

### **ARTICLE**

# **Clustered colouring of graph classes with bounded treedepth or pathwidth**

Sergey Norin<sup>1</sup>, Alex Scott<sup>2</sup> and David R. Wood<sup>3,</sup>\*

<sup>1</sup>Department of Mathematics and Statistics, McGill University, Montréal, Canada. Supported by NSERC grant 418520, <sup>2</sup>Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK and <sup>3</sup>School of Mathematics, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia. Supported by the Australian Research Council <sup>∗</sup>Corresponding author. Email: david.wood@monash.edu

(Received 14 February 2021; revised 20 January 2022; accepted 8 June 2022; first published online 5 July 2022)

#### **Abstract**

The *clustered chromatic number* of a class of graphs is the minimum integer *k* such that for some integer *c* every graph in the class is *k*-colourable with monochromatic components of size at most *c*. We determine the clustered chromatic number of any minor-closed class with bounded treedepth, and prove a best possible upper bound on the clustered chromatic number of any minor-closed class with bounded pathwidth. As a consequence, we determine the fractional clustered chromatic number of every minor-closed class.

**Keywords:** graph; graph colouring; clustered colouring; minor; treedepth; pathwidth; fractional colouring **2020 MSC Codes:** Primary: 05C83, Secondary: 05C15

## **1. Introduction**

This paper studies improper vertex colourings of graphs with bounded monochromatic degree or bounded monochromatic component size. This topic has been extensively studied recently [\[1](#page-10-0)[–6,](#page-10-1) [7,](#page-10-2) [8,](#page-10-3) [9](#page-10-4)[–18,](#page-10-5) [19–](#page-10-6)[21\]](#page-10-7); see [\[22\]](#page-10-8) for a survey.

A *k*-*colouring* of a graph *G* is a function that assigns one of *k* colours to each vertex of *G*. In a coloured graph, a *monochromatic component* is a connected component of the subgraph induced by all the vertices of one colour.

A colouring has *defect d* if each monochromatic component has maximum degree at most *d*. The *defective chromatic number* of a graph class  $G$ , denoted by  $\chi_{\Delta}(G)$ , is the minimum integer *k* such that, for some integer *d*, every graph in *G* is *k*-colourable with defect *d*.

A colouring has *clustering c* if each monochromatic component has at most *c* vertices. The *clustered chromatic number* of a graph class  $G$ , denoted by  $\chi_{\star}(G)$ , is the minimum integer k such that, for some integer *c*, every graph in *G* has a *k*-colouring with clustering *c*. We shall consider such colourings, where the goal is to minimise the number of colours, without optimising the clustering value.

Every colouring of a graph with clustering *c* has defect *c* − 1. Thus,  $\chi_{\Delta}(\mathcal{G}) \le \chi_{\star}(\mathcal{G})$  for every class *G*.

The following is a well-known and important example in defective and clustered graph colouring. Let *T* be a rooted tree. The *depth* of *T* is the maximum number of vertices on a root–to–leaf path in *T*. The *closure* of *T* is obtained from *T* by adding an edge between every ancestor and descendant in *T*. For *h*,  $k \ge 1$ , let  $C(h, k)$  be the closure of the complete *k*-ary tree of depth *h*, as illustrated in Figure [1.](#page-1-0)

<sup>C</sup> The Author(s), 2022. Published by Cambridge University Press.

<span id="page-1-0"></span>

**Figure 1.** The standard example  $C(4, 2)$ .

It is well known and easily proved (see [\[22\]](#page-10-8)) that there is no  $(h - 1)$ -colouring of *C* $\langle h, k \rangle$  with defect  $k - 1$ , which implies there is no  $(h - 1)$ -colouring of  $C(h, k)$  with clustering k. This says that if a graph class  $G$  includes  $C(h, k)$  for all  $k$ , then the defective chromatic number and the clustered chromatic number are at least *h*. Put another way, define the *tree-closure-number* of a graph class *G* to be

$$
tcn(G) := min\{h : \exists k \ C \langle h, k \rangle \notin G\} = max\{h : \forall k \ C \langle h, k \rangle \in G\} + 1;
$$

then

$$
\chi_{\star}(\mathcal{G}) \geqslant \chi_{\Delta}(\mathcal{G}) \geqslant \text{tcn}(\mathcal{G}) - 1.
$$

Our main result, Theorem [1](#page-1-1) below, establishes a converse result for minor-closed classes with bounded treedepth. First we explain these terms. A graph *H* is a *minor* of a graph *G* if a graph isomorphic to *H* can be obtained from some subgraph of *G* by contracting edges. A class of graphs *M* is *minor-closed* if for every graph *G* ∈*M* every minor of *G* is in *M*, and *M* is *proper* minorclosed if, in addition, some graph is not in *M*. The *connected treedepth* of a graph *H*, denoted by  $\overline{td}(H)$ , is the minimum depth of a rooted tree *T* such that *H* is a subgraph of the closure of *T*. This definition is a variant of the more commonly used definition of the *treedepth* of *H*, denoted by td(*H*), which equals the maximum connected treedepth of the connected components of *H*. (See [\[23\]](#page-10-9) for background on treedepth.) If *H* is connected, then  $td(H) = td(H)$ . In fact,  $td(H) = td(H)$ unless *H* has two connected components  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  with td( $H_1$ ) = td( $H_2$ ) = td( $H$ ), in which case  $\text{td}(H) = \text{td}(H) + 1$ . It is convenient to work with connected treedepth to avoid this distinction. A class of graphs has *bounded treedepth* if there exists a constant *c* such that every graph in the class has treedepth at most *c*.

<span id="page-1-1"></span>**Theorem 1.** *For every minor-closed class G with bounded treedepth,*

$$
\chi_{\Delta}(\mathcal{G}) = \chi_{\star}(\mathcal{G}) = \text{tcn}(\mathcal{G}) - 1.
$$

Our second result concerns pathwidth. A *path-decomposition* of a graph *G* consists of a sequence  $(B_1, \ldots, B_n)$ , where each  $B_i$  is a subset of  $V(G)$  called a *bag*, such that for every vertex *v* ∈ *V*(*G*), the set {*i* ∈ [1, *n*] : *v* ∈ *B<sub>i</sub>*} is an interval, and for every edge *vw* ∈ *E*(*G*) there is a bag *B<sub>i</sub>* containing both *v* and *w*. Here  $[a, b] := \{a, a + 1, \ldots, b\}$ . The *width* of a path decomposition  $(B_1, \ldots, B_n)$  is max $\{|B_i| : i \in [1, n]\} - 1$ . The *pathwidth* of a graph *G* is the minimum width of a path-decomposition of *G*. Note that paths (and more generally caterpillars) have pathwidth 1. A class of graphs has *bounded pathwidth* if there exists a constant *c* such that every graph in the class has pathwidth at most *c*.

<span id="page-2-0"></span>**Theorem 2.** *For every minor-closed class G with bounded pathwidth,*

$$
\chi_{\Delta}(\mathcal{G})\leqslant \chi_{\star}(\mathcal{G})\leqslant 2\mathrm{tcn}(\mathcal{G})-2.
$$

Theorems [1](#page-1-1) and [2](#page-2-0) are, respectively, proved in Sections [2](#page-3-0) and [3.](#page-8-0) These results are best possible and partially resolve a number of conjectures from the literature, as we now explain.

