

# ON THE QUEUE-NUMBER OF GRAPHS WITH BOUNDED TREE-WIDTH

VEIT WIECHERT

ABSTRACT. A *queue layout* of a graph consists of a linear order on the vertices and an assignment of the edges to *queues*, such that no two edges in a single queue are nested. The minimum number of queues needed in a queue layout of a graph is called its *queue-number*.

We show that for each  $k \geq 1$ , graphs with tree-width at most  $k$  have queue-number at most  $2^k - 1$ . This improves upon double exponential upper bounds due to Dujmović et al. and Giacomo et al. As a consequence we obtain that these graphs have track-number at most  $2^{O(k^2)}$ .

We complement these results by a construction of  $k$ -trees that have queue-number at least  $k + 1$ . Already in the case  $k = 2$  this is an improvement to existing results and solves a problem of Rengarajan and Veni Madhavan, namely, that the maximal queue-number of 2-trees is equal to 3.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

A *queue layout* of a graph consists of a linear order on the vertices and an assignment of the edges to *queues*, such that no two edges in a single queue are nested. This is a dual concept to stack layouts, which are defined similarly, except that no two edges in a single stack may cross. The minimum number of queues (stacks) needed in a queue layout (stack layout) of a graph is called its *queue-number* (*stack-number*).

The notion of queue-number was introduced by Heath and Rosenberg [19] in 1992. Queue layouts, however, have been implicitly studied long before and have applications in fault-tolerant processing, sorting with parallel queues, matrix computations, and scheduling parallel processors (see [18, 19, 21] for more details).

In their seminal paper, Heath and Rosenberg characterize graphs admitting a 1-queue layout as so-called *arched leveled-planar* graphs and show that it is NP-hard to recognize them. This is contrasting the situation for graphs with a 1-stack layout, since these graphs are exactly the outerplanar graphs [2] and hence can be recognized in polynomial time. Several other results relating these two types of layouts are studied in [18]. While planar graphs have stack-number at most 4 [26], it remains open whether the queue-number of planar graphs can be bounded by a constant. This is one of the most tantalizing problems regarding queue layouts and it was conjectured to be true by Heath and colleagues [18, 19]. In fact, they even conjecture that the queue-number can be bounded in terms of the stack-number; see [11] for a comprehensive study of this question.

There are some partial results towards a positive resolution of this conjecture. Improving on an earlier result by Di Battista et al. [5], Dujmović showed that planar graphs have queue-number  $O(\log n)$  [7]. This result was extended to graphs with bounded Euler genus by Dujmović, Morin, and Wood [13]. In the more general case

---

*Date:* January 9, 2018.

V. Wiechert is supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft within the research training group ‘Methods for Discrete Structures’ (GRK 1408).

of graphs that exclude a fixed graph as a minor they obtained a  $\log^{O(1)} n$  bound on the queue-number.

In this paper we focus on queue layouts of bounded tree-width graphs. A comprehensive list of references to papers about further aspects of queue layouts can be found in [10].

**1.1. Queue layouts and tree-width.** For several graph classes it is known that they have bounded queue-number. For example, trees have a 1-queue layout [19], outerplanar graphs a 2-queue layout [18], partial 2-trees (that is, series-parallel graphs) have a 3-queue layout [23], and graphs of path-width at most  $p$  have a  $p$ -queue layout [25].

All these graphs have bounded tree-width and it was first asked by Ganley and Heath [15] whether there is a constant upper bound on the queue-number of bounded tree-width graphs (for the stack-number this is true as shown in [15]). This question was answered in the affirmative for graphs that additionally have bounded maximum degree by Wood [25], and later in full by Dujmović and Wood [9] (see also [8]). In the latter result, Dujmović and Wood establish the upper bound  $3^k 6^{(4^k - 3k - 1)/9} - 1$  on the queue-number of graphs with tree-width at most  $k$ . In fact, they provide upper bounds as solutions of a system of equations. Giacomo et al. [6] present an improved system of equations with smaller solutions for each  $k \geq 1$  (without trying to find a nice expression for the corresponding upper bound), but still being double exponential in  $k$ . Answering a question of Dujmović et al. [8] we prove a single exponential upper bound.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $k \geq 0$ . For all graphs  $G$  of tree-width at most  $k$ , we have that*

$$\text{qn}(G) \leq 2^k - 1,$$

where  $\text{qn}(G)$  denotes the queue-number of  $G$ .

Observe that this bound is not only asymptotically much smaller than previous best bounds, it is also strong for small values of  $k$ . As special cases we obtain the above mentioned results that trees and partial 2-trees have queue-number at most 1 and 3, respectively. (And as we will show, 3 is best possible in the latter case). Interestingly, in his PhD thesis Pemmaraju [21] supports a conjecture of him that a certain family of planar 3-trees (the *stellated triangles*) has queue-number  $\Omega(\log n)$ . Of course, this conjecture has already been disproved by Dujmović et al. with their upper bound for  $k$ -trees. However, now with Theorem 1 we even get that planar 3-trees (and more generally partial 3-trees) have queue-number at most 7.

**1.2. Track layouts.** For the proofs of their upper bounds, Dujmović et al. and Giacomo et al. use track layouts of graphs. A *track layout* is a partition of the vertex set into *tracks* together with a linear ordering on each track, such that no two tracks induce a crossing with respect to their orderings (see Section 2 for details). The minimum number of tracks in a track layout of a graph  $G$  is called the *track-number* of  $G$ , and denoted by  $\text{tn}(G)$ .

In [8, 9] the upper bound  $3^k 6^{(4^k - 3k - 1)/9}$  is actually shown for the track-number of graphs of tree-width at most  $k$ . Since the authors can also show that for all graphs  $G$  it holds that  $\text{qn}(G) \leq \text{tn}(G) - 1$ , they obtain their bound for the queue-number from the track-number bound. In this paper we show the following result.

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $k \geq 0$ . For all graphs  $G$  of tree-width at most  $k$ , we have that*

$$\text{tn}(G) \leq (k + 1)(2^{k+1} - 2)^k.$$

Clearly, this  $2^{O(k^2)}$  bound is asymptotically a big improvement upon the double exponential bound discussed before. However, for small values of  $k$  (that is,  $k \in$

$\{1, 2, 3\}$ ) better bounds are known. For example, Giacomo et al. [6] show that graphs of tree-width at most 2 admit a 15-track layout.

**1.3. Three-dimensional drawings.** Another reason to study queue-number and track-number is their connection to three-dimensional drawings of graphs. A *three-dimensional straight-line grid drawing* is an embedding of the vertices onto distinct points of the grid  $\mathbb{Z}^3$  with edges being represented as straight lines that connect their end-vertices, such that any two straight lines intersect only if they share a common end-vertex, and a vertex can only be contained in a straight line if this vertex is the end-vertex of that line.

