta r)$ -quasi-isometry $\varphi: V(G) \rightarrow V(H)$. Let $\mathcal{T} = (T, \text{bag})$ be a tree-partition of H of width at most k_5 . Note that we may assume that T has maximum degree at most $\Delta'_5 := k_5 \cdot \Delta_5$, for the total number of neighbors of vertices contained in a single bag of \mathcal{T} is at most Δ'_5 .

Our goal is to construct a suitable tree-partition of G . We first define a new bag function bag' by naturally pulling bag through the quasi-isometry φ :

$$\text{bag}'(x) := \{u \in V(G) \mid \varphi(u) \in \text{bag}(x)\} \quad \text{for each } x \in V(T).$$

We claim that for each $x \in V(T)$, $\text{bag}(x)$ is (k'_5, r) -coverable, where $k'_5 := k_5 \cdot 2^{m \lceil \log \alpha \beta \rceil}$. For this, observe that if we have any pair of vertices $u, v \in V(G)$ with $\varphi(u) = \varphi(v)$, then

$$\frac{1}{\alpha} \text{dist}_G(u, v) - \beta r \leq \text{dist}_H(\varphi(u), \varphi(v)) = 0, \quad \text{implying} \quad \text{dist}_G(u, v) \leq \alpha \beta r.$$

Therefore, for each $v \in \text{bag}'(x)$ with non-empty $\varphi^{-1}(v)$ we can select any vertex $u_v \in \varphi^{-1}(v)$, and then $\varphi^{-1}(v) \subseteq \text{Ball}_G(u_v, \alpha \beta r)$. Since $\text{bag}(x)$ consists of at most k_5 elements, it follows that $\text{bag}'(x)$ is $(k_5, \alpha \beta r)$ -coverable. Since G has doubling dimension at most m , each radius- $\alpha \beta r$ ball in G can be covered by $2^{m \lceil \log \alpha \beta \rceil}$ radius- r balls. It follows that $\text{bag}'(x)$ is (k'_5, r) -coverable, as claimed.

It would be natural to consider (T, bag') as the sought tree-partition, but it is not clear that this is a tree-partition at all. Instead, we will construct a suitable ‘‘coarsening’’ of (T, bag') as follows; see also Fig. 1. Set

$$p := \lceil (\alpha + \beta)\gamma^{-1} \rceil.$$

Root T in an arbitrary node z and let

$$I := \{y \in V(T) \mid \text{dist}_T(y, z) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}\}.$$

Here, the edges of T are considered to be of unit length. Further, define

$$C_z := \{x \in V(T) \mid \text{dist}_T(x, z) < 2p\},$$

and for each $y \in I \setminus \{z\}$,

$$C_y := \{x \in V(T) \mid p \leq \text{dist}_T(x, y) < 2p \text{ and } \text{dist}_T(x, z) > \text{dist}_T(y, z)\}.$$

Note that $\{C_y \mid y \in I\}$ is a partition of $V(T)$. Since T has maximum degree at most Δ'_5 , we have

$$|C_y| \leq 1 + \Delta'_5 + (\Delta'_5)^2 + \dots + (\Delta'_5)^{2p-1} =: M \quad \text{for each } y \in I. \quad (1)$$

Next, define T'' to be the tree on the node set I where $y, y' \in I$ are adjacent in T'' whenever

$$\text{dist}_T(y, y') = p \quad \text{and} \quad |\text{dist}_T(y, z) - \text{dist}_T(y', z)| = p.$$

Then, from the construction we immediately obtain the following:

$$\text{for all } x, x' \in V(T), \text{ if } x \in C_y \text{ and } x' \in C_{y'} \text{ with } y \neq y' \text{ and } yy' \notin E(T''), \text{ then } \text{dist}_T(x, x') > p. \quad (2)$$

Note also that T'' has maximum degree bounded by $\Delta_1 := 1 + (\Delta'_5)^p$.