Ossona de Mendez et al. [\[20\]](#page-10-10) studied the defective chromatic number of minor-closed classes. For a graph *H*, let  $\mathcal{M}_H$  be the class of *H*-minor-free graphs (that is, not containing *H* as a minor). Ossona de Mendez et al. [\[20\]](#page-10-10) proved the lower bound,  $\chi_{\Delta}(\mathcal{M}_H) \geq \overline{\text{td}}(H) - 1$  and conjectured that equality holds.

<span id="page-2-1"></span>**Conjecture 3** ([\[20\]](#page-10-10)). *For every graph H,*

$$
\chi_{\Delta}(\mathcal{M}_H) = \overline{\operatorname{td}}(H) - 1.
$$

Conjecture [3](#page-2-1) is known to hold in some special cases. Edwards et al. [\[8\]](#page-10-3) proved it if  $H = K_t$ ; that is,  $\chi_{\Delta}(\mathcal{M}_{K_t}) = t - 1$ , which can be thought of as a defective version of Hadwiger's Conjecture; see  $[21]$  for an improved bound on the defect in this case. Ossona de Mendez et al.  $[20]$  proved Conjecture [3](#page-2-1) if  $td(H) \le 3$  or if *H* is a complete bipartite graph. In particular,  $\chi_{\Delta}(\mathcal{M}_{K_{s,t}})$  =  $min\{s, t\}.$ 

Norin et al. [\[19\]](#page-10-6) studied the clustered chromatic number of minor-closed classes. They showed that for each  $k \geq 2$ , there is a graph *H* with treedepth *k* and connected treedepth *k* such that  $\chi_{\star}(M_H) \ge 2k - 2$ . Their proof in fact constructs a set X of graphs in  $M_H$  with bounded pathwidth (at most  $2k - 3$  to be precise) such that  $\chi_{\star}(\mathcal{X}) \geq 2k - 2$ . Thus, the upper bound on  $\chi_{\star}(\mathcal{G})$ in Theorem [2](#page-2-0) is best possible.

Norin et al. [\[19\]](#page-10-6) conjectured the following converse upper bound (analogous to Conjecture [3\)](#page-2-1):

<span id="page-2-2"></span>**Conjecture 4** ([\[19\]](#page-10-6)). *For every graph H*,

$$
\chi_{\star}(\mathcal{M}_H) \leqslant 2 \overline{\operatorname{td}}(H) - 2.
$$

While Conjectures [3](#page-2-1) and [4](#page-2-2) remain open, Norin et al. [\[19\]](#page-10-6) showed in the following theorem that  $\chi_{\Delta}(\mathcal{M}_H)$  and  $\chi_{\star}(\mathcal{M}_H)$  are controlled by the treedepth of *H*:

<span id="page-2-3"></span>**Theorem 5** ([\[19\]](#page-10-6)). *For every graph H,*  $\chi_*(\mathcal{M}_H)$  *is tied to the (connected) treedepth of H. In particular,*

$$
\overline{\operatorname{td}}(H)-1\leqslant \chi_{\star}(\mathcal{M}_H)\leqslant 2^{\overline{\operatorname{td}}(H)+1}-4.
$$

Theorem [1](#page-1-1) gives a much more precise bound than Theorem [5](#page-2-3) under the extra assumption of bounded treedepth.

Our third main result concerns fractional colourings. For real  $t \geq 1$ , a graph *G* is *fractionally t*-colourable with clustering c if there exist *Y*<sub>1</sub>, *Y*<sub>2</sub>, ..., *Y*<sub>s</sub>  $\subseteq$  *V*(*G*) and  $\alpha_1$ , ...,  $\alpha_s \in [0, 1]$  such that<sup>1</sup>:

- Every component of  $G[Y_i]$  has at most *c* vertices,
- $\sum_{i=1}^s \alpha_i \leqslant t$
- $\sum_{i: v \in Y_i} \alpha_i \geq 1$  for every  $v \in V(G)$ .

The *fractional clustered chromatic number*  $\chi^f_\star(G)$  of a graph class *G* is the infimum of *t* > 0 such that there exists  $c = c(t, G)$  such that every  $G \in G$  is fractionally *t*-colourable with clustering *c*.

<span id="page-2-4"></span> ${}^{1}$ If  $c = 1$ , then this corresponds to a (proper) fractional *t*-colouring, and if the  $\alpha_i$  are integral, then this yields a *t*-colouring with clustering *c*.

<span id="page-3-3"></span>

**Figure 2.** The weak closure  $W(4, 2)$ .

*Fractionally t-colourable with defect d* and *fractional defective chromatic number*  $\chi^f_\Delta(\mathcal{G})$  are defined in exactly the same way, except the condition on the component size of *G*[*Yi*] is replaced by "the maximum degree of  $G[Y_i]$  is at most  $d$ ".

The following theorem determines the fractional clustered chromatic number and fractional defective chromatic number of any proper minor-closed class.

<span id="page-3-1"></span>**Theorem 6.** *For every proper minor-closed class G,*

$$
\chi_{\Delta}^{f}(\mathcal{G}) = \chi_{\star}^{f}(\mathcal{G}) = \text{tcn}(\mathcal{G}) - 1.
$$

This result is proved in Section [4.](#page-8-1)

We now give an interesting example of Theorem [6.](#page-3-1)

<span id="page-3-2"></span>**Corollary 7.** *For every surface*  $\Sigma$ *, if*  $\mathcal{G}_{\Sigma}$  *is the class of graphs embeddable in*  $\Sigma$ *, then* 

$$
\chi_{\Delta}^{f}(\mathcal{G}_{\Sigma}) = \chi_{\star}^{f}(\mathcal{G}_{\Sigma}) = 3.
$$

**Proof.** Note that  $C(3, k)$  is planar for all k. Thus,  $\text{ten}(\mathcal{G}_{\Sigma}) \geq 4$ . Say  $\Sigma$  has Euler genus g. It follows from Euler's formula that  $K_{3,2g+3} \notin G_{\Sigma}$ . Since  $K_{3,2g+3} \subseteq C\langle 4, 2g+3 \rangle$ , we have  $C\langle 4, 2g+3 \rangle \notin G_{\Sigma}$ .<br>Thus, tcn( $G_{\Sigma}$ ) = 4. The result follows from Theorem 6. Thus,  $ten(\mathcal{G}_{\Sigma}) = 4$ . The result follows from Theorem [6.](#page-3-1)

<span id="page-3-0"></span>In contrast to Corollary [7,](#page-3-2) Dvořák and Norin [\[7\]](#page-10-2) proved that  $\chi_{\star}(\mathcal{G}_{\Sigma}) = 4$ . Note that Archdeacon [\[2\]](#page-10-11) proved that  $\chi_{\Lambda}(\mathcal{G}_{\Sigma}) = 3$ ; see [\[5\]](#page-10-12) for an improved bound on the defect.

