

# A well-quasi-order for tournaments

Maria Chudnovsky<sup>1</sup>  
Columbia University, New York, NY 10027

Paul Seymour<sup>2</sup>  
Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544

June 12, 2009; revised July 21, 2009

<sup>1</sup>Supported by NSF grant DMS-0758364.

<sup>2</sup>Supported by ONR grant N00014-01-1-0608.

## Abstract

A digraph  $H$  is *immersed* in a digraph  $G$  if the vertices of  $H$  are mapped to (distinct) vertices of  $G$ , and the edges of  $H$  are mapped to directed paths joining the corresponding pairs of vertices of  $G$ , in such a way that the paths are pairwise edge-disjoint. For graphs the same relation (using paths instead of directed paths) is a well-quasi-order; that is, in every infinite set of graphs some one of them is immersed in some other. The same is not true for digraphs in general; but we show it is true for tournaments (a *tournament* is a directed complete graph).

# 1 Introduction

In [5], Neil Robertson and the second author proved Wagner’s conjecture, that in any infinite set of graphs, one of them is a minor of another; and in [6], the same authors proved a conjecture of Nash-Williams, that in any infinite set of graphs, one of them is weakly immersed in another (we define weak immersion below). It is tempting to try to extend these results to digraphs; but it not clear what we should mean by a “minor” of a digraph, and although digraph immersion makes sense, the statement analogous to Nash-Williams’ conjecture is false.

Let us make this more precise. Let  $G, H$  be digraphs. (In this paper, all graphs and digraphs are finite, and may have multiples edges but not loops.) A *weak immersion* of  $H$  in  $G$  is a map  $\eta$  such that

- $\eta(v) \in V(G)$  for each  $v \in V(H)$
- $\eta(u) \neq \eta(v)$  for distinct  $u, v \in V(H)$
- for each edge  $e = uv$  of  $H$  (this notation means that  $e$  is directed from  $u$  to  $v$ ),  $\eta(e)$  is a directed path of  $G$  from  $\eta(u)$  to  $\eta(v)$  (paths do not have “repeated” vertices)
- if  $e, f \in E(H)$  are distinct, then  $\eta(e), \eta(f)$  have no edges in common, although they may share vertices

If in addition we add the condition

- if  $v \in V(H)$  and  $e \in E(H)$ , and  $e$  is not incident with  $v$  in  $H$ , then  $\eta(v)$  is not a vertex of the path  $\eta(e)$

we call the relation *strong immersion*. (For undirected graphs the definitions are the same except we use paths instead of directed paths.)

A *quasi-order*  $Q$  consists of a class  $E(Q)$  and a transitive reflexive relation which we denote by  $\leq$  or  $\leq_Q$ ; and it is a *well-quasi-order* or *wqo* if for every infinite sequence  $q_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots$ ) of elements of  $E(Q)$  there exist  $j > i \geq 1$  such that  $q_i \leq_Q q_j$ . The result of [5] asserts that

**1.1** *The class of all graphs is a wqo under the minor relation.*

At first sight this looks stronger than what we said before; but it is easy to show that a quasi-order is a wqo if and only if there is no infinite antichain and no infinite strictly descending chain, so 1.1 is not really stronger. Similarly, the theorem of [6] asserts:

**1.2** *The class of all graphs is a wqo under weak immersion.*

It remains open whether the class of all graphs is a wqo under strong immersion (this is another conjecture of Nash-Williams); Robertson and the second author believe that at one time they had a proof, but it was extremely long and complicated, and was never written down.

What about directed graphs? Unfortunately weak immersion does not provide a wqo of the class of digraphs. To see this, let  $C_n$  be a cycle of length  $2n$  and direct its edges alternately clockwise and counterclockwise; then no member of the set  $\{C_i : i \geq 2\}$  is weakly immersed in another. Thor Johnson studied immersion for eulerian digraphs in his PhD thesis [2], and proved (although did not

write down) that for any  $k$ , the class of all eulerian digraphs of maximum outdegree at most  $k$  is a wqo under weak immersion.

