

# Cliques in Odd-Minor-Free Graphs<sup>\*</sup>

Ken-ichi Kawarabayashi<sup>†</sup>     David R. Wood<sup>‡</sup>

February 8, 2012

## Abstract

This paper is about: (1) bounds on the number of cliques in a graph in a particular class, and (2) algorithms for listing all cliques in a graph. We present a simple algorithm that lists all cliques in an  $n$ -vertex graph in  $O(n)$  time per clique. For  $O(1)$ -degenerate graphs, such as graphs excluding a fixed minor, we describe a  $O(n)$  time algorithm for listing all cliques. We prove that graphs excluding a fixed odd-minor have  $O(n^2)$  cliques (which is tight), and conclude a  $O(n^3)$  time algorithm for listing all cliques.

## 1 Introduction

A *clique* in a graph<sup>1</sup> is a set of pairwise adjacent vertices. This paper is about:

- (1) bounds on the number of cliques in a graph in a particular class of graphs, and
- (2) algorithms for listing all cliques in a graph in such a class.

In addition to being of intrinsic interest, bounds on the number of cliques in a graph have recently been used in a proof that minor-closed graph classes are ‘small’ [19], and in the analysis of a linear-time algorithm for computing separators in graphs in minor-closed classes [22], which in turn has been applied in shortest path [24, 30, 31] and maximum matching [32] algorithms. Note that (1) and (2) for *maximal* cliques have been extensively studied; see [9] and the references therein.

---

<sup>\*</sup>A preliminary version of this paper was published in the Proceedings of Computing: the Australasian Theory Symposium (CATS 2012).

<sup>†</sup>National Institute of Informatics, Tokyo, Japan ([k\\_keniti@nii.ac.jp](mailto:k_keniti@nii.ac.jp)).

<sup>‡</sup>Department of Mathematics and Statistics, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia ([woodd@unimelb.edu.au](mailto:woodd@unimelb.edu.au)). Supported by a QEII Fellowship and Discovery Project from the Australian Research Council.

<sup>1</sup>We consider simple finite undirected graphs  $G$  with vertex set  $V(G)$  and edge set  $E(G)$ . For each vertex  $v \in V(G)$ , let  $N_G(v)$  or simply  $N(v)$ , be  $\{w \in V(G) : vw \in E(G)\}$ .

This paper describes a simple algorithm that lists all cliques in a given  $n$ -vertex graph in  $O(n)$  time per clique (Theorem 3). This implies that if we solve (1) for a particular class, then we immediately solve (2). Note that analogous results hold for maximal cliques: there are algorithms that list all maximal cliques in polynomial time per clique [8, 11, 12, 16, 21, 27] or in total time proportional to the maximum possible number of cliques in an  $n$ -vertex graph, without additional polynomial factors [7, 26].

As an example of (1), many authors have observed that every  $n$ -vertex planar graph contains  $O(n)$  cliques [6, 20]. Wood [29] proved the best possible upper bound of  $8(n-2)$ . More generally, for each surface  $\Sigma$ , Dujmović et al. [5] characterised the  $n$ -vertex graphs embeddable in  $\Sigma$  with the maximum number of cliques in terms of so-called irreducible triangulations. They also proved that if  $K_\omega$  is the largest complete graph that embeds in  $\Sigma$ , then every  $n$ -vertex graph that embeds in  $\Sigma$  contains at most  $8n + \frac{3}{2}2^\omega + o(2^\omega)$  cliques. Exact results and a precise characterisation of the extremal examples are obtained for graphs that embed in the plane, torus, double torus, projective plane,  $\mathbb{N}_3$ , and  $\mathbb{N}_4$ .

These results are generalised by considering  $H$ -minor-free graphs. A graph  $H$  is a *minor* of a graph  $G$  if  $H$  can be obtained from a subgraph of  $G$  by contracting edges. Equivalently,  $H$  is a minor of  $G$  if  $G$  contains a set of vertex-disjoint trees, one tree  $T_v$  for each vertex  $v$  of  $H$ , such that for every edge  $e = vw$  in  $H$  there is an edge  $\hat{e}$  between  $T_v$  and  $T_w$ . A graph  $H$  is an *odd minor* of  $G$  if, in addition, the vertices in  $\bigcup_v V(T_v)$  can be 2-coloured such that for each vertex  $v \in V(H)$  the edges in  $T_v$  are bichromatic, and for each edge  $e = vw \in E(H)$ , the edge  $\hat{e}$  between  $T_v$  and  $T_w$  is monochromatic. A graph is *(odd-) $H$ -minor-free* if it contains no (odd-) $H$ -minor.