#### **2. Treedepth**

Say *G* is a subgraph of the closure of some rooted tree *T*. For each vertex  $v \in V(T)$ , let  $T_v$  be the maximal subtree of *T* rooted at *v* (consisting of *v* and all its descendants), and let  $G[T_v]$  be the subgraph of *G* induced by  $V(T_v)$ .

The *weak closure* of a rooted tree  $T$  is the graph  $G$  with vertex set  $V(T)$ , where two vertices  $v, w \in V(T)$  are adjacent in *G* whenever *v* is a leaf of *T* and *w* is an ancestor of *v* in *T*. As illustrated in Figure [2,](#page-3-3) let  $W(h, k)$  be the weak closure of the complete *k*-ary tree of height *h*.

Note that  $W(h, k)$  is a proper subgraph of  $C(h, k)$  for  $h \ge 3$ . On the other hand, Norin et al. [\[19\]](#page-10-6) showed that  $W(h, k)$  contains  $C(h, k - 1)$  $C(h, k - 1)$  $C(h, k - 1)$  as a minor for all  $h, k \ge 2$ . Therefore, Theorem 1 is an immediate consequence of the following lemma.

<span id="page-4-0"></span>**Lemma 8.** For all  $d$ ,  $k$ ,  $h \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists  $c = c(d, k, h) \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for every graph G with treedepth *at most d, either G contains a W* $\langle h, k \rangle$ -minor or G is  $(h - 1)$ -colourable with clustering c.

**Proof.** Throughout this proof, *d*, *k* and *h* are fixed, and we make no attempt to optimise *c*.

We may assume that *G* is connected. So *G* is a subgraph of the closure of some rooted tree of depth at most *d*. Choose a tree *T* of depth at most *d* rooted at some vertex *r*, such that *G* is a subgraph of the closure of *T*, and subject to this,  $\sum_{v \in V(T)} \text{dist}_T(v, r)$  is minimal. Suppose that  $G[T_v]$  is disconnected for some vertex  $v$  in *T*. Choose such a vertex  $v$  at maximum distance from *r*. Since *G* is connected,  $v \neq r$ . By the choice of *v*, for each child *w* of *v*, the subgraph  $G[T_w]$ is connected. Thus, for some child *w* of *v*, there is no edge in *G* joining *v* and *G*[*T<sub>w</sub>*]. Let *u* be the parent of *v*. Let *T'* be obtained from *T* by deleting the edge *vw* and adding the edge *uw*, so that *w* is a child of *u* in *T'*. Note that *G* is a subgraph of the closure of *T'* (since *v* has no neighbour in *G*[*T<sub>w</sub>*]). Moreover, dist<sub>*T'*</sub>(*x*, *r*) = dist<sub>*T*</sub>(*x*, *r*) − 1 for every vertex *x* ∈ *V*(*T<sub>w</sub>*), and dist<sub>*T'*</sub>(*y*, *r*) =  $dist_T(y,r)$  for every vertex  $y \in V(T) \setminus V(T_w)$ . Hence,  $\sum_{v \in V(T')} dist_{T'}(v,r) < \sum_{v \in V(T)} dist_T(v,r)$ , which contradicts our choice of *T*. Therefore,  $G[T_v]$  is connected for every vertex *v* of *T*.

Consider each vertex  $v \in V(T)$ . Define the *level*  $\ell(v) := \text{dist}_T(r, v) \in [0, d - 1]$ . Let  $T_v^+$  be the subtree of *T* consisting of  $T_v$  plus the *vr*-path in *T*, and let  $G[T_v^+]$  be the subgraph of *G* induced by  $V(T_v^+)$ . For a subtree *X* of *T* rooted at vertex *v*, define the *level*  $\ell(X) := \ell(v)$ .

A *ranked graph* (for fixed *d*) is a triple  $(H, L, \leq)$  where:

- *H* is a graph,
- $L: V(H) \rightarrow [0, d-1]$  is a function,
- $\bullet$  ≤ is a partial order on *V*(*H*) such that *L*(*v*) < *L*(*w*) whenever *v* ≺ *w*.

Here and throughout this proof,  $v \prec w$  means that  $v \preceq w$  and  $v \neq w$ . Up to isomorphism, the number of ranked graphs on *n* vertices is at most  $2^{n \choose 2} d^n 3^{n \choose 2}$ . For a vertex *v* of *T*, a ranked graph  $(H, L, \leq)$  is said to be *contained in* G[T<sup>+</sup>] if there is an isomorphism  $\phi$  from *H* to some subgraph of  $G[T_v^+]$  such that:

- (A) for each vertex  $v \in V(H)$  we have  $L(v) = \ell(\phi(v))$ , and
- (B) for all distinct vertices  $v, w \in V(H)$  we have that  $v \prec w$  if and only if  $\phi(v)$  is an ancestor of  $\phi(w)$  in *T*.

Say (*H*, *L*,  $\le$  ) is a ranked graph and *i* ∈ [0, *d* − 1]. Below we define the *i*-*splice* of (*H*, *L*,  $\le$  ) to be a particular ranked graph  $(H', L', \preceq')$ , which (intuitively speaking) is obtained from  $(H, L, \preceq)$ by copying *k* times the subgraph of *H* induced by the vertices *v* with  $L(v) > i$ . Formally, let

$$
V(H') := \{(v, 0) : v \in V(H), L(v) \in [0, i]\} \cup
$$
  

$$
\{(v, j) : v \in V(H), L(v) \in [i + 1, d], j \in [1, k]\}.
$$
  

$$
E(H') := \{(v, 0)(w, 0) : vw \in E(H), L(v) \in [0, i], L(w) \in [0, i]\} \cup
$$
  

$$
\{(v, 0)(w, j) : vw \in E(H), L(v) \in [0, i], L(w) \in [i + 1, d], j \in [1, k]\} \cup
$$
  

$$
\{(v, j)(w, j) : vw \in E(H), L(v) \in [i + 1, d], L(w) \in [i + 1, d], j \in [1, k]\}.
$$

Define  $L'((v, j)) := L(v)$  for every vertex  $(v, j) \in V(H')$ . Now define the following partial order  $\preceq'$  on  $V(H')$ :

- $(v, j) \preceq (v, j)$  for all  $(v, j) \in V(H')$ ;
- if  $v \prec w$  and  $L(v)$ ,  $L(w) \in [0, i]$ , then  $(v, 0) \prec ' (w, 0)$ ;
- if *v* ≺ *w* and *L*(*v*) ∈ [0, *i*] and *L*(*w*) ∈ [*i* + 1, *d*], then (*v*, 0) ≺ (*w*, *j*) for all *j* ∈ [1, *k*]; and
- if *v* ≺ *w* and *L*(*v*), *L*(*w*) ∈ [*i* + 1, *d*], then (*v*, *j*) ≺ (*w*, *j*) for all *j* ∈ [1, *k*].

Note that if  $(v, a) \prec ' (w, b)$ , then  $a \leq b$  and  $v \prec w$  (implying  $(L(v) < L(w))$ ). It follows that  $\prec'$  is a partial order on  $V(H')$  such that  $L'((v, a)) < L'((w, b))$  whenever  $(v, a) < ' (w, b)$ . Thus,  $(H', L', \leq')$ is a ranked graph.

