

TOWARDS A SPLITTER THEOREM FOR INTERNALLY 4-CONNECTED BINARY MATROIDS V

CAROLYN CHUN, DILLON MAYHEW, AND JAMES OXLEY

ABSTRACT. Let M be an internally 4-connected binary matroid and N be an internally 4-connected proper minor of M . In our search for a splitter theorem for internally 4-connected binary matroids, we proved in the third paper in this series that, except when M or its dual is a cubic Möbius or planar ladder or a certain coextension thereof, either M has a proper internally 4-connected minor M' with an N -minor such that $|E(M) - E(M')| \leq 3$, or, up to duality, M has a triangle T and an element e of T such that $M \setminus e$ has an N -minor and has the property that one side of every 3-separation is a fan with at most four elements. The fourth paper in the series proved that, when we cannot find such a proper internally 4-connected minor M' of M , we can incorporate the triangle T into one of two substructures of M , a good bowtie or a good augmented 4-wheel. The goal of this paper is essentially to eliminate the need to consider good augmented 4-wheels by showing that, when M contains such a substructure, either it also contains a good bowtie, or, in an easily described way, we can obtain an internally 4-connected minor of M with an N -minor.

1. INTRODUCTION

For 3-connected matroids, Seymour's Splitter Theorem [10] has proved to have numerous applications, both inductive and constructive. That theorem proves that if a 3-connected matroid M has a proper 3-connected minor N , then M has a proper 3-connected minor M' with an N -minor such that $|E(M) - E(M')| = 1$ unless $r(M) \geq 3$ and M is a wheel or a whirl. The current paper is the fifth in a series whose aim is to obtain a splitter theorem for binary internally 4-connected matroids. Specifically, we believe we can prove that if M and N are internally 4-connected binary matroids, and M has a proper N -minor, then M has a proper minor M' such that M' is internally 4-connected with an N -minor, and M' can be produced from M by a small number of simple operations.

In earlier work [1], we found it useful to consider weaker variants of internal 4-connectivity. The only 3-separations allowed in an internally 4-connected matroid have a triangle or a triad on one side. A 3-connected matroid M is $(4, 4, S)$ -connected if, for every 3-separation (X, Y) of M , one of X and Y is a triangle, a triad, or a 4-element fan, that is, a 4-element set $\{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ that can be ordered so that $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ is a triangle and $\{x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ is a triad.

Date: September 10, 2013.

1991 Mathematics Subject Classification. 05B35, 05C40.

Key words and phrases. splitter theorem, binary matroid, internally 4-connected.

The authors were supported by NSF IRFP Grant #OISE0967050, the Marsden Fund, and the National Security Agency, respectively.

To state our main theorem, we need to define some special structures. Let M be an internally 4-connected binary matroid and N be an internally 4-connected proper minor of M . Suppose M has disjoint triangles T_1 and T_2 and a 4-cocircuit D^* contained in their union. We call this structure a *bowtie* and denote it by (T_1, T_2, D^*) . If D^* has an element d such that $M \setminus d$ has an N -minor and $M \setminus d$ is $(4, 4, S)$ -connected, then (T_1, T_2, D^*) is a *good bowtie*. An *augmented 4-wheel* consists of a 4-wheel restriction of M with triangles $\{z_2, x_1, y_2\}, \{y_2, x_3, z_3\}, \{z_3, y_3, x_2\}, \{x_2, y_1, z_2\}$ along with two additional distinct elements z_1 and z_4 such that M has $\{x_1, y_1, z_1, z_2\}, \{x_2, y_2, z_2, z_3\}$, and $\{x_3, y_3, z_3, z_4\}$ as cocircuits. We say that an augmented 4-wheel labelled in this way is *good* if $M \setminus y_1$ is $(4, 4, S)$ -connected having an N -minor, while $M \setminus y_2$ has an N -minor. A diagrammatic representation of an augmented 4-wheel is shown in Figure 1. Although the matroid M we are dealing with need not be graphic, we follow the convention begun in [1] of using a modified graph diagram to keep track of some of the circuits and cocircuits in M . By that convention, the cycles in the graph diagram correspond to circuits of the matroid while a circled vertex indicates a known cocircuit of M . We call $\{x_2, y_2, z_2, z_3\}$ the *central cocircuit* of the augmented 4-wheel. We require one further special graph. A *terrahawk* is the graph that is obtained from a cube by adjoining one new vertex and adding edges from the new vertex to each of the four vertices that bound some fixed face of the cube.




FIGURE 1. An augmented 4-wheel.

The purpose of this paper is to prove the following result.

Theorem 1.1. *Let M and N be internally 4-connected binary matroids such that N is a proper minor of M . Suppose that $|E(M)| \geq 16$ and $|E(N)| \geq 6$. If M contains a good augmented 4-wheel, then*

- (i) M has an internally 4-connected minor M' that has an N -minor such that either $1 \leq |E(M) - E(M')| \leq 3$; or $|E(M) - E(M')| = 4$ and M' is obtained from M by deleting the central cocircuit of the good augmented 4-wheel; or
- (ii) M has a good bowtie; or
- (iii) M is the cycle matroid of a terrahawk; or
- (iv) M contains a configuration of the form shown in Figure 2 where all the elements shown are distinct; for some $n \geq 5$, there are n dashed elements; and the deletion of all of the dashed elements produces an internally 4-connected matroid having an N -minor.




FIGURE 2. Delete all the dashed edges.

We now describe the role that this theorem plays in obtaining the desired splitter theorem. Johnson and Thomas [6] showed that, even for graphs, a splitter theorem in the internally 4-connected case must take account of some special examples. For $n \geq 3$, let G_{2n+2} be the *biwheel* with $2n+2$ vertices, that is, G consists of a $2n$ -cycle $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{2n}, v_1$, the *rim*, and two additional vertices, u and w , both of which are adjacent to every v_i . Thus the dual of G_{2n+2} is a cubic planar ladder. Let M be the cycle matroid of G_{2n+2} for some $n \geq 3$ and let N be the cycle matroid of the graph that is obtained by proceeding around the rim of G_{2n+2} and alternately deleting the edges from the rim vertex to u and to w . Both M and N are internally 4-connected but there is no internally 4-connected proper minor of M that has a proper N -minor. We can modify M slightly and still see the same phenomenon. Let G_{n+2}^+ be obtained from G_{n+2} by adding a new edge a joining the hubs u and w . Let Δ_{n+1} be the binary matroid that is obtained from $M(G_{n+2}^+)$ by deleting the edge $v_n v_1$ and adding the third element on the line spanned by $w v_n$ and $u v_{n-1}$. This new element is also on the line spanned by $u v_n$ and $w v_{n-1}$. For $r \geq 3$, Mayhew, Royle, and Whittle [7] call Δ_r the *rank- r triangular Möbius matroid* and note that $\Delta_r \setminus a$ is the dual of the cycle matroid of a cubic Möbius ladder. The following is the main result of [3, Theorem 1.2].

Theorem 1.2. *Let M be an internally 4-connected binary matroid with an internally 4-connected proper minor N such that $|E(M)| \geq 15$ and $|E(N)| \geq 6$. Then*

- (i) *M has a proper minor M' such that $|E(M) - E(M')| \leq 3$ and M' is internally 4-connected with an N -minor; or*
- (ii) *for some (M_0, N_0) in $\{(M, N), (M^*, N^*)\}$, the matroid M_0 has a triangle T that contains an element e such that $M_0 \setminus e$ is $(4, 4, S)$ -connected having an N -minor; or*
- (iii) *M is isomorphic to $M(G_{r+1}^+)$, $M(G_{r+1})$, Δ_r , or $\Delta_r \setminus z$ for some $r \geq 5$.*

That theorem prompted us to consider those matroids for which the second condition in the last theorem holds. The next theorem, the main result of [4, Theorem 1.3], identifies some more specific outcomes that occur when (ii) above holds.

Theorem 1.3. *Let M and N be internally 4-connected binary matroids such that $|E(M)| \geq 16$ and $|E(N)| \geq 6$. Suppose that M has a triangle T containing an element e for which $M \setminus e$ is $(4, 4, S)$ -connected having an N -minor. Then one of the following holds.*

- (i) *M has an internally 4-connected minor M' that has an N -minor such that $1 \leq |E(M) - E(M')| \leq 3$; or*

- (ii) M or M^* has a good bowtie; or
- (iii) M or M^* has a good augmented 4-wheel; or
- (iv) $N \cong M(K_4)$ and M is the cycle matroid of a terrahawk.

By combining this theorem with Theorem 1.1, we obtain the following result.

Corollary 1.4. *Let M and N be internally 4-connected binary matroids such that $|E(M)| \geq 16$ and $|E(N)| \geq 6$. Suppose that M has a triangle T containing an element e for which $M \setminus e$ is $(4, 4, S)$ -connected having an N -minor. Then one of the following holds.*

- (i) M has an internally 4-connected minor M' that has an N -minor such that either $1 \leq |E(M) - E(M')| \leq 3$; or $|E(M) - E(M')| = 4$ and, for some (M_1, M_2) in $\{(M, M'), (M^*, (M')^*)\}$, the matroid M_2 is obtained from M_1 by deleting the central cocircuit of an augmented 4-wheel; or
- (ii) M or M^* has a good bowtie; or
- (iii) M is the cycle matroid of a terrahawk; or
- (iv) for some (M_0, N_0) in $\{(M, N), (M^*, N^*)\}$, the matroid M_0 contains the configuration shown in Figure 2 where the deletion of all of the dashed elements is an internally 4-connected matroid having an N_0 -minor.

This points us towards examining internally 4-connected matroids having good bowties and, indeed, the remaining papers in this series deal with precisely this situation. As we can see from Figure 3, the operation of deleting all of the dashed elements in Figure 2 is dual to the operation of contracting alternate side elements in a quartic ladder segment, turning it into a cubic ladder segment.




FIGURE 3. Turning a quartic ladder segment into a cubic one.

2. PRELIMINARIES

The matroid terminology used here will follow Oxley [8]. We shall sometimes write $N \preceq M$ to indicate that M has an N -minor, that is, a minor isomorphic to the matroid N . If x is an element of a matroid M and $Y \subseteq E(M)$, we write $x \in \text{cl}^{(*)}(Y)$ to mean that $x \in \text{cl}(Y)$ or $x \in \text{cl}^*(Y)$. The property that a circuit and a cocircuit in a matroid cannot have exactly one common element will be referred to as *orthogonality*. It is well known [8, Theorem 9.1.2] that, in a binary matroid, a circuit and cocircuit must meet in an even number of elements.

Let M be a matroid with ground set E and rank function r . The *connectivity function* λ_M of M is defined on all subsets X of E by $\lambda_M(X) = r(X) + r(E - X) - r(M)$. Equivalently, $\lambda_M(X) = r(X) + r^*(X) - |X|$. We will sometimes abbreviate

λ_M as λ . For a positive integer k , a subset X or a partition $(X, E - X)$ of E is k -*separating* if $\lambda_M(X) \leq k - 1$. A k -separating partition $(X, E - X)$ is a k -*separation* if $|X|, |E - X| \geq k$. If n is an integer exceeding one, a matroid is n -*connected* if it has no k -separations for all $k < n$. This definition [11] has the attractive property that a matroid is n -connected if and only if its dual is. Moreover, this matroid definition of n -connectivity is relatively compatible with the graph notion of n -connectivity when n is 2 or 3. For example, when G is a graph with at least four vertices and with no isolated vertices, $M(G)$ is a 3-connected matroid if and only if G is a 3-connected simple graph. But the link between n -connectivity for matroids and graphs breaks down for $n \geq 4$. In particular, a 4-connected matroid with at least six elements cannot have a triangle. Hence, for $r \geq 3$, neither $M(K_{r+1})$ nor $PG(r - 1, 2)$ is 4-connected. This motivates the consideration of other types of 4-connectivity in which certain 3-separations are allowed. In particular, a matroid is *internally 4-connected* if it is 3-connected and, whenever (X, Y) is a 3-separation, either $|X| = 3$ or $|Y| = 3$. Equivalantly, a 3-connected matroid is internally 4-connected if and only if, for every 3-separation (X, Y) of M , either X or Y is a triangle or a triad of M . As Geelen and Zhou [5, p. 539] note, “For binary matroids, internal 4-connectivity is certainly the most natural variant of 4-connectivity”. A graph G without isolated vertices is *internally 4-connected* if $M(G)$ is internally 4-connected.