Several authors have proved that for every fixed graph  $H$ , every  $H$ -minor-free graph with  $n$  vertices contains  $O(n)$  cliques [10, 19, 22, 29]. The best bound, due to Fomin et al. [10], states that every  $K_t$ -minor-free graph contains at most  $c^{t \log \log t} n$  cliques, for some constant  $c$ . It is open whether such graphs have at most  $c^t n$  cliques [29].

This paper considers (1) and (2) for graphs that exclude an odd minor. The class of odd- $H$ -minor-free graphs is more general than the class of  $H$ -minor-free graphs. For example, the complete bipartite graph  $K_{n,n}$  contains a  $K_{n+1}$  minor but contains no odd- $K_3$ -minor. In fact, a graph contains no odd  $K_3$ -minor if and only if it is bipartite. In general, every  $K_t$ -minor-free graph has  $O(t\sqrt{\log tn})$  edges, and this bound is best possible [15, 25]. On the other hand, some odd- $K_t$ -minor-free graphs, such as  $K_{n,n}$ , have  $\Theta(n^2)$  edges. This paper proves the following theorem:

**Theorem 1.** *For every fixed graph  $H$ , there is a constant  $c$ , such that every  $n$ -vertex odd- $H$ -minor-free graph  $G$  contains at most  $cn^2$  cliques, and these cliques can be listed in  $O(n^3)$  time.*

The bound on the number of cliques in Theorem 1 is best possible up to the value of  $c$ , since  $K_{n,n}$  contains no odd- $K_3$ -minor and contains  $\Theta(n^2)$  cliques. Also note that a polynomial bound on the number of cliques in every graph in a class is non-trivial, since  $K_n$  contains  $2^n$  cliques.

Theorem 1 is in sharp contrast with a number of intractability results about finding cliques: it is NP-complete to test if a graph  $G$  contains a  $k$ -clique (given  $G$  and  $k$ ) [14]; it is  $W[1]$ -complete to test if a graph  $G$  contains a  $k$ -clique (given  $G$  with parameter  $k$ ) [4]; and approximating the maximum clique size is hard [1].

## 2 General Graphs

Consider the following simple recursive algorithm for listing all cliques in a graph.

CLIQUE(S)( $G$ )  
*input:* graph  $G$   
*output:* the set of all cliques in  $G$

---

1. if  $V(G) = \emptyset$  then return  $\{\emptyset\}$
2. choose  $v \in V(G)$
3. return  $\{C \cup \{v\} : C \in \text{CLIQUE(S)}(G[N_G(v)])\} \cup \text{CLIQUE(S)}(G - v)$

**Theorem 2.** *If  $G$  is an  $n$ -vertex graph then CLIQUE(S)( $G$ ) returns the set of all cliques in  $G$ .*

*Proof.* We proceed by induction on  $|V(G)|$ . If  $V(G) = \emptyset$  then  $\emptyset$  is the only clique in  $G$ , and the algorithm correctly returns the set of all cliques in  $G$ . Otherwise, each clique  $C$  of  $G$  either contains  $v$  or does not contain  $v$ . In the first case,  $C$  is a clique of  $G$  containing  $v$  if and only if  $C = S \cup \{v\}$  for some clique  $S$  of  $G[N_G(v)]$ . In the second case,  $C$  is a clique of  $G$  not containing  $v$  if and only if  $C$  is a clique of  $G - v$ . Therefore, by induction, the algorithm correctly returns the set of all cliques of  $G$ . □

The next algorithm outputs all cliques in  $O(n)$  time per clique.

ALLCLIQUES( $G$ )	
<i>input</i> : graph $G$	
<i>output</i> : all cliques in $G$	
<hr/>	
1.	output $\emptyset$
2.	$i := 1$
3.	$V_i := V(G)$
4.	repeat
5.	if $V_i = \emptyset$ then $i := i - 1$
6.	else
7.	choose $x_i \in V_i$
8.	output $\{x_1, \dots, x_i\}$
9.	$V_{i+1} := V_i \cap N_G(x_i)$
10.	$V_i := V_i \setminus \{x_i\}$
11.	$i := i + 1$
12.	end-if
13.	until $i = 0$

**Theorem 3.** *If  $G$  is a graph with  $n$  vertices, then ALLCLIQUES( $G$ ) outputs all cliques in  $G$  in  $O(n)$  time per clique.*