For  $\ell \in [0, d-1]$ , let

$$
N_{\ell} := (d+1)(h-1)(k+1)^{d-1-\ell}.
$$

For each vertex *v* of *T*, define the *profile* of *v* to be the set of all ranked graphs  $(H, L, \leq)$  contained in  $G[T_v^+]$  such that  $|V(H)| \leqslant N_{\ell(v)}$ . Note that if *v* is a descendant of *u*, then the profile of *v* is a subset of the profile of *u*. For  $\ell \in [0, d-1]$ , if  $N = N_{\ell}$  then let

$$
M_{\ell} := 2^{2\binom{N}{2}} d^{N} 3^{\binom{N}{2}}.
$$

Then there are at most  $M_{\ell}$  possible profiles of a vertex at level  $\ell$ .

We now partition *V*(*T*) into subtrees. Each subtree is called a *group*. (At the end of the proof, vertices in a single group will be assigned the same colour.) We assign vertices to groups in nonincreasing order of their distance from the root. Initialise this process by placing each leaf *v* of *T* into a singleton group. We now show how to determine the group of a non-leaf vertex. Let  $\nu$  be a vertex not assigned to a group at maximum distance from *r*. So each child of *v* is assigned to a group. Let  $Y_v$  be the set of children y of v, such that the number of children of v that have the same profile as *y* is in the range  $[1, k - 1]$ . If  $Y_v = \emptyset$  start a new singleton group  $\{v\}$ . If  $Y_v \neq \emptyset$  then merge all the groups rooted at vertices in  $Y_v$  into one group including  $v$ . This defines our partition of *V*(*T*) into groups. Each group *X* is *rooted* at the vertex in *X* closest to *r* in *T*. A group *Y* is *above* a distinct group *X* if the root of *Y* is on the path in *T* from the root of *X* to *r*.

The next claim is the key to the remainder of the proof.

<span id="page-5-0"></span>**Claim 1.** *Let uv*  $\in E(T)$  *where u is the parent of v, and u is in a different group to v. Then for every ranked graph*  $(H, L, \leq)$  *in the profile of v, the*  $\ell(u)$ *-splice of*  $(H, L, \leq)$  *is in the profile of u.* 

**Proof.** Since  $(H, L, \leq)$  is in the profile of *v*, there is an isomorphism  $\phi$  from *H* to some subgraph of  $G[T_v^+]$  such that for each vertex  $x \in V(H)$  we have  $L(x) = \ell(\phi(x))$ , and for all distinct vertices  $x, y \in V(H)$  we have that  $x \prec y$  if and only if  $\phi(x)$  is an ancestor of  $\phi(y)$  in *T*.

Since *u* and *v* are in different groups, there are *k* children  $y_1, \ldots, y_k$  of *u* (one of which is *v*) such that the profiles of  $y_1, \ldots, y_k$  are equal. Thus,  $(H, L, \leq)$  is in the profile of each of  $y_1, \ldots, y_k$ . That is, for each  $j \in [1, k]$ , there is an isomorphism  $\phi_j$  from *H* to some subgraph of  $G[T^+_{y_j}]$  such that for each vertex  $x \in V(H)$  we have  $L(x) = \ell(\phi_i(x))$ , and for all distinct vertices  $x, y \in V(H)$  we have that  $x \prec y$  if and only if  $\phi_i(x)$  is an ancestor of  $\phi_i(y)$  in *T*.

Let  $(H', L', \preceq')$  be the  $\ell(u)$ -splice of  $(H, L, \preceq')$ . We now define a function  $\phi'$  from *V*(*H*<sup>'</sup>) to *V*(*G*[*T*<sup> $+$ </sup><sub>*u*</sub>]). For each vertex  $(x, 0)$  of *H*<sup>'</sup> (thus with  $x \in V(H)$  and  $L(x) \in [0, \ell(u)]$ ), define  $\phi'((x, 0)) := \phi(x)$ . For every other vertex  $(x, j)$  of *H'* (thus with  $x \in V(H)$  and  $L(x) \in [\ell(u) + 1, d - 1]$  and  $j \in [1, k]$ ), define  $\phi'((x, j)) := \phi_j(x)$ .

We now show that  $\phi'$  is an isomorphism from *H'* to a subgraph of *G*[*T<sub>u</sub>*<sup>1</sup>]. Consider an edge  $(x, a)(y, b)$  of *H'*. Thus,  $xy \in E(H)$ . It suffices to show that  $\phi'((x, a))\phi'((y, b)) \in E(G[T_u^+])$ . First suppose that  $a = b = 0$ . So  $L(x) \in [0, \ell(u)]$  and  $L(y) \in [0, \ell(u)]$ . Thus  $\phi'((x, a)) = \phi(x)$  and  $\phi'((y, b)) = \phi(y)$ . Since  $\phi$  is an isomorphism to a subgraph of  $G[T_v^+]$ , we have  $\phi(x)\phi(y) \in$ *E*( $G[T_v^+]$ ), which is a subgraph of  $G[T_u^+]$ . Hence,  $\phi'((x, a))\phi'((y, b)) \in E(G[T_u^+])$ , as desired. Now suppose that  $a = 0$  and  $b \in [1, k]$ . Thus,  $\phi'((x, a)) = \phi(x)$  and  $\phi'((y, b)) = \phi_b(y)$ . Moreover, both  $\ell(\phi(x))$  and  $\ell(\phi_b(x))$  equal  $L(x) \in [0, \ell(u)]$ . There is only vertex *z* in  $T_v^+$  with  $\ell(z)$  equal to a specific number in  $[0, \ell(u)]$ . Thus,  $\phi'((x, a)) = \phi(x) = \phi_b(x) \ (=z)$ . Since  $\phi_b$  is an isomorphism to a subgraph of  $G[T^+_{y_b}]$ , we have  $\phi_b(x)\phi_b(y) \in E(G[T^+_{y_b}])$ , which is a subgraph of  $G[T^+_{u}]$ . Hence,  $\phi'((x, a))\phi'((y, b)) \in E(G[T_u^+])$ , as desired. Finally, suppose that  $a = b \in [1, k]$ . Thus,  $\phi'((x, a)) =$  $\phi_a(x)$  and  $\phi'(y, b) = \phi_b(y) = \phi_a(y)$ . Since  $\phi_a$  is an isomorphism to a subgraph of  $G[T^+_{y_a}]$ , we have  $\phi_a(x)\phi_a(y) \in E(G[T_{y_a}^+])$ , which is a subgraph of  $G[T_u^+]$ . Hence,  $\phi'((x, a))\phi'((y, b)) \in E(G[T_u^+])$ , as desired. This shows that  $\phi'$  is an isomorphism from  $H'$  to a subgraph of  $G[T^+_u]$ .