Let M be a matroid. A subset S of $E(M)$ is a *fan* in M if $|S| \geq 3$ and there is an ordering (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n) of S such that $\{s_1, s_2, s_3\}, \{s_2, s_3, s_4\}, \dots, \{s_{n-2}, s_{n-1}, s_n\}$ alternate between triangles and triads. We call (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n) a *fan ordering* of S . We will be mainly concerned with 4-element and 5-element fans. For convenience, we shall always view a fan ordering of a 4-element fan as beginning with a triangle and we shall use the term *4-fan* to refer to both the 4-element fan and such a fan ordering of it. Moreover, we shall use the terms *5-fan* and *5-cofan* to refer to the two different types of 5-element fan where the first contains two triangles and the second two triads. Let (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n) be a fan ordering of a fan S . When $n \geq 4$, every fan ordering of S has its first and last elements in $\{s_1, s_n\}$. We call these elements the *ends* of the fan while the elements of $S - \{s_1, s_n\}$ are called the *internal elements* of the fan. When (s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4) is a 4-fan, our convention is that $\{s_1, s_2, s_3\}$ is a triangle, and we call s_1 the *guts element* of the fan and s_4 the *coguts element* of the fan since $s_1 \in \text{cl}(\{s_2, s_3, s_4\})$ and $s_4 \in \text{cl}^*(\{s_1, s_2, s_3\})$.

A set U in a matroid M is *fully closed* if it is closed in both M and M^* . The intersection of two fully closed sets is fully closed, and the *full closure* $\text{fcl}(U)$ of U is the intersection of all fully closed sets that contain U . Let (X, Y) be a partition of $E(M)$. If (X, Y) is k -separating in M for some positive integer k , and y is an element of Y that is also in $\text{cl}^{(*)}(X)$, then it is well known and easily checked that $(X \cup y, Y - y)$ is k -separating, and we say that we have *moved* y into X . More generally, $(\text{fcl}(X), Y - \text{fcl}(X))$ is k -separating in M . Let n be an integer n exceeding one. If M is n -connected, an n -separation (U, V) of M is *sequential* if $\text{fcl}(U)$ or $\text{fcl}(V)$ is $E(M)$. In particular, when $\text{fcl}(U) = E(M)$, there is an ordering (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_m) of the elements of V such that $U \cup \{v_m, v_{m-1}, \dots, v_i\}$ is n -separating for all i in $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. When this occurs, the set V is called *sequential*. Moreover, if $n \leq m$, then $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ is a circuit or a cocircuit of M . A 3-connected matroid is *sequentially 4-connected* if all of its 3-separations are sequential. It is




FIGURE 4. A quasi rotor.

straightforward to check that, when M is binary, a sequential set with 3, 4, or 5 elements is a fan.

To conclude this section, we note another special structure [12], which has arisen frequently in our work towards the desired splitter theorem and which is also important here. In an internally 4-connected binary matroid M , we call $(\{1, 2, 3\}, \{4, 5, 6\}, \{7, 8, 9\}, \{2, 3, 4, 5\}, \{5, 6, 7, 8\}, \{3, 5, 7\})$ a *quasi rotor* with *central triangle* $\{4, 5, 6\}$ and *central element* 5 if $\{1, 2, 3\}$, $\{4, 5, 6\}$, and $\{7, 8, 9\}$ are disjoint triangles in M such that $\{2, 3, 4, 5\}$ and $\{5, 6, 7, 8\}$ are cocircuits and $\{3, 5, 7\}$ is a triangle (see Figure 4).

3. SOME PROPERTIES OF GOOD AUGMENTED 4-WHEELS AND TERRAHAWKS

This section collects together a number of lemmas that will be needed in the proof of the main theorem. The first is an easy modification of [9, Lemma 6.1] that uses the fact that F_7 and F_7^* are the only 7-element internally 4-connected binary matroids; the second is [2, Lemma 2.2].

Lemma 3.1. *Let M be an internally 4-connected binary matroid with $|E(M)| \geq 7$. If e is an element of M that is not in a triad, then $M \setminus e$ is 3-connected. In particular, if f is an element of M that is in a triangle, then $M \setminus f$ is 3-connected.*

Lemma 3.2. *Let $(1, 2, 3, 4)$ be a 4-element fan in a binary matroid M that has an internally 4-connected minor N such that N has at least seven elements. Then $M \setminus 1$ or $M/4$ has an N -minor. Also, if $(1, 2, 3, 4, 5)$ is a 5-fan in M , then either $M \setminus 1, 5$ has an N -minor, or both $M/2 \setminus 1$ and $M/4 \setminus 5$ have N -minors. In particular, both $M \setminus 1$ and $M \setminus 5$ have N -minors.*

The following lemma will be used repeatedly in the proof of the main result.




FIGURE 5. The configuration in Lemma 3.3.

Lemma 3.3. *For some k in $\{2, 3\}$, let M be a k -connected matroid that contains the configuration in Figure 5. If (U, V) is a non-sequential k -separation of M , then $\text{fcl}(U)$ or $\text{fcl}(V)$ contains $\{1, 2, \dots, 7\}$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\{2, 4, 7\} \subseteq U$. If $6 \in U$, then we can add 5, then 3, then 1 to U to get the required result. Thus we may assume that $6 \in V$. Then $5 \in V$ otherwise we can move 6 into U . By symmetry, $\{3, 1\} \subseteq V$, so $\{6, 5, 3, 1\} \subseteq V$. Hence $\{2, 4, 7\} \subseteq \text{cl}(V)$ and the lemma holds. \square

Lemma 3.4. *Let M and N be internally 4-connected binary matroids such that N is a proper minor of M . Suppose that $|E(N)| \geq 7$ and that M contains a good augmented 4-wheel labelled as in Figure 1. Then $N \preceq M \setminus y_2, y_1$ and $M \setminus y_2, y_1$ is 3-connected.*

Proof. By the definition of a good augmented 4-wheel, as $M \setminus y_2$ has an N -minor and has $(y_1, z_2, x_2, z_3, y_3)$ as a 5-fan, it follows by Lemma 3.2 that $N \preceq M \setminus y_2, y_1$. Now, by [4, Lemma 2.1], $M \setminus y_2, y_1$ is 3-connected unless $M \setminus y_2$ has a triad containing $\{y_1, z_2\}$. In the exceptional case, M has a 4-cocircuit containing $\{y_1, y_2, z_2\}$. Thus, by orthogonality, x_3 or z_3 is in this cocircuit. Then $\lambda(\{y_1, z_2, x_2, y_2, z_3, x_3\}) \leq 2$; a contradiction. \square

Continuing to assume that M contains a good augmented 4-wheel labelled as in Figure 1, we have, by the last lemma, that $N \preceq M \setminus y_2, y_1$. As $M \setminus y_2, y_1$ has (y_3, x_2, z_3, z_2) as a 4-fan, it follows that $N \preceq M \setminus y_1, y_2, y_3$ or $N \preceq M \setminus y_1, y_2/z_2$. The first of these two cases is dealt with in the next lemma. The second is treated in Theorem 4.1.

Lemma 3.5. *Let M and N be internally 4-connected binary matroids such that N is a proper minor of M . Suppose that $|E(N)| \geq 7$ and that M contains a good augmented 4-wheel labelled as in Figure 1. If $N \preceq M \setminus y_1, y_2, y_3$, then either*

- (i) M has a 4-cocircuit containing $\{y_1, x_2, y_3\}$; or
- (ii) $M \setminus y_1, y_2, y_3$ is 3-connected.

Proof. As $M \setminus y_1, y_2$ is 3-connected having (y_3, z_3, x_2, z_2) as a 4-fan, $M \setminus y_1, y_2, y_3$ is 3-connected unless $M \setminus y_1, y_2$ has a triad T^* that avoids z_2 but contains $\{y_3, z_3\}$ or $\{y_3, x_2\}$. If $\{y_3, z_3\} \subseteq T^*$, then orthogonality implies that $\{x_1, x_3, z_2\}$ meets T^* , so $\{y_1, y_2, y_3, z_3, x_1, x_3, z_2\}$ contains a cocircuit of M containing y_3, z_3 , so $\lambda_M(\{x_1, x_2, x_3, y_1, y_2, y_3, z_2, z_3\}) \leq 2$; a contradiction. Thus $\{y_3, z_3\} \not\subseteq T^*$, so we may assume that $T^* = \{y_3, x_2, t\}$. Then $T^* \cup y_1$, $T^* \cup y_2$, or $T^* \cup \{y_1, y_2\}$ is a cocircuit C^* of M . By orthogonality, $y_2 \notin C^*$. Thus $\{y_3, x_2, y_2, t\}$ is a cocircuit of M . \square

We omit the straightforward proof of the following result, which identifies all internally 4-connected minors of the cycle matroid of the terrahawk.

Lemma 3.6. *The only internally 4-connected proper minors of the cycle matroid of the terrahawk are the cycle matroids of the cube, the octahedron, and K_4 . Moreover, both the cube and the octahedron have K_4 as a minor.*

Lemma 3.7. *Assume that M is an internally 4-connected binary matroid having at least sixteen elements and containing the configuration in Figure 6 where all the elements shown are distinct. Then M is isomorphic to the cycle matroid of the terrahawk.*




FIGURE 6. A partial terrahawk.

Proof. Let A be the set of fourteen elements shown in the configuration in Figure 6. Then $r(A - d_3) \leq 7$ and $A - d_3$ contains five cocircuits none of which is a symmetric difference of any others. Thus $\lambda(A - d_3) \leq 7 - 5 = 2$. Since $|E(M)| \geq 16$, we deduce that $\lambda(A - d_3) = 2$ and $|E(M)| = 16$. Moreover, $r(A - d_3) = 7$. Let $E(M) - A = \{b_4, d_4\}$. Clearly $\{b_4, d_4, d_3\}$ is a triangle or a triad of M . Since d_3 is already in a triad, $\{b_4, d_4, d_3\}$ must be a triad.

Now $M \setminus \{b_4, d_4, d_3\}$ has $\{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, b_1, b_2, b_3\}$ as a basis. Thus adjoining d_3 to this set gives a basis B for M . For each element α of $\{b_4, d_4\}$, the triad $\{b_4, d_4, d_3\}$ of M implies, by orthogonality, that the fundamental circuit $C(\alpha, B)$ must contain d_3 . It follows by using the other known cocircuits of M that $C(\alpha, B)$ must also contain a_4 and a_3 , and must avoid b_1 and b_2 . Moreover, $C(\alpha, B)$ contains exactly one of $\{b_3\}$ and $\{a_2, a_1\}$. As $|C(b_4, B) \Delta C(d_4, B)| \neq 2$, it follows that we may assume that $C(b_4, B) = \{b_4, b_3, d_3, a_3, a_4\}$ and $C(d_4, B) = \{d_4, d_3, a_4, a_3, a_2, a_1\}$. Using this, we are now able to construct a binary representation for the binary matroid M . But that representation is the same as the one we get for the cycle matroid of the terrahawk that is obtained by adding a new vertex to the configuration in Figure 6 where this new vertex is incident with d_3, b_4 , and d_4 , while b_4 and d_4 have their other ends meeting the vertices incident with $\{c_1, c_2\}$ and $\{a_1, d_1\}$, respectively. We conclude that M is isomorphic to the cycle matroid of the terrahawk. \square

4. A FOUR-ELEMENT WIN

The purpose of this section is to prove the following theorem, which will be a major step in the proof of Theorem 1.1. Although this theorem involves an augmented 4-wheel, we are not assuming that this augmented 4-wheel is good.