Figure 1: The construction of T'' in the proof of Theorem 1.2. **Left:** The definition of the sets I (red), C_z , and C_y for a vertex $y \in V(T)$ (both sets blue). **Right:** The vertices and edges of T'' .

We endow T'' with bag function bag'' defined as follows:

$$\text{bag}''(y) := \bigcup_{x \in C_y} \text{bag}'(x), \quad \text{for all } y \in I = V(T'').$$

Since $\text{bag}'(x)$ is (k'_5, r) -coverable for each $x \in V(T)$, from (1) it follows that $\text{bag}''(y)$ is (k_1, r) -coverable for each $y \in V(T)$, where $k_1 := M \cdot k'_5$. It remains to show that $\mathcal{T}'' := (T'', \text{bag}'')$ is a tree-partition of G of spread r .

First, note that $\{\text{bag}'(y) \mid y \in V(T'')\}$ is a partition of $V(G)$. Indeed, this follows from the fact that $\varphi(v) \in V(H)$ is uniquely defined for every $v \in V(G)$ and $\{\text{bag}(x) \mid x \in V(T)\}$ is a partition of $V(H)$. Now consider any $u, v \in V(G)$ with $u \in \text{bag}''(y)$ and $v \in \text{bag}''(y')$, where the nodes y and y' are non-equal and non-adjacent in T'' . Let $x, x' \in V(T)$ be such that $u \in \text{bag}'(x)$ and $v \in \text{bag}'(x')$. By (2), we infer that $\text{dist}_T(x, x') > p$. Since $u \in \text{bag}'(x)$, we have that $\varphi(u) \in \text{bag}(x)$, and similarly $\varphi(v) \in \text{bag}(x')$. Since \mathcal{T} is a tree-partition of H and every edge of H has weight at least γr , the assertion $\text{dist}_T(x, x') > p$ implies that

$$\text{dist}_H(\varphi(u), \varphi(v)) > p \cdot \gamma r \geq (\alpha + \beta)r.$$

Recall now that H is an $(\alpha, \beta r)$ -quasi-isometry. Hence,

$$\text{dist}_H(\varphi(u), \varphi(v)) \leq \alpha \cdot \text{dist}_G(u, v) + \beta r.$$

By combining the two inequalities above we conclude that $\text{dist}_G(u, v) > r$, as required. \square

Let us stress that in the equivalences provided by Theorem 1.2, the constants $k_1, \Delta_1, k_2, k_3, k_4, \Delta_4, k_5, \Delta_5, \alpha, \beta, \gamma$ can be bounded in terms of each other and of m , but the distance parameter r is not involved in those bounds. In other words, the equivalence holds for any choice of the “scale” $r \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. Also, we note that only implications (3) \Rightarrow (4) and (5) \Rightarrow (1) make use of the assumption that the doubling dimension is bounded.

5 General case

In this section we prove Theorems 1.3 and 1.4. In both cases, we will construct a suitable tree decomposition explicitly, using a recursive procedure similar to the one used in the classic algorithms for constructing tree decompositions of graphs, see e.g. [4, Section 7.6]. Theorem 1.3 is very simple: we just iteratively break the graph using balanced separators, accumulating them on the way throughout $\log n$ levels of recursion. The proof of Theorem 1.4 is much more intricate: the recursion keeps track of a separator that can be covered only by a constant number of balls, but the radii of those balls will grow (very slowly) during the recursion.

To facilitate the description of our recursive procedures, we need the following definition of a partial tree decomposition that encapsulates the task of decomposing a subgraph of the given graph. Let G be a graph, S be a subset of vertices of G , and U be the vertex set of a connected component of $G - S$. Then a *partial tree decomposition* of (S, U) is a tree decomposition \mathcal{T} of $G[S \cup U]$ with the following additional property: there is a bag of \mathcal{T} that contains the whole S .

In the description we will use the Iverson notation: for a condition ψ , $[\psi]$ is equal to 1 if ψ is true, and 0 otherwise.

5.1 Superconstant ball count

We first prove Theorem 1.3.