We now verify property (A) for  $(H', L', \leq')$ . For each vertex  $(x, 0)$  of  $H'$  (thus with  $x \in$ *V*(*H*) and *L*(*x*)  $\in$  [0,  $\ell(u)$ ]) we have *L'*((*x*, 0)) = *L*(*x*) =  $\ell(\phi(x)) = \ell(\phi'(x, 0))$ , as desired. For every other vertex  $(x, j)$  of  $H'$  (thus with  $x \in V(H)$  and  $L(x) \in [\ell(u) + 1, d - 1]$  and  $j \in [1, k]$ ) we have  $L'((x, j)) = L(x) = \ell(\phi_j(x)) = \ell(\phi'((x, j))),$  as desired. Hence, property (A) is satisfied for  $(H', L', \preceq').$ 

We now verify property (B) for  $(H', L', \leq')$ . Consider distinct vertices  $(x, a), (y, b) \in V(H')$ . First suppose that  $a = 0$  and  $b = 0$ . Then  $(x, a) \prec ' (y, b)$  if and only if  $x \prec y$  if and only if  $\phi(x)$ is an ancestor of  $\phi(y)$  in *T* if and only if  $\phi'((x, a))$  is an ancestor of  $\phi'((y, b))$  in *T*, as desired. Now suppose that  $a = 0$  and  $b \in [1, k]$ . Then  $(x, a) \prec ' (y, b)$  if and only if  $x \prec y$  if and only if  $\phi(x)$  is an ancestor of  $\phi_b(y)$  in *T* if and only if  $\phi'((x, a))$  is an ancestor of  $\phi'((y, b))$  in *T*, as desired. Now suppose that  $a = b \in [1, k]$ . Then  $(x, a) \prec'(y, b)$  if and only if  $x \prec y$  if and only if  $\phi_a(x)$  is an ancestor of  $\phi_b(y)$  in *T* if and only if  $\phi'((x, a))$  is an ancestor of  $\phi'((y, b))$  in *T*, as desired. Finally, suppose that  $a, b \in [1, k]$  and  $a \neq b$ . Then  $(x, a)$  and  $(y, b)$  are incomparable under  $\prec'$ , and  $\phi'((x, a))$  and  $\phi'((y, b))$  in *T* are unrelated in *T*, as desired. Hence, property (B) is satisfied for  $(H', L', \preceq')$ .

So  $\phi'$  is an isomorphism from *H'* to a subgraph of  $G[T^+_u]$  satisfying properties (A) and (B). Thus  $(H', L', \leq')$  is contained in  $G[T_u^+]$ , as desired. Since  $(H, L, \leq)$  is in the profile of *v*, we have  $|V(H)| \leq (d+1)(h-1)(k+1)^{h-\ell(v)}$ . Since  $|V(H')| \leq (k+1)|V(H)|$  and  $\ell(u) = \ell(v) - 1$ , we have  $|V(H')|$  ≤  $(d+1)(h-1)(k+1)^{h+1-\ell(v)} = (d+1)(h-1)(k+1)^{h-\ell(u)}$ . Thus,  $(H', L', \leq')$  is in the profile of *u*.  $\Box$ 

The proof now divides into two cases. If some group  $X_0$  is adjacent in *G* to at least *h* − 1 other groups above  $X_0$ , then we show that *G* contains  $W(h, k)$  as a minor. Otherwise, every group *X* is adjacent in *G* to at most *h* − 2 other groups above *X*, in which case we show that *G* is (*h* − 1)-colourable with bounded clustering.

#### **Finding the minor**

Suppose that some group  $X_0$  is adjacent in *G* to at least  $h-1$  other groups  $X_1, \ldots, X_{h-1}$  above *X*<sub>0</sub>. We now show that *G* contains  $W(h, k)$  as a minor; refer to Figure [3.](#page-7-0) For  $i \in [1, h-1]$ , since  $X_i$ is above  $X_0$ , the root  $v_i$  of  $X_i$  is on the  $v_0r$ -path in *T*. Without loss of generality,  $v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_{h-1}$ appear in this order on the *v*<sub>0</sub>*r*-path in *T*. For  $i \in [1, h - 1]$ , let  $w_i$  be a vertex in  $X_i$  adjacent to some vertex  $z_i$  in  $X_0$ ; since G is a subgraph of the closure of T,  $w_i$  is on the  $v_0r$ -path in T. For *i* ∈ [0, *h* − 2], let *u<sub>i</sub>* be the parent of *v<sub>i</sub>* in *T* (which exists since  $v_{h-2} \neq r$ ). So *u<sub>i</sub>* is not in *X<sub>i</sub>* (but may be in  $X_{i+1}$ ). Note that  $v_0$ ,  $u_0$ ,  $w_1$ ,  $v_1$ ,  $u_1$ , ...,  $w_{h-2}$ ,  $v_{h-2}$ ,  $u_{h-2}$ ,  $w_{h-1}$ ,  $v_{h-1}$  appear in this order on the *v*<sub>0</sub>*r*-path in *T*, where *v*<sub>0</sub>, *v*<sub>1</sub>, ..., *v*<sub>*h*-1</sub> are distinct (since they are in distinct groups).

Let  $P_j$  be the  $z_jr$ -path in *T* for  $j \in [1, h-1]$ . Let  $H_0$  be the graph with  $V(H_0) := V(P_1 \cup$ ... ∪ *P*<sub>*h*−1</sub>) and *E*(*H*<sub>0</sub>) := { $z_jw_j$  :  $j \in [1, h - 1]$ }. Define the function  $L_0$  :  $V(H_0) \to [0, d - 1]$  by *L*<sub>0</sub>(*x*) :=  $\ell(x)$  for each *x* ∈ *V*(*H*<sub>0</sub>). Define the partial order  $\leq$ <sub>0</sub> on *V*(*H*<sub>0</sub>), where *x*  $\lt$ <sub>0</sub> *y* if and only if *x* is ancestor of *y* in *T*. Thus,  $(H_0, L_0, \leq_0)$  is a ranked graph. By construction,  $(H_0, L_0, \leq_0)$  is contained in *G*[*T*<sup> $+$ </sup><sub>*v*</sub><sup> $0$ </sup>]. Since *H*<sub>0</sub> has less than (*d* + 1)(*h* − 1) vertices, *H*<sub>0</sub> is in the profile of *v*<sub>0</sub>. For *i* = 0, 1, ..., *h* − 2, let (*H<sub>i+1</sub>*, *L<sub>i+1</sub>*, ≺*i*<sub>+1</sub>) be the  $\ell(u_i)$ -splice of (*H<sub>i</sub>*, *L<sub>i</sub>*, ≺*i*).

By induction on *i*, using Claim [1](#page-5-0) at each step and since  $G[T_{u_i}^+] \subseteq G[T_{v_{i+1}}^+]$ , we conclude that for each  $i \in [0, h-1]$ , the ranked graph  $(H_i, L_i, \leq i)$  is in the profile of  $v_i$ . In particular,  $(H_{h-1}, L_{h-1}, \prec_{h-1})$  is in the profile of  $v_{h-1}$ , and  $H_{h-1}$  is isomorphic to a subgraph of *G*. Note that each vertex of  $H_{h-1}$  is of the form  $((( \dots (x, d_1), d_2), \dots), d_{h-1})$  for some  $x \in V(H_0)$  and *d*<sub>1</sub>, ..., *d*<sub>*h*−1</sub> ∈ [0, *k*]. For brevity, call such a vertex  $x\langle d_1, \ldots, d_{h-1}\rangle$ . Note that if  $x = w_i$  for some  $j \in [1, h-1]$ , then  $d_1 = \ldots = d_i = 0$  (since  $w_i$  is above  $u_i$  whenever  $i < j$ , and  $(H_{i+1}, L_{i+1}, \prec_{i+1})$  is the  $\ell(u_i)$ -splice of  $(H_i, L_i, \leq_i)$ ).