Theorem 4.1. *Let M and N be internally 4-connected binary matroids such that $|E(M)| \geq 16$ and $|E(N)| \geq 7$. Assume that M contains an augmented 4-wheel labelled as in Figure 1. Suppose that $M \setminus x_2, y_2/z_2$ has an N -minor. Then*

- (i) *M has an internally 4-connected minor M' such that M' has an N -minor; and either $1 \leq |E(M) - E(M')| \leq 3$ or M' is obtained from M by deleting the central cocircuit of the augmented 4-wheel; or*
- (ii) *M is the cycle matroid of a terrahawk.*

Before proving this, we establish a number of preliminary lemmas. Throughout this section and the next, we shall denote by Z the set of ten elements shown in Figure 1, that is, $Z = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, y_1, y_2, y_3, z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4\}$.




FIGURE 7. The configuration in Lemma 4.2.

Lemma 4.2. *Assume that M is an internally 4-connected binary matroid that contains the configuration shown in Figure 7 where $|Z \cup t| = 11$ and $|E(M)| \geq 15$. If T is a triangle of M that meets $Z \cup t$, then either T is one of $\{z_2, y_2, x_1\}$, $\{y_2, z_3, x_3\}$, $\{z_3, x_2, y_3\}$, and $\{x_2, z_2, y_1\}$, or $T \cap (Z \cup t)$ is $\{x_1, z_1\}$ or $\{x_3, z_4\}$.*

Proof. Suppose first that T meets $\{z_2, y_2, x_2, z_3\}$ but that T is not one of the four triangles shown in Figure 7. Then, by orthogonality, T contains exactly two elements of the set $\{z_2, y_2, x_2, z_3\}$. By orthogonality again, the third element of T must also be in $Z \cup t$. If this third element avoids $\{z_1, t, z_4\}$, then we get a contradiction to orthogonality. Thus the third element meets $\{z_1, t, z_4\}$, so $r(Z \cup t) \leq 6$ and $\lambda(Z \cup t) \leq 2$; a contradiction.

We may now assume that T avoids $\{z_2, y_2, x_2, z_3\}$. If $t \in T$, then, by orthogonality and symmetry, we may assume that $y_3 \in T$, so T is $\{t, y_3, z_4\}$ or $\{t, y_3, x_3\}$. Thus, again, $r(Z \cup t) \leq 6$ and so we obtain the contradiction that $\lambda(Z \cup t) \leq 2$. We conclude that $t \notin T$. Thus T avoids $\{y_1, y_3\}$ otherwise T must contain $\{y_1, y_3\}$ and meet both $\{x_3, z_4\}$ and $\{x_1, z_1\}$; a contradiction. We conclude that T avoids $\{z_2, y_2, x_2, z_3, t, y_1, y_3\}$. Thus $T \cap (Z \cup t) \subseteq \{x_1, z_1, x_3, z_4\}$. Hence, by orthogonality, $T \cap (Z \cup t)$ is $\{x_1, z_1\}$ or $\{x_3, z_4\}$, and the lemma holds. \square

Lemma 4.3. *Assume that M is an internally 4-connected binary matroid that contains the configuration shown in Figure 7 where $|Z \cup t| = 11$ and $|E(M)| \geq 16$. Then*

- (i) M/t is internally 4-connected; or
- (ii) M has distinct elements u and v not in $Z \cup t$ such that
 - (a) $\{y_1, t, u, z_1\}$ is a circuit and $\{z_1, u, v\}$ is a triad; or
 - (b) $\{y_3, t, u, z_4\}$ is a circuit and $\{z_4, u, v\}$ is a triad.

Proof. We assume that M/t is not internally 4-connected otherwise the lemma holds. Evidently M/t is cosimple. We show next that

4.3.1. M/t is simple.

Suppose that M/t is not simple. Then M has a triangle T containing t . By orthogonality, T must contain y_1, x_2 , or y_3 . But each of y_1, x_2 , and y_3 is contained in a 4-cocircuit contained in $Z \cup t$ other than $\{t, y_1, x_2, y_3\}$. Thus $T - t \subseteq Z$. Hence $\lambda(Z \cup t) \leq 2$. As $|Z \cup t| \leq 11$, this is a contradiction. Thus 4.3.1 holds.

Next we show that

4.3.2. *M/t is 3-connected and has a 4-fan.*

Since M/t is simple and cosimple, if it is not 3-connected, it has a non-sequential 2-separation. If M/t is 3-connected but has no 4-fan, then, as M/t is not internally 4-connected, it has a non-sequential 3-separation. Thus to prove 4.3.2, it suffices to show the following.

4.3.3. *For each k in $\{2, 3\}$, the matroid M/t has no non-sequential k -separations.*

Suppose M/t has a non-sequential k -separation (U, V) for some k in $\{2, 3\}$. Then M/t contains the configuration in Figure 5 where the elements of this configuration are labelled $\{x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, y_3, z_2, z_3\}$. By Lemma 3.3, we may assume that U contains the last set. Then we can adjoin t to U to get a non-sequential k -separation of M ; a contradiction. We conclude that 4.3.3 holds. Hence so does 4.3.2.

We now know that M/t has a 4-fan (s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4) , so $\{s_1, s_2, s_3, t\}$ is a circuit of M . By orthogonality, $\{s_1, s_2, s_3\}$ meets $\{y_1, x_2, y_3\}$. But each of y_1, x_2 , and y_3 is in a triangle of M so none is in the triad $\{s_2, s_3, s_4\}$. Thus $s_1 \in \{y_1, x_2, y_3\}$. If $s_1 = x_2$, then, by orthogonality, $\{s_2, s_3\}$ meets $\{z_2, y_2, z_3\}$, so M has a 4-fan; a contradiction. Thus, by symmetry, we may assume that $s_1 = y_1$. By orthogonality, $\{s_2, s_3\}$ meets $\{z_1, x_1, z_2\}$, so, as neither s_2 nor s_3 is in a triangle, it follows, by symmetry, that we may assume that $z_1 = s_2$. Then (ii)(a) holds provided $\{s_3, s_4\}$ avoids $Z \cup t$. Certainly $\{s_3, s_4\} \cap \{z_1, y_1, t\} = \emptyset$. As $\{s_3, s_4\}$ is contained in a triad and hence meets no triangle, $\{s_3, s_4\}$ can only meet Z in z_4 . By orthogonality between the circuit $\{t, y_1, z_1, s_3\}$ and the cocircuit $\{z_3, x_3, y_3, z_4\}$, we deduce that $z_4 \neq s_3$. If $z_4 = s_4$, then $\lambda(Z \cup t \cup s_3) \leq 2$. This is a contradiction as $|Z \cup t \cup s_3| = 12$ but $|E(M)| \geq 16$. \square

Lemma 4.4. *Let M be an internally 4-connected binary matroid with at least sixteen elements. Suppose that M contains the configuration shown in Figure 8 where all the elements shown are distinct. Then $M \setminus y_4$ or $M/z_4 \setminus x_3$ is internally 4-connected.*

Proof. We show first that

4.4.1. *$M/z_4 \setminus x_3$ is both simple and cosimple.*

As x_3 is in a triangle of M , it is not in a triad. Hence $M/z_4 \setminus x_3$ is cosimple. Now suppose $M/z_4 \setminus x_3$ has a 2-circuit C . Then $C \cup z_4$ is a triangle of M . Lemma 4.2 implies that $x_3 \in C$; a contradiction. We conclude that 4.4.1 holds.

4.4.2. *For each k in $\{2, 3\}$, the matroid $M/z_4 \setminus x_3$ has no non-sequential k -separations.*

Assume that $M/z_4 \setminus x_3$ has a non-sequential k -separation (U, V) for some k in $\{2, 3\}$. Then, by Lemma 3.3, we may assume that $\{x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, y_3, z_2, z_3\} \subseteq U$. Thus we can adjoin x_3 and then z_4 to U to get a non-sequential k -separation of M ; a contradiction. Therefore 4.4.2 holds.




FIGURE 8. The initial configuration in Lemma 4.4.

It follows immediately from 4.4.2 and Lemma 4.2 that $M/z_4 \setminus x_3$ is 3-connected. If it is internally 4-connected, then the lemma holds. Thus, we may assume, by 4.4.2 again, that $M/z_4 \setminus x_3$ has a 4-fan (s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4) .

4.4.3. *M has distinct elements u and v that are not in $Z \cup t$ such that $\{u, v, t\}$ is a triad and $\{v, t, y_3, z_4\}$ is a circuit.*

Suppose first that $\{x_3, s_2, s_3, s_4\}$ is a cocircuit of M . By orthogonality with the circuit $\{x_3, z_4, y_4\}$, it follows, since $z_4 \notin \{s_2, s_3, s_4\}$, that $y_4 \in \{s_2, s_3, s_4\}$. By orthogonality between $\{x_3, s_2, s_3, s_4\}$ and $\{x_3, y_2, z_3\}$, it follows that $\{y_2, z_3\}$ meets $\{s_2, s_3, s_4\}$. If $y_2 \in \{s_2, s_3, s_4\}$, then so is x_1 or z_2 . If $z_3 \in \{s_2, s_3, s_4\}$, then so is x_2 or y_3 . It follows that $\{x_3, s_2, s_3, s_4\} \subseteq (Z - z_1) \cup y_4$, so $\lambda((Z - z_1) \cup y_4) \leq 2$; a contradiction. We deduce that $\{x_3, s_2, s_3, s_4\}$ is not a cocircuit of M . Thus $\{s_2, s_3, s_4\}$ is a cocircuit of M . Hence $\{s_1, s_2, s_3, z_4\}$ is a circuit of M .

By orthogonality, $\{s_1, s_2, s_3\}$ meets $\{x_3, y_3, z_3\}$. But $x_3 \notin \{s_1, s_2, s_3\}$. As M has no 4-fans, we deduce that $s_1 \in \{y_3, z_3\}$. If $s_1 = z_3$, then $\{s_2, s_3\}$ meets $\{x_2, y_2, z_2\}$; a contradiction. If $s_1 = y_3$, then $\{s_2, s_3\}$ meets $\{x_2, y_1, t\}$, so, by symmetry, we may assume that $s_2 = t$. Then, letting $(s_4, s_3) = (u, v)$, we get that 4.4.3 holds unless $\{u, v\}$ meets $Z \cup t$. Consider the exceptional case. As $\{u, v, t\}$ is a triad, none of its elements is in a triangle. Thus $z_1 \in \{u, v\}$. If $z_1 = v$, then $\{z_1, t, y_3, z_4\}$ is a circuit, so $\lambda(Z \cup t \cup z_4) \leq 2$; a contradiction as $|E(M)| \geq 16$. Hence $z_1 = u$. Then $\lambda(Z \cup t \cup v) \leq 2$ and again we get a contradiction. We deduce that 4.4.3 holds.

We now know that M contains the configuration in Figure 9. Since y_4 is in a triangle, it follows that $M \setminus y_4$ is 3-connected. We show next that

4.4.4. *$M \setminus y_4$ has no non-sequential 3-separations.*

Suppose that $M \setminus y_4$ has a non-sequential 3-separation (U, V) . Then, by Lemma 3.3, we may assume that $\{x_1, x_2, x_3, y_2, y_3, z_2, z_3\} \subseteq U$. Thus we may assume that $z_4 \in U$, so we can adjoin y_4 to U to get a non-sequential 3-separation of M ; a contradiction. We deduce that 4.4.4 holds.

We may now assume that $M \setminus y_4$ has a 4-fan (t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) otherwise $M \setminus y_4$ is internally 4-connected and the lemma holds. Then $\{t_2, t_3, t_4, y_4\}$ is a cocircuit of M . Thus $\{t_2, t_3, t_4\}$ meets $\{x_3, z_4\}$ in a single element. Suppose $x_3 \in \{t_2, t_3, t_4\}$. Then $\{t_2, t_3, t_4\}$ also contains either z_3 and some element of $\{x_2, y_3\}$, or y_2 and some element of $\{x_1, z_2\}$. In both cases, $\lambda((Z - z_1) \cup y_4) \leq 2$; a contradiction. We deduce that $z_4 \in \{t_2, t_3, t_4\}$. Thus, by orthogonality, $\{v, y_3, t\}$ also meets




FIGURE 9. The configuration that results from 4.4.3.