Theorem 1.3. *Let G be an n -vertex graph ($n \geq 2$) whose distance- r balanced separator number is at most $k \geq 2$, for some positive integer r . Then G has a tree decomposition whose every bag is $(k(\log n + 2), r)$ -coverable.*

The construction of the required tree decomposition is encapsulated in the following lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *Fix $r \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. Let G be a graph with distance- r balanced separator number at most k , let S be a set of vertices of G , and let U be the vertex set of a connected component of $G - S$. Suppose S is (ℓ, r) -coverable for some $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, and $|U| \leq 2^m$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there exists a partial tree decomposition of (S, U) whose every bag is $(\ell + k(m + 1), r)$ -coverable.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on $|U|$. The case $|U| = 0$ holds vacuously, as we assume U to be a (non-empty) connected component.

Let us move on to the induction step. Consider the following weight function $\mu: V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$: for $u \in V(G)$, we set $\mu(u) := [u \in U]$. Since G has distance- r balanced separator number bounded by k , we can find a (k, r) -coverable set $Z \subseteq V(G)$ that is a balanced separator for μ . This means that every connected component of $G - Z$ contains at most $|U|/2$ vertices of U .

Let \mathcal{A} be the family of the vertex sets of all connected components of $G[U] - Z$. Since every $A \in \mathcal{A}$ is entirely contained in one connected component of $G - Z$, we have $|A| \leq |U|/2 \leq 2^{m-1}$. Noting that $S \cup Z$ is $(\ell + k, r)$ -coverable, we may apply the induction assumption to the pair $(S \cup Z, A)$ for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$, thus obtaining a partial tree decomposition \mathcal{T}_A of $(S \cup (Z \cap U), A)$ satisfying the following:

- \mathcal{T}_A has a node, say x_A , whose bag contains $S \cup (Z \cap U)$; and
- every bag of \mathcal{T}_A is $((\ell + k) + km, r)$ -coverable, hence $(\ell + k(m + 1), r)$ -coverable.

We may now combine the tree decompositions $\{\mathcal{T}_A \mid A \in \mathcal{A}\}$ into a single tree decomposition \mathcal{T} by adding a new node x with bag $S \cup (Z \cap U)$, and making x adjacent to all the nodes $\{x_A \mid A \in \mathcal{A}\}$. It is straightforward to verify that \mathcal{T} is a tree decomposition of $G[S \cup U]$. Also, the bag of x contains S , so \mathcal{T} is a partial tree decomposition of (S, U) . Finally, $S \cup (Z \cap U)$ is clearly $(\ell + k, r)$ -coverable, hence every bag of \mathcal{T} is $(\ell + k(m + 1), r)$ -coverable. \square

Now, Theorem 1.3 follows immediately by applying Lemma 5.1 for $S = \emptyset$, $U = V(G)$ (assuming without loss of generality that G is connected), $\ell = 0$, and $m = \lceil \log n \rceil$.

5.2 Superconstant radii

We now proceed to the proof of Theorem 1.4. We will need a few extra definitions. Recall that in the context of Theorem 1.4, we assume the existence of balanced separators consisting of k balls of radius r , but to cover the bags of the constructed decomposition, we allow balls of varying radii. We will only use balls of radii being multiples of r , so call a set \mathcal{B} of balls *round* if for every ball $B \in \mathcal{B}$, the radius of B , denoted $\text{rad}(B)$, is a positive integer multiple of r . We will use the following *potential* of \mathcal{B} to keep track of the growth of radii:

$$\Phi(\mathcal{B}) := \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}} 2^{\text{rad}(B)/r}.$$

Note that these definitions depend on the radius parameter $r \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$, fixed in the context.

Also, we set

$$\Gamma := 2000 \cdot k^2 \log k.$$

This will be the bound on the number of balls needed to cover every separator of the constructed tree decomposition. Again, this definition depends on the parameter $k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ fixed in the context.

With these definitions in place, our recursive procedure can be captured by the lemma below.