*Proof.* It is easily seen that ALLCLIQUES is simply a non-recursive implementation of CLIQUES, and therefore correctly outputs all cliques in  $G$ . To implement this algorithm efficiently, without loss of generality, assume that  $V(G) = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , and the adjacency lists and the sets  $V_i$  are sorted. Thus lines 7–11 can be implemented in  $O(n)$  time, and line 5 can be computed in  $O(1)$  time. Between outputting successive cliques, lines 7–11 are executed once, and line 5 is executed at most  $n$  times. Thus the algorithm takes  $O(n)$  time between outputting successive cliques.  $\square$

### 3 Degenerate Graphs

A graph  $G$  is *d-degenerate* if every non-empty subgraph of  $G$  has a vertex of degree at most  $d$ . For example, every planar graph is 5-degenerate, and every  $K_t$ -minor-free graph is  $O(t\sqrt{\log t})$ -degenerate [15, 25]. Wood [29] proved that every  $d$ -degenerate graph contains at most  $2^d(n - d + 1)$  cliques, and this bound is tight for a  $d$ -tree. Below we give an algorithm for finding all cliques in a  $d$ -degenerate graph.

First consider the following data structure. A linear ordering  $(v_1, \dots, v_n)$  of the vertices of a graph  $G$  is *d-degenerate* if  $|N^+(v_i)| \leq d$  for each vertex  $v_i$ , where  $N^+(v_i) := \{v_j : i < j, v_i v_j \in E(G)\}$ . It is easily seen that a graph is  $d$ -degenerate

if and only if it has a  $d$ -degenerate vertex ordering [17]. Moreover, there are  $O(dn)$  time algorithms for computing a  $d$ -degenerate ordering of a given  $d$ -degenerate graph, along with the set  $N^+(v_i)$ ; see [2, 22]. Also note that given a  $d$ -degenerate ordering and given the sets  $N^+(v_i)$ , adjacency testing can be performed in  $O(d)$  time, since two vertices  $v_i$  and  $v_j$  are adjacent if and only if  $v_j \in N^+(v_i)$  where  $i < j$ ; see [2].

DEGENERATECLIQUES( $G, d$ )  
*input:* a  $d$ -degenerate graph  $G$   
*output:* all cliques in  $G$

---

1. compute a  $d$ -degenerate ordering  $(v_1, \dots, v_n)$  of  $G$
2. compute the sets  $\{N^+(v_i) : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$
3. for  $i := 1, \dots, n$  do
4. ALLCLIQUES( $G[\{v_i\} \cup N^+(v_i)]$ )
5. end-for

**Theorem 4.** *If  $G$  is a  $d$ -degenerate  $n$ -vertex graph, then DEGENERATECLIQUES( $G, d$ ) outputs all the cliques in  $G$  in time  $O(d2^d n)$ .*

*Proof.* If  $C$  is a clique of  $G[N^+(v_i)]$  then  $C \cup \{v_i\}$  is a clique of  $G$ . Thus every set output by the algorithm is a clique of  $G$ . Conversely, if  $S$  is a clique of  $G$ , and  $i$  is the minimum integer such that  $v_i \in S$ , then  $S \setminus \{v_i\}$  is a clique of  $G[N^+(v_i)]$ , and  $S$  is output by the algorithm. Now consider the time complexity. Since adjacency testing can be performed in  $O(d)$  time, the subgraph  $G[\{v_i\} \cup N^+(v_i)]$  can be constructed in  $O(d^3)$  time. By Theorem 3, the call to ALLCLIQUES takes  $O(d2^d)$  time. Hence the total time is  $O(d2^d n)$ .  $\square$

Since  $H$ -minor free graphs are  $O(t\sqrt{\log t})$ -degenerate, where  $t = |V(H)|$ , Theorem 4 implies:

**Corollary 5.** *For every fixed graph  $H$ , there is a linear time algorithm to list all cliques in a given  $H$ -minor-free graph.*  $\square$

## 4 Graph Minor Decomposition

This section first describes the Robertson-Seymour decomposition theorem characterising the structure of  $H$ -minor-free graphs, and then describes the analogous decomposition theorem for odd-minor-free graphs. We need a number of definitions.

An *embedding* refers to a 2-cell embedding of a graph in a (orientable or non-orientable) surface; that is, a drawing of the vertices and edges of the graph as points and arcs in the surface such that every face (region outlined by edges) is homeomorphic to a disk; see [18].