$\{t_2, t_3, t_4\}$. Suppose $z_4 = t_4$. Then $\{v, y_3, t\}$ meets the triangle $\{t_1, t_2, t_3\}$. But no triangle contains v or t . Thus, without loss of generality, $y_3 = t_3$. Hence, by orthogonality, t_2 is either x_2 or z_3 , and we violate orthogonality with one of the triangles $\{x_2, y_1, z_2\}$ and $\{z_3, y_2, x_3\}$. We may now assume that $z_4 = t_3$. Then, by Lemma 4.2, $\{t_1, t_2, t_3\} = \{z_4, x_3, y_4\}$; a contradiction. Thus Lemma 4.4 holds. \square




FIGURE 10. The configuration in Lemma 4.5.

Lemma 4.5. *Let M be an internally 4-connected binary matroid with at least sixteen elements. Suppose that M contains the configuration shown in Figure 10 where all the elements shown are distinct. If $M \setminus x_1 / z_1$ is not internally 4-connected, then there is an element w not in $Z \cup \{t, u, v\}$ such that either $\{v, t, w\}$ is a triad and $\{w, t, y_1, z_1\}$ is a circuit, or $\{x_1, y_2, x_3, w\}$ is a cocircuit.*

Proof. We show first that

4.5.1. $M \setminus x_1 / z_1$ is 3-connected.

As x_1 is in a triangle, $M \setminus x_1$ is 3-connected. Moreover, the last matroid has (x_2, z_2, y_1, z_1) as a 4-fan. Thus we may assume that z_1 is in a triangle of M that also contains z_2 or y_1 otherwise 4.5.1 holds. If $\{z_1, z_2\}$ is contained in a triangle, then that triangle also contains z_3 and we contradict orthogonality. If $\{z_1, y_1\}$ is contained in a triangle, then orthogonality implies that that triangle must also

contain x_2, y_3 , or t . The first two possibilities yield contradictions. If the third holds, then $\lambda((Z - z_4) \cup t) \leq 2$; a contradiction. We conclude that 4.5.1 holds.

4.5.2. $M \setminus x_1 / z_1$ has no non-sequential 3-separations.

Suppose that $M \setminus x_1 / z_1$ has a non-sequential 3-separation (U, V) . By Lemma 3.3, we may assume that $\{x_2, x_3, y_1, y_2, y_3, z_2, z_3\} \subseteq U$. Thus we can adjoin x_1 and then z_1 to U to obtain a non-sequential 3-separation of M ; a contradiction. We deduce that 4.5.2 holds.

Since $M \setminus x_1 / z_1$ is not internally 4-connected, we now know that this matroid has a 4-fan (s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4) . Assume first that $\{x_1, s_2, s_3, s_4\}$ is a cocircuit of M . Then, by orthogonality, $\{s_2, s_3, s_4\}$ contains either z_2 and a member of $\{y_1, x_2\}$, or y_2 and a member of $\{x_3, z_3\}$. If $\{s_2, s_3, s_4\}$ contains $\{z_2, x_2\}$, then it also contains y_3 or z_3 and we obtain the contradiction that $\lambda(\{x_1, y_2, z_2, x_2, z_3, y_3\}) \leq 2$. If $\{s_2, s_3, s_4\}$ contains $\{z_2, y_1\}$, then we obtain the contradiction that $\{x_1, s_2, s_3, s_4\}$ is $\{x_1, z_2, y_1, z_1\}$. If $\{s_2, s_3, s_4\}$ contains $\{y_2, z_3\}$, then it also contains y_3 or x_2 , and $\lambda(\{x_1, y_2, z_2, x_2, z_3, y_3\}) \leq 2$; a contradiction. Finally, if $\{s_2, s_3, s_4\}$ contains $\{y_2, x_3\}$, then M has a 4-cocircuit containing $\{x_1, y_2, x_3\}$. Let w be the fourth element of this cocircuit. Then the lemma holds, unless $w \in Z \cup \{t, u, v\}$. Consider the exceptional case. If $w \in Z \cup t$, then $\lambda(Z \cup t) \leq 2$. If $w = v$, then we contradict orthogonality with the circuit $\{y_3, z_4, v, t\}$; and if $w = u$, then $\lambda((Z - z_1) \cup \{t, u, v\}) \leq 2$; a contradiction.

We may now assume that $\{s_2, s_3, s_4\}$ is a cocircuit of M . Then $\{s_1, s_2, s_3, z_1\}$ is a circuit of M . By orthogonality, $\{s_1, s_2, s_3\}$ must meet $\{z_2, y_1\}$ so $s_1 \in \{z_2, y_1\}$ otherwise M has a 4-fan. If $s_1 = z_2$, then $\{s_2, s_3\}$ meets $\{y_2, z_3, x_2\}$; a contradiction. Thus $s_1 = y_1$. Then $\{s_2, s_3\}$ meets $\{x_2, y_3, t\}$ and so contains t . By symmetry, we may assume that $s_2 = t$. By orthogonality, $\{s_2, s_3, s_4\}$ must meet $\{y_3, v, z_4\}$. But y_3 is not in a triad. Moreover, $s_3 \notin \{v, z_4\}$ by orthogonality with the cocircuit $\{u, v, z_4\}$. Thus $s_4 \in \{v, z_4\}$. Suppose $s_4 = z_4$. Then $\{y_3, z_3, z_4, x_3\} \Delta \{t, s_3, z_4\}$ is a cocircuit $\{y_3, z_3, x_3, t, s_3\}$ of M . Thus $\lambda(\{x_1, x_2, x_3, y_1, y_2, y_3, z_2, z_3, t, s_3\}) \leq 2$; a contradiction. We conclude that $s_4 = v$. Then letting $s_3 = w$, we have the required result unless w is in $Z \cup \{t, u, v\}$. Consider the exceptional case. As w is not in a triangle and $w \notin \{z_1, t, v\}$, it follows that $w \in \{z_4, u\}$. Since $\{z_4, u, v\}$ and $\{t, w, v\}$ are distinct triads, $w \notin \{z_4, u\}$ and the lemma follows. \square

With these preliminary results, we are now ready to prove the main theorem of this section, the proof of which is quite long.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Assume that the theorem fails. Then M is not isomorphic to the cycle matroid of the terrahawk. First we show the following.

4.6.1. $M \setminus x_2, y_2 / z_2$ is connected, simple, and cosimple.

Since M is 3-connected, M / z_2 is certainly connected. Thus $M / z_2 \setminus x_2, y_2$ is connected since x_2 and y_2 are in disjoint 2-circuits of M / z_2 . Moreover, $M / z_2 \setminus x_2, y_2$ is simple otherwise M has a triangle containing z_2 but avoiding $\{x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2\}$. By orthogonality, such a triangle must also contain $\{z_1, z_3\}$ and some element of $\{x_3, y_3, z_4\}$; a contradiction. Suppose $M / z_2 \setminus x_2, y_2$ is not cosimple. Then it has a 2-cocircuit C^* . Hence $C^* \cup \{x_2, y_2\}$ is a cocircuit of M . By orthogonality, C^* meets each of $\{z_3, x_3\}$, $\{z_2, x_1\}$, $\{z_2, y_1\}$, and $\{z_3, y_3\}$. Thus $C^* = \{z_2, z_3\}$; a contradiction. We conclude that $M / z_2 \setminus x_2, y_2$ is cosimple. Hence 4.6.1 holds.

4.6.2. *For each k in $\{2, 3\}$, the matroid $M \setminus x_2, y_2 / z_2$ has no non-sequential k -separations.*

Assume that $M \setminus x_2, y_2 / z_2$ has a non-sequential k -separation (U, V) for some k in $\{2, 3\}$. By symmetry, we may assume that $\{y_1, y_3, z_3\} \subseteq U$. Now $x_3 \in V$ otherwise $(U \cup \{x_2, y_2, z_2\}, V)$ is a non-sequential k -separation of M ; a contradiction. It follows that $x_1 \in V$ otherwise we can move x_3 into U . Then $z_1 \in V$ otherwise we can move x_1 into U . But now we can move z_3, y_1 , and y_3 into V and we obtain the contradiction that $(U - \{y_1, z_3, y_3\}, V \cup \{y_1, z_3, y_3\} \cup \{y_2, x_2, z_2\})$ is a non-sequential k -separation of M ; a contradiction. We conclude that 4.6.2 holds.

By combining 4.6.1 and 4.6.2, we deduce that $M \setminus x_2, y_2 / z_2$ is 3-connected. Moreover, we may assume that $M \setminus x_2, y_2 / z_2$ has a 4-fan (s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4) otherwise, by 4.6.2, $M \setminus x_2, y_2 / z_2$ is internally 4-connected and the theorem holds.

Next we show that

4.6.3. *M has a 4-cocircuit that contains $\{x_1, y_2, x_3\}$ or $\{y_1, x_2, y_3\}$ and also contains an element, s , that is not in Z .*

Suppose first that $\{s_2, s_3, s_4\}$ is a triad of M . Then $\{s_1, s_2, s_3, z_2\}$ is a circuit of M . Thus, by orthogonality, $\{s_1, s_2, s_3\}$ meets $\{y_2, x_2, z_3\}$. But $\{x_2, y_2\}$ avoids $\{s_1, s_2, s_3\}$, so $z_3 \in \{s_1, s_2, s_3\}$. As M has no 4-fans, we see that $z_3 = s_1$. Then $\{z_3, s_2, s_3, z_2\}$ is a circuit of M . By orthogonality, $\{s_2, s_3\}$ meets each of $\{x_1, y_1, z_1\}$ and $\{x_3, y_3, z_4\}$. As none of x_1, y_1, x_3 , and y_3 is in a triad, we deduce that $\{s_2, s_3\} = \{z_1, z_4\}$. Then M has $\{z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4\}$ as a circuit, so $\lambda(Z) \leq 2$; a contradiction.

We may now assume that $\{s_2, s_3, s_4\}$ is not a triad of M . Then M has a cocircuit C^* such that $\{s_2, s_3, s_4\} \subsetneq C^* \subseteq \{s_2, s_3, s_4, x_2, y_2\}$. Suppose C^* contains $\{x_2, y_2\}$. Then, since $z_2 \notin C^*$, it follows, as M is binary, that C^* avoids z_3 . Then, by orthogonality, C^* contains $\{x_1, x_3, y_1, y_3\}$; a contradiction. We deduce that C^* does not contain $\{x_2, y_2\}$, so C^* contains exactly one of x_2 and y_2 . We shall assume that $x_2 \in C^*$. A symmetric argument will cover the case when $y_2 \in C^*$.

By orthogonality with $\{x_2, z_2, y_1\}$, we see that $y_1 \in C^*$. As $x_2 \in C^*$, orthogonality implies that z_3 or y_3 is in C^* . Suppose $z_3 \in C^*$. Then $x_3 \in C^*$, so $C^* = \{x_2, y_1, z_3, x_3\}$ and therefore $\lambda(\{y_1, z_2, x_2, y_2, z_3, x_3\}) \leq 2$; a contradiction. We deduce that $z_3 \notin C^*$, so $y_3 \in C^*$. Hence C^* is a 4-cocircuit containing $\{x_2, y_1, y_3\}$. Let the fourth element of this cocircuit be s . If $s \in Z$, then $\lambda(Z) \leq 2$; a contradiction as $|E(M)| \geq 16$. Hence $s \notin Z$ and 4.6.3 holds.

By 4.6.3 and symmetry, we may assume that M has a 4-cocircuit $\{y_1, x_2, y_3, t\}$ where $t \notin Z$, so M contains the configuration in Figure 7. Since $M \setminus x_2, y_2 / z_2$ is 3-connected having an N -minor and having (z_3, y_1, y_3, t) as a 4-fan, either $M \setminus x_2, y_2 / z_2 / t$ or $M \setminus x_2, y_2 / z_2 \setminus z_3$ has an N -minor. Next we establish the following.