Lemma 5.2. *Fix $r \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. Let G be a graph with distance- r balanced separator number at most k , let S be a set of vertices of G , and let U be the vertex set of a connected component of $G - S$. Let \mathcal{B} be a round set of at most Γ balls whose union contains S . Suppose $|U| \leq 2^m$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there exists a partial tree decomposition \mathcal{T} of (S, U) such that each bag of \mathcal{T} can be covered with a round set of balls of size at most $\Gamma + 2k$ and potential at most $\Phi(\mathcal{B}) + 4k(m + 1)$.*

Proof. The proof is by induction on the size of U . There is no base of induction needed: the case $|U| = 0$ cannot happen, for U is the vertex set of a (non-empty) connected component of $G - S$.

We proceed to the induction step. First, we need to massage the ball set \mathcal{B} in order to achieve a certain “sparseness” property that will be useful later.

Fix

$$\alpha := 2 + \lceil \log 2k \rceil.$$

For $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$, we shall say that a vertex $x \in V(G)$ is ℓ -crowded with respect to \mathcal{B} if there exist at least 2^α balls in \mathcal{B} of radius exactly ℓr whose centers are at distance at most αr from x . Let \mathcal{B}' denote the set obtained from \mathcal{B} by replacing all such balls with a single ball of radius $r(\ell + \alpha)$ with center at x . Clearly, we have

$$|\mathcal{B}'| < |\mathcal{B}| \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi(\mathcal{B}') \leq \Phi(\mathcal{B}) - 2^\alpha \cdot 2^\ell + 2^{\ell+\alpha} = \Phi(\mathcal{B}).$$

Moreover, by triangle inequality, every ball removed from \mathcal{B} is entirely covered by the ball added, hence

$$\bigcup \mathcal{B}' \supseteq \bigcup \mathcal{B}.$$

By applying this operation repeatedly as long as there exists an ℓ -crowded vertex for some ℓ , we arrive at a round set of balls \mathcal{B}' such that

- $|\mathcal{B}'| \leq |\mathcal{B}|$,
- $\Phi(\mathcal{B}') \leq \Phi(\mathcal{B})$,
- $\bigcup \mathcal{B}' \supseteq \bigcup \mathcal{B}$, and
- no vertex $u \in V(G)$ is ℓ -crowded with respect to \mathcal{B}' , for any $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$.

Also, without loss of generality we may assume that no ball in \mathcal{B}' is entirely contained in another ball from \mathcal{B}' , for the smaller ball can be just removed from \mathcal{B}' without breaking any of the properties above.

We observe the following consequence of the construction of \mathcal{B}' .

Claim 5.3. *For every vertex $u \in V(G)$, there are at most $2\alpha \cdot 2^\alpha$ balls in \mathcal{B}' whose centers lie at distance at most αr from u .*

Proof of Claim. Let \mathcal{B}'_u be the set of balls from \mathcal{B}' whose centers are at distance at most αr from u . Pick any two distinct balls $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}'_u$, say with centers o_1, o_2 and radii $\ell_1 r, \ell_2 r$, respectively. Suppose for a moment that $\ell_1 \geq \ell_2 + 2\alpha$. Then for every vertex $v \in B_2$, we have

$$\text{dist}(v, o_1) \leq \text{dist}(v, o_2) + \text{dist}(o_2, u) + \text{dist}(u, o_1) \leq (\ell_2 + 2\alpha)r \leq \ell_1 r,$$

implying $B_2 \subseteq B_1$, which is a contradiction with the construction of \mathcal{B}' . Similarly, supposition $\ell_2 \geq \ell_1 + 2\alpha$ also leads to a contradiction. Therefore we have $|\ell_1 - \ell_2| < 2\alpha$. Since B_1, B_2 were chosen arbitrarily, we conclude that there are at most 2α different radii among the balls of \mathcal{B}'_u . Since u is not ℓ -crowded with respect to \mathcal{B}' for any $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, every fixed radius gives rise to at most 2^α balls of \mathcal{B}'_u . We conclude that $|\mathcal{B}'_u| \leq 2\alpha \cdot 2^\alpha$, as claimed. \square