Using the *moment curve* one can show that each graph has such a drawing. Therefore, we would like to minimize the volume of the bounding box defined by the grid points used for the embedding. Cohen et al. [4] showed that the complete graph  $K_n$  requires  $\Theta(n^3)$  volume. Graphs with bounded chromatic number can be drawn on the three-dimensional grid with  $O(n^2)$  volume, as shown by Pach et al. [20], and this is best possible for complete bipartite graphs. The latter result was improved by Bose et al. [3], who showed that graphs with  $n$  vertices and  $m$  edges need at least  $\frac{1}{8}(n+m)$  volume. In particular, this implies that graphs with three-dimensional drawings of linear volume have only linear many edges. Dujmović and Wood [12] showed that graphs with bounded degeneracy admit drawings with  $O(n^{3/2})$  volume. A major open problem in this area is due to Felsner et al. [14] and asks whether planar graphs can be drawn with linear volume. The best known volume bound for this problem is  $O(n \log n)$  and was given by Dujmović [7] (see also [13] for an extension of this bound to apex-minor free graphs, and an  $n \log^{O(1)} n$  bound for proper minor-closed families). In [8] Dujmović et al. argue that if planar graphs have bounded queue-number, then this would imply a linear bound on the required volume for three-dimensional drawings of planar graphs.

Let us focus on graphs of bounded tree-width now. For outerplanar graphs, which have tree-width at most 2, Felsner et al. [14] proved a linear volume bound. Their argument is based on track layouts and a technique called “wrapping”. Dujmović et al. [8] showed that graphs of track-number at most  $t$  have a  $O(t) \times O(t) \times O(n)$  drawing, implying that bounded tree-width graphs can be drawn with linear volume. To be more precise, using the bounds on the track-number obtained by Dujmović et al. one can deduce that graphs of tree-width at most  $k$  admit  $O(t_k) \times O(t_k) \times O(n)$  drawings, where  $t_k = 3^k \cdot 6^{(4^k - 3k - 1)/9}$ . The resulting volume was slightly improved by Giacomo et al. [6] with their new bounds on track-number. Now, the aforementioned volume bound in terms of the track-number combined with our Theorem 2 significantly reduces the required volume for bounded tree-width graphs to  $2^{O(k^2)} \times 2^{O(k^2)} \times O(n)$ .

**1.4. Lower bounds on the queue-number.** Not much is known with respect to lower bounds on the queue-number of graphs. Heath and Rosenberg [19] give a simple argument for the fact that the queue-number is always larger than half of the edge density. In particular, graph families with more than linear many edges have unbounded queue-number. Gregor et al. [16] show that the  $n$ -dimensional hypercube has queue-number at least  $(\frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon)n - O(1/\varepsilon)$ , for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

To the author’s knowledge, the best published lower bound on the queue-number of planar graphs is 2 [23]. In fact, the example given is an outerplanar graph and hence has tree-width at most 2. In the same paper it is conjectured that there are planar graphs with queue-number 5 (without providing deep evidence for this).

For graphs of tree-width at most  $k$  the situation is similar. It is easy to see that complete graphs and complete bipartite graphs yield examples with queue-number at least  $\lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \rfloor$ , but besides that no lower bounds depending on  $k$  have

been discussed. (On the other hand, this is the case for track-number [6, 8].) For the special case of 2-trees we already mentioned that their queue-number is at most 3. The aforementioned example also shows that there are 2-trees with queue-number 2. We close this gap and thereby answer a question of Rengarajan and Veni Madhavan [23] with the following general lower bound.

**Theorem 3.** *For each  $k \geq 2$ , there is a  $k$ -tree with queue-number at least  $k + 1$ .*

Since 2-trees are planar, we particularly obtain that there are planar graphs with queue-number at least 3.

**1.5. Proof ideas and organization.** For the proof of Theorem 1 we make use of tree-partitions, which were introduced by Seese [24] and independently by Halin [17]. A *tree-partition* of a graph is a partition of its vertex set into “bags”, combined with an underlying tree (or forest) on the bags so that each edge of the graph is either contained within a bag, or it goes along an edge of the tree. The fact that  $k$ -trees admit tree-partitions such that each bag induces a  $(k - 1)$ -tree (see [8]) allows us to apply induction. In contrast to the proofs of [6, 8], we do not construct a track layout as an intermediate step, but directly build a queue layout of the given graph.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we provide necessary definitions and basic propositions for our proofs. In Section 3 we prove Theorem 1 and 2. Then we show the lower bound of Theorem 3 in Section 4. We conclude the paper with some open problems in Section 5.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we introduce the necessary definitions and basic concepts for our main result.

**2.1. Queue and Track layouts.** Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph and let  $L$  be a linear order on the vertices of  $G$ . We say that edges  $uv, u'v' \in E$  are *nested* with respect to  $L$  if  $u < u' < v' < v$  or  $u' < u < v < v'$  in  $L$ . A set  $Q$  of edges in  $G$  forms a *queue* with respect to  $L$  if no two edges of  $Q$  are nested in  $L$ . A *queue layout* of  $G$  is a linear order  $L$  on the vertices of  $G$  together with a partition of the edge set of  $G$  into queues with respect to  $L$ . The minimum number of queues in a queue layout of  $G$  is called the *queue-number* of  $G$ , and denoted by  $qn(G)$ .

There is a different access to the queue-number via  $k$ -rainbows. Given a linear order  $L$  on the vertices of a graph  $G$ , we say that the edges  $a_1b_1, \dots, a_kb_k$  form a *rainbow* of size  $k$  (or  *$k$ -rainbow*) if

$$a_1 < \dots < a_k < b_k < \dots < b_1$$

in  $L$ . Clearly, if  $k$  is the maximum size of a rainbow in  $L$ , then each queue layout using  $L$  as the linear order will consist of at least  $k$  queues. It is not hard to see that  $k$  queues suffice in this case.

**Proposition 4** ([19]). *If  $G$  has no rainbow of size  $k + 1$  with respect to a given linear order  $L$ , then  $G$  has a queue layout using at most  $k$  queues with respect to  $L$ .*

As a consequence, the queue-number can be described as the minimum number taken over the maximal size of a rainbow in a linear order of  $V(G)$ .

We define *track layouts* now. Let  $G$  be graph and let  $\{V_i : i = 1, \dots, \ell\}$  be a partition of  $V(G)$  into independent set. A set  $V_i$  combined with a linear order  $<_i$  on its elements is a *track* of  $G$ . Then a set of tracks  $\{(V_i, <_i) : i = 1, \dots, \ell\}$  is called a *track assignment* of  $G$ . Two edges  $ab$  and  $cd$  form an *X-crossing* in a track assignment  $\{(V_i, <_i) : i = 1, \dots, \ell\}$  if there are  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$  such that  $a <_i c$  and  $d <_j b$ . A track assignment without an X-crossing is called a *track layout*. The




FIGURE 1. A tree-partition of a 3-tree whose vertices are labeled with  $a, b, \dots, m$ . The figure on the right shows the underlying tree of the tree-partition.

minimum number of tracks in a track layout of  $G$  is the *track-number* of  $G$ , which we denote by  $\text{tn}(G)$ .

