

Strong modeling limits of graphs with bounded tree-width*

Andrzej Grzesik[†] Daniel Král'[‡] Samuel Mohr[‡]

Abstract

The notion of first order convergence of graphs unifies the notions of convergence for sparse and dense graphs. Nešetřil and Ossona de Mendez [J. Symbolic Logic 84 (2019), 452–472] proved that every first order convergent sequence of graphs from a nowhere-dense class of graphs has a modeling limit and conjectured the existence of such modeling limits with an additional property, the strong finitary mass transport principle. The existence of modeling limits satisfying the strong finitary mass transport principle was proved for first order convergent sequences of trees by Nešetřil and Ossona de Mendez [Electron. J. Combin. 23 (2016), P2.52] and for first order sequences of graphs with bounded path-width by Gajarský et al. [Random Structures Algorithms 50 (2017), 612–635]. We establish the existence of modeling limits satisfying the strong finitary mass transport principle for first order convergent sequences of graphs with bounded tree-width.

1 Introduction

The theory of combinatorial limits is an evolving area of combinatorics. The most developed is the theory of graph limits, which is covered in detail in a recent monograph by Lovász [23]. Further results concerning many other combinatorial structures exist, e.g. for permutations [14, 17, 18, 22] or for partial orders [16, 20]. In the case of graphs,

*This work received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 648509). The second and third authors were also supported by the MUNI Award in Science and Humanities of the Grant Agency of Masaryk University. This publication reflects only its authors’ view; the European Research Council Executive Agency is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

[†]Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, Jagiellonian University, Łojasiewicza 6, 30-348 Kraków, Poland. E-mail: Andrzej.Grzesik@uj.edu.pl.

[‡]Faculty of Informatics, Masaryk University, Botanická 68A, 602 00 Brno, Czech Republic. E-mail: {dkral,mohr}@fi.muni.cz.

limits of dense graphs [5–7, 24, 25], also see [8, 9] for a general theory of limits of dense combinatorial structures, and limits of sparse graphs [1–4, 12, 15] evolved to a large extent independently. A notion of first order convergence was introduced by Nešetřil and Ossona de Mendez [33, 35] as an attempt to unify convergence notions in the dense and sparse regimes. This general notion can be applied in the setting of any relational structures, see e.g. [19] for results on limits of mappings. Informally speaking, a sequence of relational structures is *first order convergent* if for any first order property, the density of ℓ -tuples of the elements having this property converges; a formal definition is given in Subsection 2.1. Every first order convergent sequence of dense graphs is convergent in the sense of dense graph convergence from [6, 7], and every first order convergent sequence of graphs with bounded degree is convergent in the sense of Benjamini-Schramm convergence as defined in [2].

A first order convergent sequence of graphs can be associated with an analytic limit object, which is referred to as a *modeling limit* (see Subsection 2.1 for a formal definition). However, not every first order convergent sequence of graphs has a modeling limit [35] and establishing the existence of a modeling limit for first order convergent sequences of graphs is an important problem in relation to first order convergence of graphs: a modeling limit of a first order convergent sequence of dense graphs yields a graphon, the standard limit object for convergent sequences of dense graphs, and a modeling limit of a first order convergent sequence of sparse graphs that satisfies the strong finitary mass transport principle (see Subsection 2.1 for the definition of the principle) yields a graphing, the standard limit object for convergent sequence of sparse graphs.

Nešetřil and Ossona de Mendez [35] conjectured that every first order convergent sequence of graphs from a nowhere-dense class of graphs has a modeling limit. Nowhere-dense classes of graphs include many sparse classes of graphs, in particular, classes of graphs with bounded degree and minor closed classes of graphs; see [26–29, 31] for further details and many applications. The existence of modeling limits for convergent sequences of graphs from a nowhere-dense class of graphs was proven in [34].

Theorem 1 (Nešetřil and Ossona de Mendez [34]). *Let \mathcal{C} be a class of graphs. Every first order convergent sequence of graphs from \mathcal{C} has a modeling limit if and only if \mathcal{C} is nowhere-dense.*

Theorem 1 gives little control on the measure of vertex subsets in a modeling limit, which naturally have the same size in finite graphs, e.g., those joined by a perfect matching. The strong finitary mass transport principle, vaguely speaking, translates natural constraints on sizes of vertex subsets to measures of corresponding vertex subsets in a modeling limit. We refer to Subsection 2.1 for further details.

Nešetřil and Ossona de Mendez [34] conjectured that Theorem 1 can be strengthened by adding a condition that modeling limits satisfy the strong finitary mass transport principle.

Conjecture 1 (Nešetřil and Ossona de Mendez [34, Conjecture 6.1]). *Let \mathcal{C} be a nowhere-dense class of graphs. Every first order convergent sequence of graphs from \mathcal{C} has a modeling limit that satisfies the strong finitary mass transport principle.*

The existence of modeling limits satisfying the strong finitary mass transport principle is known for first order convergent sequences of trees of bounded depth and more generally sequences of graphs with bounded tree-depth [35], sequences of trees [33] and sequences of graphs with bounded path-width [13], which can be interpreted in plane trees. Our main result (Theorem 2) establishes the existence of modeling limits satisfying the strong finitary mass transport principle for sequences of graphs with bounded tree-width.

Theorem 2. *Let k be a positive integer. Every first-order convergent sequence of graphs with tree-width at most k has a modeling limit satisfying the strong finitary mass transport principle.*

While it may seem at the first sight that a proof of Theorem 2 can be an easy combination of a proof of the existence of modeling limits satisfying the strong finitary mass transport principle for trees from [33] and for graphs with bounded path-width [13], this is actually not the case. In fact, the argument in [13] is based on interpretation of graphs with bounded path-width in plane trees, i.e., the results in both [13] and [33] on the existence of modeling limits satisfying the strong finitary mass transport principle do not go significantly beyond the class of trees.

We have not been able to find a first order interpretation of graphs with bounded tree-width in (plane) trees, and we believe that this is related to a possibly complex structure of vertex cuts in such graphs, which need to be addressed using a more general approach. Specifically, the proof of Theorem 2 is based on constructing modeling limits of rooted k -trees, whose orientation essentially encodes the universal weak coloring orders studied in relation to sparse classes of graphs [31], so the proof may be amenable to an extension to graph classes with bounded expansion in principle. We remark that our arguments can be easily adapted to show the existence of modeling limits of first order convergent sequences of graphs with bounded tree-width that are residual, which could yield an alternative proof of Theorem 2 when combined with the framework described in [33, Theorem 1].