Immersion for another class of digraphs arose in our work on Rao's conjecture about degree sequences; we needed to prove that the class of all directed complete bipartite graphs is a wqo under strong immersion. (Moreover, we needed the immersion relation to respect the parts of the bipartition.) This we managed to do, and it led to a proof of Rao's conjecture, that we will publish in a separate paper [4].

This suggests what seems to be a more natural question; instead of directed complete bipartite graphs, what about using directed complete graphs (that is, tournaments)? We found that our proof also worked for tournaments, and in this context was much simpler; and since this seems to be of independent interest we decided to write up the tournament result separately. That is the content of this paper. Thus, the result of this paper asserts:

**1.3** *The class of all tournaments is a wqo under strong immersion.*

## 2 Cutwidth

If  $k \geq 0$  is an integer, an enumeration  $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$  of the vertex set of a digraph has *cutwidth* at most  $k$  if for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ , there are at most  $k$  edges  $uv$  such that  $u \in \{v_1, \dots, v_j\}$  and  $v \in \{v_{j+1}, \dots, v_n\}$ ; and a digraph has *cutwidth* at most  $k$  if there is an enumeration of its vertex set with cutwidth at most  $k$ . The following was proved in [1]:

**2.1** *For every set  $\mathcal{S}$  of tournaments, the following are equivalent:*

- *there exists  $k$  such that every member of  $\mathcal{S}$  has cutwidth at most  $k$*
- *there is a digraph  $H$  such that  $H$  cannot be strongly immersed in any member of  $\mathcal{S}$ .*

We will prove:

**2.2** *For every integer  $k \geq 0$ , the class of all tournaments with cutwidth at most  $k$  is a wqo under strong immersion.*

**Proof of 1.3, assuming 2.2.** Suppose that the class of all tournaments is not a wqo under strong immersion. Then there is an infinite sequence  $T_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots$ ) such that for  $1 \leq i < j$ , there is no strong immersion of  $T_i$  in  $T_j$ . Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be the set  $\{T_2, T_3, \dots\}$ ; then there is a digraph  $H$  such that  $H$  cannot be strongly immersed in any member of  $\mathcal{S}$ , namely  $T_1$ . By 2.1 there exists  $k$  such that every member of  $\mathcal{S}$  has cutwidth at most  $k$ ; but this is contrary to 2.2. This proves 1.3. ■

The remainder of the paper is devoted to proving 2.2.

Let  $G$  be a digraph, and let  $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$  be an enumeration of  $V(G)$ . For  $1 \leq i < n$  let  $B_i = \{v_1, \dots, v_i\}$  and  $A_i = \{v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n\}$ , and let  $F_i$  be the set of all edges from  $B_i$  to  $A_i$ . We say that the enumeration  $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$  is *linked* if for all  $h, j$  with  $1 \leq h < j < n$ , if  $|F_h| = |F_j| = t$  say, and  $|F_i| \geq t$  for all  $i$  with  $h \leq i \leq j$ , then there are  $t$  pairwise edge-disjoint directed paths of  $G$  from  $B_h$  to  $A_j$ . We need:

**2.3** Let  $G$  be a digraph and  $k \geq 0$  an integer. If  $G$  has cutwidth at most  $k$  then there is a linked enumeration of  $G$  with cutwidth at most  $k$ .

**Proof.** Let  $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$  be an enumeration of  $V(G)$  with cutwidth at most  $k$ , chosen optimally in the following sense. For  $1 \leq i < n$ , let  $A_i, B_i, F_i$  be as before. For  $0 \leq s \leq k$ , let  $n_s$  be the number of values of  $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$  with  $|F_i| = s$ . Let us choose the enumeration  $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$  such that  $n_0$  is as large as possible; subject to that,  $n_1$  is as large as possible; subject to that,  $n_2$  is as large as possible, and so on. We claim that this enumeration is linked.