**2.2. Tree-width.** Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph. A *tree-decomposition* of  $G$  is a pair  $(T, \{T_x\}_{x \in V})$  consisting of a tree  $T$  and a family of non-empty subtrees of  $T$ , such that  $V(T_x) \cap V(T_y) \neq \emptyset$  for each edge  $xy \in E$ . The vertices of  $T$  are called *nodes*, and each node  $u \in V(T)$  induces a *bag*  $\{x \in V : u \in T_x\}$ . The maximum size of a bag minus one is the *width* of the tree-decomposition. Then the *tree-width* of  $G$  can be defined as the minimum width of a tree-decomposition of  $G$ .

For our purposes it is convenient to follow the work of Dujmovic et al. [8] and define  $k$ -trees as introduced by Reed [22]. Given some fixed integer  $k \geq 0$ , a  $k$ -tree is defined recursively. The empty graph is a  $k$ -tree, and each graph obtained by adding a vertex  $v$  to a  $k$ -tree so that the adjacent vertices of  $v$  form a clique of size at most  $k$  is also a  $k$ -tree. (Arnborg and Proskurowski [1] introduced  $k$ -trees in a slightly more restrictive way. They start with defining a  $k$ -clique to be a  $k$ -tree, and each graph obtained from a  $k$ -tree by adding a vertex being adjacent to a  $k$ -clique is also a  $k$ -tree. Sometimes the notion of *strict*  $k$ -trees is used for this more restrictive version.) A subgraph of a  $k$ -tree is called a *partial*  $k$ -tree. It is well-known that a graph has tree-width at most  $k$  if and only if it is a partial  $k$ -tree. Moreover,  $k$ -trees are *chordal* graphs, that is, they do not contain a cycle on more than three vertices as an induced subgraph.

**2.3. Tree-partitions.** For the construction of a queue layout in our main proof, we do not use a specific tree-decomposition, but instead we use a tree-partition. Given a graph  $G$ , a *tree-partition* of  $G$  is a pair consisting of a tree  $T$  (or forest) and a partition of  $V(G)$  into sets  $\{T_x : x \in V(T)\}$  being indexed by the vertices of  $T$ , such that for each edge  $uv$  in  $G$  we either have that  $u, v \in T_x$  for some  $x \in V(T)$ , or there is an edge  $xy$  of  $T$  with  $u \in T_x$  and  $v \in T_y$ . We refer to the vertices of  $T$  as *nodes*, and say that  $T_x$  ( $x \in V(T)$ ) is a *bag* of the tree-partition. By  $G[T_x]$  we denote the subgraph of  $G$  induced by the vertices of  $T_x$ . For an example of a tree-partition see Figure 1. A fixed tree-partition of  $G$  naturally divides the edges of  $G$  into two classes. If both endpoints of an edge are contained in the same bag, then we call it an *intrag edge*. In the other case, so if the two endpoints lie in different bags, then we call it an *interbag edge*.

### 3. UPPER BOUNDS – PROOFS OF THEOREM 1 AND 2

We begin this section with a proof of Theorem 1 and conclude it with a short proof of Theorem 2.

We would like to note that it is enough to prove Theorem 1 for  $k$ -trees. Indeed, this follows from the two facts that each graph of tree-width  $k$  can be extended to a  $k$ -tree by adding edges to the graph (for example, by taking the *chordal completion*

that minimizes the size of the maximum clique), and that the queue-number of a graph does not decrease under the addition of edges.

As noted before, our queue layout construction relies on tree-partitions that capture the structure of  $k$ -trees. The following theorem by Dujmović et al. will give us such a tree-partition.

**Theorem 5** ([8]). *Let  $G$  be a  $k$ -tree. Then there is a rooted tree-partition  $(T, \{T_x : x \in V(T)\})$  of  $G$  such that*

- (i) *for each node  $x$  of  $T$ , the induced subgraph  $G[T_x]$  is a connected  $(k - 1)$ -tree,*
- (ii) *for each nonroot node  $x \in T$ , if  $y \in T$  is the parent node of  $x$  in  $T$  then the vertices in  $T_y$  with a neighbor in  $T_x$  form a clique.*

Let us give a brief sketch of how one can obtain a tree-partition of a connected  $k$ -tree  $G$  as in the theorem. Fix an arbitrary vertex  $r$  of  $G$  and perform a *Breadth-first Search* (BFS) in  $G$  starting from  $r$ . For each  $d \geq 0$  and each component induced by the vertices at distance  $d$  from  $r$ , we introduce a node and associate with this node a bag containing the vertices of the component. Two nodes become adjacent if their corresponding sets of vertices are joined by at least one edge of  $G$ . Using the chordality of  $G$  one can show that the constructed graph  $T$  on the nodes is indeed a tree, and that the vertices of each bag induce a  $(k - 1)$ -tree. Note that the bag of the root node of  $T$  contains only one vertex ( $r$  in our case). The tree-partition in Figure 1 can be obtained with the described procedure by starting the BFS from vertex  $a$ .

Let  $(T, \{T_x : x \in V(T)\})$  be a rooted tree-partition as in the previous theorem. For each nonroot node  $x$  of  $T$ , we denote by  $p(x)$  the parent node of  $x$  in  $T$ . Moreover, we let  $C_x$  denote the clique in  $T_{p(x)}$  according to item (ii) of Theorem 5. For instance, in our example of Figure 1 we have that  $p(x_3) = x_1$  and the vertices of  $C_{x_3}$  are  $b$  and  $c$ .

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1. In fact, we show the following slightly stronger result.

**Theorem 6.** *Let  $k \geq 0$ . For each  $k$ -tree  $G$ , there is a queue layout using at most  $t_k = 2^k - 1$  queues, such that for each  $v \in V(G)$ , edges with  $v$  as their right endpoint in the layout are assigned to pairwise different queues.*

*Proof.* We prove the theorem by induction on  $k$ . In the base case  $k = 0$ , the graph  $G$  has no edges and thus no queues are needed in a queue layout of  $G$ .

Suppose now that  $G$  is a  $k$ -tree for some  $k \geq 1$ , and that the theorem holds for  $k - 1$ . We may assume that  $G$  is connected, since we can combine layouts of different components of  $G$  by putting them next to each other, and since we can reuse queues for different components. Let  $(T, \{T_x : x \in V(T)\})$  be a tree-partition of  $G$  as given by Theorem 5, and denote the root of  $T$  by  $r$ . Then we can assign to each node of  $T$  a *depth* according to its distance to  $r$  (with  $r$  being at depth 0). We say that a vertex  $v \in V(G)$  is at depth  $d$  if  $v$  is contained in a bag of some node at depth  $d$ .


In the following, we first construct a linear order  $L^G$  for the queue layout of  $G$ , and then we assign the edges to queues. Let us give some intuition of how we obtain  $L^G$  now. We build  $L^G$  by going through the depths one by one (starting with depth 0). That is to say, given the already produced linear order of vertices at depth  $d - 1$ , we construct a linear order of vertices at depth  $d$  and append it to the right of the one already produced. To do so, we first specify a linear order  $L_d^T$  on the nodes at depth  $d$  in  $T$ , and then we replace each node  $x$  in  $L_d^T$  by the linear order of the layout obtained by applying induction to the  $(k - 1)$ -tree  $G[T_x]$ .

Now let us be more precise. At depth 0 we only have the root node  $r$  of  $T$ , and hence we set  $L_0^T$  to be the linear order consisting only of  $r$ . We apply induction on

the  $(k-1)$ -tree  $G[T_r]$  and obtain a linear order  $L_0^G$  of vertices at depth 0 (as noted before,  $T_r$  actually contains only one vertex).

So suppose that we have built the linear order  $L_{d-1}^G$  containing all vertices at depth at most  $d-1$  in  $G$ . Let  $L_{d-1}^T$  be the linear order on the nodes at depth  $d-1$  that was produced in the last step of our procedure. We proceed by constructing  $L_d^T$  now.

As in a *lexicographical breadth-first ordering* (Lex-BFS ordering), we order the nodes according to their parent nodes. That is, for nodes  $x, y$  at depth  $d$  we set  $x < y$  in  $L_d^T$  if  $p(x) < p(y)$  in  $L_{d-1}^T$ . It remains to specify the order of nodes sharing a parent node. So suppose that  $x_1, \dots, x_\ell$  have the same parent node  $y$  at depth  $d-1$ . Consider the cliques  $C_{x_1}, \dots, C_{x_\ell}$  in  $T_y$ . For each  $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ , let  $c_{x_i}$  be the rightmost vertex of  $C_{x_i}$  in  $L_{d-1}^G$ . Then we order  $x_1, \dots, x_\ell$  according to the positions of  $c_{x_1}, \dots, c_{x_\ell}$ , which means that we set  $x_i < x_j$  in  $L_d^T$  if  $c_{x_i}$  appears before  $c_{x_j}$  in  $L_{d-1}^G$ . Nodes with the same parent node and with the same rightmost vertex in their corresponding clique are still not ordered with this rule. We order those nodes arbitrarily so that  $L_d^T$  becomes a linear order on nodes at depth  $d$ . To illustrate this procedure, consider the following linear order, where vertices at depth at most 1 of our example from Figure 1 have been ordered so far.



Here we have  $x_1 < x_2$  in  $L_1^T$ , and since  $x_1 = p(x_3) = p(x_4)$  and  $x_2 = p(x_5) = p(x_6)$ , this implies that  $x_3, x_4$  are placed before  $x_5, x_6$  in  $L_2^T$ . As  $c_{x_3} = c < d = c_{x_4}$  in the order, we set  $x_3 < x_4$  in  $L_2^T$ . The order between  $x_5$  and  $x_6$  in  $L_2^T$  can be chosen arbitrarily as  $c_{x_5} = c_{x_6} = g$ .

By Theorem 5 we have that the bag of each node  $x$  in the tree-partition induces a  $(k-1)$ -tree, which allows us to apply induction. Let  $L_x$  be the linear order of the queue layout obtained in this way. Now we replace each node  $x$  in  $L_d^T$  by the linear order  $L_x$ . We put the resulting order of vertices at depth  $d$  to the right of  $L_{d-1}^G$ , which yields a linear order  $L_d^G$  on all vertices at depth at most  $d$ . This concludes the step for vertices at depth  $d$ .

Let  $L^G$  be the linear order on the vertices of  $G$  obtained after going through all the depths. Similarly, let  $L^T$  be the linear order on the nodes of  $T$  obtained during the procedure. Recall that by our applied rules,  $L^T$  has the following properties. For nodes  $x, y \in V(T)$  with depths  $d(x)$  and  $d(y)$ , respectively, it holds that

$$\text{if } d(x) < d(y) \text{ in } T, \text{ then } x < y \text{ in } L^T, \quad (1)$$

$$\text{if } p(x) < p(y) \text{ in } L^T, \text{ then } x < y \text{ in } L^T. \quad (2)$$

Property (1) asserts that  $L^T$  is a BFS ordering, and combined with property (2) we have that  $L^T$  is a Lex-BFS ordering. Therefore, no two edges of  $T$  are nested in  $L^T$ . This has an immediate consequence for interbag edges as they go along edges of  $T$ . Let  $uv$  and  $u'v'$  be interbag edges such that  $u < v$  and  $u' < v'$  in  $L^G$ . Then we have the property that if  $uv$  and  $u'v'$  are nested in  $L^G$ , then  $u$  and  $u'$  are contained in the same bag of the tree-partition.

We need to assign the edges of  $G$  to queues now. For convenience, let us instead first color the edges with colors from  $\{1, \dots, 2t_{k-1} + 1\}$  and then show that each color class induces a queue with respect to  $L^G$ .

We start with the intrabag edges. For each bag  $T_x$ , we color the contained edges according to the queue assignment that is given by the induction hypothesis for the  $(k-1)$ -tree  $G[T_x]$ . We use the colors  $1, \dots, t_{k-1}$  for this coloring (so we reuse the same colors for different bags).

Let us continue with the interbag edges now, and let  $uv \in E(G)$  be one of those. Say,  $u$  is at a smaller depth than  $v$ . Then there is a node  $x$  in  $T$  such that  $v \in T_x$  and  $u \in T_{p(x)}$ . If  $u = c_x$ , then we color  $uv$  with  $2t_{k-1} + 1$ . Otherwise, if  $u \neq c_x$ , then we color  $uv$  with  $i + t_{k-1}$ , where  $i \in \{1, \dots, t_{k-1}\}$  is the color of the intrabag edge  $uc_x$ .

**Claim.** *For each color  $c \in \{1, \dots, 2t_{k-1} + 1\}$ , the edges of  $G$  colored with  $c$  form a queue with respect to  $L^G$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose for a contradiction that there are edges  $uv$  and  $u'v'$  with color  $c$  that are nested in  $L^G$ . Say, we have  $u < u' < v' < v$  in  $L^G$ .

If  $c \in \{1, \dots, t_{k-1}\}$  then  $uv$  and  $u'v'$  are both intrabag edges. However, if they lie within the same bag, then they cannot be nested as we used a valid queue layout from the induction hypothesis. And if they lie in different bags, then both endpoints of one edge lie before both endpoints of the other edge in  $L^G$ . Thus, the two edges are not nested in  $L^G$ , a contradiction.