The proof of Theorem 2, similarly to the proof of the existence of modeling limits of plane trees in [13], has two steps: the decomposition step, focused on distilling first order properties of graphs in the sequence, and the composition step, focused on constructing a modeling limit consistent with the identified first order properties. These two steps also appear implicitly in [33, 35], in particular, the decomposition step is strongly related to the comb structure results presented in [33, 35]. The arguments of the decomposition step of the proof of Theorem 2 are analogous to those used in [13, Subsection 3.1].

The composition step however requires a conceptual extension of techniques used for modeling limits of trees as we had to deal with vertex separations of sizes larger than one. This was achieved by a careful analysis of different types of paths arising in the orientation corresponding to a weak coloring order. This analysis allows defining the edge set of a modeling limit in a measurable and consistent way for vertex separations of sizes larger than one.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce notation used in the paper, in particular, notions related to graphs with bounded tree-width, first order convergence, and model theory. In Section 3, we overview the decomposition step from [13] and phrase the presented results in the context of graphs with bounded tree-width. The core of the paper is Section 4 where we construct modeling limits of edge-colored rooted k -trees that satisfy the strong finitary mass transport principle. This construction is then used in Section 5 to prove Theorem 2.

2 Notation

We first introduce notation specific for this paper. For the notions not defined here, we refer the reader to [10] and [11] for the graph theory terminology and the model theory terminology, respectively. Some of the less common general notation that we use here include the following. The set of the first k positive integers is denoted by $[k]$ and \mathbb{N}^* denotes the set $\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. If x is a real number and z is a positive real, we write $x \bmod z$ for the unique real $x' \in [0, z)$ such that $x = x' + kz$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Finally, if G is a graph, then $|G|$ stands for the number of vertices of G .

A graph has tree-width at most k if and only if it is a subgraph of a k -tree. We next define a notion of a *rooted k -tree*; the definition is recursive. Any transitive tournament with at most k vertices is a rooted k -tree, and if G is a rooted k -tree and v_1, \dots, v_k are vertices that form a transitive tournament, then the graph obtained from G by adding a new vertex v and adding an edge directed from v to v_i for every $i \in [k]$ is also a rooted k -tree. Observe that every rooted k -tree is an acyclic orientation of a k -tree (the converse need not be true). In the setting above, assume that $v_1 \cdots v_k$ is a directed path; we say that the vertex v_i , $i \in [k]$, is the *i -parent* of the vertex v . We extend this notation to the initial tournament by setting the out-neighbors of each vertex to be its 1-parent, 2-parent, etc. in a way that a vertex with ℓ out-neighbors has an i -parent for every $i \in [\ell]$ and there is an edge from its i -parent to its i' -parent for every $i < i'$. An edge from v to its i -parent is referred to as an *i -edge*. Hence, every edge is an i -edge for some $i \in [k]$. To simplify our exposition, we say that e is an *A -edge* for $A \subseteq [k]$ if e is an i -edge for $i \in A$. Finally, when i is not important for our considerations, we may just say that v' is a *parent* of v , and v is a *child* of v' , if there is a directed edge from v to v' , i.e., when v' is an i -parent of v for some $i \in [k]$.

We state several simple properties of rooted k -trees in the form of propositions to be able to refer to them later in our exposition.

Proposition 3. *The tree-width of a graph G is the minimum k for which there exists an orientation of G being a subgraph of a rooted k -tree.*

Proposition 4. *Let G be a rooted k -tree, v a vertex of G , and w and w' the i -parent and i' -parent of v for some $i < i'$. Then the vertex w' is an i'' -parent of w for some $i'' \leq i'$.*

In our exposition, we will consider rooted k -trees with edges colored with two colors, which we will refer to as *2-edge-colored k -trees*. We would like to emphasize that the edge-coloring and the notion of an i -edge for $i \in [k]$ as defined above are independent, in particular, the color of each edge of the rooted k -tree does not depend on whether the edge is an i -edge or not in any way.

2.1 First order convergence

We now formally define the notion of first order convergence. This notion can be used for all relational structures and beyond, e.g., matroids [21], however, for simplicity, we limit our exposition to graphs, which may (but need not) be directed and edge-colored. In particular, in the case of 2-edge-colored k -trees, we have $k + 2$ binary relations, k of them encoding the relation between vertices and their i -parents, $i \in [k]$, and two encoding the edge-coloring. If ψ is a first order formula with ℓ free variables and G is a (finite) graph, then the *Stone pairing* $\langle \psi, G \rangle$ is the probability that a uniformly chosen ℓ -tuple of vertices of G satisfies ψ . A sequence $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of graphs is *first order convergent* if the limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \psi, G_n \rangle$ exists for every first order formula ψ . Every sequence of graphs has a first order convergent subsequence, see e.g. [30, 32, 35].

A *modeling* M is a (finite or infinite) graph with a standard Borel space on its vertex set equipped with a probability measure such that for every first order formula ψ with ℓ free variables, the set of all ℓ -tuples of vertices of M satisfying a formula ψ is measurable in the product measure. In the analogy to the graph case, the *Stone pairing* $\langle \psi, M \rangle$ is the probability that a randomly chosen ℓ -tuple of vertices satisfies ψ . If a finite graph is viewed as a modeling with a uniform discrete probability measure on its vertex set, then the Stone pairings for the graph and the modeling obtained in this way coincide. A modeling M is a *modeling limit* of a first order convergent sequence $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \psi, G_n \rangle = \langle \psi, M \rangle$$

for every first order formula ψ .

Every modeling limit M of a first order convergent sequence of graphs satisfies the *finitary mass transport principle*. This means that for any two given first order formulas

ψ and ψ' , each with one free variable, such that every vertex v satisfying $\psi(v)$ has at least a neighbors satisfying ψ' and every vertex v satisfying $\psi'(v)$ has at most b neighbors satisfying ψ , it holds that

$$a\langle\psi, M\rangle \leq b\langle\psi', M\rangle.$$

For further details, we refer the reader to [33].