For let  $1 \leq h < j < n$ , and suppose that  $|F_h| = |F_j| = t$  say, and  $|F_i| \geq t$  for all  $i$  with  $h \leq i \leq j$ , and there do not exist  $t$  pairwise edge-disjoint directed paths of  $G$  from  $B_h$  to  $A_j$ . By Menger's theorem there is a partition  $(P, Q)$  of  $V(G)$  with  $B_h \subseteq P$  and  $A_j \subseteq Q$ , such that  $|F| < t$ , where  $F$  is the set of all edges of  $G$  with tail in  $P$  and head in  $Q$ . Choose such a partition  $(P, Q)$  with  $|F|$  as small as possible. Let  $P = \{x_1, \dots, x_p\}$ , and  $Q = \{y_1, \dots, y_q\}$ , where both sets are enumerated in the order induced from the enumeration  $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ . Since  $B_h \subseteq P$  it follows that  $h \leq p$ , and similarly  $p \leq j$ . Now  $\{x_1, \dots, x_p, y_1, \dots, y_q\}$  is an enumeration of  $V(G)$ , say  $\{v'_1, \dots, v'_n\}$ . For  $1 \leq i < n$ , let  $B'_i = \{v'_1, \dots, v'_i\}$  and  $A'_i = \{v'_{i+1}, \dots, v'_n\}$ , and let  $F'_i$  be the set of all edges from  $B'_i$  to  $A'_i$ . Thus  $B'_p = P$  and  $A'_p = Q$ , and  $F'_p = F$ . For a subset  $Z \subseteq V(G)$ , we denote by  $\delta^+(Z)$  the set of edges of  $G$  with tail in  $Z$  and head in  $V(G) \setminus Z$ .

We claim that  $|F'_1|, \dots, |F'_{p-1}| \leq k$ . For let  $1 \leq r < p$ , and choose  $i < n$  such that  $B'_r = B_i \cap P$  and  $A'_r = A_i \cup Q$ . Since  $P \not\subseteq B_i$  (because  $x_{r+1} \notin B'_r$ ), and  $P \subseteq B_j$ , it follows that  $i < j$ , and so  $A_j \cap (B_i \cup P) = \emptyset$ . Since  $B_h \subseteq P \subseteq B_i \cup P$ , the minimality of  $|F|$  implies that  $|\delta^+(B_i \cup P)| \geq |F|$ . Now

$$|\delta^+(B_i)| + |\delta^+(P)| \geq |\delta^+(B_i \cap P)| + |\delta^+(B_i \cup P)|,$$

and so

$$|F_i| + |F| \geq |F'_r| + |\delta^+(B_i \cup P)| \geq |F'_r| + |F|,$$

that is,  $|F'_r| \leq |F_i|$ . In particular,  $|F'_1|, \dots, |F'_{p-1}| \leq k$ , and similarly  $|F'_{p+1}|, \dots, |F'_{n-1}| \leq k$ , and since  $F'_p = F$  and  $|F| < t \leq k$ , we see that the enumeration  $\{v'_1, \dots, v'_n\}$  has cutwidth at most  $k$ .

For  $0 \leq s \leq k$ , let  $n'_s$  be the number of values of  $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$  with  $|F'_i| = s$ . We claim that  $n'_s \geq n_s$  for  $0 \leq s \leq t-1$ . For let  $0 \leq s \leq t-1$ , and let  $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$  with  $|F_i| = s$ . We claim that  $|F'_i| = s$ , and indeed  $F'_i = F_i$ . From the choice of  $h, j$  it follows that either  $i < h$  or  $i > j$ , and from the symmetry we may assume the first. But then  $B_i \subseteq P$ , and so  $B'_i = B_i$  and  $A'_i = A_i$ ; and so  $F'_i = F_i$ . This proves that  $n'_s \geq n_s$  for  $0 \leq s \leq t-1$ . From the choice of  $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ , we deduce that  $n'_s = n_s$  for  $0 \leq s \leq t-1$ ; and so for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ , if  $|F'_i| < t$ , then  $i < h$  or  $i > j$ . But  $|F'_p| = |F| < t$ , and  $h \leq p \leq j$ , a contradiction. This proves that  $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$  is linked, and so proves 2.3. ■

### 3 Codewords

A *march* is a finite sequence  $x_1, \dots, x_k$  of distinct elements, and  $k$  is the *length* of this march. If  $\mu$  is a march  $x_1, \dots, x_k$ , we define its *support* to be  $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ . If  $(\mu_1, \nu_1)$  and  $(\mu_2, \nu_2)$  are both pairs of marches, we say they are *equivalent* if

- $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$  have the same length, say  $m$

- $\nu_1$  and  $\nu_2$  have the same length, say  $n$
- for  $1 \leq i \leq m$  and  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , the  $i$ th term of  $\mu_1$  equals the  $j$ th term of  $\nu_1$  if and only if the  $i$ th term of  $\mu_2$  equals the  $j$ th term of  $\nu_2$ .

A *codeword of type  $k$*  is a pair  $(P, f)$ , where  $P$  is a directed path and  $f$  is a map from  $V(P)$  into the class of ordered pairs of marches both of length at most  $k$ , with the following properties:

- let  $P$  have vertices  $p_1, \dots, p_n$  in order; then for  $1 \leq i < n$ , the second term of the pair  $f(p_i)$  and the first term of the pair  $f(p_{i+1})$  have the same length
- the first term of the pair  $f(p_1)$  and the second term of the pair  $f(p_n)$  both have length zero.

For each edge  $e = p_i p_{i+1}$  of  $P$ , let  $a(e)$  be the common lengths of the second term of the pair  $f(p_i)$  and the first term of the pair  $f(p_{i+1})$ . We call the function  $a : E(P) \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$  the *cutsizes function* of the codeword.

We define a quasi-order  $\mathcal{C}_k$  on the class of all codewords of type  $k$  as follows. Let  $(P, f)$  and  $(Q, g)$  be codewords of type  $k$ , with cutsizes functions  $a, b$  respectively. Let  $P, Q$  have vertices (in order)  $p_1, \dots, p_m$  and  $q_1, \dots, q_n$  respectively. We say  $(P, f) \leq (Q, g)$  if there exist  $r(1), \dots, r(m)$  with  $1 \leq r(1) < r(2) < \dots < r(m) \leq n$ , such that

- for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $f(p_i)$  and  $g(q_{r(i)})$  are equivalent pairs of marches
- for  $1 \leq i < m$ , let  $e$  be the edge  $p_i p_{i+1}$  of  $P$ ; then  $a(e) \leq b(e')$  for every edge  $e'$  of the subpath of  $Q$  between  $q_{r(i)}$  and  $q_{r(i+1)}$ .

Since the class of all pairs of matchings of length at most  $k$ , ordered by equivalence, is a wqo (since there are only finitely many equivalence classes), we have by [3] that:

**3.1** For each  $k \geq 0$ , the quasi-order  $\mathcal{C}_k$  is a wqo.

## 4 Encoding

We need the following lemma.

**4.1** Let  $G$  be a digraph, and let  $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$  be a linked enumeration of  $V(G)$ . For  $1 \leq i < n$  let  $B_i = \{v_1, \dots, v_i\}$  and  $A_i = \{v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n\}$ , and let  $F_i$  be the set of all edges from  $B_i$  to  $A_i$ . Then for  $1 \leq i < n$  there is a march  $\mu_i$  with support  $F_i$ , such that for all  $h, j$  with  $1 \leq h < j < n$ , if  $|F_h| = |F_j| = t$  say, and  $|F_i| \geq t$  for all  $i$  with  $h \leq i \leq j$ , then there are  $t$  pairwise edge-disjoint directed paths  $P_1, \dots, P_t$  of  $G$  from  $B_h$  to  $A_j$ , such that for  $1 \leq s \leq t$ , the  $s$ th term of  $\mu_h$  and the  $s$ th term of  $\mu_j$  are both edges of  $P_s$ .