With \mathcal{B}' constructed, we proceed with the proof. Since the balls of \mathcal{B}' are not contained one in another, they have pairwise different centers. Let then O be the set of centers of balls from \mathcal{B}' . We define the following weight functions: for $u \in V(G)$, we set

$$\mu_U(u) := [u \in U] \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_O(u) := [u \in O].$$

Since G has distance- r balanced separator number bounded by k , we may find sets \mathcal{D}_U and \mathcal{D}_O of radius- r balls with $|\mathcal{D}_U|, |\mathcal{D}_O| \leq k$ such that $\bigcup \mathcal{D}_U$ is a balanced separator for μ_U and $\bigcup \mathcal{D}_O$ is a balanced separator for μ_O . Define

$$\mathcal{D} := \mathcal{D}_U \cup \mathcal{D}_O \quad \text{and} \quad Z := \bigcup \mathcal{D}.$$

Observe that $|\mathcal{D}| \leq 2k$ and Z is a balanced separator both for μ_U and for μ_O . In what follows we will define a number of sets of balls, see Fig. 2.

Let $O_{\mathcal{D}}$ be the set of centers of balls from \mathcal{D} . Further, let $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}$ be the set of those balls from \mathcal{B}' whose centers lie at distance at most αr from any vertex of $O_{\mathcal{D}}$. By Claim 5.3, we have

$$|\widehat{\mathcal{D}}| \leq 2\alpha \cdot 2^\alpha \cdot |O_{\mathcal{D}}| \leq 4\alpha k \cdot 2^\alpha.$$

Let W be the vertex set of any connected component of $G - Z$. Since Z is a balanced separator for μ_U and for μ_O , we have

$$|W \cap U| \leq |U|/2 \leq 2^{m-1} \quad \text{and} \quad |W \cap O| \leq |O|/2 \leq \Gamma/2.$$

Consider all balls of $\mathcal{B}' - \widehat{\mathcal{D}}$ with centers outside of W and let R_W denote the largest radius among them. We set $R_W := (\alpha - 1)r$ in case there are no such balls or all such balls have radius less than $(\alpha - 1)r$. Let \mathcal{D}_W be the set of balls obtained from the set \mathcal{D} by changing the radius of every ball to $R_W - (\alpha - 2)r$ (note that this value is at least r). Next, let \mathcal{B}'_W be those balls from \mathcal{B}' whose centers lie in W . We set

$$\mathcal{B}_W := \widehat{\mathcal{D}} \cup \mathcal{D}_W \cup \mathcal{B}'_W.$$

Note that

$$|\mathcal{B}_W| \leq |\widehat{\mathcal{D}}| + |\mathcal{D}_W| + |\mathcal{B}'_W| \leq 4\alpha k \cdot 2^\alpha + 2k + \Gamma/2 \leq \Gamma,$$

where the last inequality can be argued by substituting $\alpha = 2 + \lceil \log 2k \rceil$ and $\Gamma = 2000 \cdot k^2 \log k$ followed by direct estimations.

Now let us bound the potential of \mathcal{B}_W . We consider two cases: either there exists a ball $B \in \mathcal{B}' - \widehat{\mathcal{D}}$ with center outside of W and radius at least $(\alpha - 1)r$, or not. If not, then $\mathcal{D}_W = \mathcal{D}$ and all the balls of \mathcal{D}_W have radius r , hence

$$\Phi(\mathcal{B}_W) \leq \Phi(\widehat{\mathcal{D}} \cup \mathcal{B}'_W) + \Phi(\mathcal{D}_W) \leq \Phi(\mathcal{B}') + |\mathcal{D}_W| \cdot 2 \leq \Phi(\mathcal{B}) + 4k.$$