A stronger variant of this principle, known as the *strong finitary mass transport principle*, requires that the following holds for any measurable subsets A and B of the vertices of M : if each vertex of A has at least a neighbors in B and each vertex of B has at most b neighbors in A , then

$$a\mu(A) \leq b\mu(B),$$

where μ is the probability measure of M . Note that the assertion of the finitary mass transport principle requires this inequality to hold only for first order definable subsets of vertices. The strong finitary mass transport principle is satisfied by any finite graph when viewed as a modeling but it need not hold for modelings in general. In particular, the existence of a modeling limit of a first order convergent sequence of graphs does not a priori imply the existence of a modeling limit satisfying the strong finitary mass transport principle. The importance of the strong finitary mass transport principle comes from its relation to graphings, which are limit representations of Benjamini-Schramm convergent sequences of bounded degree graphs: a modeling limit of a first order convergent sequence of bounded degree graphs is a limit graphing of the sequence if and only if M satisfies the strong finitary mass transport principle.

2.2 Hintikka chains

Our argument uses the topology space of Hintikka chains, which was used in [13] and which we now recall. We remark that this space is homeomorphic to the Stone space of $\text{FO}_1^{\text{local}}$ studied in [33–35]. Hintikka sentences are maximally expressive sentences with a certain quantifier depth, and, informally speaking, Hintikka chains form a local variant of this notion with a single free variable.

Consider a signature that includes the signature of graphs and is finite except that it may contain countably many constants. In the exposition of our main argument, the signature will consist of relational symbols for i -edges, $i \in [k]$, the 2-edge-coloring, and constants c_i , $i \in \mathbb{N}$. A first order formula ψ where each quantifier is restricted to the neighbors of one of the vertices is said to be *local*, i.e., it only contains quantifiers of the form $\forall_z x$ or $\exists_z x$ and x is required to be a neighbor of z . For example, we can express that a vertex z has a neighbor of degree exactly one with the local formula $\psi(z) \equiv \exists_z x \forall_x y \ y = z$. The quantifier depth of a local formula is defined in the usual way. A formula is a *d-formula* if its quantifier depth is at most d and it does not involve

any constants except for the constants c_1, \dots, c_d ; a d -formula with no free variables is referred to as a d -sentence.

The same argument as in the textbook case of first order sentences yields that there are only finitely many non-equivalent local d -formulas with one free variable for every d . Let $\text{FO}_1^{\text{local}}$ be a maximal set of non-equivalent local formulas with one free variable, i.e., a set containing one representative from each equivalence class of local formulas with one free variable. If d is an integer, the d -Hintikka type of a vertex v of a (not necessarily finite) graph G is the set of all d -formulas $\psi \in \text{FO}_1^{\text{local}}$ such that $G \models \psi(v)$. A formula $\psi \in \text{FO}_1^{\text{local}}$ with quantifier depth at most d is called a d -Hintikka formula if there exist a (not necessarily finite) graph G and a vertex v of G such that ψ is equivalent to the conjunction of the d -Hintikka type of the vertex v of the graph G (note that ψ must actually be equivalent to one of the formulas in the d -Hintikka type of v).

Fix a d -Hintikka formula ψ . Observe that if v is a vertex of a graph G and v' is a vertex of a graph G' such that $G \models \psi(v)$ and $G' \models \psi(v')$, then the d -Hintikka types of v and v' are the same. So, we can speak of the d -Hintikka type of ψ ; these are all d -formulas ψ' such that if $G \models \psi(v)$, then $G \models \psi'(v)$ for any graph G and any vertex v of G . A *Hintikka chain* is a sequence $(\psi_d)_{d \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that ψ_d is an d -Hintikka formula and the d -Hintikka type of ψ_d contains $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_{d-1}$. If ψ is a d -Hintikka formula, the set $\{(\psi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} : \psi_d = \psi\}$ of Hintikka chains is called *basic*. The set of Hintikka chains (formed by Hintikka formulas with a fixed signature) can be equipped with the topology with the base formed by basic sets; basic sets are clopen in this topology. This defines a Polish space on the set of Hintikka chains.

3 Decomposition step

Our main argument consists of two steps, which we refer in the analogy to [13] as the decomposition step and the composition step. In this section, we present the former, which is analogous to that for plane trees given in [13, Section 3.1]; this step is also closely related to comb structure results presented in [33, 35]. As the decomposition step follows closely [13, Section 3.1] and the arguments are analogous, we present the main ideas and refer the reader to [13, Section 3.1] for further details.

We start with recalling the following structural result from [35].

Theorem 5. *Let \mathcal{C} be a nowhere-dense class of graphs. For every $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that every graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$ contains a set S of at most N vertices such that the d -neighborhood of every vertex $G \setminus S$ contains at most $\varepsilon|G|$ vertices.*

We will enhance the signature of graphs by countably many constants c_i , $i \in \mathbb{N}$; these constants will correspond to vertices described in Theorem 5, whose removal makes the considered sequence of graphs residual in the sense of [33, 34]. We will require that these

constants are interpreted by different vertices, and some of the constants may not be interpreted at all. We will refer to graphs with some vertices being constants as *marked graphs* following the terminology used in [34]. A sequence of marked graphs $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is *null-partitioned* if the following two conditions hold (the definition is analogous to that for plane trees in [13]):

- for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that all constants c_1, \dots, c_k are interpreted in G_n for every $n \geq n_0$, and
- for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist integers n_0 and k_0 such that the size of each components of $G \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{k_0}\}$ is at most $\varepsilon|G_n|$ for every $n \geq n_0$.

Note that the first condition in the definition above guarantees that for every first order formula φ , there exists n_0 such that φ can be evaluated in every G_n , $n \geq n_0$.

The following lemma, which is a counterpart of [13, Lemma 4] and the proof follows the same lines, readily follows from Theorem 5, and corresponds to the existence of marked quasi-residual sequences used in [34].