So we have  $c \geq t_{k-1} + 1$  and consequently  $uv$  and  $u'v'$  are interbag edges. By the consequences of properties (1) and (2) for interbag edges, it follows that  $u$  and  $u'$  both are contained in the same bag. Suppose that this is bag  $T_y$ , and let  $x, x' \in V(T)$  be such that  $v \in T_x$  and  $v' \in T_{x'}$ . Note that  $u \in C_x$  and  $u' \in C_{x'}$ . We distinguish two cases now.

First, suppose  $c = 2t_{k-1} + 1$ . Then  $u$  and  $u'$  are rightmost in  $L^G$  among vertices of  $C_x$  and  $C_{x'}$ , respectively. So we have  $u = c_x$  and  $u' = c_{x'}$ , and hence  $x \neq x'$ . Recall that since  $x$  and  $x'$  share the parent  $y$ , they are ordered in  $L^T$  according to the positions of  $c_x$  and  $c_{x'}$  in  $L^G$ . Thus, as  $c_x = u < u' = c_{x'}$  in  $L^G$ , this implies  $x < x'$  in  $L^T$ . It follows that vertices of  $T_x$  lie before vertices of  $T_{x'}$  in  $L^G$ , a contradiction to our assumption  $v' < v$  in  $L^G$ .

So we are left with the case  $c \in \{t_{k-1} + 1, \dots, 2t_{k-1}\}$ . Let  $i \in \{1, \dots, t_{k-1}\}$  be such that  $c = i + t_{k-1}$ . This time we have  $u \neq c_x$  and  $u' \neq c_{x'}$ . Since  $u \in C_x$  and  $u' \in C_{x'}$ , it follows that  $u < c_x$  and  $u' < c_{x'}$  in  $L^G$ . By our coloring, edges  $uc_x$  and  $u'c_{x'}$  are colored with  $i$ . This implies  $c_x \neq c_{x'}$  as otherwise  $c_x$  is the right endpoint of two intrabag edges of the same color, which is contradicting the induction hypothesis. In particular, this yields  $x \neq x'$ . By our assumption that  $v' < v$  in  $L^G$ , we conclude  $x' < x$  in  $L^T$ . And since  $x$  and  $x'$  are ordered in  $L^T$  according to the positions of  $c_x$  and  $c_{x'}$  in  $L^G$ , this in turn implies  $c_{x'} < c_x$  in  $L^G$ . Together with  $c_{x'}$  being the rightmost vertex of  $C_{x'}$  in  $L^G$ , we deduce  $u < u' < c_{x'} < c_x$  in  $L^G$ . It follows that the edges  $uc_x$  and  $u'c_{x'}$  are nested. However, note that both edges are contained in  $T_y$  and have the same color  $i$ . This is a contradiction to the fact that we colored these edges according to the queue layout obtained by the induction hypothesis. This concludes the proof of the claim.  $\square$

To complete the induction step, we have to show that for each  $v \in V(G)$ , no two edges with  $v$  as their right endpoint in  $L^G$  are colored with the same color. Suppose for a contradiction that there are distinct edges  $uv$  and  $u'v$  colored with  $c$  such that  $u < v$  and  $u' < v$  in  $L^G$ . By the induction hypothesis we cannot have  $c \in \{1, \dots, t_{k-1}\}$ . Therefore, both edges are interbag edges and  $c \in \{t_{k-1} + 1, \dots, 2t_{k-1} + 1\}$ . Let  $x \in V(T)$  be such that  $v \in T_x$ . Then  $u$  and  $u'$  are vertices of the clique  $C_x$ . Since  $c_x$  is the unique vertex of  $C_x$  that is connected by an edge in color  $2t_{k-1} + 1$  to  $v$ , we deduce  $c \neq 2t_{k-1} + 1$ . However, then our coloring



rule for the edges  $uv$  and  $u'v$  implies that the edges  $uc_x$  and  $u'c_x$  are colored with  $c - t_{k-1} \in \{1, \dots, t_{k-1}\}$ . As  $c_x$  is the rightmost vertex of  $C_x$  with respect to  $L^G$ , we obtain that the intrabag edges  $uc_x, u'c_x$  have the same color and the same right endpoint in  $L^G$ , which is a contradiction to the induction hypothesis. We conclude that any two edges with the same right endpoint in  $L^G$  are colored with different colors.

Finally, since we use  $2t_{k-1} + 1 = 2(2^{k-1} - 1) + 1 = 2^k - 1$  queues in our layout of  $G$ , this completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

We continue with a proof of Theorem 2 now. A proper coloring of the vertices of a graph  $G$  is *acyclic* if any two color classes induce a forest (so each cycle receives at least three colors). The minimum number of colors used in an acyclic coloring of  $G$  is the *acyclic chromatic number* of  $G$ . Dujmović et al. [8] obtained the following relationship between track-number and queue-number.

**Lemma 7** ([8]). *Every graph  $G$  with acyclic chromatic number at most  $c$  and queue-number at most  $q$  has track-number*

$$\text{tn}(G) \leq c(2q)^{c-1}.$$

It is well-known that graphs of tree-width at most  $k$  have acyclic chromatic number at most  $k + 1$ . Using this, we immediately obtain a proof of our claimed upper bound on the track-number of bounded tree-width graphs.

*Proof of Theorem 2.* Combine Theorem 1 and Lemma 7.  $\square$

#### 4. LOWER BOUNDS – PROOF OF THEOREM 3

This section is devoted to a proof of Theorem 3. We start by introducing a two-player game between Alice and Bob on  $k$ -trees (where  $k \geq 2$ ), in which Bob has to build a queue-layout of the  $k$ -tree to be presented by Alice. We call it the  *$k$ -queue game*.

The game starts with a  $(k+1)$ -clique and an arbitrary linear order on the vertices of this clique. Now, each round of the game consists of two moves. First, Alice introduces a new vertex  $v$  and chooses a  $k$ -clique of the current graph to which  $v$  becomes adjacent. And second, Bob has to specify the position in the current layout where  $v$  is inserted. Clearly, since we start with a  $(k+1)$ -clique, the graphs obtained during the  $k$ -queue game remain  $k$ -trees. It is the goal of Alice to increase the maximum size of a rainbow in the layout, while Bob tries to keep it small. Alice *wins* the  $k$ -queue game if Bob creates a rainbow of size  $k+1$  in the layout. We aim to show the following.

**Lemma 8.** *For each  $k \geq 1$ , there is an integer  $d_k$  such that Alice has a strategy to win the  $k$ -queue game within at most  $d_k$  rounds.*

Before we prove this lemma, we use it to show Theorem 3. Let us make some new definitions first.

