

## Treewidth and graph minors (homework)

We shall touch upon the theory of *Graph Minors* by Robertson and Seymour. As a motivating example, we show that maximum weight independent set on trees can be solved in polynomial time, using dynamic programming. (Note however that bandwidth is NP-hard on trees.) We then introduce the notion of a tree decomposition of a graph.

**Definition:** A *tree decomposition* of a graph  $G(V, E)$  is a tree  $T$ , where each node  $i$  of  $T$  is labeled by a subset (*bag*)  $B_i \subset V$  of vertices of  $G$ , each edge of  $G$  is in a subgraph induced by at least one of the  $B_i$ , and the nodes of  $T$  labeled by any vertex  $v \in V$  are connected in  $T$ . The *treewidth* of  $G$  is the minimum integer  $p$  such that there exists a tree decomposition  $G$  with all subsets of cardinality at most  $p + 1$ .

**Theorem:** For every graph  $G(V, E)$  of treewidth  $p$  and  $X \subset V$ , there is a vertex separator  $S$ ,  $|S| \leq p + 1$ , that partitions  $X$  into two subsets  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  of size at most  $2|X|/3$ , with all paths between  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  going through  $S$ .

We shall show that a tree has treewidth 1, a series-parallel graph has treewidth 2, a  $k$ -clique has treewidth  $k - 1$ , and an  $n$  by  $n$  grid has treewidth  $\Theta(n)$ .

**Definition:**  $H$  is a *minor* of  $G$  if it can be obtained from  $G$  by a sequence of operations of taking subgraphs and edge *contractions* (merging endpoints together).

Kuratowski showed that non-planar graphs must contain either  $K_5$  or  $K_{3,3}$  as minors.

**Theorem (planar minor):** Let  $H$  be a planar graph. If  $G$  has no  $H$ -minor, then the treewidth of  $G$  is bounded by some function of  $H$ , independent of  $G$ . (Not proved in class.)

**Theorem:** For graphs that have bounded treewidth, a corresponding tree decomposition can be found in polynomial (in fact, linear) time.

We shall use this and dynamic programming to design a polynomial time algorithm for  $k$ -coloring graphs of bounded treewidth.

Robertson and Seymour show that every family of graphs that is closed w.r.t. taking minors has a finite *obstruction set* of minors (such as  $K_5$  or  $K_{3,3}$  for planarity). They further show that for every fixed  $H$ , testing whether  $G$  contains  $H$  as a minor can be done in time  $O(n^3)$ . A consequence of their theory is that any property of graphs that is inherited by minors (such as being embeddable in 3-dimensional space without linked cycles) can be *decided* in polynomial time. (Their theory does not necessarily produce an explicit algorithm, and if it does, the hidden constants in the running time are often huge.)

### Homework.

1. Recall that graphs of treewidth at most 1 are those without a  $K_3$  minor (trees) and graphs of treewidth at most 2 are those without a  $K_4$  minor (series parallel graphs). Prove that for every  $p$  there is a finite list of forbidden minors (that depends on  $p$ )

such that graphs of treewidth at most  $p$  are those without any of these subgraphs as a minor.

2. Prove the following approximate min-max relation between treewidth and grid minors – for every graph, its treewidth (which is a minimization problem) is “approximately” related to the size of its largest grid minor.
  - (a) If a graph has a  $k$  by  $k$  grid as a minor, then it has treewidth at least  $\Omega(k)$ .
  - (b) If a graph has treewidth more than  $p$  then it has an  $f(p)$  by  $f(p)$  grid as a minor, for some nonnegative function  $f(p)$  that tends to infinity as  $p$  grows.
3. Show that for every planar graph  $H$  there is a large enough grid for which  $H$  is a minor. (As a consequence, proving the Theorem “planar minor” in the special case that  $H$  is required to be a grid implies the theorem for all planar  $H$ .)

If needed, see footnote<sup>1</sup> for **Hints**.

---

<sup>1</sup>Hints.

1. Show that if  $H$  is a minor of  $G$  then necessarily the treewidth of  $H$  is no larger than the treewidth of  $G$ . Thereafter refer to the theory of Robertson and Seymour.
2. (For 2(b)). Use Theorem “planar minor”. You need not specify  $f$  explicitly, and in fact it is still not known what the best  $f$  can be in this relation.
3. Consider a planar (with no crossing edges) drawing of  $H$ , where edges are lines with some nonzero thickness and vertices are discs with nonzero radius (similar to the object that one would get by using paper and pencil to draw a planar graph).