Lemma 6. *Let \mathcal{C} be a nowhere-dense class of graphs. Let $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a first order convergent sequence of graphs $G_n \in \mathcal{C}$ such that the orders of G_n tend to infinity. There exists a first order convergent null-partitioned sequence $(G'_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ obtained from a subsequence of $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ by interpreting some of the constants c_i .*

The first order properties are linked with Ehrenfeucht-Fraïssé games [11]. It is well-known that two structures satisfy the same first order sentences with quantifier depth d if and only if the duplicator has a winning strategy for the d -round Ehrenfeucht-Fraïssé game played on two structures, in our settings, on two 2-edge-colored rooted marked k -trees. The d -round Ehrenfeucht-Fraïssé game is played by two players, called the spoiler and the duplicator. In the i -th round, the spoiler chooses a vertex of one of the k -trees (the spoiler can choose a different k -tree in different rounds) and places the i -th pebble on that vertex. The duplicator responds with placing the i -th pebble on a vertex of the other k -tree. At the end of the game, the duplicator wins if the mapping between the subtrees induced by the vertices with the pebbles that maps the vertex with the i -pebble in the first k -tree to the vertex with the i -pebble in the other k -tree is an isomorphism preserving the j -parent relations, $j \in [k]$, and the edge colors. If two 2-edge-colored rooted marked k -trees satisfy the same d -sentences if and only if the duplicator has a winning strategy for the d -round Ehrenfeucht-Fraïssé game.

The following theorem is the counterpart of [13, Theorem 6]; the argument to establish it are completely analogous to those in [13, Lemma 5 and Theorem 6].

Theorem 7. *For every integer d , there exist integers D and Γ such that for any two (not necessarily finite) 2-edge-colored rooted marked k -trees G and G' if the k -trees G*

and G' have the same number of vertices of each D -Hintikka type or the number of the vertices of this type is at least Γ in both G and G' , then the sets of d -sentences satisfied by G and G' are the same.

Fix a first order convergent null-partitioned sequence of 2-edge-colored rooted marked k -trees $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. We associate the sequence with two functions, $\nu : \text{FO}_1^{\text{local}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^*$ and $\mu : \text{FO}_1^{\text{local}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, which we will refer to as the *discrete Stone measure* and the *Stone measure* of the sequence (strictly speaking, ν and μ are not measures as they are not defined on a σ -algebra, however, each can be extended to a measure on the σ -algebra formed by Borel sets of Hintikka chains as argued in the next paragraph). If $\psi \in \text{FO}_1^{\text{local}}$, then $\nu(\psi)$ is the limit of the number of vertices u such that $T_n \models \psi(u)$, and $\mu(\psi)$ is the limit of $\langle \psi, T_n \rangle$. If M is a modeling limit, then it is also possible to speak about its discrete Stone measure and its Stone measure by setting $\nu(\psi) = |\{u \text{ s.t. } M \models \psi(u)\}|$ and $\mu(\psi) = \langle \psi, M \rangle$ for $\psi \in \text{FO}_1^{\text{local}}$.

As we have already mentioned, the Stone measure μ defined in the previous paragraph yields a measure on the σ -algebra formed by Borel sets of Hintikka chains. This follows from [35, Theorem 8] but we present a short self-contained argument. Let \mathcal{R} be the ring formed by finite unions of basic sets of Hintikka chains; observe that \mathcal{R} consists of finite unions of disjoint basic sets of Hintikka chains. Let $X \in \mathcal{R}$ be the union of disjoint basic sets corresponding to Hintikka formulas ψ_1, \dots, ψ_k and define $\mu_{\mathcal{R}}(X) = \mu(\psi_1) + \dots + \mu(\psi_k)$. Clearly, the mapping $\mu_{\mathcal{R}}$ is additive. Since every countable union of non-empty pairwise disjoint sets from \mathcal{R} that is contained in \mathcal{R} is finite, $\mu_{\mathcal{R}}$ is a premeasure. By Carathéodory's Extension Theorem, the premeasure $\mu_{\mathcal{R}}$ extends to a measure on the σ -algebra formed by Borel sets of Hintikka chains. We will also use μ to denote this measure, which is uniquely determined by the Stone measure μ ; we believe that no confusion can arise by doing us so.

The following lemma relates first order convergent sequences of 2-edge-colored rooted marked k -trees and their modeling limits. The proof is analogous to that of [13, Lemma 7], and it can also be derived from [33, Theorem 36].

Lemma 8. *Let $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a first order convergent null-partitioned sequence of 2-edge-colored rooted marked k -trees with increasing orders and let ν and μ be its discrete Stone measure and Stone measure, respectively. If M is a 2-edge-colored rooted k -tree modeling such that*

- *the discrete Stone measure of M is ν ,*
- *the Stone measure of M is μ ,*
- *the r -neighborhood in $M \setminus \{c_i, i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of each vertex in $M \setminus \{c_i, i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ has zero measure for every $r \in \mathbb{N}$,*

then M is a modeling limit of $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

4 Composition step

The following theorem is the core result of this paper.

Theorem 9. *Fix a positive integer k . Let $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a first order convergent null-partitioned sequence of 2-edge-colored rooted marked k -trees and let ν and μ be its discrete Stone measure and Stone measure, respectively. Then there exists a modeling limit M such that*

- *the discrete Stone measure of M is ν ,*
- *the Stone measure of M is μ ,*
- *the r -neighborhood of each vertex in $M \setminus \{c_i, i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ has zero measure for every $r \in \mathbb{N}$, and*
- *the modeling M satisfies the strong finitary mass transport principle.*

Proof. We start by extending the mapping ν to Hintikka chains. If $\Psi = (\psi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Hintikka chain, then

$$\nu(\Psi) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \nu(\psi_i).$$

Observe that the support of the measure μ is a subset of $\nu^{-1}(\infty)$. Assume to a contrary that $\nu(\Psi) = k \in \mathbb{N}$ for some Ψ in the support of μ . Then there exists a d -Hintikka chain ψ_d such that $\nu(\psi_d) = k$. Hence, there exists n_0 such that every G_n , $n \geq n_0$, contains exactly k vertices u_1, \dots, u_k such that $G_n \models \psi_d(u_i)$ for $i \in [k]$. Since the sequence $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is null-partitioned (in particular, the orders of $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ tend to infinity), it follows that $\mu(\psi_d) = 0$. Consequently, the measure of the basic set of Hintikka chains corresponding to ψ_d is zero and Ψ is not in the support of μ .

The proof is next split into several steps, each of which we start with a brief title of the step.