If yes, then since $B \notin \widehat{\mathcal{D}} \cup \mathcal{B}'_W$, we have

$$\Phi(\mathcal{B}_W) \leq \Phi(\widehat{\mathcal{D}} \cup \mathcal{B}'_W) + \Phi(\mathcal{D}_W) \leq \Phi(\mathcal{B}' - \{B\}) + \Phi(\mathcal{D}_W) \leq \Phi(\mathcal{B}') - 2^{R_W/r} + 2k \cdot 2^{R_W/r - (\alpha - 2)}.$$




Figure 2: Various sets of balls in the proof of Theorem 1.4. Blue disks indicate balls from \mathcal{D} and their centers, i.e., the set $O_{\mathcal{D}}$, are shown by blue dots. Balls \mathcal{D}_W are obtained by (possibly) enlarging balls from \mathcal{D} , while keeping the same centers; this is not shown in the picture for the sake of clarity. Red disks depict balls from \mathcal{B}' . Balls filled with diagonal lines have their centers in W , i.e., they belong to \mathcal{B}'_W . Filled red disks indicate the set $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}$, i.e., their centers are close to the vertices from $O_{\mathcal{D}}$.

We have $\alpha - 2 = \lceil \log 2k \rceil$, so

$$\Phi(\mathcal{B}_W) \leq \Phi(\mathcal{B}') - 2^{R_W/r} + 2^{R_W/r} \cdot (2k \cdot 2^{-\log 2k}) = \Phi(\mathcal{B}') \leq \Phi(\mathcal{B}).$$

The intuition of the remainder of the proof is as follows. Recall that $G[U]$ is a connected component of $G - S$, hence the removal of Z breaks $G[U]$ into several smaller components. Each such component $G[A]$ is contained in some component of $G - Z$, say $G[W]$. We would like to apply induction for all components $G[A]$ as above, keeping \mathcal{B}_W as the cover for a suitable set S_A separating A from the rest of the graph. However, the construction of \mathcal{B}_W used only a subset of the balls from \mathcal{B}' , so we need to make sure that the part of S contained in S_A is still covered by \mathcal{B}_W . We do this in the following claim.

Claim 5.4. *Let W be the vertex set of a connected component of $G - Z$. Then every ball $B \in \mathcal{B}' - \widehat{\mathcal{D}}$ whose center lies outside of W is disjoint from $W - \bigcup \mathcal{D}_W$.*

Proof of Claim. Pick any ball $B \in \mathcal{B}' - \widehat{\mathcal{D}}$, say of radius $r' \leq R_W$, and let o be its center; assume $o \notin W$. Pick any vertex $x \in W$ with $\text{dist}(x, o) \leq r'$ and let P be a shortest path connecting o and x . Since $o \notin W$ and $x \in W$, there exists a ball $B' \in \mathcal{D}$ which intersects P ; recall that B' has radius r . Let o' denote the center of B' and let z be any vertex on P that belongs to B' . As P is a shortest path, we have that $\text{dist}(o, x) = \text{dist}(o, z) + \text{dist}(z, x)$, and since $z \in B'$, we have $\text{dist}(o', z) \leq r$. Since $B \notin \widehat{\mathcal{D}}$, we have $\text{dist}(o, z) \geq \text{dist}(o, o') - \text{dist}(o', z) \geq (\alpha - 1)r$, hence

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(x, o') &\leq \text{dist}(o', z) + \text{dist}(z, x) = \text{dist}(o', z) + \text{dist}(o, x) - \text{dist}(o, z) \\ &\leq r + r' - \text{dist}(o, z) \leq r + R_W - (\alpha - 1)r = R_W - (\alpha - 2)r. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, the ball of radius $R_W - (\alpha - 2)r$ with center at o' both contains x and belongs to \mathcal{D}_W . So $x \in \bigcup \mathcal{D}_W$ and the proof is complete. \lrcorner

Let \mathcal{A} comprise the vertex sets of all the connected components of $G[U] - Z$. For $A \in \mathcal{A}$, let $G[W_A]$ be the connected component of $G - Z$ such that $A \subseteq W_A$. We define

$$S_A := (Z \cap (U \cup S)) \cup (S \cap W_A).$$

Let us first verify that the ball set \mathcal{B}_{W_A} covers S_A .