Let  $I$  be a linearly ordered set. A *path decomposition* of a graph  $G$  is a sequence  $(\mathcal{B}_i : i \in I)$  of subsets of  $V(G)$  called *bags* such that:

1.  $\bigcup_{i \in I} \mathcal{B}_i = V(G)$ ;
2. for each edge  $uv \in E(G)$ , there exists  $i \in I$  such that both  $u$  and  $v$  are in  $\mathcal{B}_i$ ;  
and
3. for each vertex  $v \in V(G)$ , the set  $\{i : v \in \mathcal{B}_i\}$  is a sub-interval of  $I$ .

The *width* of  $(\mathcal{B}_i : i \in I)$  is the maximum cardinality of a bag minus 1. The *pathwidth* of a graph  $G$  is the minimum width over all possible path decompositions of  $G$ .

At a high level, the Robertson-Seymour decomposition theorem says that for every graph  $H$ , every  $H$ -minor-free graph can be expressed as a tree structure of pieces, where each piece is a graph that can be drawn in a surface in which  $H$  cannot be drawn, except for a bounded number of “apex” vertices and a bounded number of local areas of non-planarity called “vortices”. Here the bounds depend only on  $H$ . Each piece in the decomposition is “ $h$ -almost-embeddable” where  $h$  is a constant depending on the excluded minor  $H$ . Roughly speaking, a graph  $G$  is  *$h$ -almost embeddable* in a surface  $\Sigma$  if there exists a set  $A \subseteq V(G)$  of size at most  $h$ , such that  $G - A$  can be obtained from a graph embedded in  $\Sigma$  by attaching at most  $h$  graphs of pathwidth at most  $h$  to within  $h$  faces in an orderly way. The elements of  $A$  are called *apex vertices*.

More precisely, a graph  $G$  is  *$h$ -almost embeddable* in a surface  $\Sigma$  if there exists a set  $A \subseteq V(G)$  of size at most  $h$  such that  $G - A$  can be written  $G_0 \cup G_1 \cup \dots \cup G_h$ , where

- $G_0$  has an embedding in  $\Sigma$ ;
- the graphs  $G_1, \dots, G_h$ , called *vortices*, are pairwise disjoint;
- there are faces  $F_1, \dots, F_h$  of  $G_0$  in  $\Sigma$ , and there are pairwise disjoint disks  $D_1, \dots, D_h$  in  $\Sigma$ , such that for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, h\}$ ,
  - $D_i \subset F_i$  and  $U_i := V(G_0) \cap V(G_i) = V(G_0) \cap D_i$ ; and
  - if  $U_i$  is linearly ordered around the boundary of  $F_i$ , then  $G_i$  has a path decomposition  $(\mathcal{B}_u : u \in U_i)$  of width less than  $h$ , such that  $u \in \mathcal{B}_u$  for each  $u \in U_i$ .

The pieces of the decomposition are combined according to “clique-sum” operations, a notion which goes back to the characterisations of  $K_{3,3}$ -minor-free and  $K_5$ -minor-free graphs by Wagner [28]. Suppose  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are graphs with disjoint vertex sets and let  $k \geq 0$  be an integer. For  $i = 1, 2$ , suppose that  $W_i \subseteq V(G_i)$  is a  $k$ -clique in  $G_i$ . Let  $G'_i$  be obtained from  $G_i$  by deleting some (possibly no) edges from the induced subgraph  $G_i[W_i]$  with both endpoints in  $W_i$ . Consider a bijection  $h : W_1 \rightarrow W_2$ . A  $k$ -sum  $G$  of  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ , denoted by  $G = G_1 \oplus_k G_2$  or simply by  $G = G_1 \oplus G_2$  is the graph obtained from the union of  $G'_1$  and  $G'_2$  by identifying  $w$  with  $h(w)$  for all  $w \in W_1$ . A  $(\leq k)$ -sum is a  $k'$ -sum for some  $k' \leq k$ . Note that  $\oplus$  is not uniquely defined.

Now we can finally state a precise form of the decomposition theorem:

**Theorem 6.** [23, Theorem 1.3] *For every graph  $H$ , there exists an integer  $h \geq 0$  depending only on  $|V(H)|$  such that every  $H$ -minor-free graph can be obtained by  $(\leq h)$ -sums of graphs that are  $h$ -almost-embeddable in some surfaces in which  $H$  cannot be embedded.*

In particular, if  $H$  is fixed then a surface in which  $H$  cannot be embedded has bounded Euler genus. Thus the summands in Theorem 6 are  $h$ -almost embeddable in surfaces of bounded Euler genus. A graph is  $h$ -almost embeddable if it is  $h$ -almost embeddable in a surface of Euler genus at most  $h$ .