Vertex set. The vertex set of the modeling M that we construct consists of two sets: V_f contains all pairs (Ψ, i) where Ψ is a Hintikka chain such that $\nu(\Psi) \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i \in [\nu(\Psi)]$, and $V_\infty = \nu^{-1}(\infty) \times [0, 1]^{2k}$. Note that the set V_f is countable. Also observe that it contains all vertices interpreting the constants.

A Hintikka chain encodes many properties of a vertex. In particular, it uniquely determine the Hintikka chains of the i -parent of the vertex for every $i \in [k]$, which we will refer to as the i -parent Hintikka chains. The Hintikka chain also describes the existence or the non-existence of finite paths consisting only of A -edges for arbitrary $A \subseteq [k]$ between the parents of the vertex. Further, the Hintikka chain determines whether the vertex is one of the constants or contained in the initial tournament (initial stands here for initial in the recursive definition of a rooted k -tree). Finally, the Hintikka

chain also determines the numbers of its children satisfying a particular local first order formula. In a slightly informal way, we will be speaking about all these properties as the properties of the Hintikka chain.

Constants. We now continue with the construction of the modeling M with setting the constants. For each constant c_i , there is at most one Hintikka chain Ψ with $\nu(\Psi) > 0$ such that the vertex of Ψ is the constant c_i . If such a Hintikka chain Ψ exists, then $\nu(\Psi) = 1$ and we set the constant c_i to be the vertex $(\Psi, 1) \in V_f$.

Edges. We next define the edges of the modeling limit M by describing the edges leading from each vertex of M to its parents. To do so, we fix for every $d \in [2k]$ a measure preserving bijection $\zeta^d : [0, 1) \rightarrow [0, 1)^d$ from $[0, 1)$ to $[0, 1)^d$.

We first consider the vertices contained in V_f . Let $(\Psi, m) \in V_f$ (note that such a vertex may be one of the constants). For every $i \in [k]$ such that Ψ implies the existence of an i -parent, we proceed as follows. Let Ψ' be the i -parent Hintikka chain of Ψ ; observe that $\Psi' \neq \Psi$ as a rooted k -tree is acyclic. The definition of the discrete Stone measure and the first order convergence of $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ imply that $\nu(\Psi')$ is a non-zero integer which divides $\nu(\Psi)$. The i -parent of the vertex (Ψ, m) is the vertex (Ψ', m') where $m' = \lceil m\nu(\Psi')/\nu(\Psi) \rceil$, and the color of the edge from (Ψ, m) to (Ψ', m') is determined by the Hintikka chain Ψ . This determines all edges between the vertices of V_f .

Next, consider a vertex $(\Psi, h_1, n_1, \dots, h_k, n_k) \in V_\infty$ and $i \in [k]$. Since there are at most k vertices without an i -parent, the Hintikka chain Ψ determines that the vertex has an i -parent; let Ψ' be the Hintikka chain of the i -parent.

Let L be the smallest integer such that the Hintikka chain Ψ implies the existence of a finite path from $(\Psi, h_1, n_1, \dots, h_k, n_k)$ to its i -parent that uses only $\{1, \dots, L\}$ -edges; such an integer L exists since the i -parent is joined by an i -edge to the vertex, i.e., $L \leq i$. We will describe the edge from $(\Psi, h_1, n_1, \dots, h_k, n_k) \in V_\infty$ to its i -parent by uniquely computing the name of the i -parent based on the integer L and a particular path defined further.

Fix a path P from a vertex $(\Psi, h_1, n_1, \dots, h_k, n_k)$ to the i -parent that uses only $\{1, \dots, L\}$ -edges and subject to all the following conditions. Among all candidates assume that P is chosen to contain the minimum possible number of L -edges and let this number be ℓ_L . Subject to P having ℓ_L L -edges, P has the minimum possible number of $(L - 1)$ -edges after the last L -edge; let this number be ℓ_{L-1} . Subject to P having the minimum possible number of L -edges and having the minimum possible number of $(L - 1)$ -edges after the last L -edge, the path P has the minimum possible number of $(L - 2)$ -edges after the last $\{L - 1, L\}$ -edge; let this number be ℓ_{L-2} . The definition of the path continues until the constraint on the minimum number of 1-edges after the last $\{2, \dots, L\}$ -edge. Note that some ℓ_i defined above may be zero. We fix the path P for the rest of the definition of the edge from $(\Psi, h_1, n_1, \dots, h_k, n_k)$ to its i -parent.

We will call an edge e of P important if e is an j -edge and all $\{j + 1, \dots, L\}$ -edges of P precede e , i.e., the edges of P after e are only $\{1, \dots, j\}$ -edges. Observe that

the number of important edges is equal to $\ell = \ell_1 + \dots + \ell_L$. Set $\Psi^0 = \Psi$ and define Ψ^j to be the Hintikka chain of the head of the j -th important edge; in particular, $\Psi' = \Psi^\ell$. Next, let L_∞ be the largest j such that $\nu(\Psi^j) = \infty$ (possibly $\ell_\infty = \ell$) and observe that $\nu(\Psi^j) = \infty$ for every $j \leq \ell_\infty$ and $\nu(\Psi^j) \in \mathbb{N}$ for every $j > \ell_\infty$. Set $(h_1^0, n_1^0, \dots, h_k^0, n_k^0) = (h_1, n_1, \dots, h_k, n_k)$ and define $(h_1^j, n_1^j, \dots, h_k^j, n_k^j)$ for $j = 1, \dots, \ell_\infty$ recursively as follows. If the j -th important edge of the path P is an m -edge and each vertex with the Hintikka chain Ψ^j has exactly $M \in \mathbb{N}$ children joined by an m -edge that have the same Hintikka chain as the tail of the j -th important edge, then

$$\begin{aligned} (h_1^j, n_1^j, \dots, h_k^j, n_k^j) &= (\zeta_1^{2m-2}(n_m^{j-1}), \dots, \zeta_{2m-2}^{2m-2}(n_m^{j-1}), \\ &\quad h_m^{j-1} + \sqrt{2} \pmod{1}, Mn_m^{j-1} \pmod{1}, \\ &\quad h_{m+1}^{j-1}, n_{m+1}^{j-1}, \dots, h_k^{j-1}, n_k^{j-1}). \end{aligned}$$

