A NOTION OF MINOR-BASED MATROID CONNECTIVITY
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Abstract. For a matroid $N$, a matroid $M$ is $N$-connected if every two elements of $M$ are in an $N$-minor together. Thus a matroid is connected if and only if it is $U_{1,2}$-connected. This paper proves that $U_{1,2}$ is the only connected matroid $N$ such that if $M$ is $N$-connected with $|E(M)| > |E(N)|$, then $M \setminus e$ or $M/e$ is $N$-connected for all elements $e$. Moreover, we show that $U_{1,2}$ and $M(W_2)$ are the only matroids $N$ such that, whenever a matroid has an $N$-minor using $\{e,f\}$ and an $N$-minor using $\{f,g\}$, it also has an $N$-minor using $\{e,g\}$. Finally, we show that $M$ is $U_{0,1} \oplus U_{1,1}$-connected if and only if every clonal class of $M$ is trivial.

1. Introduction

Our terminology follows Oxley [8]. We say that a matroid $M$ uses an element $e$ or a set $Z$ of elements if $e \in E(M)$ or $Z \subseteq E(M)$. Let $N$ be a matroid. A matroid $M$ with $|E(M)| \geq 2$ is $N$-connected if, for every pair of distinct elements $e,f$ of $E(M)$, there is a minor of $M$ that is isomorphic to $N$ and uses $\{e,f\}$.

We will assume, unless otherwise stated, that the matroids discussed here have at least two elements. Note that $U_{1,2}$-connectivity coincides with the usual notion of connectivity for matroids. Hence, relying on a well-known inductive property of matroid connectivity [13], we have that if $M$ is $U_{1,2}$-connected, $e \in E(M)$, and $|E(M)| \geq 3$, then $M \setminus e$ or $M/e$ is $U_{1,2}$-connected. Our first theorem shows that $U_{1,2}$ is the only connected matroid with this property.

Theorem 1.1. Let $N$ be a matroid. If, for every $N$-connected matroid $M$ with $|E(M)| > |E(N)|$ and, for every $e \in E(M)$, at least one of $M \setminus e$ or $M/e$ is $N$-connected, then $N$ is isomorphic to one of $U_{1,2}$, $U_{0,2}$, or $U_{2,2}$.

One attractive property of matroid connectivity is that elements can be assigned to components. We say that a matroid $N$ has the transitivity property if, for every matroid $M$ and every triple $\{e,f,g\} \subseteq E(M)$, if $e$ is in an $N$-minor with $f$, and $f$ is in an $N$-minor with $g$, then $e$ is in an $N$-minor with $g$. Let $M(W_2)$ be the rank-2 wheel. In Section 5 we prove the following result.

Theorem 1.2. The only matroids with the transitivity property are $U_{1,2}$ and $M(W_2)$.

On combining the last two theorems, we get the following result, which indicates how special the usual matroid connectivity is.

Corollary 1.3. Let $N$ be a matroid with the transitivity property such that whenever $M$ is an $N$-connected matroid, $e \in E(M)$, and $|E(M)| > |E(N)|$, at least one of $M \setminus e$ and $M/e$ is $N$-connected. Then $N \cong U_{1,2}$.
The concept of $N$-connectivity can also convey interesting information when $N$ is disconnected, as the next result indicates.

**Theorem 1.4.** A matroid $M$ is $U_{0,1} \oplus U_{1,1}$-connected if and only if every clonal class of $M$ is trivial.

The paper is structured as follows. In the next section, we recall Cunningham and Edmonds’s decomposition theorem for connected matroids that are not 3-connected, which is a basic tool in our proofs. Sections 3, 4, and 5 treat the cases of $N$-connected matroids when $N$ is 3-connected, connected, and disconnected, respectively. In particular, we prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 in Section 6 and Theorem 1.4 in Section 7. Finally, in Section 8 we consider what can be said when every set of three elements occurs in some minor. Moser showed that 3-connected matroids can be characterized as those in which every set of four elements is contained in a minor isomorphic to a member of $\{W^2, W^3, W^4, M(W_5), M(W_4), Q_6\}$.

### 2. Preliminaries

The concept of $N$-connectivity is closely related to roundedness, which is exemplified by Bixby’s result that if $e$ is an element of a 2-connected non-binary matroid $M$, then $M$ has a $U_{2,4}$-minor using $e$. Formally, let $t$ be a positive integer and let $N$ be a class of matroids. A matroid $M$ has an $N$-minor if $M$ has a minor isomorphic to a member of $N$. Seymour defined $N$ to be $t$-rounded if, for every $(t+1)$-connected matroid $M$ with an $N$-minor and every subset $X$ of $E(M)$ with at most $t$ elements, $M$ has an $N$-minor using $X$. Thus Bixby’s result shows that $\{U_{2,4}\}$ is 1-rounded. Seymour extended this result as follows.

**Theorem 2.1.** Let $M$ be a 3-connected matroid having a $U_{2,4}$-minor, and let $e$ and $f$ be elements of $M$. Then $M$ has a $U_{2,4}$-minor using $\{e, f\}$.