4.6.4. *If $N \preceq M \setminus x_2, y_2, z_3 / z_2$, then there is an element u that is not in $Z \cup t$ such that $\{z_1, x_1, u\}$ or $\{x_3, z_4, u\}$ is a circuit of M .*

Because the theorem fails, we know that $M \setminus x_2, y_2, z_3 / z_2$ is not internally 4-connected. Now $M \setminus x_2, y_2 / z_2 \setminus z_3$ is 3-connected unless z_3 is in a triad T^* of $M \setminus x_2, y_2 / z_2$. Consider the exceptional case. Then T^* meets $\{x_1, x_3\}$ and $\{y_1, y_3\}$, so $\lambda(\{x_1, x_2, x_3, y_1, y_2, y_3, z_2, z_3\}) \leq 2$; a contradiction. Thus $M \setminus x_2, y_2, z_3 / z_2$ is indeed 3-connected.

Now assume that $M \setminus x_2, y_2, z_3 / z_2$ has a non-sequential 3-separation (U, V) . We may also assume that $\{y_1, y_3, t\} \subseteq U$. Suppose x_3 or x_1 is in U . Then we may assume that $\{x_3, x_1\} \subseteq U$ and hence that $\{z_4, z_1\} \subseteq U$. Thus $(U \cup \{z_2, x_2, y_2, z_3\}, V)$ is

a non-sequential 3-separation of M . It follows that we may assume that $\{x_3, x_1\} \subseteq V$. Then $\{z_4, z_1\} \subseteq V$ otherwise we can move x_3 or x_1 into U . But now we can move y_1 and y_3 into V to get that $\{U - \{y_1, y_3\}, V \cup \{z_2, x_2, y_2, z_3\} \cup \{y_1, y_3\}\}$ is a non-sequential 3-separation of M ; a contradiction. We conclude that $M \setminus x_2, y_2, z_3 / z_2$ is sequentially 4-connected, so it must have a 4-fan (t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) .

First observe that $\{t_1, t_2, t_3\}$ is a triangle of M otherwise $\{t_1, t_2, t_3, z_2\}$ is a circuit of M that violates orthogonality with $\{x_2, y_2, z_2, z_3\}$. As M has no 4-fans, it has a cocircuit C^* such that $\{t_2, t_3, t_4\} \subsetneq C^* \subseteq \{t_2, t_3, t_4, x_2, y_2, z_3\}$. Moreover, $z_2 \notin C^*$.

Now $\{t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4\}$ avoids $\{x_2, y_2, z_2, z_3\}$. Thus, by Lemma 4.2, either $\{t_1, t_2, t_3\}$ meets $Z \cup t$ in $\{x_1, z_1\}$ or $\{x_3, z_4\}$; or $\{t_1, t_2, t_3\}$ avoids $Z \cup t$. In the former case, 4.6.4 holds. Now consider the latter case. Then C^* meets $\{x_2, y_2, z_3\}$ as $|C^*| \geq 4$. Suppose $z_3 \in C^*$. Then the circuits $\{z_3, x_3, x_1, z_2\}$ and $\{z_3, y_3, y_1, z_2\}$ imply, by orthogonality, that $t_4 \in \{x_1, x_3\} \cap \{y_1, y_3\}$. This contradiction implies that $z_3 \notin C^*$. If $x_2 \in C^*$, then, as $z_3 \notin C^*$, orthogonality implies that $t_4 \in \{z_2, y_1\} \cap \{y_3\}$; a contradiction. Thus $x_2 \notin C^*$ and, similarly, $y_2 \notin C^*$. Hence C^* avoids $\{x_2, y_2, z_3\}$; a contradiction. We conclude that 4.6.4 holds.

Now observe that

$$M \setminus x_2, y_2 / z_2 \cong M \setminus x_2, y_2 / z_3 \cong M / z_3 \setminus x_3, y_3 \cong M \setminus x_3, y_3 / z_4.$$

Thus, as $N \preceq M \setminus x_2, y_2 / z_2$, we see that

4.6.5. $N \preceq M / z_4$.

Next we show that

4.6.6. $N \not\preceq M \setminus x_2, y_2, z_3 / z_2$, so $N \preceq M \setminus x_2, y_2 / z_2, t$.

Assume that $N \preceq M \setminus x_2, y_2, z_3 / z_2$. Then, by 4.6.4 and symmetry, M contains the configuration shown in Figure 8. As $N \preceq M / z_4$, we see that $N \preceq M / z_4 \setminus y_4$ and $N \preceq M / z_4 \setminus x_3$. Thus $N \preceq M \setminus y_4$ and $N \preceq M / z_4 \setminus x_3$. By Lemma 4.4, $M \setminus y_4$ or $M / z_4 \setminus x_3$ is internally 4-connected; a contradiction. We conclude that 4.6.6 holds.

We now know that $N \preceq M / t$. By Lemma 4.3 and symmetry, we may assume that M contains the configuration in Figure 10.




FIGURE 11. A configuration obtained by Lemma 4.5.

As $N \preceq M \setminus x_2, y_2 / z_2$ and $M \setminus x_2, y_2 / z_2 \cong M / z_2 \setminus x_1, y_1 \cong M \setminus x_1, y_1 / z_1$, we see that $N \preceq M \setminus x_1 / z_1$. As $M \setminus x_1 / z_1$ is not internally 4-connected, Lemma 4.5 implies that there is an element s not in $Z \cup \{t, u, v\}$ such that either $\{v, t, s\}$ is a triad

and $\{s, t, y_1, z_1\}$ is a circuit, or $\{x_1, y_2, x_3, s\}$ is a cocircuit. If the first option occurs, then M contains a relabelled form of the configuration shown in Figure 6, so Lemma 3.7 implies that M is the cycle matroid of the terrahawk; a contradiction. We conclude that $\{x_1, y_2, x_3, s\}$ is a cocircuit, and that M contains the configuration in Figure 11, where all of the elements shown are distinct.

Now rotate the configuration in Figure 11 a quarter turn clockwise and compare the resulting configuration with that shown in Figure 7. By 4.6.5, $N \preceq M/z_4$ so M/z_4 is not internally 4-connected. Thus, by Lemma 4.3, M has distinct elements q and w not in $(Z - z_1) \cup \{s, t\}$ such that either $\{y_3, z_4, q, t\}$ is a circuit and $\{t, q, w\}$ is a triad, or $\{x_3, z_4, q, s\}$ is a circuit and $\{s, q, w\}$ is a triad. Suppose $\{x_3, z_4, q, s\}$ is a circuit. Orthogonality with the cocircuit $\{u, v, z_4\}$ implies that q is in $\{u, v\}$. If $q = v$, then $\lambda((Z - z_1) \cup \{t, v, s\}) \leq 2$; a contradiction. Thus $q = u$. Again rotating the configuration in Figure 11 a quarter turn clockwise and comparing the resulting configuration with that shown in Figure 6, we deduce, by Lemma 3.7, that M is the cycle matroid of the terrahawk; a contradiction. We conclude that $\{y_3, z_4, q, t\}$ is a circuit and $\{t, q, w\}$ is a triad. Thus $q = v$ and M contains the configuration shown in Figure 12.

4.6.7. $w \notin Z \cup \{s, t, u, v\}$.

By construction, $w \notin (Z - z_1) \cup \{s, t\}$, and clearly $w \neq v$. If $w \in \{z_1, u\}$, then $\lambda((Z - z_1) \cup \{t, v, w\}) \leq 2$; a contradiction. Hence 4.6.7 holds.




FIGURE 12

Now $M \setminus x_2, y_2 / z_2, t \cong M \setminus x_2, y_2 / z_3, t \cong M / z_3 \setminus x_3, y_3 / t \cong M \setminus x_3, y_3 / z_4, t$. Since $N \preceq M \setminus x_2, y_2 / z_2, t$, we deduce that $N \preceq M \setminus y_3 / z_4, t$.

As y_3 is in a triangle, $M \setminus y_3$ is 3-connected. Since $M \setminus y_3$ has (y_2, x_3, z_3, z_4) as a 4-fan and has no triangle containing z_4 , it follows that $M \setminus y_3 / z_4$ is 3-connected. We deduce that $M \setminus y_3 / z_4, t$ is 2-connected and cosimple. It is also simple since, by orthogonality, M has no 4-circuit that contains $\{z_4, t\}$ but avoids y_3 .

4.6.8. For each k in $\{2, 3\}$, the matroid $M \setminus y_3 / z_4, t$ has no non-sequential k -separations.

Suppose $M \setminus y_3 / z_4, t$ has a non-sequential k -separation (U, V) for some k in $\{2, 3\}$. Then, by Lemma 3.3, we may assume that $\{x_1, x_2, x_3, y_1, y_2, z_2, z_3\} \subseteq U$. Thus we

can adjoin y_3 , then t and z_4 to U to get a non-sequential k -separation of M ; a contradiction. We conclude that 4.6.8 holds.

By 4.6.8, we deduce that $M \setminus y_3 / z_4, t$ is 3-connected. Since it is not internally 4-connected, it must have a 4-fan (s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4) .

4.6.9. $\{s_2, s_3, s_4\}$ is a triad of M avoiding v .

Suppose $\{s_2, s_3, s_4\}$ is not a triad of M . Then $\{s_2, s_3, s_4, y_3\}$ is a cocircuit of M . By orthogonality, $\{s_2, s_3, s_4\}$ meets each of $\{z_4, v, t\}$, $\{z_3, x_2\}$, and $\{x_3, x_1, y_1\}$. But $\{s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4\}$ avoids $\{z_4, t\}$. Thus $v \in \{s_2, s_3, s_4\}$. As $\{s_2, s_3, s_4\} \subseteq (Z - \{z_1, z_4\}) \cup v$, it follows that $\lambda(Z \cup \{t, v\}) \leq 2$; a contradiction. We conclude that $\{s_2, s_3, s_4\}$ is a triad of M . This triad avoids v since the circuit $\{t, y_3, z_4, v\}$ implies that the only triads containing v contain z_4 or t , but $\{z_4, t\}$ avoids $\{s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4\}$. Thus 4.6.9 holds.

From 4.6.9, it follows that M has a circuit C such that $\{s_1, s_2, s_3\} \subsetneq C \subseteq \{s_1, s_2, s_3, z_4, t\}$. If $z_4 \in C$, then, by orthogonality, $\{s_1, s_2, s_3\}$ meets both $\{u, v\}$ and $\{x_3, z_3\}$; so $s_1 \in \{x_3, z_3\}$ and $u \in \{s_2, s_3\}$. If $t \in C$, then, by orthogonality, $\{s_1, s_2, s_3\}$ meets both $\{v, w\}$ and $\{y_1, x_2\}$; so $s_1 \in \{y_1, x_2\}$ and $w \in \{s_2, s_3\}$. By combining the last two sentences, we immediately obtain that C contains exactly one of z_4 and t .

Suppose $t \in C$. Then $z_4 \notin C$. Moreover, as noted above, $s_1 \in \{y_1, x_2\}$ and $w \in \{s_2, s_3\}$. By orthogonality, $s_1 \neq x_2$ otherwise $\{s_2, s_3\}$ meets $\{y_2, z_2, z_3\}$; a contradiction. Therefore $s_1 = y_1$. Hence, by orthogonality with the cocircuit $\{y_1, x_1, z_2, z_1\}$, we deduce that $z_1 \in \{s_2, s_3\}$. Thus $C = \{y_1, z_1, w, t\}$. Hence M contains the configuration in Figure 6, so M is the cycle matroid of the terrahawk; a contradiction.