Given a graph  $H$  and a clique  $C$  in  $H$ , we *stack* on  $C$  in  $H$  by introducing a new vertex  $v_C$  and by making  $v_C$  adjacent to the vertices of  $C$ . (Note that if we stack on a  $k$ -clique of a  $k$ -tree, then the resulting graph is also a  $k$ -tree.) If a graph  $H'$  is obtained by simultaneously stacking on each  $k$ -clique of  $H$ , then we call  $H'$  the  *$k$ -stack* of  $H$ .

We iteratively construct a family of  $k$ -trees  $(G_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  now. We let  $G_0$  be a  $(k+1)$ -clique, and given  $i \geq 1$ , we define  $G_i$  to be the  $k$ -stack of  $G_{i-1}$ . Note that with this definition  $G_i$  contains  $G_{i-1}$  as an induced subgraph. In fact,  $G_i$  might contain several distinct induced subgraphs being isomorphic to  $G_{i-1}$ . For us it is important

that  $G_i$  contains an *intrinsic* copy  $G'_{i-1}$  of  $G_{i-1}$  as an induced subgraph, which is such that  $G_i$  can be obtained by taking the  $k$ -stack of  $G'_{i-1}$ .

The following lemma implies Theorem 3

**Lemma 9.** *Given  $k \geq 2$ , let  $d_k$  be as in the statement of Lemma 8. Then the queue-number of the  $k$ -tree  $G_{d_k}$  is at least  $k + 1$ .*

*Proof.* Consider the following variant of the  $k$ -queue game. Alice's move in a round of the variant consists of simultaneously stacking on each possible  $k$ -clique. It is then Bob's task in this round to insert all the newly introduced vertices in the current layout. Again, Alice wins the game when a rainbow of size  $k + 1$  appears in the layout.

Clearly, for Bob this variant is harder than the  $k$ -queue game, in the sense that when Alice has a strategy to win the  $k$ -queue game within  $d$  rounds, then she also has a strategy to win the variant within  $d$  rounds. In particular, Lemma 8 also holds for the variant.

Now suppose for a contradiction that there is a linear order  $L$  on the vertices of  $G_{d_k}$  such that there is no rainbow of size  $k + 1$  in  $L$ . We claim that Bob can use  $L$  as an instruction to avoid rainbows of size  $k + 1$  during the first  $d_k$  rounds in the variant of the  $k$ -queue game.

To see this, observe that after  $i$  rounds of the variant, the game graph is isomorphic to  $G_i$ . This gives rise to a strategy for Bob. He only has to fix induced subgraphs  $H_0, H_1, \dots, H_{d_k}$  of  $G_{d_k}$  such that  $H_{d_k} = G_{d_k}$  and such that  $H_{i-1}$  is the intrinsic copy of  $G_{i-1}$  in  $H_i$  for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, d_k\}$ . (Note that  $H_i$  is isomorphic to  $G_i$ ). Then  $L|_{V(H_i)}$  is an extension of  $L|_{V(H_{i-1})}$  for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, d_k\}$ . Therefore, Bob can ensure that the linear order after  $i$  rounds is equal to  $L|_{V(H_i)}$ . Indeed, he only has to read from  $L$  how to extend the layout in each round. Applying this strategy, the linear order built after  $d_k$  rounds is equal to  $L$ . As  $L$  does not contain a rainbow of size  $k + 1$ , Bob can prevent Alice from winning within the first  $d_k$  rounds. This is a contradiction to Lemma 8 and completes the proof.  $\square$

The rest of this section is devoted to a proof of Lemma 8. We proceed with some definitions that will help us to talk about the  $k$ -queue game.

Let  $G$  be a  $k$ -tree designed by Alice during the game and let  $L$  be the linear order on  $V(G)$  built by Bob. Given  $x, y \in V(G)$ , we say that  $x$  *lies left of*  $y$  in  $L$ , if  $x < y$  in  $L$ , and we say that  $x$  *lies right of*  $y$  in  $L$ , otherwise. We denote the leftmost and the rightmost vertex of a subgraph  $H$  of  $G$  with respect to  $L$  by  $\ell(H)$  and  $r(H)$ , respectively. An edge  $e$  of  $G$  *covers* a subgraph  $H$  of  $G$  in  $L$  if  $\ell(e) \leq \ell(H) < r(H) \leq r(e)$  in  $L$ . The edge  $e$  *strictly covers*  $H$  if we have  $\ell(e) < \ell(H)$  and  $r(H) < r(e)$  in  $L$ . Suppose Alice chooses to stack on the clique  $C$  in her next move. Then we say that Bob *goes inside*  $C$  if he places the new vertex  $v_C$  such that  $\ell(C) < v_C < r(C)$  in the layout. Otherwise, we say that Bob *goes outside*  $C$ . If Bob places  $v_C$  such that  $r(C) < v_C$  in the layout, then he *goes to the right outside* of  $C$ .

We continue by developing a strategy for Alice to win the  $k$ -queue game within a finite number of rounds. Whenever we write that Alice *can force* Bob to make certain moves, then we mean that she has a strategy to win the game unless Bob does these moves.

**Lemma 10.** *For any  $k$ -clique  $C$  in the game graph and any positive number  $d$ , Alice can force Bob to go outside some  $k$ -clique  $C^*$ , which is covered by the edge  $\ell(C)r(C)$ , for at least  $d$  times.*

*Proof.* We describe a strategy for Alice to enforce the claimed behavior of Bob. First, Alice starts to stack on the clique  $C$  in her moves. If Bob does not go inside  $C$  for  $d$  rounds, then  $C$  fulfills the desired requirements.




FIGURE 2. Situation in the 4-queue game (not all existing edges are depicted). If Bob places  $v_{C'}$  to the left of  $v_5$ , then this creates a 5-rainbow.

So suppose that Bob goes inside  $C$  with the vertex  $v_C$  so that  $\ell(C) < v_C < r(C)$  in  $L$ . Note that the vertices in the set  $V(C) \setminus \{\ell(C)\} \cup \{v_C\}$  form a  $k$ -clique  $C'$ . For the next rounds, Alice keeps on stacking on  $C'$ . Again, if Bob does not go inside  $C'$  for  $d$  rounds, then we are done with clique  $C'$ . So suppose that he goes inside  $C'$  with the vertex  $v_{C'}$ . Then the vertices in  $V(C') \setminus \{r(C')\} \cup \{v_{C'}\}$  form a  $k$ -clique  $C''$  that is strictly covered by the edge  $\ell(C)r(C)$ .