Claim 5.5. *For every $A \in \mathcal{A}$, we have $S_A \subseteq \bigcup \mathcal{B}_{W_A}$.*

Proof of Claim. Pick any $x \in S_A$. If $x \in Z$, then x is covered by some ball in $\mathcal{D}_{W_A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{W_A}$ (recall that every ball of \mathcal{D}_{W_A} is obtained from a ball of \mathcal{D} by possibly increasing the radius). Now, assume that $x \in S \cap W_A$, so in particular there exists a ball $B \in \mathcal{B}'$ that contains x . If the center of B lies in W_A , then $B \in \mathcal{B}'_{W_A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{W_A}$ and consequently $x \in \bigcup \mathcal{B}_{W_A}$. If $B \in \widehat{\mathcal{D}}$, then $x \in \bigcup \widehat{\mathcal{D}} \subseteq \bigcup \mathcal{B}_{W_A}$. And if $B \in \mathcal{B}' - \widehat{\mathcal{D}}$ and the center of B lies outside of W , then by Claim 5.4 we have $x \in \bigcup \mathcal{D}_{W_A} \subseteq \bigcup \mathcal{B}_{W_A}$. \square

Observe that since $|W \cap U| \leq |U|/2$ for each component W of $G - Z$, we also have $|A| \leq |U|/2 \leq 2^{m-1}$ for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Also, by Claim 5.5 we have that \mathcal{B}_{W_A} covers S_A , and recall that $|\mathcal{B}_{W_A}| \leq \Gamma$ and $\Phi(\mathcal{B}_{W_A}) \leq \Phi(\mathcal{B}) + 4k$. Therefore, we may apply induction to the pair (S_A, A) for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$, thus obtaining a partial tree decomposition \mathcal{T}_A of (S_A, A) with the following properties:

- \mathcal{T}_A has a node, say x_A , whose bag contains the whole S_A ; and
- every bag of \mathcal{T}_A can be covered by a round set of at most $\Gamma + 2k$ balls with potential bounded by

$$\Phi(\mathcal{B}_{W_A}) + 4km \leq \Phi(\mathcal{B}) + 4k + 4km = \Phi(\mathcal{B}) + 4k(m + 1).$$

We now combine the decompositions $\{\mathcal{T}_A \mid A \in \mathcal{A}\}$ into a tree decomposition \mathcal{T} of $G[S \cup U]$ by creating a fresh node x with bag $S \cup (Z \cap U)$ and making it adjacent to all the nodes x_A for $A \in \mathcal{A}$. It is straightforward to verify that \mathcal{T} is a tree decomposition of $G[S \cup U]$; we leave the verification to the reader. Since S is contained in the bag of x , \mathcal{T} is a partial tree decomposition of (S, U) .

It only remains to check whether the bag of x – namely $S \cup (Z \cap U)$ – can be covered by a round set of at most $\Gamma + 2k$ balls with potential bounded by $\Phi(\mathcal{B}) + 4k(m + 1)$. For this, we take $\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{D}$. Note that

$$\bigcup (\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{D}) = \bigcup \mathcal{B} \cup \bigcup \mathcal{D} \supseteq S \cup Z \supseteq S \cup (Z \cap U).$$

Finally, we have

$$|\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{D}| \leq |\mathcal{B}| + |\mathcal{D}| \leq \Gamma + 2k \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi(\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{D}) \leq \Phi(\mathcal{B}) + \Phi(\mathcal{D}) \leq \Phi(\mathcal{B}) + 4k \leq \Phi(\mathcal{B}) + 4k(m + 1),$$

where the pre-last inequality follows from each ball of \mathcal{D} having potential 2. \square

Now Theorem 1.4 follows from an easy application of Lemma 5.2.