If the j -th important edge of the path P is an m -edge and each vertex with the Hintikka chain Ψ^j has infinitely many children joined by an m -edge that have the same Hintikka chain as the tail of the j -th important edge, then

$$\begin{aligned} (h_1^j, n_1^j, \dots, h_k^j, n_k^j) &= (\zeta_1^{2m-1}(n_m^{j-1}), \dots, \zeta_{2m-2}^{2m-1}(n_m^{j-1}), \\ &\quad h_m^{j-1} + \sqrt{2} \pmod{1}, \zeta_{2m-1}^{2m-1}(n_m^{j-1}), \\ &\quad h_{m+1}^{j-1}, n_{m+1}^{j-1}, \dots, h_k^{j-1}, n_k^{j-1}). \end{aligned}$$

If $\ell = \ell_\infty$, we set the i -parent of $(\Psi, h_1, n_1, \dots, h_k, n_k)$ to be $(\Psi', h_1^\ell, n_1^\ell, \dots, h_k^\ell, n_k^\ell)$.

If $\ell > \ell_\infty$, we define integers $t_{\ell_\infty+1}, \dots, t_\ell$ as follows. First, we set $t_{\ell_\infty+1}$ to be $\lfloor n_m^{\ell_\infty} \nu(\Psi^{\ell_\infty+1}) \rfloor + 1$ where m is the integer such that the $(\ell_\infty + 1)$ -th edge of P is an m -edge. Next, we recursively define $t_j = \lceil t_{j-1} \nu(\Psi^j) / \nu(\Psi^{j-1}) \rceil$ for $j = \ell_\infty + 2, \dots, \ell$. Finally, we set the i -parent of $(\Psi, h_1, n_1, \dots, h_k, n_k)$ to be (Ψ', t_ℓ) .

The color of the edge from $(\Psi, h_1, n_1, \dots, h_k, n_k)$ to the i -parent is determined by the Hintikka chain Ψ in either of the two cases ($\ell = \ell_\infty$ and $\ell > \ell_\infty$) discussed above. This concludes the definition of the edge set of the modeling limit M .

Edge consistency. We next verify the following property, which we refer to as *edge consistency*. For every vertex w , the following holds: if w' and w'' are the i' -parent and the i'' -parent of w , $i' < i''$, respectively, and w'' is the i -parent of w' according to the Hintikka chain of w , then w'' is the i -parent of w' in M (see Figure 1 for the notation). Note that this property is not automatically satisfied as the definition of edges from w' to its parents is independent of the definition of edges from w to its parents. The edge consistency property in particular guarantees that if the Hintikka chain of w describes the existence of two different directed paths P and P' from w to another vertex w' , then the same vertex of M is reached by following the edges on P and by following the edges of P' .




Figure 1: Notation used in the edge consistency part of the proof of Theorem 9.

We verify the edge consistency property primarily for vertices w contained in V_∞ . The argument for vertices contained in V_f is straightforward as any parent (Ψ', m') of a vertex $w = (\Psi, m) \in V_f$ satisfies that $m' = \lceil m\nu(\Psi')/\nu(\Psi) \rceil$. Fix a vertex $w = (\Psi, h_1, n_1, \dots, h_k, n_k) \in V_\infty$ and integers $i' < i''$. Let w' and w'' be the i' -parent and the i'' -parent of w , respectively, and suppose that w'' is the i -parent of w' . Let P' and P'' be the paths from the definition of the edges from w to w' and from w to w'' , respectively, and let Q be the path from the definition of the edge from w' to w'' . We first show that we can assume without loss of generality that w' is contained in the path P'' . Suppose that this is not the case and let w_1 be the last vertex of the path P'' that is a child of w' , and let w_2 be the next vertex on the path P'' . The definition of a rooted k -tree implies that both w_2 and w' are parents of w_1 . Since w_2 is not a child of w' , it must be one of its parents by Proposition 4. Suppose that w' is the i_1 -parent of w_1 , w_2 is the i_{12} -parent of w_1 , and w_2 is the i_2 -parent of w' . Observe that $i_{12} > i_1$ and $i_2 \leq i_{12}$; the second inequality follows from Proposition 4. Hence, the edge w_1w_2 is not important and the path P'' with the edge w_1w_2 replaced with $w_1w'w_2$ has the same set of important edges; therefore it can also be used to define the edge from w to w'' . The definition of P' now implies that we can assume that the part of P'' from w to w' is P' and the definition of Q implies that we can assume that the part of P'' from w' to w'' is Q . It follows that w'' is the i -parent of w' as required. Hence, the edge consistency property is established.

We also briefly argue that the modeling M is acyclic, i.e., it does not contain a finite directed cycle. Again, this is straightforward to verify for vertices in V_f as the Hintikka chain of no vertex reachable from a vertex $(\Psi, m) \in V_f$ can be Ψ . Hence, if M has a directed cycle, then it is comprised by vertices of V_∞ only. Observe that if two vertices $(\Psi, h_1, n_1, \dots, h_k, n_k)$ and $(\Psi', h'_1, n'_1, \dots, h'_k, n'_k)$ are joined by a directed path, then there exists j and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n'_j = n_j + m\sqrt{2} \pmod{1}$ and $n'_{j'} = n_{j'}$ for $j' = j+1, \dots, k$. It follows that M has no directed cycle comprised by vertices of V_∞ only.

Measure and its properties. We next define a probability measure on $V_f \cup V_\infty$ as follows. Every subset of V_f is measurable and its measure is zero. The set V_∞ is

equipped with the product σ -algebra and the product measure determined by μ and the uniform (Borel) measure on $[0, 1]^{2k}$.