Now observe that if Alice applies the above strategy to  $C''$  instead of  $C$ , and Bob keeps on avoiding to go outside  $k$ -cliques as before, then we will see  $k$ -clique being strictly covered by the edge  $\ell(C'')r(C'')$  after several rounds. Clearly, if Alice is repeating this strategy, then we will see a rainbow of size  $k + 1$  in the layout unless Bob goes outside some  $k$ -clique being covered by  $\ell(C)r(C)$  for at least  $d$  times, as claimed.  $\square$

**Lemma 11.** *Let  $C$  be a  $k$ -clique in the game graph with vertices  $v_1, \dots, v_k$  such that  $v_1 < \dots < v_k$  in the layout. Assume that Alice can force Bob to go to the right outside of  $C$  at least  $2k + 1$  many times. Then Alice can enforce the existence of a vertex  $v_{k+1}$  in the layout such that*

- (i)  $v_k < v_{k+1}$  in the layout,
- (ii)  $v_{k+1}$  is adjacent to  $C$ , and
- (iii) Alice can force Bob to go to the right outside of  $C'$  arbitrary many times, where  $C'$  denotes the  $k$ -clique on the vertices  $v_1, v_3, \dots, v_{k+1}$ .

*Proof.* By assumption, Alice can force Bob to place  $2k + 1$  vertices  $p_1, \dots, p_k, v_{k+1}, q_1, \dots, q_k$ , which are adjacent to  $C$ , to the right of  $C$  in the layout. Let us suppose that

$$p_k < \dots < p_1 < v_{k+1} < q_k < \dots < q_1$$

in the layout. For each  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , we let  $e_i := p_i v_i$  and  $e'_i := q_i v_i$ . Observe that the edges  $e_1, \dots, e_k$  and  $e'_1, \dots, e'_k$  form rainbows of size  $k$ .

We claim that  $v_{k+1}$  fulfills the requirements of the statement. Clearly,  $v_{k+1}$  lies to the right of  $v_k$  in the layout and it is adjacent to  $C$ , so (i) and (ii) hold. Denote the  $k$ -clique on the vertices  $v_1, v_3, \dots, v_{k+1}$  by  $C'$ . Even stronger than condition (iii), we can show that whenever Alice introduces a vertex  $v_{C'}$  being adjacent to  $C'$ , then Bob loses unless he puts  $v_{C'}$  to the right of  $C'$  (that is, to the right of  $v_{k+1} = r(C')$ ).

So suppose that Bob places  $v_{C'}$  to the left of  $v_{k+1}$ . Then let  $j \in \{1, \dots, k + 1\}$  be minimal such that  $v_{C'} < v_j$  in the layout (see Figure 2 illustrating an example with  $k = 4$  and  $j = 3$ ). We obtain that the edges  $e'_1, \dots, e'_{j-1}, v_{C'} v_{k+1}, e_j, \dots, e_k$  form a rainbow of size  $k + 1$  in the layout (in Figure 2 this is the rainbow consisting of red edges), implying that Bob lost the game. Therefore, condition (iii) holds.  $\square$

Later, we will show that Alice can reach a winning configuration in the  $k$ -queue game by using the previous lemma. This configuration is described in the following lemma.




FIGURE 3. Winning configuration for Alice.

**Lemma 12.** *Suppose that there are edges  $e, e', e''$ , and a  $k$ -clique  $C$  in the game graph such that*

$$\ell(e) \leq \ell(e') < r(e') < \ell(C) < r(C) < \ell(e'') < r(e'') \leq r(e)$$

*in the layout built by Bob (see Figure 3 for an illustration of such a situation). Then Alice has a strategy to win the current  $k$ -queue game within a finite number of rounds.*

*Proof.* Given the configuration of the statement, we describe a strategy for Alice to win the game. Alice starts by applying the strategy of Lemma 10 to enforce a  $k$ -clique  $C'$  being covered by the edge  $\ell(C)r(C)$ , such that Bob is forced to go outside  $C'$ . Note that  $C'$  and the edges  $e, e', e''$  also build a configuration as described in the statement of the lemma. So we may assume that  $C$  is already the clique on which Bob is forced to go outside. In the following, let  $v_1, \dots, v_k$  be the vertices of  $C$  such that  $v_1 < \dots < v_k$  in the layout.

Next, Alice keeps on stacking on  $C$  until there are  $2k - 1$  vertices adjacent to  $C$  that all lie to the left of  $C$ , or that all lie to the right of  $C$  (as Bob has to go outside  $C$ , this happens after at most  $4k - 3$  rounds). By symmetry, we may assume that these  $2k - 1$  vertices lie left of  $\ell(C)$ . Using the pigeonhole principle we obtain that either there are  $k$  such vertices lying to the left of  $\ell(e)$ , or  $k$  such vertices lying between  $\ell(e)$  and  $\ell(C)$ .

Let us consider the first case now. So we have  $k$  vertices  $p_1, \dots, p_k$  adjacent to  $C$  such that

$$p_k < \dots < p_1 < \ell(e) \leq \ell(e') < r(e') < v_1 < \dots < v_k$$

in the layout. Then the edges  $e', p_1v_1, \dots, p_kv_k$  form a rainbow of size  $k + 1$ , and hence Alice wins the game.

In the second case Bob has placed  $k$  vertices  $p_1, \dots, p_k$  being adjacent to  $C$  such that

$$\ell(e) < p_k < \dots < p_1 < v_1 < \dots < v_k < r(e)$$

in the layout. However, in this case the edges  $p_1v_1, \dots, p_kv_k, e$  form a rainbow of size  $k + 1$ .

This shows that Alice has a winning strategy once the configuration in the statement of the lemma occurs during the game.  $\square$

We are now ready to combine the previous lemmas to give a proof of Lemma 8.

*Proof of Lemma 8.* We describe a strategy for Alice to win the  $k$ -queue game. Using a  $k$ -clique of the initial graph in the game and the strategy of Lemma 10, Alice can enforce a  $k$ -clique  $C_1$  on which Bob has to go outside arbitrary many times. Next, Alice keeps on stacking on  $C_1$  until Bob has placed  $2k + 1$  of the newly introduced vertices either to the left of  $C_1$ , or to the right of  $C_1$ . By symmetry, we may assume that the latter occurs.

Observe that  $C_1$  fulfills the assumptions of Lemma 11. Starting with  $C_1$ , we now describe how Alice can iteratively apply the strategy of this lemma. Let  $v_1, \dots, v_k$




FIGURE 4. Situation in the 4-queue game after applying Lemma 11 four times (starting with the 4-clique on  $v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4$ ). It contains the winning configuration of Figure 3 that is formed by the edges  $v_1v_8, v_1v_2, v_7v_8$  and the clique on  $v_3, v_4, v_5, v_6$ .

be the vertices of  $C_1$  such that  $v_1 < \dots < v_k$  in the layout. Then by Lemma 11 Alice can enforce a vertex  $v_{k+1}$  to the right of  $v_k$ , such that  $v_{k+1}$  is adjacent to  $C_1$  and Bob is forced to go to the right outside of the  $k$ -clique  $C_2$  consisting of the vertices  $v_1, v_3, \dots, v_{k+1}$ .