**Proof.** Fix  $t$  such that  $|F_i| = t$  for some  $i$ . Let  $i(1), i(2), \dots, i(m)$  be the values of  $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$  with  $|F_i| = t$ , with  $i(1) < i(2) < \dots < i(m)$ . Choose a march  $\mu_{i(1)}$  with support  $F_{i(1)}$ . Inductively, having defined a march  $\mu_{i(j-1)}$  with support  $F_{i(j-1)}$ , with  $j < m$ , there are two cases:

- if there do not exist  $t$  directed paths of  $G$  from  $B_{i(j-1)}$  to  $A_{i(j)}$ , pairwise edge-disjoint (that is, if there exists  $i$  with  $i(j-1) < i < i(j)$  and with  $|F_i| < t$ ), let  $\mu_{j(i)}$  be some march with support  $F_{j(i)}$ , chosen arbitrarily

- if there exist  $t$  directed paths of  $G$  from  $B_{i(j-1)}$  to  $A_{i(j)}$ , pairwise edge-disjoint, choose some set of  $t$  such paths; we may number these paths as  $P_1, \dots, P_t$  in such a way that for  $1 \leq s \leq t$ , the  $s$ th term of  $\mu_{i(j-1)}$  is an edge of  $P_s$ , and then choose  $\mu_{j(i)}$  with support  $F_{j(i)}$  in such a way that for  $1 \leq s \leq t$ , the  $s$ th term of  $\mu_{i(j)}$  is an edge of  $P_s$ .

Then it follows easily that for all  $h, j$  with  $1 \leq h < j < n$ , if  $|F_h| = |F_j| = t$ , and  $|F_i| \geq t$  for all  $i$  with  $h \leq i \leq j$ , then there are  $t$  pairwise edge-disjoint directed paths  $P_1, \dots, P_t$  of  $G$  from  $B_h$  to  $A_j$ , such that for  $1 \leq s \leq t$ , the  $s$ th term of  $\mu_h$  and the  $s$ th term of  $\mu_j$  are both edges of  $P_s$ . By repeating this process for all values of  $t$  we obtain marches satisfying the theorem. This proves 4.1.  $\blacksquare$

Let  $G$  be a tournament of cutwidth at most  $k$ . We now define how to associate a codeword (not necessarily uniquely) with  $G$ . Choose a linked enumeration  $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$  of  $V(G)$  of cutwidth at most  $k$ ; this is possible by 2.3. For  $1 \leq i < n$ , let  $A_i, B_i, F_i$  be as in 4.1, and choose a march  $\mu_i$  as in 4.1. Define  $\mu_0, \mu_n$  to both be the march of length zero. Let  $P$  be a directed path with vertices  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  in order. For  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , let  $f(v_i) = (\mu_{i-1}, \mu_i)$ . Then  $(P, f)$  is a codeword of type  $k$ , and we say this codeword is *associated* with  $G$ .

**4.2** *Let  $G, H$  be tournaments of cutwidth at most  $k$ , with associated codewords  $(P, f)$  and  $(Q, g)$  respectively. Suppose that  $(P, f) \leq (Q, g)$  in  $\mathcal{C}_k$ . Then there is a strong immersion of  $G$  in  $H$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $\{u_1, \dots, u_m\}$  be a linked enumeration of  $V(G)$  of cutwidth at most  $k$  giving rise to the codeword  $(P, f)$ , and choose  $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\} = V(H)$  similarly. Thus  $P$  has vertices  $u_1, \dots, u_m$  in order. For  $1 \leq i < m$ , let  $B_i = \{u_1, \dots, u_i\}$  and  $A_i = \{u_{i+1}, \dots, u_m\}$ , and let  $E_i$  be the set of edges of  $G$  from  $B_i$  to  $A_i$ . For  $1 \leq j < n$ , let  $D_j = \{v_1, \dots, v_j\}$  and  $C_j = \{v_{j+1}, \dots, v_n\}$ , and let  $F_j$  be the set of edges of  $H$  from  $D_j$  to  $C_j$ . For  $1 \leq i < m$  let  $\mu_i$  be the march with support  $E_i$  as in 4.1 used to obtain the codeword  $(P, f)$ , and for  $1 \leq j < n$  let  $\nu_j$  be a march with support  $F_j$  chosen similarly.