We now describe a decomposition theorem for odd-minor-free graphs by Demaine et al. [3]. This result generalises Theorem 6. A graph  $G$  is  $h$ -almost bipartite if  $G - A$  is bipartite for some set  $A \subseteq V(G)$  with  $|A| \leq h$ .

**Theorem 7** ([3]). *For every fixed integer  $t$ , there is a constant  $h$  such that every odd- $K_t$ -minor-free graph  $G$  can be obtained by  $(\leq h)$ -sums of  $h$ -almost bipartite graphs and  $h$ -almost embeddable graphs.*

## 5 Listing Cliques in Odd-Minor-Free Graphs

This section describes an algorithm for finding all the cliques in a graph  $G$  excluding a fixed odd-minor. The time complexity is  $O(n^3)$ . Thus, we may assume that  $G$  is represented by an adjacency matrix (which takes  $O(n^2)$  time to pre-compute), and adjacency testing can be performed in  $O(1)$  time.

**Lemma 8.** *Let  $G$  be an  $h$ -almost-bipartite graph on  $n$  vertices. Then  $G$  contains at most  $2^h n^2 + 2$  cliques.*

*Proof.*  $G - A$  is bipartite for some  $A \subseteq V(G)$  with  $|A| \leq h$ . Since  $G - A$  is triangle-free, the cliques in  $G - A$  are precisely  $E(G - A) \cup V(G - A) \cup \{\emptyset\}$ . There are at

most  $\frac{1}{4}(n - |A|)^2 + n - |A| + 1$  such cliques. There are at most  $2^{|A|}$  cliques in  $G[A]$ . Every clique in  $G$  is the union of a clique in  $G - A$  and a clique in  $G[A]$ . Thus  $G$  contains at most  $2^{|A|}(\frac{1}{4}(n - |A|)^2 + n - |A| + 1) \leq 2^h n^2 + 2$  cliques.  $\square$

**Lemma 9.** *Let  $G$  be an  $h$ -almost embeddable graph on  $n$  vertices. Then, for some  $h'$  and  $h''$  that only depend on  $h$ ,  $G$  contains at most  $h'n$  cliques, and they can be listed in  $O(h''n)$  time.*

*Proof.* It is well known that  $G$  contains no  $K_{h'}$ -minor, for some  $h'$  depending only on  $h$  (see [13] for a tight bound on  $h'$ ). Thus  $G$  is  $O(h'\sqrt{\log h'})$ -degenerate, and the claim follows from Corollary 5.  $\square$

**Lemma 10.** *Let  $c > 0$ . Let  $G$  be a  $k$ -sum of graphs  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ , where each  $G_i$  has  $n_i$  vertices and contains at most  $cn_i^2$  cliques. Assume that  $n_1 \geq \frac{k^2}{2} + k$  and  $G$  has  $n$  vertices. Then  $G$  contains at most  $cn_1^2 + cn_2^2$  cliques, which is at most  $cn^2$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $n_1 \geq \frac{k^2}{2} + k$  and  $n_2 \geq k + 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} n_1 &\geq \frac{k^2}{2} + k \geq \frac{k^2}{2(n_2 - k)} + k = \frac{2k(n_2 - k) + k^2}{2(n_2 - k)} \\ &= \frac{k(2n_2 - k)}{2(n_2 - k)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $2n_1n_2 - 2kn_1 \geq 2kn_2 - k^2$ , implying

$$\begin{aligned} n^2 &= (n_1 + n_2 - k)^2 \\ &= n_1^2 + n_2^2 + 2n_1n_2 - 2kn_1 - 2kn_2 + k^2 \\ &\geq n_1^2 + n_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Each clique in  $G$  is a clique of  $G_1$  or  $G_2$ . Thus  $G$  contains at most  $cn_1^2 + cn_2^2 \leq cn^2$  cliques.  $\square$

**Lemma 11.** *Let  $k$  be a positive integer. Let  $G_1, \dots, G_p$  be graphs, such that each  $G_i$  has  $n_i$  vertices and contains at most  $f(k) \cdot n_i^2$  cliques, for some function  $f$ . Furthermore, suppose that each  $G_i$  contains no  $k$ -clique. Let  $G$  be an  $n$ -vertex graph obtained by  $(\leq k)$ -sums of  $G_1, \dots, G_p$ . Then for some function  $f'$  depending on  $f$  and  $k$ ,  $G$  contains at most  $f'(k) \cdot n^2$  cliques.*