Clearly, Alice can now apply the strategy of Lemma 11 to  $C_2$ . So suppose that Alice goes on like this for another three times starting with  $C_2$ , and denote the three newly enforced vertices by  $v_{k+2}, v_{k+3}$ , and  $v_{k+4}$ . Then we have  $v_1 < \dots < v_{k+4}$  in the layout, and with their introduction the new vertices became adjacent to the following vertices: vertex  $v_{k+2}$  to  $v_1, v_3, \dots, v_{k+1}$ , vertex  $v_{k+3}$  to  $v_1, v_4, \dots, v_{k+2}$ , and vertex  $v_{k+4}$  to  $v_1, v_5, \dots, v_{k+3}$ . Figure 4 shows this situation for  $k = 4$ .

Next we show that the resulting layout contains the winning configuration of Lemma 12. To see this, let  $e := v_1v_{k+4}$ ,  $e' := v_1v_2$ , and  $e'' := v_{k+3}v_{k+4}$ . Now note that  $e, e', e''$  and the  $k$ -clique formed by the vertices  $v_3, \dots, v_{k+2}$  build such a winning configuration.

Therefore, Alice can apply the strategy of Lemma 12 and wins the  $k$ -queue game. By the arguments used for the proofs of Lemmas 10-12, it is also clear that Alice can exploit her winning strategy within a number of rounds that only depends on  $k$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

## 5. OPEN PROBLEMS

In this paper we showed a single exponential upper bound on the queue-number of graphs with tree-width at most  $k$ . It remains open whether this bound can be reduced to a bound that is polynomial in  $k$ . Regarding our theorem on the lower bound, it seems unlikely that  $k+1$  is the right answer for the maximal queue-number of  $k$ -trees. A quadratic lower bound would already be an exciting improvement.

As mentioned in the introduction, it remains open whether planar graphs have bounded queue-number. The current best upper bound of  $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$  is due to Dujmovic [7]. From below we showed the existence of planar graphs with queue-number at least 3. This is a surprising large gap for such a popular class of graphs.

Concerning the track-number, the analogue upper bound problems are unsolved as well.

## 6. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We are very grateful to Piotr Micek for the many discussions on the topic.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Stefan Arnborg and Andrzej Proskurowski. Linear time algorithms for NP-hard problems restricted to partial  $k$ -trees. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 23(1):11–24, 1989.
- [2] Frank Bernhart and Paul C. Kainen. The book thickness of a graph. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B*, 27:320–331, 1979.

- [3] Prosenjit Bose, Jurek Czyzowicz, Pat Morin, and David R. Wood. The maximum number of edges in a three-dimensional grid-drawing. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.*, 8(1):21–26, 2004.
- [4] R. F. Cohen, P. Eades, Tao Lin, and F. Ruskey. Three-dimensional graph drawing. *Algorithmica*, 17(2):199–208, 1997.
- [5] Giuseppe Di Battista, Fabrizio Frati, and János Pach. On the queue number of planar graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 42(6):2243–2285, 2013.
- [6] Emilio Di Giacomo, Giuseppe Liotta, and Henk Meijer. Computing straight-line 3D grid drawings of graphs in linear volume. *Comput. Geom.*, 32(1):26–58, 2005.
- [7] Vida Dujmović. Graph layouts via layered separators. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 110:79–89, 2015.
- [8] Vida Dujmović, Pat Morin, and David R. Wood. Layout of graphs with bounded tree-width. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 34(3):553–579, 2005.
- [9] Vida Dujmović and David R. Wood. Tree-partitions of  $k$ -trees with applications in graph layout. In *Graph-theoretic concepts in computer science*, volume 2880 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 205–217. Springer, Berlin, 2003.
- [10] Vida Dujmović and David R. Wood. On linear layouts of graphs. *Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 6(2):339–357, 2004.
- [11] Vida Dujmović and David R. Wood. Stacks, queues and tracks: layouts of graph subdivisions. *Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 7(1):155–201, 2005.
- [12] Vida Dujmović and David R. Wood. Upward three-dimensional grid drawings of graphs. *Order*, 23(1):1–20, 2006.
- [13] Vida Dujmović, Pat Morin, and David R. Wood. Layered separators in minor-closed families with applications, 2013.
- [14] Stefan Felsner, Giuseppe Liotta, and Stephen Wismath. Straight-line drawings on restricted integer grids in two and three dimensions. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.*, 7(4):363–398 (electronic), 2003.
- [15] Joseph L. Ganley and Lenwood S. Heath. The pagenumber of  $k$ -trees is  $O(k)$ . *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 109(3):215–221, 2001.
- [16] Petr Gregor, Riste Škrekovski, and Vida Vukašinović. Queue layouts of hypercubes. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 26(1):77–88, 2012.
- [17] R. Halin. Tree-partitions of infinite graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 97(1-3):203217, 1991.
- [18] Lenwood S. Heath, Frank Thomson Leighton, and Arnold L. Rosenberg. Comparing queues and stacks as mechanisms for laying out graphs. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 5(3):398–412, 1992.
- [19] Lenwood S. Heath and Arnold L. Rosenberg. Laying out graphs using queues. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 21(5):927–958, 1992.
- [20] János Pach, Torsten Thiele, and Géza Tóth. Three-dimensional grid drawings of graphs. In *Advances in discrete and computational geometry (South Hadley, MA, 1996)*, volume 223 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 251–255. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1999.
- [21] Sriram Venkata Pemmaraju. *Exploring the powers of stacks and queues via graph layouts*. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 1992. Thesis (Ph.D.)—Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- [22] B. A. Reed. Algorithmic aspects of tree width. In *Recent advances in algorithms and combinatorics*, pages 85–107. New York, NY: Springer, 2003.
- [23] S. Rengarajan and C. E. Veni Madhavan. Stack and queue number of 2-trees. In *Computing and combinatorics (Xi'an, 1995)*, volume 959 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 203–212. Springer, Berlin, 1995.
- [24] D. Seese. Tree-partite graphs and the complexity of algorithms. Fundamentals of computation theory, Proc. 5th Int. Conf., Cottbus/Ger. 1985, Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. 199, 412–421 (1985)., 1985.
- [25] David R. Wood. Queue layouts, tree-width, and three-dimensional graph drawing. In *FST TCS 2002: Foundations of software technology and theoretical computer science (Kanpur)*, volume 2556 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 348–359. Springer, Berlin, 2002.
- [26] Mihalis Yannakakis. Embedding planar graphs in four pages. *J. Comput. System Sci.*, 38(1):36–67, 1989. 18th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (Berkeley, CA, 1986).

(V. Wiechert) Institut für Mathematik, Technische Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany  
*E-mail address:* wiechert@math.tu-berlin.de