Since  $(P, f) \leq (Q, g)$  in  $\mathcal{C}_k$ , there exist  $r(1), \dots, r(m)$  with  $1 \leq r(1) < r(2) < \dots < r(m) \leq n$ , such that

- for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $f(u_i)$  and  $g(v_{r(i)})$  are equivalent pairs of marches
- for  $1 \leq i < m$ , let  $e$  be the edge  $u_i u_{i+1}$  of  $P$ ; then  $a(e) \leq b(e')$  for every edge  $e'$  of the subpath of  $Q$  between  $v_{r(i)}$  and  $v_{r(i+1)}$ , where  $a, b$  are the cutsize functions of  $(P, f)$  and  $(Q, g)$  respectively.

Thus we have

(1) *For  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $(\mu_{i-1}, \mu_i)$  and  $(\nu_{r(i)-1}, \nu_{r(i)})$  are equivalent pairs of marches. In particular,  $|E_{i-1}| = |F_{r(i)-1}|$ , and  $|E_i| = |F_{r(i)}|$ , and  $|E_{i-1} \cap E_i| = |F_{r(i)-1} \cap F_{r(i)}|$ .*

This is just a reformulation of the first bullet statement above. Similarly the second bullet implies:

(2) *For  $1 \leq i < m$ ,  $|F_{r(i)}| = |F_{r(i+1)-1}| = |E_i|$ , and  $|F_j| \geq |E_i|$  for all  $j$  with  $r(i) \leq j \leq r(i+1) - 1$ .*

(3) *Let  $1 \leq i < m$ . For each edge  $e \in E_i$  there is a directed path  $P_i(e)$  of  $H$  with the following properties:*

- the paths  $P_i(e)$  ( $e \in E_i$ ) are pairwise edge-disjoint
- the first edge of  $P_i(e)$  is in  $F_{r(i)}$ , and has tail  $v_{r(i)}$  if and only if  $e$  has tail  $u_i$
- the last edge of  $P_i(e)$  is in  $F_{r(i+1)}$ , and has head  $v_{r(i+1)}$  if and only if  $e$  has head  $u_{i+1}$
- all internal vertices of  $P_i(e)$  belong to  $\{v_{r(i)+1}, \dots, v_{r(i+1)-1}\}$
- choose  $s$  such that  $e$  is the  $s$ th term of the march  $\mu_i$ ; then the first edge of  $P_i(e)$  is the  $s$ th term of the march  $\nu_{r(i)}$ , and the last edge of  $P_i(e)$  is the  $s$ th term of the march  $\nu_{r(i+1)-1}$ .