For  $x \in V(H_0)$ , let  $\Lambda_x$  be the set of vertices  $x\langle d_1, \ldots, d_{h-1} \rangle$  in  $H_{h-1}$ . By construction, no two vertices in  $\Lambda_x$  are comparable under  $\leq_{h-1}$ . Therefore, by property (B),  $V(T_a) \cap V(T_b) = \emptyset$  for all distinct  $a, b \in \Lambda_x$ . In particular,  $V(T_a) \cap V(T_b) = \emptyset$  for all distinct  $a, b \in \Lambda_{\nu_0}$ . As proved above,

<span id="page-7-0"></span>

**Figure 3.** Construction of a  $W(4, k)$  minor (where  $u_i$  might be in  $X_{i+1}$ ).

 $G[T_a]$  is connected for each  $a \in V(T)$ . Let *G'* be the graph obtained from *G* by contracting  $G[T_a]$ into a single vertex  $\alpha \langle d_1, \ldots, d_{h-1} \rangle$ , for each  $a = v_0 \langle d_1, \ldots, d_{h-1} \rangle \in \Lambda_{v_0}$ . So *G'* is a minor of *G*.

Let *U* be the tree with vertex set

$$
\{\langle d_1,\ldots,d_{h-1}\rangle:\exists j\in[0,h-1]\ d_1=\ldots=d_j=0\text{ and }d_{j+1},\ldots,d_{h-1}\in[1,k]\},\
$$

where the parent of  $(0, \ldots, 0, d_{j+1}, d_{j+2}, \ldots, d_{h-1})$  is  $(0, \ldots, 0, d_{j+2}, \ldots, d_{h-1})$ . Then *U* is isomorphic to the complete *k*-tree of height *h* rooted at  $(0, \ldots, 0)$ . We now show that the weak closure of *U* is a subgraph of *G*<sup>'</sup>, where each vertex  $\langle 0, \ldots, 0, d_{j+1}, \ldots, d_{h-1} \rangle$  of *U* with  $j \in [1, h-1]$ is mapped to vertex  $w_j(0, \ldots, 0, d_{j+1}, \ldots, d_{h-1})$  of *G'*, and each other vertex  $\langle d_1, \ldots, d_{h-1} \rangle$  of *U* is mapped to  $\alpha \langle d_1, \ldots, d_{h-1} \rangle$  of *G*'. For all  $d_1, \ldots, d_{h-1} \in [1, k]$  and  $j \in [1, h-1]$  the vertex  $z_j$ *d*<sub>1</sub>, ..., *d*<sub>*h*-1</sub>) of *G* is contracted into the vertex  $\alpha$ *(d*<sub>1</sub>, ..., *d*<sub>*h*-1</sub>) of *G'*. By construction,  $z_j(d_1, \ldots, d_{h-1})$  is adjacent to  $w_j(0, \ldots, 0, d_{j+1}, \ldots, d_{h-1})$  in *G*. So  $\alpha \langle d_1, \ldots, d_{h-1} \rangle$  is adjacent to  $w_j(0, \ldots, 0, d_{j+1}, \ldots, d_{h-1})$  in *G'*. This implies that the weak closure of *U* (that is,  $W(h, k)$ ) is isomorphic to a subgraph of *G*', and is therefore a minor of *G*.

#### **Finding the colouring**

Now assume that every group *X* is adjacent in *G* to at most *h* − 2 other groups above *X*. Then  $(h - 1)$ -colour the groups in order of distance from the root, such that every group *X* is assigned a colour different from the colours assigned to the neighbouring groups above *X*. Assign each vertex within a group the same colour as that assigned to the whole group. This defines an  $(h-1)$ -colouring of *G*.

Consider the function  $s : [0, d-1] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  recursively defined by

$$
s(\ell) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \ell = d - 1 \\ (k - 1) \cdot M_{\ell + 1} \cdot s(\ell + 1) & \text{if } \ell \in [0, d - 2]. \end{cases}
$$

<span id="page-8-0"></span>Then every group at level  $\ell$  has at most  $s(\ell)$  vertices. By construction, our  $(h-1)$ -colouring of *G* has clustering *s*(0), which is bounded by a function of *d*, *k* and *h*, as desired.  $\Box$ 

### **3. Pathwidth**

The following lemma of independent interest is the key to proving Theorem [2.](#page-2-0) Note that Eppstein [\[24\]](#page-11-0) independently discovered the same result (with a slightly weaker bound on the path length). The decomposition method in the proof has been previously used, for example, by Dujmovic, ´ Joret, Kozik, and Wood [\[25,](#page-11-1) Lemma 17].

<span id="page-8-2"></span>**Lemma 9.** *Every graph with pathwidth at most w has a vertex 2-colouring such that each monochromatic path has at most*  $(w + 3)^w$  *vertices.* 

**Proof.** We proceed by induction on  $w \ge 1$ . Every graph with pathwidth 1 is a caterpillar, and is thus properly 2-colourable. Now assume  $w \geq 2$  and the result holds for graphs with pathwidth at most  $w - 1$ . Let G be a graph with pathwidth at most w. Let  $(B_1, \ldots, B_n)$  be a path-decomposition of *G* with width at most *w*. Let  $t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_m$  be a maximal sequence such that  $t_1 = 1$  and for each *i*  $\geq$  2, *t<sub>i</sub>* is the minimum integer such that *B<sub>ti</sub>* ∩ *B<sub>ti−1</sub>* = Ø. For odd *i*, colour every vertex in *B<sub>ti</sub>* 'red'. For even *i*, colour every vertex in  $B_{t_i}$  'blue'. Since  $B_{t_i} \cap B_{t_{i-1}} = \emptyset$  for  $i \geq 2$ , no vertex is coloured twice. Let *G'* be the subgraph of *G* induced by the uncoloured vertices. By the choice of  $B_{t_i}$ , for *i* ≥ 2 each bag *B<sub>j</sub>* with *j* ∈ [ $t_{i-1}$  + 1,  $t_i$  − 1] intersects *B*<sub> $t_{i-1}$ </sub>. Thus, (*B*<sub>1</sub> ∩ *V*(*G*<sup>'</sup>), ..., *B<sub>n</sub>* ∩ *V*(*G*<sup>'</sup>)) is a path-decomposition of *G'* of width at most  $w - 1$ . By induction, *G'* has a vertex 2-colouring such that each monochromatic path has at most  $(w + 3)^{w-1}$  vertices. Since  $B_{t_i} \cup B_{t_{i+2}}$  separates  $B_{t_{i+1}} \cup \ldots \cup B_{t_{i+2}-1}$  from the rest of *G*, each monochromatic component of *G* is contained in *B*<sub>ti+1</sub> ∪ ... ∪ *B*<sub>ti+2</sub>-1 for some *i* ∈ [0, *n* − 2]. Consider a monochromatic path *P* in *G*[*B*<sub>ti+1</sub> ∪ ... ∪ *B*<sub>*t*<sub>i+2</sub>-1</sub>]. Then *P* has at most *w* + 1 vertices in *B*<sub>*t*<sub>i+1</sub></sub>. Note that *P* − *B*<sub>*t*<sub>i+1</sub></sub> is contained in *G*'. Thus, *P* consists of up to  $w + 2$  monochromatic subpaths in *G'* plus  $w + 1$  vertices in  $B_{t_{i+1}}$ . Hence, *P* has at most  $(w + 2)(w + 3)^{w-1} + (w + 1) < (w + 3)^w$  vertices. П

Nešetřil and Ossona de Mendez [\[23\]](#page-10-9) showed that if a graph *G* contains no path on *k* vertices, then td(*G*)  $\lt k$  (since *G* is a subgraph of the closure of a DFS spanning tree with height at most *k*). Thus Lemma [9](#page-8-2) implies:

<span id="page-8-3"></span>**Corollary 10.** *Every graph with pathwidth at most w has a vertex 2-colouring such that each monochromatic component has treedepth at most*  $(w + 3)^w$ .

**Proof of Theorem [2.](#page-2-0)** Let *G* be a minor-closed class of graphs, each with pathwidth at most *w*. Let *h* be the minimum integer such that  $C(h, k) \notin \mathcal{G}$  for some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Consider  $G \in \mathcal{G}$ . Thus,  $W(h, k+1)$ is not a minor of *G* (since  $C(h, k)$  is a minor of  $W(h, k + 1)$ , as noted above). By Corollary [10,](#page-8-3) *G* has a vertex 2-colouring such that each monochromatic component *H* of *G* has treedepth at most (*w* + 3)<sup>*w*</sup>. Thus, *W* $\langle h, k+1 \rangle$  is not a minor of *H*. By Lemma [8,](#page-4-0) *H* is  $(h-1)$ -colourable with clustering  $c((w + 3)^w, k + 1, h)$ . Taking a product colouring, *G* is  $(2h - 2)$ -colourable with clustering  $c((w + 2)^w, k + 1, h)$ .  $(3)^{w}, k+1, h$ . Hence,  $\chi_{\Delta}(\mathcal{G}) \leq \chi_{\star}(\mathcal{G}) \leq 2h-2$ .

<span id="page-8-1"></span>Note that Lemma [9](#page-8-2) cannot be extended to the setting of bounded tree-width graphs: Esperet and Joret (see [[\[14\]](#page-10-13), Theorem 4.1]) proved that for all positive integers *w* and *d* there exists a graph *G* with tree-width at most *w* such that for every *w*-colouring of *G* there exists a monochromatic component of *G* with diameter greater than *d* (and thus with a monochromatic path on more than *d* vertices, and thus with treedepth at least  $log_2 d$ .

#### **4. Fractional colouring**

This section proves Theorem [6.](#page-3-1) The starting point is the following key result of Dvořák and Sereni  $[26]$ <sup>[2](#page-9-0)</sup>

<span id="page-9-2"></span>**Theorem 11** ([\[26\]](#page-11-2)). *For every proper minor-closed class G and every*  $\delta > 0$  *there exists*  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ *satisfying the following. For every*  $G \in \mathcal{G}$  *there exist*  $s \in \mathbb{N}$  *and*  $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_s \subseteq V(G)$  *such that:* 

- $td(G[X_i]) \leq d$ , and
- *every*  $v \in V(G)$  *belongs to at least*  $(1 \delta)s$  *of these sets.*

We now prove a lower bound on the fractional defective chromatic number of the closure of complete trees of given height.

<span id="page-9-1"></span>**Lemma 12.** Let  $C_h := \{C(h, k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Then  $\chi^f_{\Delta}(C_h) \geq h$ .

**Proof.** We show by induction on *h* that if *Ch*, *k* is fractionally *t*-colourable with defect *d*, then  $t \geq h - (h - 1)d/k$ . This clearly implies the lemma. The base case  $h = 1$  is trivial.

For the induction step, suppose that  $G := C \langle h, k \rangle$  is fractionally *t*-colourable with defect *d*. Thus, there exist  $Y_1, Y_2, \ldots, Y_s \subseteq V(G)$  and  $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_s \in [0, 1]$  such that:

- every component of  $G[Y_i]$  has maximum degree at most  $d$ ,
- $\sum_{i=1}^s \alpha_i \leq t$ , and
- $\sum_{i: v \in Y_i} \alpha_i \geq 1$  for every  $v \in V(G)$ .

Let *r* be the vertex of *G* corresponding to the root of the complete *k*-ary tree and let  $H_1, \ldots, H_k$ be the components of *G* − *r*. Then each *H<sub>i</sub>* is isomorphic to *C* $\langle h-1, k \rangle$ . Let *J*<sub>0</sub> := {*j* : *r* ∈ *Y<sub>j</sub>*}, and let  $J_i := \{j : Y_j \cap V(H_i) \neq \emptyset\}$  for  $i \in [1, k]$ . Denote  $\sum_{j \in J_i} \alpha_j$  by  $\alpha(J_i)$  for brevity. Thus,  $\alpha(J_0) \geqslant 1$ . For  $i \in [1, k]$ , the subgraph  $H_i$  is  $\alpha(J_i)$ -colourable with defect *d*, and thus  $\alpha(J_i) \geq h - 1 - (h - 2)d/k$  by the induction hypothesis. Thus,

$$
(k-d)\alpha(J_0) + \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha(J_i) \geqslant (k-d) + k(h-1) - (h-2)d = kh - (h-1)d.
$$

If  $j \in J_0$  then  $Y_j$  intersects at most *d* of  $H_1, \ldots, H_k$  (since  $G[Y_j]$  has maximum degree at most *d*). Thus, every  $\alpha_i$  appears with coefficient at most *k* in the left side of the above inequality, implying

$$
(k-d)\alpha(J_0)+\sum_{i=1}^k\alpha(J_i)\leqslant k\sum_{i=1}^s\alpha_i\leqslant kt.
$$

Combining the above inequalities yields the claimed bound on *t*.

**Proof of Theorem [6.](#page-3-1)** By [Lemma 12,](#page-9-1)

$$
\chi^f_{\star}(\mathcal{G}) \geqslant \chi^f_{\Delta}(\mathcal{G}) \geqslant \text{tcn}(\mathcal{G}) - 1.
$$

It remains to show that  $\chi^f_\star(\mathcal{G}) \leqslant \text{tr}(\mathcal{G}) - 1$ . Equivalently, we need to show that for all *h*,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , if  $C(h, k) \notin \mathcal{G}$  then there exists *c* such that every graph in  $\mathcal{G}$  is fractionally  $(h - 1 +$ *ε*)-colourable with clustering *c*. This is trivial for  $h = 1$ , and so we assume  $h \ge 2$ .

 $\Box$ 

<span id="page-9-0"></span><sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Dvořák and Sereni [\[26\]](#page-11-2) expressed their result in the terms of "treedepth fragility". The sentence "proper minor-closed classes are fractionally treedepth-fragile" after Theorem 31 in [\[26\]](#page-11-2) is equivalent to Theorem [11.](#page-9-2) Informally speaking, Theorem [11](#page-9-2) shows that the fractional "treedepth" chromatic number of every minor-closed class equals 1.

Let  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfy the conclusion of Theorem [11](#page-9-2) for the class  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\delta = 1 - \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon/(h-1)}$ . Choose  $c = c(d, k + 1, h)$  to satisfy the conclusion of Lemma [8.](#page-4-0) We show that *c* is as desired.

Consider *G* ∈ *G*. By the choice of *d* there exists  $s \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_s \subseteq V(G)$  such that:

- $td(G[X_i]) \leq d$ , and
- every  $v \in V(G)$  belongs to at least  $(1 \delta)s$  of these sets.

Since  $C(h, k) \notin G$ , we have  $W(h, k + 1) \notin G$ , and by the choice of *c*, for each  $i \in [1, s]$  there exists a partition  $(Y_i^1, Y_i^2, \ldots, Y_i^{h-1})$  of  $X_i$  such that every component of  $G[Y_i^j]$  has at most *c* vertices. Every vertex of *G* belongs to at least  $(1 - \delta)s$  sets  $Y_i^j$  where  $i \in [1, s]$  and  $j \in [1, h - 1]$ . Considering these sets with equal coefficients  $\alpha_i^j := \frac{1}{(1-\delta)s}$ , we conclude that *G* is fractionally  $\frac{h-1}{1-\delta}$ -colourable with clustering *c*, as desired (since  $\frac{h-1}{1-\delta} = h - 1 + \varepsilon$ ).

### **Acknowledgement**

This work was partially completed while SN was visiting Monash University supported by a Robert Bartnik Visiting Fellowship. SN thanks the School of Mathematics at Monash University for its hospitality. Thanks to the referee for several helpful comments.

#### **References**

- <span id="page-10-0"></span>[1] Alon, N., Ding, G., Oporowski, B. and Vertigan, D. (2003) Partitioning into graphs with only small components. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **87**(2) 231–243.
- <span id="page-10-11"></span>[2] Archdeacon, D. (1987) A note on defective colorings of graphs in surfaces. *J. Graph Theory* **11**(4) 517–519.
- [3] Broutin, N. and Kang, R. J. (2018) Bounded monochromatic components for random graphs. *J. Comb.* **9**(3) 411–446.
- [4] Choi, I. and Esperet, L. (2019) Improper coloring of graphs on surfaces. *J. Graph Theory* **91**(1) 16–34.
- <span id="page-10-12"></span>[5] Cowen, L., Goddard, W. and Jesurum, C. E. (1997) Defective coloring revisited. *J. Graph Theory* **24**(3) 205–219.
- <span id="page-10-1"></span>[6] Dujmovic, V., Esperet, L., Morin, P., Walczak, B. and Wood, D. R. (2022) Clustered 3-colouring graphs of bounded ´ degree. *Combin. Probab. Comput.* **31**(1) 123–135.
- <span id="page-10-2"></span>[7] Dvořák, Z. and Norin, S. (2017) Islands in minor-closed classes. I. Bounded treewidth and separators, arXiv: 1710.02727.
- <span id="page-10-3"></span>[8] Edwards, K., Kang, D. Y., Kim, J., Oum, S. and Seymour, P. (2015) A relative of Hadwiger's conjecture. *SIAM J. Disc. Math.* **29**(4) 2385–2388.
- <span id="page-10-4"></span>[9] Esperet, L. and Joret, G. (2014) Colouring planar graphs with three colours and no large monochromatic components. *Combin., Probab. Comput.* **23**(4) 551–570.
- [10] Haxell, P., Szabó, T. and Tardos, G. (2003) Bounded size components—partitions and transversals. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **88**(2) 281–297.
- [11] Kang, D. Y. and Oum, S. (2019) Improper coloring of graphs with no odd clique minor. *Combin. Probab. Comput.* **28**(5) 740–754.
- [12] Kawarabayashi, K. (2008) A weakening of the odd Hadwiger's conjecture. *Combin. Probab. Comput.* **17**(6) 815–821.
- [13] Kawarabayashi, K. and Mohar, B. (2007) A relaxed Hadwiger's conjecture for list colorings. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **97**(4) 647–651.
- <span id="page-10-13"></span>[14] Liu, C.-H. and Oum, S. (2018) Partitioning *H*-minor free graphs into three subgraphs with no large components. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **128** 114–133.
- [15] Liu, C.-H. and Wood, D. R. (2019a) Clustered coloring of graphs excluding a subgraph and a minor , arXiv: 1905.09495.
- [16] Liu, C.-H. and Wood, D. R. (2019b) Clustered graph coloring and layered treewidth, arXiv: 1905.08969.
- [17] Liu, C.-H. and Wood, D. R. (2022) Clustered variants of Hajós' conjecture. *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. B* **152**(2) 27–54.
- <span id="page-10-5"></span>[18] Mohar, B., Reed, B. and Wood, D. R. (2017) Colourings with bounded monochromatic components in graphs of given circumference. *Australas. J. Combin.* **69**(2) 236–242.
- <span id="page-10-6"></span>[19] Norin, S., Scott, A., Seymour, P. and Wood, D. R. (2019) Clustered colouring in minor-closed classes. *Combinatorica* **39**(6) 1387–1412.
- <span id="page-10-10"></span>[20] Ossona de Mendez, P., Oum, S. and Wood, D. R. (2019) Defective colouring of graphs excluding a subgraph or minor. *Combinatorica* **39**(2) 377–410.
- <span id="page-10-7"></span>[21] van den Heuvel, J. and Wood, D. R. (2018) Improper colourings inspired by Hadwiger's conjecture. *J. London Math. Soc.* **98**(1) 129–148, arXiv: 1704.06536.
- <span id="page-10-8"></span>[22] Wood, D. R. (2018) Defective and clustered graph colouring. *Electron. J. Combin.,* DS23, Version 1.
- <span id="page-10-9"></span>[23] Nešetřil, J. and Ossona de Mendez, P. (2012) *Sparsity*, vol. 28. Algorithms and Combinatorics. Springer .
- <span id="page-11-0"></span>[24] Eppstein, D. (2020) Pathbreaking for intervals, *11011110.*
- <span id="page-11-1"></span>[25] Dujmovic, V., Joret, G., Kozik, J. and Wood, D. R. (2016) Nonrepetitive colouring via entropy compression. ´ *Combinatorica* **36**(6) 661–686.
- <span id="page-11-2"></span>[26] Dvoˇrák, Z. and Sereni, J.-S. (2020) On fractional fragility rates of graph classes. *Electronic J. Combinat*. **27**(4) P4.9.

**Cite this article:** Norin S, Scott A, and Wood DR (2023). Clustered colouring of graph classes with bounded treedepth or pathwidth. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* **32**, 122–133. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548322000165>