We may now assume that $z_4 \in C$, so $C = \{z_4, s_1, s_2, s_3\}$ with $s_1 \in \{x_3, z_3\}$ and $u \in \{s_2, s_3\}$. If $s_1 = z_3$, then orthogonality implies that $\{s_2, s_3\}$ meets $\{x_2, y_2, z_2\}$; a contradiction. Thus $s_1 = x_3$. Then orthogonality implies that $C = \{z_4, x_3, s, u\}$. Adding this circuit to the configuration in Figure 12 and then inverting the resulting configuration, we see that M contains the configuration in Figure 6. Thus, by Lemma 3.7, M is the cycle matroid of the terrahawk; a contradiction. \square

5. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

In this section, we complete the proof of the main result of the paper.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We shall assume that the theorem fails. First assume that $|E(N)| = 6$. Then $N \cong M(K_4)$. As $|E(M)| \geq 16$, it follows by [1, Theorem 1.3] that M has an internally 4-connected minor M' with $1 \leq |E(M) - E(M')| \leq 3$ unless M or M^* is the cycle matroid of a planar or Möbius quartic ladder. If such an M' exists, then, since every 3-connected binary matroid with at least six elements has an $M(K_4)$ -minor, M' has an N -minor; a contradiction. We deduce that the exceptional case arises. But then we obtain the contradiction that M does not contain an augmented 4-wheel. We may now assume that $|E(N)| \geq 7$. Then, by Lemma 3.4, $N \preceq M \setminus y_2, y_1$ and $M \setminus y_2, y_1$ is 3-connected. Since $M \setminus y_2, y_1$ has (y_3, x_2, z_3, z_2) as a 4-fan, we know that $N \preceq M \setminus y_1, y_2 / z_2$ or $N \preceq M \setminus y_1, y_2, y_3$. By Theorem 4.1, $N \not\preceq M \setminus y_1, y_2 / z_2$. Thus $N \preceq M \setminus y_1, y_2, y_3$. By Lemma 3.5, either $M \setminus y_1, y_2, y_3$ is 3-connected, or M has $\{y_1, x_2, y_3, t\}$ as a cocircuit for some element t . Assume the latter holds. As $N \preceq M \setminus y_1, y_2, y_3$, we have that $N \preceq M \setminus y_1, y_3 \setminus y_2 / x_2$, so $N \preceq M \setminus y_2 / x_2 \setminus z_2, z_3$. Hence $N \preceq M \setminus x_2, y_2, z_2, z_3$, so $N \preceq$

$M/z_2 \setminus y_1, y_2$; a contradiction. Thus $M \setminus y_1, y_2, y_3$ is 3-connected. Since the theorem fails, $M \setminus y_1, y_2, y_3$ is not internally 4-connected. Next we show the following.

Lemma 5.1. *$M \setminus y_1, y_2, y_3$ is sequentially 4-connected.*

Proof. Assume that $M \setminus y_1, y_2, y_3$ has a non-sequential 3-separation (U, V) . Without loss of generality, $\{z_2, z_3, x_2\} \subseteq U$. If x_1 or x_3 is in U , then $(U \cup \{y_1, y_2, y_3\}, V)$ is a non-sequential 3-separation of M ; a contradiction. Thus $\{x_1, x_3\} \subseteq V$. It follows that $z_1 \in V$, otherwise we can move x_1 into U . By symmetry, we deduce that $z_4 \in V$. Then $\{z_2, z_3\} \subseteq \text{cl}^*_{M \setminus y_1, y_2, y_3}(V)$, so $(U - \{z_2, z_3, x_2\}, V \cup \{z_2, z_3, x_2\})$ is a non-sequential 3-separation of $M \setminus y_1, y_2, y_3$. Hence $(U - \{z_2, z_3, x_2\}, V \cup \{z_2, z_3, x_2\} \cup \{y_1, y_2, y_3\})$ is a non-sequential 3-separation of M ; a contradiction. \square

It follows immediately from the last lemma that $M \setminus y_1, y_2, y_3$ has a 4-fan and this fact will play a key role in the proof of the next lemma. Recall that $Z = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, y_1, y_2, y_3, z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4\}$.

Lemma 5.2. *The matroid M has a triangle $\{x_3, z_4, y_4\}$ for some element y_4 not in Z .*

Proof. If M has a triangle containing $\{x_3, z_4\}$, then the third element of this triangle is not in Z , otherwise $r(Z) \leq 5$ and we obtain the contradiction that $\lambda(Z) \leq 2$. We assume now that M has no triangle containing $\{x_3, z_4\}$. Let (a, b, c, d) be a 4-fan in $M \setminus y_1, y_2, y_3$. Since M has no 4-fans, M has a cocircuit C^* such that $\{b, c, d\} \subsetneq C^* \subseteq \{b, c, d, y_1, y_2, y_3\}$.

5.2.1. $\{a, b, c\} \cap \{x_2, z_2, z_3\} = \emptyset$ and $\{a, b, c\}$ contains neither $\{x_1, x_3\}$ nor $\{z_1, z_4\}$.

Suppose $\{a, b, c\}$ meets $\{x_2, z_2, z_3\}$. Then, by orthogonality, $\{a, b, c\}$ contains two elements of $\{x_2, z_2, z_3\}$. As $\{a, b, c\}$ avoids $\{y_1, y_3\}$, it follows that $\{z_2, z_3\} \subseteq \{a, b, c\}$. This yields a contradiction to orthogonality. If $\{a, b, c\}$ contains $\{x_1, x_3\}$ or $\{z_1, z_4\}$, then we also get a contradiction to orthogonality. Thus 5.2.1 holds.

Next we show that

5.2.2. $y_2 \notin C^*$.

Suppose $y_2 \in C^*$. Then C^* meet both $\{x_1, z_2\}$ and $\{x_3, z_3\}$. By 5.2.1, $\{b, c\}$ avoids $\{z_2, z_3\}$, and $\{b, c\} \neq \{x_1, x_3\}$. Thus $d \in \{x_1, z_2, x_3, z_3\}$, and $\{x_1, x_3\}$ meets $\{b, c\}$ in a single element. Hence x_1 or x_3 is in the triangle $\{a, b, c\}$. But $M \setminus y_1$ is $(4, 4, S)$ -connected, so x_1 is not in a triangle avoiding $\{y_1, y_2\}$. Hence $x_3 \in \{b, c\}$, so the triangle $\{a, b, c\}$ must contain z_4 ; a contradiction. Thus 5.2.2 holds.

It follows immediately from 5.2.2 that C^* meets $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$ in $\{y_1\}, \{y_3\}$, or $\{y_1, y_3\}$.

5.2.3. *If $C^* \cap \{y_1, y_2, y_3\} = \{y_3\}$, then $d = z_3$ and $\{b, c\} = \{x_3, z_4\}$.*

By orthogonality, x_2 or z_3 is in $\{b, c, d\}$. Now 5.2.1 implies that neither x_2 nor z_3 is in $\{a, b, c\}$. Thus d is x_2 or z_3 . Assume first that $d = x_2$. Then $\{y_3, x_2, b, c\}$ is a cocircuit, so $z_2 \in \{b, c\}$; a contradiction to 5.2.1. We deduce that $d = z_3$, so $\{y_3, z_3, b, c\}$ is a cocircuit of M . Hence, by orthogonality, $x_3 \in \{b, c\}$. Thus $\{y_3, z_3, b, c\}$ is the cocircuit $\{y_3, z_3, x_3, z_4\}$ so $\{b, c\} = \{x_3, z_4\}$. We conclude that 5.2.3 holds.

Since 5.2.3 implies that the lemma holds, we deduce that $C^* \cap \{y_1, y_2, y_3\} \neq \{y_3\}$.

5.2.4. $C^* \cap \{y_1, y_2, y_3\} \neq \{y_1\}$.

By symmetry from 5.2.3, we see that if $C^* \cap \{y_1, y_2, y_3\} = \{y_1\}$, then $d = z_2$ and $\{b, c\} = \{x_1, z_1\}$. But this means that $M \setminus y_1$ has a triangle containing $\{x_1, z_1\}$ and so it is not $(4, 4, S)$ -connected; a contradiction. Hence 5.2.4 holds.

We now know that $C^* \cap \{y_1, y_2, y_3\} = \{y_1, y_3\}$. Next we show that

5.2.5. $d = x_2$ and $\{a, b, c\} \cap Z = \emptyset$, so $C^* = \{b, c, x_2, y_1, y_3\}$.

As $\{y_1, y_3\} \subseteq C^*$, either $x_2 \in \{b, c, d\}$, or $\{z_2, z_3\} \subseteq \{b, c, d\}$. By 5.2.1, $\{b, c\} \cap \{x_2, z_2, z_3\} = \emptyset$. Thus $x_2 = d$, so $C^* = \{b, c, x_2, y_1, y_3\}$. We now show that $\{a, b, c\} \cap Z = \emptyset$. Clearly $\{a, b, c\}$ avoids $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$ and, by 5.2.1, $\{a, b, c\}$ avoids $\{z_2, z_3, x_2\}$. Now $x_1 \notin \{b, c\}$ otherwise, by orthogonality, $z_2 \in \{b, c\}$. Similarly, $x_3 \notin \{b, c\}$. If $x_1 = a$, then $z_1 \in \{b, c\}$ so $M \setminus y_1$ has a 5-fan; a contradiction. If $x_3 = a$, then $z_4 \in \{b, c\}$; so M has a triangle containing $\{x_3, z_4\}$; a contradiction. Finally, suppose $z_1 \in \{a, b, c\}$. Then x_1 or z_2 is in $\{a, b, c\}$; a contradiction. Hence z_1 avoids $\{a, b, c\}$ and, by symmetry, so does z_4 . We conclude that 5.2.5 holds.

Since $M \setminus y_1, y_2, y_3$ has (a, b, c, x_2) as a 4-fan and has an N -minor, either

- (i) $N \preceq M \setminus y_1, y_2, y_3 / x_2$; or
- (ii) $N \preceq M \setminus y_1, y_2, y_3 \setminus a$.

In the first case, $N \preceq M / x_2 \setminus y_2, z_2, z_3$, so $N \preceq M \setminus y_2, z_2, z_3, x_2$. Hence $N \preceq M / z_2 \setminus x_2, y_2$ and we obtain a contradiction by Theorem 4.1. Thus we may assume that (ii) holds. Then $N \preceq M \setminus a$.

As a is in a triangle, $M \setminus a$ is 3-connected. Next we show that

5.2.6. $M \setminus a$ is sequentially 4-connected.

Assume that $M \setminus a$ has a non-sequential 3-separation (U, V) . Then we may assume that $b \in U$ and $c \in V$. Moreover, by Lemma 3.3, we may assume that $\{x_2, x_3, y_1, y_2, y_3, z_2, z_3\} \subseteq U$. Now, since $C^* = \{b, c, x_2, y_1, y_3\}$, we can move c into U and then adjoin a to U to get a non-sequential 3-separation of $M \setminus a$; a contradiction. Hence 5.2.6 holds.

We now know, since $M \setminus a$ is not internally 4-connected, that it has a 4-fan.

5.2.7. If $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta)$ is a 4-fan in $M \setminus a$, then $\delta \in \{b, c\}$ and $\{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\} \cap \{a, b, c\} = \emptyset$.

Since $\{\beta, \gamma, \delta, a\}$ is a cocircuit of M , it follows that $\{b, c\}$ meets $\{\beta, \gamma, \delta\}$ in a single element. Suppose $\delta \notin \{b, c\}$. Then $\{b, c\}$ meets $\{\beta, \gamma\}$ so, by symmetry, we may assume that $\gamma = c$. Since $\{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\} \neq \{a, b, c\}$, it follows that $b \notin \{\alpha, \beta\}$. By orthogonality between $\{\alpha, \beta, c\}$ and the cocircuit $\{b, c, x_2, y_1, y_3\}$, we deduce that $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ meets $\{x_2, y_1, y_3\}$ in a single element.

Suppose $x_2 \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$. Then $\{z_2, z_3\}$ avoids $\{\alpha, \beta, c\}$ otherwise the triangle $\{\alpha, \beta, c\}$ contains y_1 or y_3 ; a contradiction. Thus, by orthogonality, $y_2 \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$. Hence $\{x_2, y_2, c\}$ is a triangle of M . By taking the symmetric difference of this triangle with each of the circuits $\{x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2\}$ and $\{x_2, y_2, x_3, y_3\}$, separately, we deduce that M has $\{c, x_1, y_1\}$ and $\{c, x_2, y_2\}$ as circuits. The cocircuit $\{a, c, \beta, \delta\}$ must have $\{\beta, \delta\}$ meeting each of $\{x_2, y_2\}$, $\{x_1, y_1\}$, and $\{x_3, y_3\}$; a contradiction. We deduce that $x_2 \notin \{\alpha, \beta\}$.