*Proof.* The construction of  $G$  defines a binary tree  $T$  rooted at some node  $r$ , and associated with each node  $v$  of  $T$  is a subgraph  $G_v$  of  $G$ , such that  $G_r = G$ ;  $G_1, \dots, G_p$  are the subgraphs associated with the leaves of  $T$ ; and  $G_v = G_u \oplus_{\leq k} G_w$  for each non-leaf node  $v$  with children  $u$  and  $w$ . Let  $n_v$  be the number of vertices in each  $G_v$ . Say  $G_v$  is *small* if  $n_v < \frac{k^2}{2} + k$ .

Let  $T'$  be the subtree of  $T$  obtained by applying the following rule until it cannot be further applied: If  $u$  and  $w$  are leaf nodes with a common parent  $v$ , and both  $G_u$  and  $G_w$  are small, then delete  $u$  and  $w$ . The remainder of the proof focuses on  $T'$ .

We now prove (by induction, working from the leaves of  $T'$  up through the tree) that each subgraph  $G_v$  contains at most  $f'(k) \cdot n_v^2$  cliques, where  $f'(k) := \max\{f(k), 2^{k^2+2k}\}$ . If  $v$  is a leaf of  $T$  then this hypothesis holds by assumption. If  $v$  is a leaf of  $T'$  but not of  $T$ , then  $G_u$  and  $G_w$  are small, where  $u$  and  $w$  are the children of  $v$  in  $T$ . In this case  $n_v \leq k^2 + 2k$ , implying  $G_v$  contains at most  $2^{k^2+2k} \leq f'(k) \cdot n_v^2$  cliques. Thus the hypothesis again holds.

Now consider a non-leaf node  $v$  of  $T'$ . Let  $u$  and  $w$  be the children of  $v$ . We have  $G_v = G_u \oplus_\ell G_w$  for some  $\ell \leq k$ . By induction,  $G_u$  contains at most  $f'(k) \cdot n_u^2$  cliques, and  $G_w$  contains at most  $f'(k) \cdot n_w^2$  cliques. Suppose that  $G_u$  and  $G_w$  are both small. If  $u$  and  $w$  are both leaves in  $T$  then the above rule is applicable. Otherwise, without loss of generality,  $w$  is not a leaf in  $T$ , in which case every descendent subgraph of  $w$  is small, implying the subtree rooted at  $w$  contains two leaves for which the above rule is applicable. Hence at least one of  $G_u$  and  $G_w$  is not small. Thus Lemma 10 is applicable with  $c = f'(k)$ . Hence  $G_v$  contains at most  $f'(k) \cdot n_u^2 + f'(k) \cdot n_w^2$  cliques, which is at most  $f'(k) \cdot n_v^2$  cliques. In particular,  $G = G_r$  contains at most  $f'(k) \cdot n^2$  cliques, as claimed. Observe that the above argument actually proves that the sum of  $n_u^2$ , taken over all leaf nodes  $u$  in  $T'$ , is at most  $n^2$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.* By Theorem 7,  $G$  is the ( $\leq h$ )-sum of graphs  $G_1, \dots, G_p$ , where each  $G_i$  is  $h$ -almost bipartite or  $h$ -almost embeddable in a surface of Euler genus  $h$ . By Lemmas 8 and 9, for some  $h'$  that only depends on  $h$ , if each  $G_i$  has  $n_i$  vertices, then  $G_i$  contains at most  $h' n_i^2$  cliques. Note that  $G$  contains no  $h$ -clique. By Lemma 11,  $G$  contains at most  $h'' n^2$  cliques, for some  $h''$  depending only on  $h$ . By Theorem 3, the cliques in  $G$  can be output in  $O(h'' n^2)$  time by algorithm ALLCLIQUES( $G$ ).  $\square$

Note that reference [3] describes a polynomial time algorithm for computing the decomposition described in Theorem 7. However, by using Theorem 3 it suffices to merely prove an upper bound on the number of cliques in an odd-minor-free graph, to obtain an efficient algorithm for listing all cliques.

## Acknowledgements

Many thanks to the referees of the conference version of this paper who found some minor errors that have now been corrected.