We next verify that M is a modeling limit, i.e., all first order definable subsets of M^k for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ are measurable, and has the properties given in the statement of the theorem. The edge consistency of M implies that, for every Hintikka chain $\Psi = (\psi_d)_{d \in \mathbb{N}}$, the vertices u of M such that the d -Hintikka type of u is ψ_d for all $d \in \mathbb{N}$ are exactly the vertices whose first coordinate is Ψ , i.e., vertices $(\Psi, i) \in V_f$ if $\nu(\Psi) \in \mathbb{N}$ and vertices $(\Psi, h_1, n_1, \dots, h_k, n_k) \in V_\infty$ if $\nu(\Psi) = \infty$. This implies that every subset of M defined by a local first order formula ψ is open and so measurable, and that the discrete Stone measure and the Stone measure of M are ν and μ , respectively. Since the mappings $f(x) := x + \sqrt{2} \bmod 1$ and ζ^d , $d \in [2k]$, are invertible measure preserving transformations and μ is the Stone measure of a first order convergent sequence of rooted 2-edge-colored k -trees, one can argue using the way that M was constructed that all first order definable subsets of M^k , $k \in \mathbb{N}$, are measurable in the product measure and the modeling M satisfies the strong finitary mass transport principle. This argument follows the lines of the analogous argument in the proof of [33, Lemma 40], and so we briefly sketch the main steps of the argument. We have already argued that every subset of M defined by a local first order formula ψ is open. Next, the subset of M^2 given by the i -th child-parent relation is measurable for every $i \in [k]$ because the mappings f and ζ^d are invertible measure preserving transformations. Theorem 7 yields that whether a k -tuple of vertices of M satisfies a particular formula with k variables depends on the types of the vertices and the configuration formed by them, which can be described by a finite encoding using the child-parent relations in a measurable way. It follows that every first order-definable subset of M^k is measurable, i.e., M is a modeling limit.

Finally, the modeling M satisfies the strong finitary mass transport principle since the mappings $f(x) := x + \sqrt{2} \bmod 1$ and ζ^d , $d \in [2k]$ are invertible measure preserving transformations, and μ is the Stone measure of a first order-convergent sequence of rooted 2-edge-colored k -trees (this is important to translate the bounds on the sizes of vertex subsets from G_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, to M , cf. [33, Lemma 40]).

Residuality. It now remains to verify the third property from the statement of the theorem. Suppose that there exist a vertex $(\Psi, i) \in V_f$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the r -neighborhood of (Ψ, i) in $M \setminus \{c_i, i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ has a positive measure, say $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $\Psi = (\psi_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$. Since $\nu(\Psi)$ is finite, there exists ψ_j such that $\nu(\psi_j) = m$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. By the definition of a null-partitioned sequence of graphs, there exist integers n_0 and k_0 such that the r -neighborhood of each vertex in $T_n \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{k_0}\}$, $n \geq n_0$, contains at most $\varepsilon|T_n|/2m$ vertices. In particular, this holds for the m vertices satisfying ψ_j . This implies that the Stone measure of vertices joined to one of the m vertices satisfying ψ_j by a (not necessarily directed) path of length at most r that avoids c_1, \dots, c_{k_0} does not exceed $\varepsilon/2$ (note that this property is first order expressible and therefore captured by

the Stone measure). Hence, the r -neighborhood of (Ψ, i) in $M \setminus \{c_i, i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ can have measure at most $\varepsilon/2$, contrary to our assumption that its measure is ε .

Next, suppose that there exist a vertex $(\Psi, h_1, n_1, \dots, h_k, n_k) \in V_\infty$ and an integer r such that the r -neighborhood of $(\Psi, h_1, n_1, \dots, h_k, n_k)$ in $M \setminus \{c_i, i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ has a positive measure. The r -neighborhood of $(\Psi, h_1, n_1, \dots, h_k, n_k)$ contains only vertices of V_∞ (otherwise, V_f would contain a vertex whose $2r$ -neighborhood has a positive measure). However, the definition of the modeling M implies that the penultimate coordinates of all the vertices in the r -neighborhood of $(\Psi, h_1, n_1, \dots, h_k, n_k)$ are $h \pm \sqrt{2}i \pmod 1$ for $i = -r, \dots, +r$ (here, we use that the r -neighborhood does not contain a vertex from V_f). Since the set of all vertices of V_∞ with the penultimate coordinate equal to $h \pm \sqrt{2}i \pmod 1$, $i = -r, \dots, +r$, has measure zero, the r -neighborhood of $(\Psi, h_1, n_1, \dots, h_k, n_k)$ in $M \setminus \{c_i, i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ also has measure zero. \square

5 Graphs with bounded tree-width

Theorem 9 almost readily yields our main result. For a formal argument, we use the framework based on interpretation schemes from [35, Sections 6–8], which we now briefly overview. Let κ and λ be two signatures where λ has ℓ relational symbols R_1, \dots, R_ℓ with arities r_1, \dots, r_ℓ . A (first order) *interpretation scheme* I of λ -structures in κ -structures consists of a first order κ -formula Φ_0 with one free variable and first order κ -formulas Φ_i , each with r_i free variables. If K is a κ -structure, then $I(K)$ is the λ -structure with the domain $\{x \in K : \Phi_0(x)\}$ and $R_i = \{(x_1, \dots, x_{r_i}) \in K^{r_i} : \Phi_i(x_1, \dots, x_{r_i})\}$. We say that the relational symbol R_i is *interpreted trivially* by a relational symbol Q (from the signature κ) if $\Phi_i(x_1, \dots, x_{r_i}) = Q(x_1, \dots, x_{r_i})$. The following lemma from [35] links modelings of κ -structures and λ -structures.

Lemma 10. *Let κ and λ be two signatures and $I = \{\Phi_0, \Phi_1, \dots\}$ an interpretation scheme of λ -structures in κ -structures. Suppose that $(L_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a first order convergent sequence of λ -structures and that there exists a first order convergent sequence $(K_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of κ -structures such that $I(K_n) = L_n$. If the sequence $(K_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ has a modeling limit M with a measure μ and $\langle \Phi_0, M \rangle$ is positive, then the λ -structure $I(M)$ together with the measure μ' defined on the measurable subsets Z of $\{x \in M : \Phi_0(x)\}$ as $\mu'(Z) = \mu(Z) / \langle \Phi_0, M \rangle$ is a modeling limit for the sequence $(L_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.*

Moreover, if κ and λ are extensions of the signature of graphs, the edge relational symbol from λ is interpreted trivially by the edge relational symbol from κ , and the modeling M satisfies the strong finitary mass transport principle, then the modeling $I(M)$ also satisfies the strong finitary mass transport principle.

Fix a positive integer k . Theorem 9 and Lemma 8 yield that every first order convergent sequence of 2-edge-colored rooted k -trees has a modeling limit satisfying the strong

finitary mass transport principle. Let $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a first-order convergent sequence of graphs with tree-width at most k . For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ each graph G_n can be considered as a 2-edge-colored rooted k -tree (by Proposition 3), where the 2-edge-coloring represents which edges of the k -tree are edges in G and which not. Hence, Theorem 2 follows immediately from the existence of modeling limits of 2-edge-colored rooted k -tree satisfying the strong finitary mass transport principle using Lemma 10.

Theorem 2. *Let k be a positive integer. Every first-order convergent sequence of graphs with tree-width at most k has a modeling limit satisfying the strong finitary mass transport principle.*

References

- [1] D. Aldous and R. Lyons: *Processes on unimodular random networks*, Electron. J. Probab. **12** (2007), 1454–1508.
- [2] I. Benjamini and O. Schramm: *Recurrence of distributional limits of finite planar graphs*, Electron. J. Probab. **6** (2001).
- [3] B. Bollobás and O. Riordan: *Sparse graphs: metrics and random models*, Random Structures Algorithms **39** (2011), 1–38.
- [4] C. Borgs, J. Chayes and D. Gamarnik: *Convergent sequences of sparse graphs: A large deviations approach*, Random Structures Algorithms **51** (2017), 52–89.
- [5] C. Borgs, J. Chayes, L. Lovász, V. T. Sós, B. Szegedy and K. Vesztergombi: *Graph limits and parameter testing*, Proc. 38th annual ACM Symposium on Theory of computing (STOC) (2006), 261–270.
- [6] C. Borgs, J. T. Chayes, L. Lovász, V. T. Sós and K. Vesztergombi: *Convergent sequences of dense graphs I: Subgraph frequencies, metric properties and testing*, Adv. Math. **219** (2008), 1801–1851.
- [7] C. Borgs, J. T. Chayes, L. Lovász, V. T. Sós and K. Vesztergombi: *Convergent sequences of dense graphs II. Multiway cuts and statistical physics*, Ann. Math. (2012), 151–219.
- [8] L. N. Coregliano and A. A. Razborov: *Natural quasirandomness properties*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.11773 (2020).
- [9] L. N. Coregliano and A. A. Razborov: *Semantic limits of dense combinatorial objects*, Russian Math. Surveys **75** (2020), 627–723.

- [10] R. Diestel: Graph Theory, Graduate texts in mathematics 173, 2010.
- [11] H.-D. Ebbinghaus and J. Flum: Finite model theory, 2005.
- [12] G. Elek: *Note on limits of finite graphs*, Combinatorica **27** (2007), 503–507.
- [13] J. Gajarský, P. Hliněný, T. Kaiser, D. Král', M. Kupec, J. Obdržálek, S. Ordyniak and V. Tůma: *First order limits of sparse graphs: Plane trees and path-width*, Random Structures Algorithms **50** (2017), 612–635.
- [14] R. Glebov, A. Grzesik, T. Klimošová and D. Král': *Finitely forcible graphons and permutons*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B **110** (2015), 112–135.
- [15] H. Hatami, L. Lovász and B. Szegedy: *Limits of locally–globally convergent graph sequences*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **24** (2014), 269–296.
- [16] J. Hladký, A. Máthé, V. Patel and O. Pikhurko: *Poset limits can be totally ordered*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **367** (2015), 4319–4337.
- [17] C. Hoppen, Y. Kohayakawa, C. G. Moreira, B. Ráth and R. M. Sampaio: *Limits of permutation sequences*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B **103** (2013), 93–113.
- [18] C. Hoppen, Y. Kohayakawa, C. G. Moreira and R. M. Sampaio: *Testing permutation properties through subpermutations*, Theor. Comput. Sci. **412** (2011), 3555–3567.
- [19] L. Hosseini, J. Nešetřil and P. Ossona de Mendez: *Limits of mappings*, European J. Combin. **66** (2017), 145–159.
- [20] S. Janson: *Poset limits and exchangeable random posets*, Combinatorica **31** (2011), 529–563.
- [21] F. Kardoš, D. Král', A. Liebenau and L. Mach: *First order convergence of matroids*, European J. Combin. **59** (2017), 150–168.
- [22] D. Král' and O. Pikhurko: *Quasirandom permutations are characterized by 4-point densities*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **23** (2013), 570–579.
- [23] L. Lovász: Large Networks and Graph Limits, Colloquium Publications 60, 2012.
- [24] L. Lovász and B. Szegedy: *Limits of dense graph sequences*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B **96** (2006), 933–957.
- [25] L. Lovász and B. Szegedy: *Testing properties of graphs and functions*, Israel J. Math. **178** (2010), 113–156.

- [26] J. Nešetřil and P. Ossona de Mendez: *Grad and classes with bounded expansion I. Decompositions*, European J. Combin. **29** (2008), 760–776.
- [27] J. Nešetřil and P. Ossona de Mendez: *Grad and classes with bounded expansion II. Algorithmic aspects*, European J. Combin. **29** (2008), 777–791.
- [28] J. Nešetřil and P. Ossona de Mendez: *Grad and classes with bounded expansion III. Restricted graph homomorphism dualities*, European J. Combin. **29** (2008), 1012–1024.
- [29] J. Nešetřil and P. Ossona de Mendez: *On nowhere dense graphs*, European J. Combin. **32** (2011), 600–617.
- [30] J. Nešetřil and P. Ossona de Mendez: *A model theory approach to structural limits*, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae **53** (2012), 581–603.
- [31] J. Nešetřil and P. Ossona de Mendez: *Sparsity: graphs, structures, and algorithms*, Algorithms and Combinatorics 28, 2012.
- [32] J. Nešetřil and P. Ossona de Mendez: *First-order limits, an analytical perspective*, European J. Combin. **52** (2016), 368–388.
- [33] J. Nešetřil and P. Ossona de Mendez: *Modeling limits in hereditary classes: Reduction and application to trees*, Electron. J. Combin. **23** (2016), P2.52.
- [34] J. Nešetřil and P. Ossona de Mendez: *Existence of modeling limits for sequences of sparse structures*, J. Symbolic Logic **84** (2019), 452–472.
- [35] J. Nešetřil and P. Ossona de Mendez: *A unified approach to structural limits and limits of graphs with bounded tree-depth*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **263** (2020).