Next suppose that $y_1 \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$. Then, by orthogonality, $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ also meets $\{z_1, x_1, z_2\}$. As $\{\alpha, \beta, c\} \neq \{y_1, z_2, x_2\}$, we see that $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ meets $\{z_1, x_1\}$. If $x_1 \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$, then M has $\{x_1, y_1, c\}$ as a circuit and so has $\{x_2, y_2, c\}$ and $\{x_3, y_3, c\}$ as circuits. This gives a contradiction as above. We conclude that $\{\alpha, \beta\} = \{y_1, z_1\}$. Moreover, $c \notin Z$ by 5.2.5. We deduce that M has

$(\{y_1, z_1, c\}, \{x_1, z_2, y_2\}, \{y_1, z_1, x_1, z_2\})$ as a bowtie. Moreover, this bowtie is good as $M \setminus y_1$ is $(4, 4, S)$ -connected having an N -minor; a contradiction. Hence $y_1 \notin \{\alpha, \beta\}$.

Finally, suppose that $y_3 \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$. Then, by a symmetric argument to that given in the last paragraph, we get that M has $(\{y_3, z_4, c\}, \{x_3, z_3, y_2\}, \{y_3, z_4, x_3, z_3\})$ as a bowtie and $c \notin Z$. Since $N \preceq M \setminus y_3$ and this bowtie is not good, we deduce that $M \setminus y_3$ is not $(4, 4, S)$ -connected. We now switch attention to the bowtie $(\{x_1, y_2, z_2\}, \{x_2, z_3, y_3\}, \{y_2, z_2, x_2, z_3\})$ and use [4, Lemma 2.6]. By that result, $\{x_2, z_3, y_3\}$ is the central triangle of a quasi rotor whose other triangles include $\{x_1, y_2, z_2\}$ and whose 4-cocircuits include $\{y_2, z_2, x_2, z_3\}$.

Suppose z_3 is the central element of this quasi rotor. By orthogonality, M has no triangle containing $\{z_2, z_3\}$. Thus the second triangle of the quasi rotor containing z_3 also contains y_2 and so is $\{z_3, y_2, x_3\}$. Hence the second 4-cocircuit of the quasi rotor apart from $\{y_2, z_2, x_2, z_3\}$ must contain $\{z_3, y_3, x_3\}$ and so is $\{z_3, y_3, x_3, z_4\}$. Thus the quasi rotor contains a triangle containing $\{x_3, z_4\}$; a contradiction.

We may now assume that x_2 is the central element of this quasi rotor. Then the 4-cocircuit, D^* , of the quasi rotor other than $\{y_2, z_2, x_2, z_3\}$ must contain $\{x_2, y_3\}$. By orthogonality, D^* must meet $\{y_1, z_2\}$ and $\{z_4, c\}$. If $z_2 \in D^*$, then D^* also meets $\{x_1, y_2\}$ so $|D^*| \geq 5$; a contradiction. Thus $y_1 \in D^*$, so D^* contains $\{y_1, x_2, y_3\}$. Then $D^* \triangle \{b, c, x_2, y_1, y_3\}$ is a triad that must meet $\{b, c\}$, so M has a 4-fan. This contradiction completes the proof that $\delta \in \{b, c\}$. Certainly $\{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$ avoids a ; if it meets $\{b, c\}$, then M is not internally 4-connected; a contradiction. We conclude that 5.2.7 holds.

We show next that

5.2.8. $M \setminus a$ is $(4, 4, S)$ -connected.

Assume that this fails. Then, by 5.2.6, $M \setminus a$ has a sequential 3-separating set with at least five elements and so has a sequential 3-separating set with exactly five elements. Thus $M \setminus a$ has a 5-fan or a 5-cofan. First suppose that $M \setminus a$ has a 5-fan $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \varepsilon)$. Then, by 5.2.7, $\delta \in \{b, c\}$ and $\beta \in \{b, c\}$. Thus $a \in \text{cl}(\{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \varepsilon\})$, so M is not internally 4-connected; a contradiction. We deduce that $M \setminus a$ has a 5-cofan $(\omega, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta)$. Then $M \setminus a$ has $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta)$ and $(\gamma, \beta, \alpha, \omega)$ as 4-fans. Thus $\delta \in \{b, c\}$ and $\omega \in \{b, c\}$, so $a \in \text{cl}(\{\omega, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta\})$. Hence M is not internally 4-connected; a contradiction. We conclude that 5.2.8 holds.

Now let $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta)$ be a 4-fan in $M \setminus a$. Then, by 5.2.7, $\delta \in \{b, c\}$. By symmetry, we may assume that $\delta = b$ and so $(\{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}, \{a, b, c\}, \{a, b, \beta, \gamma\})$ is a good bowtie in M since $M \setminus a$ is $(4, 4, S)$ -connected having an N -minor. This contradiction completes the proof of Lemma 5.2. \square

By Lemma 5.2, M contains the structure shown in Figure 13. This means that, for some $k \geq 3$, we have a configuration of the form shown in Figure 14 where the following hold:

- (i) $M \setminus y_1$ is $(4, 4, S)$ -connected;
- (ii) $N \not\preceq M \setminus x_1, y_1/z_2$;
- (iii) all the elements shown are distinct; and
- (iv) $M \setminus y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k$ is sequentially 4-connected having an N -minor.

We shall assume that k is chosen to be maximal subject to these conditions. The particular form of Figure 14 may suggest to the reader that we are requiring k to be odd, but no such assumption is being made.




FIGURE 13. The configuration that arises from Lemma 5.2.

For the rest of the proof of Theorem 1.1, we shall be arguing in terms of the configuration shown in Figure 14 and assuming that conditions (i)–(iv) above hold.

Lemma 5.3. *If $N \preceq M \setminus x_j, y_j / z_j$ for some j with $2 \leq j \leq k$, then $N \preceq M \setminus x_2, y_2 / z_2$ and $N \preceq M \setminus x_1, y_1 / z_2$.*

Proof. In M / z_j , we have $\{x_j, y_{j-1}\}$ and $\{y_j, x_{j-1}\}$ as 2-circuits. Thus $M / z_j \setminus x_j, y_j \cong M / z_j \setminus x_{j-1}, y_{j-1} \cong M \setminus x_{j-1}, y_{j-1} / z_{j-1}$. By repeatedly applying this observation, we obtain the required result. \square

Now consider $M \setminus y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k$. It is 3-connected having an N -minor and having $(y_{k+1}, z_{k+1}, x_k, z_k)$ as a 4-fan. Thus either

- (i) $N \preceq M \setminus y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k \setminus y_{k+1}$; or
- (ii) $N \preceq M \setminus y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k / z_k$.

If (ii) holds, then $N \preceq M / z_k \setminus y_k, y_{k-1}$, so $N \preceq M / z_k \setminus y_k, x_k$. Thus, by Lemma 5.3, $N \preceq M / z_2 \setminus y_1, x_1$; a contradiction.

Lemma 5.4. *$M \setminus y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k, y_{k+1}$ is 3-connected.*

Proof. Assume that the lemma fails. Then $M \setminus y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k$ has a triad containing y_{k+1} and one of x_k and z_{k+1} . Thus either $M \setminus y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k, y_{k+1} / x_k$




FIGURE 14. $N \preceq M \setminus y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k$, which is sequentially 4-connected.

or $M \setminus y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k, y_{k+1} / z_{k+1}$ has an N -minor. In the first case, $N \not\preceq M \setminus y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k / x_k \setminus z_{k+1}$, so $N \preceq M \setminus y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k \setminus z_{k+1} / z_k$. Hence $N \not\preceq M \setminus x_k, y_k / z_k$. We obtain the same conclusion in the second case, as $N \not\preceq M / z_{k+1} \setminus x_k, y_k$. Thus, in both cases, we may apply Lemma 5.3 to get that $N \preceq M / z_2 \setminus x_1, y_1$; a contradiction. \square

Lemma 5.5. $M \setminus y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k, y_{k+1}$ is sequentially 4-connected.

Proof. Assume that $M \setminus y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k, y_{k+1}$ has a non-sequential 3-separation (U, V) . Then, without loss of generality, we may assume that $\{z_k, x_k, z_{k+1}\} \subseteq U$. Thus $(U \cup y_{k+1}, V)$ is a non-sequential 3-separation of $M \setminus y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k$; a contradiction. \square

We observe that M has $(\{y_{k+1}, z_{k+1}, x_k\}, \{z_k, y_k, x_{k-1}\}, \{z_{k+1}, x_k, z_k, y_k\})$ as a bowtie. The following is an immediate consequence of [4, Lemma 2.6].

Lemma 5.6. Exactly one of the following holds.

- (i) $M \setminus y_{k+1}$ is internally 4-connected; or
- (ii) $M \setminus y_{k+1}$ is $(4, 4, S)$ -connected but not internally 4-connected; or
- (iii) $\{y_{k+1}, z_{k+1}, x_k\}$ is the central triangle of a quasi rotor in M .

Because $M \setminus y_{k+1}$ has an N -minor but the theorem fails, (i) of the last lemma cannot occur.

Lemma 5.7. When $M \setminus y_{k+1}$ is $(4, 4, S)$ -connected but not internally 4-connected, $M \setminus y_{k+1}$ has a unique 4-fan. Moreover, this 4-fan has y_k as its guts element and has z_{k+1} as an internal element.

Proof. Let (u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4) be a 4-fan in $M \setminus y_{k+1}$. Then M has $\{u_2, u_3, u_4, y_{k+1}\}$ as a cocircuit. Thus, by orthogonality and symmetry, $\{u_3, u_4\}$ meets $\{x_k, z_{k+1}\}$. Now $u_4 \notin \{x_k, z_{k+1}\}$ otherwise $(\{u_1, u_2, u_3\}, \{x_k, z_{k+1}, y_{k+1}\}, \{u_2, u_3, u_4, y_{k+1}\})$ is a good bowtie in M since $N \preceq M \setminus y_{k+1}$. Thus we may assume that $u_3 \in \{x_k, z_{k+1}\}$.

Suppose $u_3 = x_k$. By orthogonality, the cocircuit $\{u_2, u_4, x_k, y_{k+1}\}$ must meet both $\{z_k, y_{k-1}\}$ and $\{y_k, y_{k-2}, x_{k-2}\}$. Thus $\{u_2, u_4, x_k, y_{k+1}\} \subseteq \{x_{k-2}, y_{k-2}, x_{k-1}, y_{k-1}, z_{k-1}, x_k, y_k, z_k, y_{k+1}, z_{k+1}\}$. Letting the last set be Z' , we see that $\lambda(Z') \leq 2$; a contradiction. We deduce that $u_3 = z_{k+1}$.

The triangle $\{z_{k+1}, u_1, u_2\}$ meets the cocircuit $\{x_k, z_{k+1}, y_k, z_k\}$. As $\{z_{k+1}, z_k\}$ is not contained in a triangle and $x_k \notin \{u_1, u_2\}$, we deduce that $y_k \in \{u_1, u_2\}$. If $y_k = u_2$, then $\{y_k, z_{k+1}, y_{k+1}, u_4\}$ is a cocircuit, so $u_4 \in \{z_k, x_{k-1}\}$ and hence $\lambda(\{x_{k-1}, y_k, z_k, x_k, y_{k+1}, z_{k+1}\}) \leq 2$; a contradiction. It follows that $y_k = u_1$. Thus every 4-fan of $M \setminus y_{k+1}$ has y_k as its guts element and has z_{k+1} as an internal element. It follows by [4, Lemma 2.11] that there is a unique such fan, so the lemma holds. \square

Lemma 5.8. When $M \setminus y_{k+1}$ is $(4, 4, S)$ -connected but not internally 4-connected, $M \setminus y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k, y_{k+1}$ is internally 4-connected.

Proof. Assume that this is false. Then, by Lemma 5.7, $M \setminus y_{k+1}$ has a unique 4-fan and this 4-fan has y_k as its guts element and has z_{k+1} as an internal element. Let x_{k+1} be the other internal element of this 4-fan and z_{k+2} be its guts element. Then M has $\{y_k, z_{k+1}, x_{k+1}\}$ as a triangle and has $\{x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}, z_{k+1}, z_{k+2}\}$ as a cocircuit. Moreover, since $M \setminus y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k, y_{k+1}$ is sequentially 4-connected, this

matroid must have a 4-fan (w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4) . Then M has $\{w_1, w_2, w_3\}$ as a triangle and has a cocircuit C^* such that $\{w_2, w_3, w_4\} \subsetneq C^* \subseteq \{w_2, w_3, w_4, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{k+1}\}$.