## References

- [1] SANJEEV ARORA, CARSTEN LUND, RAJEEV MOTWANI, MADHU SUDAN, AND MARIO SZEGEDY. Proof verification and the hardness of approximation problems. *J. ACM*, 45(3):501–555, 1998. doi: [10.1145/278298.278306](https://doi.org/10.1145/278298.278306).
- [2] MAREK CHROBAK AND DAVID EPPSTEIN. Planar orientations with low out-degree and compaction of adjacency matrices. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 86(2):243–266, 1991. doi: [10.1016/0304-3975\(91\)90020-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(91)90020-3).
- [3] ERIK D. DEMAINE, MOHAMMADTAGHI HAJIAGHAYI, AND KEN-ICHI KAWARABAYASHI. Decomposition, approximation, and coloring of odd-minor-free graphs. In *Proc. of 21st Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA '10)*, pp. 329–344. ACM Press, 2010. <http://portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1873629>.
- [4] ROD G. DOWNEY AND MICHAEL R. FELLOWS. Fixed-parameter tractability and completeness. II. On completeness for  $W[1]$ . *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 141(1-2):109–131, 1995. doi: [10.1016/0304-3975\(94\)00097-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(94)00097-3).
- [5] VIDA DUJMOVIĆ, GAŠPER FIJAVŽ, GWENAËL JORET, DAVID R. WOOD, AND THOM SULANKE. On the maximum number of cliques in a graph embedded in a surface. *European J. Combin.*, 32(8):1244–1252, 2011. doi: [10.1016/j.ejc.2011.04.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejc.2011.04.001).
- [6] DAVID EPPSTEIN. Connectivity, graph minors, and subgraph multiplicity. *J. Graph Theory*, 17(3):409–416, 1993. doi: [10.1002/jgt.3190170314](https://doi.org/10.1002/jgt.3190170314).
- [7] DAVID EPPSTEIN. Small maximal independent sets and faster exact graph coloring. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.*, 7(2):131–140, 2003. <http://jgaa.info/accepted/2003/Eppstein2003.7.2.pdf>.
- [8] DAVID EPPSTEIN. All maximal independent sets and dynamic dominance for sparse graphs. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 5(4):#38, 2009. doi: [10.1145/1597036.1597042](https://doi.org/10.1145/1597036.1597042).
- [9] DAVID EPPSTEIN, MAARTEN LÖFFLER, AND DARREN STRASH. Listing all maximal cliques in sparse graphs in near-optimal time. In OT-FRIED CHEONG, KYUNG-YONG CHWA, AND KUNSOO PARK, eds., *Proc. of 21st International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation (ISAAC 2010)*, vol. 6506 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pp. 403–414. 2010. doi: [10.1007/978-3-642-17517-6\\_36](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-17517-6_36). arXiv: [1006.5440](https://arxiv.org/abs/1006.5440).
- [10] FEDOR V. FOMIN, SANG IL OUM, AND DIMITRIOS M. THILIKOS. Rank-width and tree-width of  $H$ -minor-free graphs. *European J. Combin.*, 31(7):1617–1628, 2010. doi: [10.1016/j.ejc.2010.05.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejc.2010.05.003).