For let  $t = |E_i|$ . By (2) and the choice of the marches  $\nu_j$ , there are  $t$  pairwise edge-disjoint directed paths  $Q_1, \dots, Q_t$  of  $H$  from  $D_{r(i)}$  to  $C_{r(i+1)-1}$ , such that for  $1 \leq s \leq t$ , the  $s$ th term of  $\nu_{r(i)}$  and the  $s$ th term of  $\nu_{r(i+1)-1}$  are both edges of  $Q_s$ . Since  $Q_1, \dots, Q_t$  are pairwise edge-disjoint and each contains an edge of  $F_{r(i)}$ , and  $|F_{r(i)}| = t$ , it follows that each  $Q_s$  has exactly one edge in  $F_{r(i)}$ , and similarly exactly one edge in  $F_{r(i+1)-1}$ . By choosing  $Q_s$  minimal we may assume that the  $s$ th term of  $\nu_{r(i)}$  is the first edge of  $Q_s$ , and the  $s$ th term of  $\nu_{r(i+1)-1}$  is the last edge of  $Q_s$ , for  $1 \leq s \leq t$ , and all internal vertices of  $Q_s$  belong to  $\{v_{r(i)+1}, \dots, v_{r(i+1)-1}\}$ . Now let  $1 \leq s \leq t$ , and let  $e$  be the  $s$ th term of  $\mu_i$ . We define  $P_i(e) = Q_s$ . This defines  $P_i(e)$  for each  $e \in E_i$ , and we claim the five bullets above are all satisfied. We have already seen that the first, fourth and fifth bullet are satisfied; let us check the second. Certainly the first edge of  $P_i(e)$  is in  $F_{r(i)}$ ; let it be  $f$  say. We must show that  $f$  has tail  $v_{r(i)}$  if and only if  $e$  has tail  $u_i$ . Now  $e$  has tail  $u_i$  if and only if  $e \notin E_{i-1}$  or  $i = 1$ , that is, if and only if  $e$  does not belong to the support of  $\mu_{i-1}$ . But since  $e$  is the  $s$ th term of  $\mu_i$  and the pairs of marches  $(\mu_{i-1}, \mu_i)$  and  $(\nu_{r(i)-1}, \nu_{r(i)})$  are equivalent, it follows that  $e$  is not in the support of  $\mu_{i-1}$  if and only if the  $s$ th term of  $\nu_{r(i)}$  is not in the support of  $\nu_{r(i)-1}$ , that is, if and only if  $f$  has tail  $v_{r(i)}$ . This proves the second bullet, and the third follows similarly. This proves (3).

(4) For each edge  $e \in E(G)$  with  $e = u_h u_j$  say with  $h < j$ , there is a directed path  $\eta(e)$  of  $H$  from  $v_{r(h)}$  to  $v_{r(j)}$ , such that none of  $v_{r(1)}, \dots, v_{r(m)}$  is an internal vertex of  $\eta(e)$ , and the paths  $\eta(e)$  ( $e \in E(G)$ ) are pairwise edge-disjoint. Moreover, if  $e$  is the  $s$ th term of  $\mu_h$  then the first edge of  $\eta(e)$  is the  $s$ th term of  $\nu_{r(h)}$ , and if  $e$  is the  $t$ th term of  $\mu_{j-1}$  then the last edge of  $\eta(e)$  is the  $t$ th term of  $\nu_{r(j)-1}$ .

For let  $e = u_h u_j$  say with  $h < j$ . It follows that  $e$  belongs to each of the sets  $E_i$  for  $h \leq i < j$ , and so the paths  $P_h(e), P_{h+1}(e), \dots, P_{j-1}(e)$  are all defined, as in (3). We claim that for  $h+1 \leq i \leq j-1$ , the last edge of  $P_{i-1}(e)$  is the first edge of  $P_i(e)$ . For let  $e$  be the  $s$ th term of the march  $\mu_{i-1}$  and the  $t$ th term of the march  $\mu_i$ . Let  $f$  be the  $s$ th term of the march  $\nu_{r(i)-1}$ , and let  $g$  be the  $t$ th term of the march  $\nu_{r(i)}$ . Then by the last statement of (3), it follows that  $f$  is the last edge of  $P_{i-1}(e)$ , and  $g$  is the first edge of  $P_i(e)$ . But the  $s$ th term of  $\mu_{i-1}$  equals the  $t$ th term of  $\mu_i$ , and since the pairs  $(\mu_{i-1}, \mu_i)$  and  $(\nu_{r(i)-1}, \nu_{r(i)})$  are equivalent, it follows that the  $s$ th term of  $\nu_{r(i)-1}$  equals the  $t$ th term of  $\nu_{r(i)}$ , that is,  $f = g$ . This proves our claim that for  $h+1 \leq i \leq j-1$ , the last edge of  $P_{i-1}(e)$  is the first edge of  $P_i(e)$ . Hence the union of the paths  $P_h(e), P_{h+1}(e), \dots, P_{j-1}(e)$  is a directed path  $\eta(e)$  say from  $v_{r(h)}$  to  $v_{r(j)}$ . If  $e$  is the  $s$ th term of  $\mu_h$ , then from (3) the first edge of  $P_h(e)$  is the  $s$ th term of  $\nu_{r(h)}$ , and hence the first edge of  $\eta(e)$  is the  $s$ th term of  $\nu_{r(h)}$ ; and similarly if  $e$  is the  $t$ th term of  $\mu_{j-1}$  then the last edge of  $\eta(e)$  is the  $t$ th term of  $\nu_{r(j)-1}$ . We see that the paths  $\eta(e)$  ( $e \in E(G)$ ) are pairwise edge-disjoint paths of  $H$ , and none of  $v_{r(1)}, \dots, v_{r(m)}$  is an internal vertex of any of the

paths  $\eta(e)$ . This proves (4).

(5) If  $1 \leq h < j \leq m$  and  $u_j$  is adjacent in  $G$  to  $u_h$ , then  $v_{r(j)}$  is adjacent in  $H$  to  $v_{r(h)}$ .

For suppose not. Then  $v_{r(h)}$  is adjacent in  $H$  to  $v_{r(j)}$ ; let  $f$  be the edge from  $v_{r(h)}$  to  $v_{r(j)}$ . Then  $f \in F_{r(h)}$ ; let  $f$  be the  $s$ th term of  $\nu_{r(h)}$ . Let  $e$  be the  $s$ th term of  $\mu_h$ ; then by (4)  $f$  is an edge of  $\eta(e)$ . Thus both  $v_{r(h)}, v_{r(j)}$  are vertices of  $\eta(e)$ , and since neither of them is an internal vertex of  $\eta(e)$  by (4), we deduce that  $\eta(e)$  is from  $v_{r(h)}$  to  $v_{r(j)}$ . From the definition of  $\eta(e)$  it follows that  $e = u_h u_j$ , a contradiction since  $u_j$  is adjacent to  $u_h$  in  $G$  by hypothesis, and  $G$  is a tournament, a contradiction. This proves (5).

From (5), if  $e = u_j u_h$  is an edge of  $G$  with  $h < j$ , let us define  $\eta(e)$  to be the path of  $H$  of length one from  $v_{r(j)}$  to  $v_{r(h)}$ . (Thus these paths are pairwise edge-disjoint; and moreover, they are edge-disjoint from the paths  $\eta(e)$  we defined in (4), since those paths have no internal vertex in  $\{v_{r(1)}, \dots, v_{r(m)}\}$ .) Now for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , let  $\eta(u_i) = v_{r(i)}$ ; then  $\eta$  is a strong immersion of  $G$  in  $H$ . This proves 4.2. ■

**Proof of 2.2.** Let  $G_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots$ ) be an infinite sequence of tournaments, all of cutwidth at most  $k$ . We must show that there exist  $j > i \geq 1$  such that  $G_i$  is strongly immersed in  $G_j$ . For each  $i$  let  $(P_i, f_i)$  be a codeword of type  $k$  associated with  $G_i$ . By 3.1 there exist  $j > i \geq 1$  such that  $(P_i, f_i) \leq (P_j, f_j)$  in the wqo  $\mathcal{C}_k$ . By 4.2 it follows that there is a strong immersion of  $G_i$  in  $G_j$ . This proves 2.2, and hence completes the proof of 1.3. ■

## References

- [1] Maria Chudnovsky, Alexandra Fradkin and Paul Seymour, “Tournament immersion and cutwidth”, in preparation.
- [2] Thor Johnson, “Eulerian Digraph Immersion”, Ph. D. thesis, Princeton University, 2002.
- [3] Igor Kriz, “Well-quasiordering finite trees with gap-condition”, *Annals of Mathematics*, 130 (1989), 215–226.
- [4] Maria Chudnovsky and Paul Seymour, “A proof of Rao’s degree sequence conjecture”, in preparation.
- [5] Neil Robertson and Paul Seymour, “Graph minors. XX. Wagner’s conjecture”, *J. Combinatorial Theory, Ser. B*, 92 (2004), 325–357.
- [6] Neil Robertson and Paul Seymour, “Graph minors. XXIII. Nash-Williams’s immersion conjecture”, *J. Combinatorial Theory, Ser. B*, to appear.