Next we show that

5.8.1. $\{w_1, w_2, w_3\} \cap \{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{k+2}, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k+1}\} = \emptyset$.

First observe that $\{x_1, z_1\}$ is not in a triangle as $M \setminus y_1$ is $(4, 4, S)$ -connected. Let $i = \min\{j : z_j \in \{w_1, w_2, w_3\}\}$. If $i = 1$, then, by orthogonality, $\{w_1, w_2, w_3\}$ contains $\{z_1, z_2\}$. By orthogonality again, $\{w_1, w_2, w_3\}$ is $\{z_1, z_2, x_2\}$. This is a contradiction as $\{y_1, z_2, x_2\}$ is a triangle too. Thus $i > 1$. Suppose $i = k + 2$. Then $\{z_{k+2}, x_{k+1}\}$ is contained in a triangle, so $M \setminus y_{k+1}$ is not $(4, 4, S)$ -connected; a contradiction. Hence $i < k + 2$. Now, as $z_{i-1} \notin \{w_1, w_2, w_3\}$, we must have that $x_{i-1} \in \{w_1, w_2, w_3\}$. Hence $\{w_1, w_2, w_3\}$ coincides with the triangle $\{z_i, x_{i-1}, y_i\}$; a contradiction. We conclude that $\{w_1, w_2, w_3\}$ avoids $\{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{k+2}\}$. Then, by orthogonality, $\{w_1, w_2, w_3\}$ avoids $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k+1}\}$. Hence 5.8.1 holds.

5.8.2. For j in $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, if $y_j \in C^*$, then $w_4 \in \{z_{j+1}, x_{j+1}\}$. For i in $\{2, 3, \dots, k + 1\}$, if $y_i \in C^*$, then $w_4 \in \{x_{i-1}, z_i\}$.

To see the first part, observe that $\{y_j, z_{j+1}, x_{j+1}\}$ is a triangle. Then, by orthogonality, $\{z_{j+1}, x_{j+1}\}$ meets $\{w_2, w_3, w_4\}$. The first part follows immediately from 5.8.1. A similar argument establishes the second part. Thus 5.8.2 holds.

Suppose $y_m \in C^*$ for some m with $2 \leq m \leq k$. Then, by 5.8.2, $w_4 \in \{z_{m+1}, x_{m+1}\} \cap \{x_{m-1}, z_m\}$; a contradiction. We deduce that C^* avoids $\{y_2, y_3, \dots, y_k\}$. Hence y_1 or y_{k+1} is in C^* . If both y_1 and y_{k+1} are in C^* , then $w_4 \in \{z_2, x_2\} \cap \{x_k, z_{k+1}\}$; a contradiction as $k \geq 3$. Thus C^* contains exactly one of y_1 and y_{k+1} .

Suppose $y_{k+1} \in C^*$. Then $w_4 \in \{x_k, z_{k+1}\}$. Also (w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4) is a 4-fan of $M \setminus y_{k+1}$. But the unique 4-fan of $M \setminus y_{k+1}$ has y_k as its guts element. This contradiction to the fact that (w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4) is a 4-fan of $M \setminus y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{k+1}$ establishes that $y_{k+1} \notin C^*$.

We now know that $y_1 \in C^*$. Thus $w_4 \in \{x_2, z_2\}$. If $w_4 = x_2$, then, by orthogonality, $\{z_3, y_3\}$ meets $\{w_2, w_3\}$; a contradiction. If $w_4 = z_2$, then, by orthogonality, $\{x_1, y_2\}$ meets $\{w_2, w_3\}$; a contradiction. We conclude that Lemma 5.8 holds. \square

This completes the treatment of the case when (ii) of Lemma 5.6 holds. It remains to consider what happens when (iii) of Lemma 5.6 holds.

Lemma 5.9. If $\{y_{k+1}, z_{k+1}, x_k\}$ is the central triangle of a quasi rotor in M , then M has elements x_{k+1}, z_{k+2} , and y_{k+2} such that this quasi rotor is labelled as in Figure 15(a).

Proof. By orthogonality, M has no triangle containing $\{z_k, z_{k+1}\}$. Thus the quasi rotor is labelled as in (a), (b), or (c) of Figure 15. In (b), by orthogonality, the triangle $\{y_{k-1}, z_{k-1}, x_{k-2}\}$ must contain α . Then $\lambda(\{x_{k-2}, x_{k-1}, x_k, y_{k-2}, y_{k-1}, y_k, y_{k+1}, z_{k-1}, z_k, z_{k+1}\}) \leq 2$; a contradiction. In (c), the other circuits of M imply that $\{x_j, y_j, \gamma\}$ is a circuit for all j in $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. Thus, by orthogonality, $\delta \in \{x_{k-1}, y_{k-1}\} \cap \{x_{k-2}, y_{k-2}\}$; a contradiction. We conclude that (a) holds. \square

By the last lemma, M contains the configuration shown in Figure 16.

Lemma 5.10. $\{x_{k+1}, z_{k+2}, y_{k+2}\} \cap \{x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_{k+1}, z_1, \dots, z_{k+1}\} = \emptyset$.




FIGURE 15. Possible labelled quasi rotors.

Proof. First we observe that $\{x_{k+1}, z_{k+2}, y_{k+2}\}$ avoids $\{x_{k-1}, x_k, y_k, y_{k+1}, z_k, z_{k+1}\}$. Moreover, $y_{k-1} \notin \{x_{k+1}, z_{k+2}\}$ by orthogonality; and $y_{k-1} \neq y_{k+2}$ otherwise $\lambda(\{x_{k-1}, x_k, x_{k+1}, y_{k-1}, y_k, y_{k+1}, y_{k+2}, z_k, z_{k+1}, z_{k+2}\}) \leq 2$; a contradiction. Now suppose that $\{x_{k+1}, z_{k+2}, y_{k+2}\}$ meets $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k-2}, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{k-2}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{k-1}\}$. Then, because the last set can be covered by the set of 4-cocircuits of the form $\{z_i, x_i, y_i, z_{i+1}\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq k-2$, the triangle $\{x_{k+1}, z_{k+2}, y_{k+2}\}$ must contain exactly two elements of one of these 4-cocircuits. Now, by orthogonality, no set of the form $\{z_i, z_{i+1}\}$ with $1 \leq i \leq k-2$ is contained in a triangle.

5.10.1. $\{x_{k+1}, z_{k+2}, y_{k+2}\}$ contains no set $\{x_i, y_i\}$ with $1 \leq i \leq k-2$.

Suppose that $\{x_i, y_i\}$ is contained in $\{x_{k+1}, z_{k+2}, y_{k+2}\}$ for some i in $\{1, 2, \dots, k-2\}$, say $\{x_{k+1}, z_{k+2}, y_{k+2}\} = \{x_i, y_i, t\}$. Since $\{x_i, y_i, x_k, y_k\}$ is a circuit of M , so is $\{x_k, y_k, t\}$. Suppose $t = x_{k+1}$. Then the triangles $\{x_k, y_k, t\}$ and $\{y_k, x_{k+1}, z_{k+1}\}$ are equal. Thus $x_k = z_{k+1}$; a contradiction since the members of $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{k+1}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{k+1}\}$ are distinct. We deduce that




FIGURE 16. Our basic configuration extended.

$t \in \{z_{k+2}, y_{k+2}\}$. Thus $x_{k+1} \in \{x_i, y_i\}$. Then the triangle $\{z_{k+1}, x_{k+1}, y_k\}$ and the cocircuit $\{x_i, y_i, z_i, z_{i+1}\}$ have a single common element; a contradiction. We conclude that 5.10.1 holds.

We now know that $\{x_{k+1}, z_{k+2}, y_{k+2}\}$ meets $\{x_i, y_i, z_i, z_{i+1}\}$ in $\{x_i, z_i\}$, $\{x_i, z_{i+1}\}$, $\{y_i, z_i\}$, or $\{y_i, z_{i+1}\}$. Thus $\{x_{k+1}, z_{k+2}, y_{k+2}\}$ coincides with $\{x_i, z_i, y_{i-1}\}$, $\{x_i, z_{i+1}, y_{i+1}\}$, $\{y_i, z_i, x_{i-1}\}$, or $\{y_i, z_{i+1}, x_{i+1}\}$ unless $i = 1$ and $\{x_{k+1}, z_{k+2}, y_{k+2}\}$ contains $\{x_1, y_1\}$ or $\{y_1, z_1\}$. Provided the exceptional case does not occur, x_{k+1} is in $\{x_{i-1}, y_{i-1}, x_i, y_i, z_i, x_{i+1}, y_{i+1}, z_{i+1}\}$ so the triangle $\{y_k, z_{k+1}, x_{k+1}\}$ meets some 4-cocircuit $\{x_j, y_j, z_j, z_{j+1}\}$ for j in $\{i-1, i, i+1\}$ in a single element; a contradiction since $i+1 \leq k-1$. It remains to consider the exceptional case. Because $M \setminus y_1$ is $(4, 4, S)$ -connected, $\{x_1, z_1\}$ is not contained in a triangle. Hence we may assume that $\{y_1, z_1\} \subseteq \{x_{k+1}, y_{k+2}, z_{k+2}\}$. Letting x_0 be the element of $\{x_{k+1}, y_{k+2}, z_{k+2}\} - \{y_1, z_1\}$, we deduce that M has $(\{x_0, y_1, z_1\}, \{x_1, y_2, z_2\}, \{x_1, y_1, z_1, z_2\})$ as a good bowtie; a contradiction. This completes the proof of Lemma 5.10. \square

As we now know that all the elements in Figure 16 are distinct and that $M \setminus y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{k+1}$ is sequentially 4-connected having an N -minor, we have contradicted the choice of k , thereby completing the proof of the theorem. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Chun, D. Mayhew, J. Oxley, A chain theorem for internally 4-connected binary matroids, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 101 (2011) 141–189.
- [2] C. Chun, D. Mayhew, J. Oxley, Towards a splitter theorem for internally 4-connected binary matroids II, *European J. Combin.*, to appear.
- [3] C. Chun, D. Mayhew, J. Oxley, Towards a splitter theorem for internally 4-connected binary matroids III, *Adv. Appl. Math.* 51 (2013) 309–344.
- [4] C. Chun, D. Mayhew, J. Oxley, Towards a splitter theorem for internally 4-connected binary matroids IV, *Adv. Appl. Math.*, to appear.
- [5] J. Geelen, X. Zhou, Generating weakly 4-connected matroids, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 98 (2008) 538–557.
- [6] T. Johnson, R. Thomas, Generating internally four-connected graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 85 (2002) 21–58.
- [7] D. Mayhew, G. Royle, G. Whittle, The binary matroids with no $M(K_{3,3})$ -minor, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* 208 (2010), no. 981.
- [8] J. Oxley, *Matroid Theory*, Second edition, Oxford University Press, New York, 2011.
- [9] J. Oxley, C. Semple, G. Whittle, A chain theorem for matroids, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 98 (2008) 447–483.
- [10] P. D. Seymour, Decomposition of regular matroids, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 28 (1980) 305–359.
- [11] W. T. Tutte, Connectivity in matroids, *Canad. J. Math.* 18 (1966) 1301–1324.
- [12] X. Zhou, Generating an internally 4-connected matroid from another, *Discrete Math.* 312 (2012) 2375–2387.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, BRUNEL UNIVERSITY, LONDON, ENGLAND
E-mail address: `chchchun@gmail.com`

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, STATISTICS AND OPERATIONS RESEARCH, VICTORIA UNIVERSITY,
 WELLINGTON, NEW ZEALAND
E-mail address: `dillon.mayhew@msor.vuw.ac.nz`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY, BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA,
 USA
E-mail address: `oxley@math.lsu.edu`