- [11] ALAIN GÉLY, LHOUARI NOURINE, AND BACHIR SADI. Enumeration aspects of maximal cliques and bicliques. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 157(7):1447–1459, 2009. doi: [10.1016/j.dam.2008.10.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2008.10.010).
- [12] DAVID S. JOHNSON, MIHALIS YANNAKAKIS, AND CHRISTOS H. PAPADIMITRIOU. On generating all maximal independent sets. *Inform. Process. Lett.*, 27(3):119–123, 1988. doi: [10.1016/0020-0190\(88\)90065-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0190(88)90065-8).
- [13] GWENAËL JORET AND DAVID R. WOOD. Complete graph minors and the graph minor structure theorem. 2011. arXiv: [1105.3549](https://arxiv.org/abs/1105.3549).
- [14] RICHARD M. KARP. Reducibility among combinatorial problems. In R. E. MILLER AND J. W. THATCHER, eds., *Complexity of Computer Communications*, pp. 85–103. Plenum Press, 1972.
- [15] ALEXANDR V. KOSTOCHKA. Lower bound of the Hadwiger number of graphs by their average degree. *Combinatorica*, 4(4):307–316, 1984. doi: [10.1007/BF02579141](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02579141). MR: [0779891](https://www.jstor.org/stable/0779891).
- [16] EUGENE L. LAWLER, JAN KAREL LENSTRA, AND ALEXANDER H. G. RINNOOY KAN. Generating all maximal independent sets: NP-hardness and polynomial-time algorithms. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 9(3):558–565, 1980. doi: [10.1137/0209042](https://doi.org/10.1137/0209042).
- [17] DON R. LICK AND ARTHUR T. WHITE.  $k$ -degenerate graphs. *Canad. J. Math.*, 22:1082–1096, 1970. doi: [10.4153/CJM-1970-125-1](https://doi.org/10.4153/CJM-1970-125-1).
- [18] BOJAN MOHAR AND CARSTEN THOMASSEN. *Graphs on surfaces*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, U.S.A., 2001.
- [19] SERGUEI NORINE, PAUL SEYMOUR, ROBIN THOMAS, AND PAUL WOLLAN. Proper minor-closed families are small. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 96(5):754–757, 2006. doi: [10.1016/j.jctb.2006.01.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jctb.2006.01.006).
- [20] CHRISTOS H. PAPADIMITRIOU AND MIHALIS YANNAKAKIS. The clique problem for planar graphs. *Inform. Process. Lett.*, 13(4-5):131–133, 1981. doi: [10.1016/0020-0190\(81\)90041-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0190(81)90041-7).
- [21] M. C. PAULL AND S. H. UNGER. Minimizing the number of states in incompletely specified sequential switching functions. *IRE Trans. Electron. Comput.*, EC-8:356–367, 1959.
- [22] BRUCE REED AND DAVID R. WOOD. A linear time algorithm to find a separator in a graph excluding a minor. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 5(4):#39, 2009. doi: [10.1145/1597036.1597043](https://doi.org/10.1145/1597036.1597043).

- [23] NEIL ROBERTSON AND PAUL D. SEYMOUR. Graph minors. XVI. Excluding a non-planar graph. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 89(1):43–76, 2003. doi: [10.1016/S0095-8956\(03\)00042-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0095-8956(03)00042-X).
- [24] SIAMAK TAZARI AND MATTHIAS MÜLLER-HANNEMANN. Shortest paths in linear time on minor-closed graph classes, with an application to Steiner tree approximation. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 157(4):673–684, 2009. doi: [10.1016/j.dam.2008.08.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2008.08.002).
- [25] ANDREW THOMASON. An extremal function for contractions of graphs. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 95(2):261–265, 1984. doi: [10.1017/S0305004100061521](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305004100061521). MR: [0735367](https://www.jstor.org/stable/2373367), Zbl: [0551.05047](https://www.jstor.org/stable/2373367).
- [26] ETSUJI TOMITA, AKIRA TANAKA, AND HARUHISA TAKAHASHI. The worst-case time complexity for generating all maximal cliques and computational experiments. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 363(1):28–42, 2006. doi: [10.1016/j.tcs.2006.06.015](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2006.06.015).
- [27] SHUJI TSUKIYAMA, MIKIO IDE, HIROMU ARIYOSHI, AND ISAO SHIRAKAWA. A new algorithm for generating all the maximal independent sets. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 6(3):505–517, 1977. doi: [10.1137/0206036](https://doi.org/10.1137/0206036).
- [28] KLAUS WAGNER. Über eine Eigenschaft der ebene Komplexe. *Math. Ann.*, 114:570–590, 1937. doi: [10.1007/BF01594196](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01594196). MR: [1513158](https://www.jstor.org/stable/2373367). Zbl: [0017.19005](https://www.jstor.org/stable/2373367).
- [29] DAVID R. WOOD. On the maximum number of cliques in a graph. *Graphs Combin.*, 23(3):337–352, 2007. doi: [10.1007/s00373-007-0738-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00373-007-0738-8). MR: [2320588](https://www.jstor.org/stable/2373367).
- [30] CHRISTIAN WULFF-NILSEN. Faster shortest path algorithm for  $H$ -minor free graphs with negative edge weights. 2010. arXiv: [1008.1048](https://arxiv.org/abs/1008.1048).
- [31] RAPHAEL YUSTER. Single source shortest paths in  $H$ -minor free graphs. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 411(34–36):3042–3047, 2010. doi: [10.1016/j.tcs.2010.04.028](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2010.04.028).
- [32] RAPHAEL YUSTER AND URI ZWICK. Maximum matching in graphs with an excluded minor. In *Proc. 18th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA '07)*, pp. 108–117. SIAM, 2007. <http://portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1283396>.