The connectivity function $\lambda_M$ of a matroid $M$ is defined for every subset $X$ of $E(M)$ by $\lambda_M(X) = r(X) + r(E(M) - X) - r(M)$; equivalently, $\lambda_M(X) = r(X) + r^*(X) - |X|$. For disjoint subsets $A, B$ of $E(M)$, define $\kappa_M(A, B) = \min\{\lambda_M(X) : A \subseteq X \subseteq E(M) - B\}$.

**Lemma 2.2.** If $N$ is a minor of $M$ and $A, B$ are disjoint subsets of $E(N)$, then $\kappa_N(A, B) \leq \kappa_M(A, B)$.

Next we give a brief outline of Cunningham and Edmonds’s decomposition of matroids that are 2-connected but not 3-connected. More complete details can be found in [8, Section 8.3]. First recall that when $(X, Y)$ is a 2-separation of a connected matroid $M$, we can write $M = M_X \oplus M_Y$ where $M_X$ and $M_Y$ have ground sets $X \cup p$ and $Y \cup p$. A matroid-labeled tree is a tree $T$ with vertex set $\{M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_n\}$ such that each $M_i$ is a matroid and, for distinct vertices $M_j$ and $M_k$, the sets $E(M_j)$ and $E(M_k)$ are disjoint if $M_j$ and $M_k$ are non-adjacent, whereas if $M_j$ and $M_k$ are joined by an edge $e$, then $E(M_j) \cap E(M_k) = \{e\}$, and $\{e\}$ is not a separator in either $M_j$ or $M_k$.

When $f$ is an edge of a matroid-labeled tree $T$ joining vertices $M_i$ and $M_j$, if we contract the edge $f$, we obtain a new matroid-labeled tree $T/f$ by relabeling the composite vertex that results from this contraction as $M_i \oplus_{2} M_j$, with every other vertex retaining its original label.

A tree decomposition of a 2-connected matroid $M$ is a matroid-labeled tree $T$ such that if $V(T) = \{M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_n\}$ and $E(T) = \{e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_{n-1}\}$, then
(i) $E(M) = (E(M_1) \cup E(M_2) \cup \cdots \cup E(M_n)) - \{e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_{n-1}\};$

(ii) $|E(M_i)| \geq 3$ for all $i$ unless $|E(M)| < 3$, in which case, $n = 1$ and $M_1 = M$; and

(iii) the label of the single vertex of $T/\{e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_{n-1}\}$ is $M$.

We call the members of $\{e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_{n-1}\}$ basepoints since each member of this set is the basepoint of a 2-sum when we construct $M$. Cunningham and Edmonds (in [4]) proved the following (see also [8, Theorem 8.3.10]).

**Theorem 2.3.** Let $M$ be a 2-connected matroid. Then $M$ has a tree decomposition $T$ in which every vertex label that is not a circuit or a cocircuit is 3-connected, and there are no adjacent vertices that are both labeled by circuits or are both labeled by cocircuits. Moreover, $T$ is unique up to relabeling of its edges.

The tree decomposition $T$ whose existence is guaranteed by the last theorem is called the canonical tree decomposition of $M$. Although circuits and cocircuits with at most three elements are 3-connected matroids, when we refer to a 3-connected vertex, we shall mean one with at least four elements. Clearly, for each edge $p$ of $T$, the graph $T \setminus p$ has two components. Thus $p$ induces a partition of $V(T)$ and a corresponding partition $(X_p, Y_p)$ of $E(M)$. The latter partition is a 2-separation of $M$; we say that it is displayed by the edge $p$. Moreover, $M = M_{X_p} \oplus_2 M_{Y_p}$ where $M_{X_p}$ and $M_{Y_p}$ have ground sets $X_p \cup p$ and $Y_p \cup p$, respectively. We shall refer to this 2-sum decomposition of $M$ as having been induced by the edge $p$ of $T$.

We shall frequently use the following well-known result, which appears, for example, as [2] Lemma 2.15.

**Lemma 2.4.** Let $M_1$ and $M_2$ label distinct vertices in a tree decomposition $T$ of a connected matroid $M$. Let $P$ be the path in $T$ joining $M_1$ and $M_2$, and let $p_1$ and $p_2$ be the edges of $P$ meeting $M_1$ and $M_2$, respectively. Then $M$ has a minor that uses $(E(M_1) \cup E(M_2)) \cap E(M)$ and is isomorphic to the 2-sum of $M_1$ and $M_2$, with respect to the basepoints $p_1$ and $p_2$.

We will often use the next result, another consequence of Theorem 2.3.

**Lemma 2.5.** Let $(X, Y)$ be a 2-separation displayed by an edge $p$ in a 2-connected matroid $M$. Suppose $y \in Y$. Then $M$ has, as a minor, the matroid $M_X(y)$ that is obtained from $M_X$ by relabeling $p$ by $y$. In particular, let $N$ be a 3-connected minor of $M$ with $|E(N)| \geq 4$ and $|E(N) \cap Y| \leq 1$. If $|E(N) \cap Y| = 1$, let $y \in E(N) \cap Y$; otherwise let $y$ be an arbitrary element of $Y$. Then $M_X(y)$ has $N$ as a minor.

Let $T$ be the canonical tree decomposition of a 2-connected matroid $M$, and let $M_0$ label a vertex of $T$. Let $p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_d$ be the edges of $T$ that meet $M_0$. For each $p_i$, let $(X_i, