
SEPARATION NUMBER AND TREEWIDTH, REVISITED[‡]

Hussein Houdrouge[‡], Babak Miraftab[‡], and Pat Morin[‡]

ABSTRACT. We give a constructive proof of the fact that the treewidth of a graph G is bounded by a linear function of the separation number of G .

1 Introduction

In this paper every graph G is undirected and simple with vertex set $V(G)$ and edge set $E(G)$. A *tree decomposition* of a graph G is a collection $\mathcal{T} := (B_x : x \in V(T))$ of vertex subsets of G , called *bags*, that is indexed by the vertices of a tree T and such that (i) for each $vw \in E(G)$, there exists $x \in V(T)$ such that $\{v, w\} \subseteq B_x$; and (ii) for each vertex v of G , $T[\{x \in V(T) : v \in B_x\}]$ is a non-empty (connected) subtree of T . The *width*, of a tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} := (B_x : x \in V(T))$ is $\text{width}(\mathcal{T}) := \max\{|B_x| : x \in V(T)\} - 1$. The *treewidth* of a graph G is $\text{tw}(G) := \min\{\text{width}(\mathcal{T}) : \mathcal{T} \text{ is a tree decomposition of } G\}$.

A *separation* (A, B) of a graph G is a pair of subsets of $V(G)$ with $A \cup B = V(G)$ and such that, for each edge vw of G , $\{v, w\} \subseteq A$ or $\{v, w\} \subseteq B$. The *order* of a separation (A, B) is $|A \cap B|$. A separation (A, B) is *balanced* if $|A \setminus B| \leq \frac{2}{3}|V(G)|$ and $|B \setminus A| \leq \frac{2}{3}|V(G)|$. The *separation number* $\text{sn}(G)$ of a graph G is the minimum integer a such that every subgraph of G has a balanced separation of order at most a .

A short argument due to Robertson and Seymour [5], which has many generalizations, shows that for any graph G , $\text{sn}(G) \leq \text{tw}(G) + 1$. We reprove a weak converse of this fact, first proven by Dvořák and Norin [4].

Theorem 1. *There exists a constant c such that, for every graph G , $\text{tw}(G) \leq c \cdot \text{sn}(G)$.*

To put [Theorem 1](#) into context, consider the following classic result of Robertson and Seymour [5]. Let W be a subset of the vertices in a graph G . A separation (A, B) of G is *W -balanced* if $|(A \setminus B) \cap W| \leq \frac{2}{3}|W|$ and $|(B \setminus A) \cap W| \leq \frac{2}{3}|W|$.

Theorem 2 (Robertson and Seymour [5]). *Let G be a graph with the property that, for each $W \subseteq V(G)$, G has a W -balanced separation of order at most a . Then $\text{tw}(G) < 4a$.*

The proof of [Theorem 2](#) is constructive and intuitive. Indeed, a tree decomposition of G can be constructed iteratively by an algorithm that maintains a separation (X, Y) of order at most $3a$, and a tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} := (B_x : x \in V(T))$ of $G[Y]$ of width less than $4a$ in which some bag B_x contains all vertices in $W := X \cap Y$. To extend \mathcal{T} , the algorithm takes a W -balanced separation (A, B) of $G[X]$ of order at most a and creates a leaf x' in T

[‡]This research was partly funded by NSERC.

[‡]School of Computer Science, Carleton University.

adjacent to x with $B_{x'} := W \cup (A \cap B)$.¹ Note that $|B_{x'}| \leq |W| + |A \cap B| \leq 4a$, so the width of \mathcal{T} is still less than $4a$. Let $X_A := A$, $Y_A := Y \cup (A \cap B)$, $G_A := G[X_A \cup Y_A] = G[Y \cup A]$ and $W_A := X_A \cap Y_A$. Then \mathcal{T} is a tree decomposition $G[Y_A]$ of width less than $4a$ and (X_A, Y_A) is a separation of G_A of order $|W_A| \leq |W \setminus B| + |A \cap B| \leq \frac{2}{3}|W| + a \leq 3a$ and a bag $B_{x'}$ of \mathcal{T} contains W_A . The algorithm then inductively extends \mathcal{T} to a tree decomposition of G_A of width less than $4a$. Let $X_B := B$, $Y_B := Y \cup A$, $G_B := G$, and $W_B := X_B \cap Y_B$. Then \mathcal{T} is a tree decomposition of Y_B of width less than $4a$ and (X_B, Y_B) is a separation of G_B of order $|W_B| \leq |W \cap B| + |A \cap B| \leq \frac{2}{3}|W| + a \leq 3a$ and a bag $B_{x'}$ of \mathcal{T} contains W_B . The algorithm finishes by inductively extending \mathcal{T} to a tree decomposition of $G_B = G$ of width less than $4a$.

The challenge in establishing [Theorem 1](#) is that the balanced separations in the definition of separation number are only guaranteed to balance the entire set of vertices in an arbitrary subgraph of G , rather than separating G in such a way the vertices in a specific $W \subseteq V(G)$ are balanced. In the language of the previous paragraph, there is no reason that a balanced separation (A, B) of $G[X]$ should have $|(A \setminus B) \cap W| < |W|$ and $|(B \setminus A) \cap W| < |W|$.

Dvořák and Norin [[4](#)] prove [Theorem 1](#) with the constant $c = 15$. Their proof is by contradiction and makes use of the relationship between treewidth and brambles established by Seymour and Thomas [[6](#)]. Essentially, they show that if $\text{tw}(G) > 15 \text{sn}(G)$, then there exists an α -tame W -cloud (a special kind of network flow) which contradicts the choice of a haven (a special kind of flap assignment) that is derived from a bramble of order $15 \text{sn}(G)$. The crux of their proof [[4](#), Proof of Lemma 7] involves showing that, for a *carefully chosen* $W \subseteq V(G)$, a balanced separation of the subgraph $H \subseteq G$ induced by the saturated and hungry vertices of an α -tame W -cloud is, by necessity, also (roughly) W -balanced. This leads to a contradiction related to the choice of W .²

In the current paper, we prove [Theorem 1](#) with the constant $c = 7915/139 < 56.943$. Despite the larger constant, we believe that the proof given here has a number of advantages. The proof is constructive: It proves that $\text{tw}(G) \leq c \cdot \text{sn}(G)$ by constructing a tree decomposition of G having width less than $c \cdot \text{sn}(G)$. The proof requires fewer definitions and previous results: It does not use brambles, havens, or network flows. Brambles and havens are avoided entirely. The use of network flows is replaced by a collection of paths obtained from repeated applications of the simplest version of Menger's Theorem on vertex-disjoint paths in (unweighted undirected) graphs.

Most importantly, the proof given here is built around a generalization of W -balanced separations: For a sufficiently large $t > 0$ and an *arbitrary* $W \subseteq V(G)$ of size at least $t \cdot \text{sn}(G)$, there exists a subgraph H of G with $W \subseteq V(H)$ and a separation (X, Y) of G with $W \subseteq Y$ and $V(G) \setminus V(H) \subseteq X \setminus Y$ and having order less than $|W|$ and such that any balanced separation of H must necessarily balance $W \cup (X \cap Y)$. This leads to an algorithm for constructing a tree decomposition of G similar in spirit to the algorithm outlined above. In particular, recursively taking balanced separations of subgraphs of H gives an algorithm

¹A W -balanced separation (A, B) of $G[X]$ can be obtained from a W -balanced separation (A', B') of G by setting $(A, B) := (A' \cap X, B' \cap X)$.

²In an earlier draft of their result, Dvořák and Norin [[3](#)], used tangles rather than brambles and havens, and confluent flows [[1](#)] rather than W -clouds to establish [Theorem 1](#) with the constant $c = 105$. They credit an anonymous referee for help in reducing the value of c .

for constructing a tree decomposition $\mathcal{T}_Y := (B_x : x \in V(T_Y))$ of $G[Y]$ in which some bag B_y contains $W \cup (X \cap Y)$. Then, recursion/induction is used to find a tree decomposition $\mathcal{T}_X := (B_x : x \in V(T_X))$ of $G' := G[X]$ in which some bag B_x contains $W' := X \cap Y$. Joining \mathcal{T}_X and \mathcal{T}_Y with the edge xy gives a tree T such that $\mathcal{T} := (B_x : x \in V(T))$ is the desired tree decomposition of G .

2 Preliminaries

For standard graph theoretic terminology and notations, see Diestel [2]. Let G be a graph and let $S, T \subseteq V(G)$. An *S-T path* in G is a path in G whose first vertex is in S and whose last vertex is in T . We say that a set $Z \subseteq V(G)$ *separates* S and T if $G - Z$ has no S - T path. When Z separates S and T , any separation (X, Y) of G with $S \subseteq X$, $T \subseteq Y$ and $X \cap Y = Z$ is called an *(S, Z, T)-separation*. To see that an (S, Z, T) -separation always exists, let G_X be the union of all components of $G - Z$ that contain a vertex of S . Then $S \subseteq V(G_X) \cup Z$. Take G_Y to be the union of all components of $G - Z$ not included in G_X . Since every component of G_X contains a vertex in S , no component of G_X contains a vertex in T . Therefore, $T \subseteq V(G_Y) \cup Z$. Then the separation $(X, Y) := (V(G_X) \cup Z, V(G_Y) \cup Z)$ is an (S, Z, T) -separation.

We make use of the following vertex connectivity version of Menger's Theorem (see, for example, Diestel [2, Theorem 3.3.1]):

Theorem 3 (Menger's Theorem). *Let G be a graph and let S and T be subsets of $V(G)$. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, exactly one of the following is true:*

- (i) G contains k pairwise vertex-disjoint S - T paths; or
- (ii) G has a vertex subset Z of size less than k that separates S and T .

The *depth*, $\text{depth}_T(x)$ of a node x in a rooted tree T is the number of edges on the path from x to the root of T . The *height* of a rooted tree T is $\text{height}(T) := \max\{\text{depth}_T(x) : x \in V(T)\}$. For a node x in a rooted tree T , we let T_x denote the subtree of T induced by all the descendants of x , including x itself.

A tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} := (B_x : x \in V(T))$ of a graph G is *rooted* if the tree T is rooted. If x_0 is the root of T , then B_{x_0} is called the *root bag* of \mathcal{T} . Let $\mathcal{T} := (B_x : x \in V(T))$ be a rooted tree decomposition of a graph G where x_0 is the root of T . The *boundary* of x_0 is $\partial_{\mathcal{T}}(x_0) := \emptyset$. For a node x of T with parent y , the *boundary* of x is $\partial_{\mathcal{T}}(x) := B_x \cap B_y$. The *interior* of a node x in T is $\text{int}_{\mathcal{T}}(x) := (\bigcup_{x' \in V(T_x)} B_{x'}) \setminus \partial_{\mathcal{T}}(x)$. Note that, for the root x_0 of T , $\text{int}_{\mathcal{T}}(x_0) = V(G)$. From these definitions it follows that, if $T_y \supseteq T_x$, then $\text{int}_{\mathcal{T}}(y) \supseteq \text{int}_{\mathcal{T}}(x)$ and that $\text{int}_{\mathcal{T}}(y) \cup \partial_{\mathcal{T}}(y) \supseteq \text{int}_{\mathcal{T}}(x) \cup \partial_{\mathcal{T}}(x)$. In particular, these inclusion relations hold for every ancestor y of x .

The following lemma allows us to restrict a rooted tree decomposition of a graph G to the subgraph $G[Y]$ induced by one part of a separation (X, Y) in such a way that $X \cap Y$ is contained in a single bag (the root bag) of the resulting decomposition.

Lemma 4. *Let $\mathcal{T}' := (B'_x : x \in V(T'))$ be a rooted tree decomposition of a graph G , let (X, Y) be a separation of G , and let $B_x := (B'_x \cap Y) \cup (\text{int}_{\mathcal{T}'}(x) \cap X \cap Y)$ for each $x \in V(T')$. Then $\mathcal{T} := (B_x : x \in V(T'))$ is a tree decomposition of $G[Y]$. Furthermore, the root bag B_{x_0} of \mathcal{T} contains $X \cap Y$.*

Proof. The “furthermore” clause of the statement is immediate, since $\text{int}_{\mathcal{T}}(x_0) = V(G)$, so $B_{x_0} \subseteq V(G) \cap X \cap Y = X \cap Y$. To show that \mathcal{T} is a tree decomposition of G we must show that \mathcal{T} satisfies Properties (i) and (ii) of tree decompositions. Let vw be an edge of $G[Y]$. Since vw is also an edge of G and \mathcal{T}' is a tree decomposition of G , $\{v, w\} \subseteq B'_x$ for some $x \in V(\mathcal{T}')$, so $\{v, w\} \subseteq B'_x \cap Y \subseteq B_x$. Thus, \mathcal{T} has Property (i) of tree decompositions.

Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that \mathcal{T} violates Property (ii). Then there exists some $v \in Y$, some $r \geq 2$, and some path $P = x_0, \dots, x_r$ in \mathcal{T}' with $v \in B_{x_0}$, $v \in B_{x_r}$ and $v \notin B_{x_i}$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, r-1\}$. Let P be chosen so that its length, r , is minimum. Then $v \notin B_{x_i}$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, r-1\}$. Since \mathcal{T}' is a tree decomposition of G , $v \notin B'_{x_0}$ or $v \notin B'_{x_r}$ since, otherwise $v \in B_{x_i} \subseteq B'_{x_i} \cap Y$ for each $i \in \{0, \dots, r\}$. Assume, without loss of generality that $v \notin B'_{x_r}$. Then $v \in \text{int}_{\mathcal{T}'}(x_r) \cap X \cap Y$ since $v \in B_{x_r}$. In particular, $v \in X \cap Y$.

Define i^* so that x_{i^*} is the unique vertex in P that is an ancestor of both x_0 and x_r . Then $\text{int}_{\mathcal{T}'}(x_{i^*}) \supseteq \text{int}_{\mathcal{T}'}(x_i)$ for each $i \in \{0, \dots, r\}$. In particular $v \in \text{int}_{\mathcal{T}'}(x_r) \cap X \cap Y \subseteq \text{int}_{\mathcal{T}'}(x_{i^*}) \cap X \cap Y \subseteq B_{x_{i^*}}$ for each $i \in \{i^*, \dots, r\}$. Therefore $i^* = r$ and x_r is an ancestor of x_0 . Therefore x_1 is the parent of x_0 , $v \in B_{x_0}$ and $v \notin B_{x_1}$. If $v \in \text{int}_{\mathcal{T}'}(x_0)$ then $v \in \text{int}_{\mathcal{T}'}(x_0) \cap X \cap Y \subseteq \text{int}_{\mathcal{T}'}(x_1) \cap X \cap Y \subseteq B_{x_1}$, a contradiction. Therefore $v \in B'_{x_0}$ since $v \in B_{x_0}$. Thus x_1 is the parent of x_0 , $v \in B'_{x_0}$ and $v \notin B'_{x_1}$. Therefore $v \in \text{int}_{\mathcal{T}'}(x_1)$, so $v \in \text{int}_{\mathcal{T}'}(x_1) \cap X \cap Y \subseteq B_{x_1}$, also a contradiction. \square

The following construction of a tree decomposition using balanced separations (or variants of this construction using balanced separators) is fairly standard.

Lemma 5. *Let G be an n -vertex graph with $\text{sn}(G) \leq a$. Then, for every integer $h \geq 0$, G has a rooted tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} := (B_x : x \in V(\mathcal{T}))$ such that*

- (i) $\text{height}(\mathcal{T}) \leq h$;
- (ii) for each $x \in V(\mathcal{T})$, $|\text{int}_{\mathcal{T}}(x)| \leq n \cdot (\frac{2}{3})^{\text{depth}_{\mathcal{T}}(x)}$ and $|\partial(x)| \leq \text{depth}_{\mathcal{T}}(x) \cdot a$;
- (iii) for each leaf y of \mathcal{T} , $|\text{int}_{\mathcal{T}}(y)| \leq n \cdot (\frac{2}{3})^h$.

Proof. The tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} = (B_x : x \in V(\mathcal{T}))$ and its supporting tree T is constructed recursively, as follows: Fix a global value $N := n \cdot (\frac{2}{3})^h$ that does not change during recursive invocations. Each recursive invocation takes a pair (G', ∂') and the initial invocation is on the pair (G, \emptyset) . When recursing on (G', ∂') to construct a subtree T' we apply the following rule: If $|V(G') \setminus \partial'| \leq N$, then T' consists of a single node x with $B_x := V(G')$. Otherwise, let (A', B') be a balanced separation of $G' - \partial'$ of order at most a . The root x of T' has $B_x := \partial' \cup (A' \cap B')$. The left child of x is the root of the tree obtained by recursing on $(G'[A'], A' \cap (\partial' \cup B'))$ and the right child of x is the root of the tree obtained by recursing on $(G[B'], B' \cap (\partial' \cup A'))$.

We now show that $\partial_{\mathcal{T}}(x) = \partial_x$, for each subtree T_x rooted at $x \in V(\mathcal{T})$ that was constructed by a recursive invocation on (G_x, ∂_x) . If $\text{depth}_{\mathcal{T}}(x) = 0$ then x is the root of T and $\partial_{\mathcal{T}}(x) = \emptyset = \partial_x$, by definition. Now suppose $\text{depth}_{\mathcal{T}}(x) \geq 1$, the parent of x is y and T_y is the result of a recursive invocation on (G_y, ∂_y) . Without loss of generality, $G_x = G[A^y]$ where (A^y, B^y) is a separation of $G_y - \partial_y$. Then $\partial_x = (A^y \cap (\partial_y \cup B^y)) = (A^y \cap (\partial_y \cup (A^y \cap B^y))) = A^y \cap B_y$. If x is a leaf of T then $B_x = V(G_x) = A^y$, so $B_x \cap B_y = A^y \cap B_y = \partial_x$. If x is not a leaf of T then $B_x = \partial_x \cup (A^x \cap B^x)$ where (A^x, B^x) is a separation of $G_x - \partial_x = G[A^y \setminus (A^y \cap B_y)] = G[A^y \setminus B_y]$.

In particular, $A^x \cup B^x$ contains no vertex of B_y , so $B_x \cap B_y = (\partial_x \cup (A^x \cap B^x)) \cap B_y = \partial_x \cap B_y = \partial_x$ since $\partial_x = A^y \cap B_y \subseteq B_y$. In either case $\partial_T(x) = B_x \cap B_y = \partial_x$.

Now the bounds on $|\text{int}_T(x)|$ and $|\partial_T(x)|$ are easily established by induction on $d := \text{depth}_T(x)$: When $d = 0$, $|\partial_T(x)| = |\emptyset| = 0 = 0a$ and $|\text{int}_T(x)| = |V(G) \setminus \partial_T(x)| = n = n \cdot (\frac{2}{3})^0$. Now consider a node x of depth $d \geq 1$ with parent y that was created by a recursive invocation on $(G_y, \partial_y) = (G_y, \partial_T(y))$. Without loss of generality T_x was created by a recursive invocation on $(G[A^y], \partial_x)$ where (A^y, B^y) is a balanced separation of $G_y - \partial_y = \text{int}_T(y)$. Then $|\text{int}_T(x)| \leq \frac{2}{3} \cdot |\text{int}_T(y)| \leq \frac{2}{3} \cdot (\frac{2}{3})^{d-1} \cdot n = (\frac{2}{3})^d \cdot n$ and $|\partial_T(x)| = |\partial_x| \leq |\partial_y| + |A^y \cap B^y| = |\partial_T(y)| + |A^y \cap B^y| \leq (d-1)a + a = da$.

The bound on $\text{height}(T)$ follows from the bound $|\text{int}_T(x)| \leq n \cdot (\frac{2}{3})^{\text{depth}_T(x)}$ and the fact that the algorithm returns a 1-node tree (of height 0) when $|V(G) \setminus \partial| \leq N = n \cdot (\frac{2}{3})^h$. \square

3 The Proof

The following definition replaces the notion of W -clouds in [4]. Let $W_{-1} := \emptyset$, let G be a graph, let $W \subseteq V(G)$, let $W_0 \subseteq W_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq W_\ell \subseteq W_{\ell+1} \subseteq V(G)$ be a nested sequence of vertex subsets of G , and let $\Delta_i := W_i \setminus W_{i-1}$ and $s_i := |\Delta_i|$, for each $i \in \{0, \dots, \ell+1\}$. Then $W_0, \dots, W_{\ell+1}$ is a *W -sequence of width w* in G if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (a) $W_0 = W$.
- (b) $s_i = w$, for each $i \in \{0, \dots, \ell\}$.
- (c) $s_{\ell+1} \in \{0, \dots, w-1\}$.
- (d) $G[W_i]$ contains s_i pairwise vertex-disjoint Δ_i - W paths, for each $i \in \{0, \dots, \ell+1\}$.
- (e) There exists $Z \subseteq W_{\ell+1}$ with $|Z| = s_{\ell+1}$ that separates $V(G) \setminus W_\ell$ and W .

Lemma 6. *For every graph G , every $W \subseteq V(G)$ and every non-negative integer $w \leq |W|$, there exists a W -sequence of width w in G .*

Proof. Let $W_0 := W$ and suppose that sets W_0, \dots, W_i have been defined that satisfy (a), (b) and (d) for some $i \geq 0$. (These conditions are trivially satisfied for $i = 0$.) We now show how to construct W_{i+1} .

Let w' be the maximum number of pairwise vertex-disjoint $(V(G) \setminus W_i)$ - W paths in G , let $r := \min\{w, w'\}$, and let P_1, \dots, P_r be pairwise vertex-disjoint $(V(G) \setminus W_i)$ - W paths in G . For each $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ let v_j be the last vertex of P_j contained in $V(G) \setminus W_i$ and let P'_j be the subpath of P_j that begins at v_j and ends at the first vertex of P_j contained in W . Set $W_{i+1} := \{v_1, \dots, v_r\} \cup W_i$, which implies that $s_{i+1} = r$. The paths $P'_1, \dots, P'_{s_{i+1}}$ certify that W_0, \dots, W_{i+1} satisfies (d).

If $r = w$ then W_{i+1} also satisfies (b) so that we now have a sequence W_0, \dots, W_{i+1} that satisfies (a), (b) and (d). In this case we can continue to define W_{i+2} as above.

If $r < w$ then we set $\ell := i$. Since $r < w$, $s_{\ell+1} = r < w$, so this choice of ℓ satisfies (c). Since G does not contain $k := r+1$ pairwise vertex-disjoint $(V(G) \setminus W_i)$ - W paths, Theorem 3 implies that there exists $Z \subseteq V(G)$ with $|Z| \leq r$ such that $G - Z$ has no $(V(G) \setminus W_\ell)$ - W path. Since the paths P'_1, \dots, P'_r are pairwise vertex-disjoint $(V(G) \setminus W_\ell)$ - W paths, Z must contain at least one vertex from each of these paths, so $|Z| \geq r$. Therefore, $r \leq |Z| \leq r$, so

$|Z| = r = s_{\ell+1}$. Since $V(P'_j) \subseteq W_{\ell+1}$ for each $j \in \{1, \dots, s_{\ell+1}\}$, $Z \subseteq W_{\ell+1}$. Therefore, this choice of Z satisfies (e). Therefore, the sequence $W_0, \dots, W_{\ell+1}$ satisfies (a) (a condition on W_0), (b) (conditions on W_1, \dots, W_ℓ), (c) (a condition $W_{\ell+1}$), (d) (conditions on $W_0, \dots, W_{\ell+1}$), and (e) (a condition on $W_{\ell+1}$). Thus, $W_0, \dots, W_{\ell+1}$ is a W -sequence of width w in G . \square

Observe that, for any W -sequence $W_0, \dots, W_{\ell+1}$, we have the bounds $(\ell+1)|W| \leq |W_{\ell+1}| < (\ell+2)|W|$, so $1/(\ell+2) < |W|/|W_{\ell+1}| \leq 1/(\ell+1)$. The following lemma shows that, for any separation (A, B) of $G[W_{\ell+1}]$, the size of the intersection of $A \setminus B$ with $W \cup Z$ is bounded by the order $|A \cap B|$ of (A, B) and the ratio $|A \setminus B| \cdot |W|/|W_{\ell+1}|$.

Lemma 7. *Let G be a graph, let $W \subseteq V(G)$, let $W_0, \dots, W_{\ell+1}$ be a W -sequence of width $|W|$ in G with $\ell \geq 1$, let $\Delta_{\ell+1} := W_{\ell+1} \setminus W_\ell$, and let $Z \subseteq W_{\ell+1}$, $|Z| = |\Delta_{\ell+1}|$, separate $V(G) \setminus W_\ell$ and W in G . Then every $(V(G) \setminus W_\ell, Z, W)$ -separation (X, Y) of G has the property that, for any separation (A, B) of $G[W_{\ell+1}]$,*

$$|W \setminus B| + |Z \setminus B| \leq \frac{(2 + \frac{1}{\delta})|A \setminus B|}{\ell + 2} + 3|A \cap B| .$$

Remark 8. The proof of Lemma 7 requires some extra effort to obtain $\ell + 2$ in the denominator. The reader who is not interested in precise constants can already stop at Equation (5) in the proof, from which the bound

$$|W \setminus B| + |Z \setminus B| \leq \frac{2|A \setminus B|}{\ell + 1} + 3|A \cap B|$$

follows immediately. This weaker bound is still sufficient to prove Theorem 1 with the constant $c < 69$.

Proof. Let $W_{-1} := \emptyset$ and, for each $i \in \{0, \dots, \ell + 1\}$, let $\Delta_i := W_i \setminus W_{i-1}$ (as in the definition of W -sequence). By the definition of W -sequence, $G[W_i]$ contains a set \mathcal{P}_i of $|W \setminus B|$ pairwise vertex-disjoint Δ_i - $(W \setminus B)$ paths, for each $i \in \{0, \dots, \ell\}$.

We begin by bounding $|W \setminus B|$ using the path sets $\mathcal{P}_0, \dots, \mathcal{P}_\ell$. For each $i \in \{0, \dots, \ell\}$, let $\mathcal{Q}_i \subseteq \mathcal{P}_i$ contain the paths in \mathcal{P}_i that begin at a vertex in $A \setminus B$ and let $\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_i := \mathcal{P}_i \setminus \mathcal{Q}_i$ contain the paths in \mathcal{P}_i that begin at a vertex in B . Since each path in \mathcal{Q}_i begins at a distinct vertex in $\Delta_i \setminus B$, $|\mathcal{Q}_i| \leq |\Delta_i \setminus B|$. Each path in $\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_i$ begins at a vertex in B and ends at a vertex in $W \setminus B$. Since (A, B) is a separation of $G[W_{\ell+1}]$, this implies that each path in $\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_i$ contains a vertex in $A \cap B$. Since the paths in $\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_i$ are pairwise vertex-disjoint, $|\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_i| \leq |A \cap B|$.

Each vertex $w \in W \setminus B$ is the last vertex of exactly one path in \mathcal{P}_i , for each $i \in \{0, \dots, \ell\}$. Thus, each vertex $w \in W \setminus B$ is the endpoint of exactly $\ell + 1$ paths in $\bigcup_{i=0}^{\ell} \mathcal{P}_i$. Since

$\{\Delta_0, \dots, \Delta_{\ell+1}\}$ is a partition of $W_{\ell+1}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
|W \setminus B| &= \frac{1}{\ell+1} \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} |\mathcal{P}_i| \\
&= \frac{1}{\ell+1} \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} (|\mathcal{Q}_i| + |\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_i|) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\ell+1} \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} (|\Delta_i \setminus B| + |A \cap B|) \\
&= \frac{|W \setminus B|}{\ell+1} + |A \cap B| \\
&= \frac{|A \setminus B| - |\Delta_{\ell+1} \setminus B|}{\ell+1} + |A \cap B|.
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Next, we bound $|Z \setminus B|$. By the definition of W -sequence, $G[W_{\ell+1}]$ has a set \mathcal{R} of $|\Delta_{\ell+1}| = |Z|$ pairwise vertex-disjoint $\Delta_{\ell+1}$ - W paths. Let $\mathcal{P}^\star := \{P \in \mathcal{R} : V(P) \cap (Z \setminus B) \neq \emptyset\}$. Since each of the paths in \mathcal{R} contains a distinct vertex in Z , $|\mathcal{P}^\star| = |Z \setminus B|$. Partition \mathcal{P}^\star into three sets:

0. \mathcal{P}_0^\star are the paths in \mathcal{P}^\star that start at a vertex of $\Delta_{\ell+1} \setminus B$ and end at a vertex in $W \setminus B$.
1. \mathcal{P}_1^\star are the paths in \mathcal{P}^\star that start at a vertex in $\Delta_{\ell+1} \cap B$ and end at a vertex in $W \setminus B$.
2. \mathcal{P}_2^\star are the paths in \mathcal{P}^\star that start at a vertex in $\Delta_{\ell+1} \setminus B$ and end at a vertex in $W \cap B$.

Since the paths in $\mathcal{P}_0^\star \cup \mathcal{P}_1^\star$ are pairwise vertex-disjoint and each contains a vertex of $W \setminus B$, $|\mathcal{P}_0^\star| + |\mathcal{P}_1^\star| \leq |W \setminus B|$. Each path in $\mathcal{P}_1^\star \cup \mathcal{P}_2^\star$ contains a vertex in $Z \setminus B$ and a vertex in B . Since (A, B) is a separation of $G[W_{\ell+1}]$ this implies that each path in $\mathcal{P}_1^\star \cup \mathcal{P}_2^\star$ contains a vertex in $A \cap B$. Since the paths in $\mathcal{P}_1^\star \cup \mathcal{P}_2^\star$ are pairwise vertex-disjoint, this implies that $|\mathcal{P}_1^\star \cup \mathcal{P}_2^\star| \leq |A \cap B|$. Therefore,

$$|Z \setminus B| = |\mathcal{P}^\star| = |\mathcal{P}_0^\star| + |\mathcal{P}_1^\star| + |\mathcal{P}_2^\star| \leq |W \setminus B| + |\mathcal{P}_2^\star| \leq \frac{|A \setminus B| - |\Delta_{\ell+1} \setminus B|}{\ell+1} + |A \cap B| + |\mathcal{P}_2^\star|, \tag{2}$$

where the last inequality is an application of inequality (1). At this point, adding (1) and (2) and using the inequality $|\mathcal{P}_2^\star| \leq |\mathcal{P}_1^\star \cup \mathcal{P}_2^\star| \leq |A \cap B|$ immediately gives the bound discussed in Remark 8. With a bit more work, we can do better. Since each path in $\mathcal{P}_0^\star \cup \mathcal{P}_2^\star$ starts at a distinct vertex in $\Delta_{\ell+1} \setminus B$,

$$|\Delta_{\ell+1} \setminus B| \geq |\mathcal{P}_0^\star| + |\mathcal{P}_2^\star| = |Z \setminus B| - |\mathcal{P}_1^\star|. \tag{3}$$

Using inequality (3) in Equation (2) we obtain

$$|Z \setminus B| \leq \frac{|A \setminus B| - |Z \setminus B| + |\mathcal{P}_1^\star|}{\ell+1} + |A \cap B| + |\mathcal{P}_2^\star|.$$

Rewriting this equation to isolate $|Z \setminus B|$, we obtain

$$|Z \setminus B| \leq \frac{|A \setminus B| + |\mathcal{P}_1^\star|}{\ell+2} + \left(\frac{\ell+1}{\ell+2}\right) \cdot (|A \cap B| + |\mathcal{P}_2^\star|) \tag{4}$$

$$< \frac{|A \setminus B|}{\ell+2} + |A \cap B| + |\mathcal{P}_2^\star| + \frac{1}{3}|\mathcal{P}_1^\star| . \quad (5)$$

(The second inequality uses the assumption that $\ell \geq 1$.) Using inequality (3) in Equation (1) we obtain,

$$|W \setminus B| + \frac{|Z \setminus B|}{\ell+1} \leq \frac{|A \setminus B| + |\mathcal{P}_1^\star|}{\ell+1} + |A \cap B| \leq \frac{|A \setminus B|}{\ell+1} + |A \cap B| + \frac{1}{2}|\mathcal{P}_1^\star| . \quad (6)$$

(The second inequality again uses the assumption that $\ell \geq 1$.) Adding (6) and (5) and using the fact that $\frac{5}{6}|\mathcal{P}_1^\star| + |\mathcal{P}_2^\star| \leq |\mathcal{P}_1^\star| + |\mathcal{P}_2^\star| \leq |A \cap B|$, we obtain

$$|W \setminus B| + \left(\frac{\ell+2}{\ell+1}\right) \cdot |Z \setminus B| \leq \frac{|A \setminus B|}{\ell+1} + \frac{|A \setminus B|}{\ell+2} + 3|A \cap B| \quad (7)$$

We can now upper bound $|W \setminus B| + |Z \setminus B|$ by maximizing $x_0 + x_1$ subject to

$$x_0 + \left(\frac{\ell+2}{\ell+1}\right) \cdot x_1 \leq R , \quad (8)$$

where R denotes the expression in (7). For a fixed $x_0 = x_0^\star$ the maximum value of x_1 that satisfies (8) is

$$x_1 = x_1^\star := \left(\frac{\ell+1}{\ell+2}\right) \cdot (R - x_0^\star)$$

in which case

$$x_0 + x_1 = x_0^\star + x_1^\star = \left(\frac{\ell+1}{\ell+2}\right) \cdot R + \frac{x_0^\star}{\ell+2}$$

maximizes $x_0 + x_1$ subject to fixed $x_0 = x_0^\star$. This is an increasing linear function of x_0^\star . From (1), we have the constraint

$$x_0^\star \leq \frac{|A \setminus B| - |\Delta_{\ell+1} \setminus B|}{\ell+1} + |A \cap B| \leq \frac{|A \setminus B|}{\ell+1} + |A \cap B|$$

from which we obtain the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} |W \setminus B| + |Z \setminus B| &\leq \left(\frac{\ell+1}{\ell+2}\right) \cdot R + \frac{x_0^\star}{\ell+2} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{\ell+1}{\ell+2}\right) \left(\frac{|A \setminus B|}{\ell+1} + \frac{|A \setminus B|}{\ell+2} + 3|A \cap B|\right) + \frac{|A \setminus B| - |Z \setminus B|}{(\ell+1)(\ell+2)} + \frac{|A \cap B|}{\ell+2} \\ &= \frac{|A \setminus B|}{\ell+2} \cdot \left(\frac{\ell+1}{\ell+1} + \frac{\ell+1}{\ell+2} + \frac{1}{\ell+1}\right) + \left(\frac{3\ell+4}{\ell+2}\right) \cdot |A \cap B| \\ &= \frac{|A \setminus B|}{\ell+2} \cdot \left(2 - \frac{1}{\ell+2} + \frac{1}{\ell+1}\right) + \left(\frac{3\ell+4}{\ell+2}\right) \cdot |A \cap B| \\ &= \frac{|A \setminus B|}{\ell+2} \cdot \left(2 + \frac{1}{(\ell+1)(\ell+2)}\right) + \left(\frac{3\ell+4}{\ell+2}\right) \cdot |A \cap B| \\ &< \frac{(2 + \frac{1}{6})|A \setminus B|}{\ell+2} + 3|A \cap B| . \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

We are now ready to prove [Theorem 1](#).

Proof of Theorem 1. Let G be a graph and let $a := \text{sn}(G)$. Let

$$h := 4 \quad \text{and} \quad t := \frac{4h}{1 - (2 + \frac{1}{6}) \cdot (\frac{2}{3})^h} = \frac{3888}{139} < 27.972 .$$

We will show that $\text{tw}(G) < (2t+1)a$. The proof is by induction on the number of vertices of G . We will prove the following stronger statement: For any graph G and any non-empty subset $W \subseteq V(G)$ of size at most ta , G has a tree decomposition $(B_x : x \in V(T))$ of width less than $(2t+1)a$ in which $W \subseteq B_x$ for some $x \in V(T)$.

If G has less than ta vertices, then the proof is trivial. We use a tree T with a single vertex x and set $B_x := V(G)$. We now assume that $|V(G)| \geq ta$. By [Lemma 6](#), G has a W -sequence $W_0, \dots, W_{\ell+1}$ of width $|W|$. Let $\Delta_0, \dots, \Delta_{\ell+1}$ and Z be as in the definition of W -sequence. Let (X, Y) be a $(V(G) \setminus W_\ell, Z, W)$ -separation.

Since $|X \cap Y| = |Z| < |W| \leq ta$, the inductive hypothesis implies that $G[X]$ has a tree decomposition $\mathcal{T}_X := (B_x : x \in V(T_X))$ of width less than $(2t+1)a$ in which $Z \subseteq B_x$ for some $x \in V(T_X)$. To finish the proof, we construct a tree decomposition $\mathcal{T}_Y := (B_y : y \in V(T_Y))$ of $G[Y]$ of width less than $(2t+1)a$ in which some bag B_y contains $W \cup Z$. Then the tree T obtained by joining T_Y and T_X using the edge xy gives the desired tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} := (B_x : x \in V(T))$.

If $\ell = 0$ then we use the trivial tree decomposition in which T_Y has a single node y where $B_y := W \cup Z$. Since $W \cup Z \subseteq Y$ and $|Y| = |W_1| = |W| + |Z| < 2|W| < (2t+1)a$, this decomposition has width less than $(2t+1)a$. We now assume that $\ell \geq 1$.

Since $\ell \geq 1$, $W_0, \dots, W_{\ell+1}$ satisfies the conditions of [Lemma 7](#). Let $\mathcal{T}'_Y := (B'_y : y \in V(T'_Y))$ be the tree decomposition of $G[W_{\ell+1}]$ obtained by applying [Lemma 5](#) to $G[W_{\ell+1}]$ with the height h defined above. The following claim will be used to bound the width of a tree decomposition that we derive from \mathcal{T}'_Y .

Claim 9. For each $d \in \{0, \dots, h\}$ and each node y of T'_Y with $|\text{int}_{\mathcal{T}'_Y}(y)| \leq (\frac{2}{3})^d \cdot |W_{\ell+1}|$,

$$|\text{int}_{\mathcal{T}'_Y}(y) \cap (W \cup Z)| \leq (2 + \frac{1}{6})ta \cdot (\frac{2}{3})^d + 3da \tag{9}$$

Proof of Claim: Consider the separation

$$(A, B) := (\text{int}_{\mathcal{T}'_Y}(y) \cup \partial_{\mathcal{T}'_Y}(y), W_{\ell+1} \setminus \text{int}_{\mathcal{T}'_Y}(y))$$

of $G[W_{\ell+1}]$ and observe that $A \setminus B := \text{int}_{\mathcal{T}'_Y}(y)$. By [Lemma 7](#),

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{int}_{\mathcal{T}'_Y}(y) \cap (W \cup Z)| &= |(A \setminus B) \cap (W \cup Z)| \\ &\leq |W \setminus B| + |Z \setminus B| \\ &\leq \frac{(2 + \frac{1}{6})|A \setminus B|}{\ell + 2} + 3|A \cap B| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{(2 + \frac{1}{6})(\frac{2}{3})^d |W_{\ell+1}|}{\ell + 2} + 3|A \cap B| \\
&= \frac{(2 + \frac{1}{6})(\frac{2}{3})^d ((\ell + 1)|W| + |\Delta_{\ell+1}|)}{\ell + 2} + 3|A \cap B| \\
&< \frac{(2 + \frac{1}{6})(\frac{2}{3})^d (\ell + 2)|W|}{\ell + 2} + 3|A \cap B| \\
&\leq (2 + \frac{1}{6})ta \cdot (\frac{2}{3})^d + 3da . \quad \blacksquare
\end{aligned}$$

For each node y of T'_Y , define $B_y := (B'_y \cap Y) \cup (\text{int}_{T'_Y}(y) \cap (W \cup Z))$ and let $T''_Y := (B_y : y \in V(T'_Y))$. By [Lemma 4](#) (applied with the separation $(X \cup W, Y \cup W)$), T''_Y is a tree decomposition of $G[Y]$ in which the root bag contains $(X \cup W) \cap (Y \cup W) = Z \cup W$.

Claim 10. For each leaf y of T'_Y , $|\partial_{T''_Y}(y)| \leq ta$.

Proof. Let y be a leaf of T'_Y and let z be the parent of y . Then, by [Lemma 5](#), $|\text{int}_{T'_Y}(y)| \leq (\frac{2}{3})^h \cdot |W_{\ell+1}|$ and $\partial_{T''_Y}(y) = B_y \cap B_z \subseteq (B'_y \cap B'_z) \cup (\text{int}_{T'_Y}(y) \cap (W \cup Z)) = \partial_{T'_Y}(y) \cup (\text{int}_{T'_Y}(y) \cap (W \cup Z))$. Therefore, by [Lemma 5](#) and [Claim 9](#)

$$|\partial_{T''_Y}(y)| \leq |\partial_{T'_Y}(y)| + |\text{int}_{T'_Y}(y) \cap (W \cup Z)| \leq ha + (2 + \frac{1}{6})ta \cdot (\frac{2}{3})^h + 3ha = (2 + \frac{1}{6})ta \cdot (\frac{2}{3})^h + 4ha .$$

The values of h and t , defined above, are chosen so that the right hand side of this inequality is equal to ta . \square

By [Claim 10](#), $|\partial_{T''_Y}(y)| \leq ta$ for each leaf y of T'_Y . Therefore, by the inductive hypothesis, $G[\text{int}_{T''_Y}(y) \cup \partial_{T''_Y}(y)]$ has a tree decomposition $T^y := (B_y : y \in V(T^y))$ of width less than $(2t + 1)a$ in which some bag B_{y_0} contains $\partial_{T''_Y}(y)$, for each leaf y of T'_Y . Create a new tree T_Y from T'_Y by replacing each leaf y of T'_Y with the node y_0 from the tree T^y . Then $T_Y := (B_y : y \in V(T_Y))$ is a tree decomposition of $G[Y]$.

Claim 11. The width of T_Y is less than $(2t + 1)a$.

Proof of Claim: The inductive hypothesis ensures that all bags of the tree decomposition have size at most $(2t + 1)a$ except for those associated with non-leaf nodes of T'_Y . Let y be a non-leaf node in T'_Y whose depth is $d < h$. If $d = 0$, then

$$|B_y| \leq |W \cup Z| + |B'_y| \leq (2ta - 1) + a < (2t + 1)a .$$

If $d \geq 1$ then, by [Lemma 5](#), $|B'_y| \leq (d + 1)a$ and $|\text{int}_{T'_Y}(y)| \leq |W_\ell| \cdot (\frac{2}{3})^d$. By [Claim 9](#),

$$|B_y| \leq |\text{int}_{T'_Y}(y) \cap (W \cup Z)| + |B'_y| \leq (2 + \frac{1}{6})ta \cdot (\frac{2}{3})^d + 3da + (d + 1)a \leq (2 + \frac{1}{6})ta \cdot (\frac{2}{3})^d + (4d + 1)a .$$

With the choices of t and h above, the right hand side of this equation is less than $(2t + 1)a$ for all $d \in \{1, \dots, h - 1\}$. \blacksquare

Let y_r be the root of T_Y . Then, $B_{y_r} := B'_{y_r} \cap Y \supseteq W \cup Z$. Therefore, $T_Y = (B_y : y \in V(T_Y))$ is a tree decomposition of $G[Y]$ that (by [Claim 11](#)) has width less than $(2t + 1)a$ and there exists $y \in V(T_Y)$ such that $W \cup Z \subseteq B_y$. This completes the proof. \square

References

- [1] Jiangzhuo Chen, Robert D. Kleinberg, László Lovász, Rajmohan Rajaraman, Ravi Sundaram, and Adrian Vetta. (almost) tight bounds and existence theorems for single-commodity confluent flows. *J. ACM*, 54(4):16, 2007. doi : 10.1145/1255443.1255444.
- [2] R. Diestel. *Graph Theory: 5th edition*. Springer Graduate Texts in Mathematics. 2017.
- [3] Zdenek Dvořák and Sergey Norin. Treewidth of graphs with balanced separations. *CoRR*, abs/1408.3869, 2014. 1408.3869v1.
- [4] Zdenek Dvořák and Sergey Norin. Treewidth of graphs with balanced separations. *J. Comb. Theory B*, 137:137–144, 2019. doi : 10.1016/J.JCTB.2018.12.007.
- [5] Neil Robertson and Paul D. Seymour. Graph minors. II. algorithmic aspects of tree-width. *J. Algorithms*, 7(3):309–322, 1986. doi : 10.1016/0196-6774(86)90023-4.
- [6] Paul D. Seymour and Robin Thomas. Graph searching and a min-max theorem for tree-width. *J. Comb. Theory B*, 58(1):22–33, 1993. doi : 10.1006/JCTB.1993.1027.