Theorem 1.4. *There is a constant $c \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds. Let G be an n -vertex graph ($n \geq 2$) whose distance- r balanced separator number is at most $k \geq 2$, for some positive integer r . Then G has a tree decomposition whose every bag is $(ck^2 \log k, r(\log k + \log \log n + c))$ -coverable.*

Proof. Assuming without loss of generality that G is connected, we apply Lemma 5.2 to $S = \emptyset$ and $U = V(G)$. Thus, we obtain a tree decomposition \mathcal{T} of G whose every bag can be covered by a round set of $\Gamma + 2k \leq 2002k^2 \log k$ balls whose potential is at most $4k \cdot (\lceil \log n \rceil + 1)$. Let \mathcal{B} be any such set and denote $R := \max_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \text{rad}(B)$. We have

$$2^{R/r} \leq \Phi(\mathcal{B}) \leq 4k \cdot (\lceil \log n \rceil + 1) \leq 12k \log n.$$

Taking a logarithm, we get $R \leq r \cdot (\log k + \log \log n + \log 12)$, which completes the proof. \square

References

- [1] Eli Berger and Paul D. Seymour. Bounded-diameter tree-decompositions. *Combinatorica*, 44(3):659–674, 2024.
- [2] Édouard Bonnet, Jędrzej Hodor, Tuukka Korhonen, and Tomáš Masařík. Treewidth is polynomial in maximum degree on graphs excluding a planar induced minor. Preprint, arXiv:2312.07962 [math.CO], 2023.
- [3] Maria Chudnovsky, Peter Gartland, Sepehr Hajebi, Daniel Lokshtanov, and Sophie Spirkl. Tree Independence Number IV. Even-hole-free graphs. In *36th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2025*, pages 4444–4461. SIAM, 2025.
- [4] Marek Cygan, Fedor V. Fomin, Łukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michał Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer, 2015.
- [5] Guoli Ding and Bogdan Oporowski. Some results on tree decomposition of graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 20(4):481–499, 1995.
- [6] Peter Gartland. *Quasi-Polynomial Time Techniques for Independent Set and Beyond in Hereditary Graph Classes*. Phd thesis, University of California Santa Barbara, 2023.
- [7] Peter Gartland, Tuukka Korhonen, and Daniel Lokshtanov. On induced versions of Menger’s Theorem on sparse graphs. Preprint, arXiv:2309.08169 [math.CO], 2023.
- [8] Peter Gartland and Daniel Lokshtanov. Independent set on P_k -free graphs in quasi-polynomial time. In *61st IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2020*, pages 613–624. IEEE, 2020.
- [9] Peter Gartland, Daniel Lokshtanov, Tomáš Masařík, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michał Pilipczuk, and Paweł Rzażewski. Maximum weight independent set in graphs with no long claws in quasi-polynomial time. In *56th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2024*, pages 683–691. ACM, 2024.
- [10] Agelos Georgakopoulos and Panos Papasoglu. Graph minors and metric spaces. Preprint, arXiv:2305.07456 [math.CO], 2023.
- [11] Daniel J. Harvey and David R. Wood. Parameters tied to treewidth. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 84(4):364–385, 2017.
- [12] Meike Hatzel and Michał Pilipczuk. On graphs coverable by chubby shortest paths, 2025. Unpublished manuscript.
- [13] Kevin Hendrey, Sergey Norin, Raphael Steiner, and Jérémie Turcotte. On an induced version of Menger’s theorem. *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 31(4), 2024.
- [14] Robert Hickingbotham. Graphs quasi-isometric to graphs with bounded treewidth. Preprint, arXiv:2501.10840 [math.CO], 2025.
- [15] Tuukka Korhonen. Grid induced minor theorem for graphs of small degree. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 160:206–214, 2023.
- [16] Tung Nguyen, Alex Scott, and Paul Seymour. Coarse tree-width. Preprint, arXiv:2501.09839 [math.CO], 2025.
- [17] Kunal Talwar. Bypassing the embedding: algorithms for low dimensional metrics. In *36th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2004*, pages 281–290. ACM, 2004.

- [18] David R. Wood. On tree-partition-width. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 30(5):1245–1253, 2009.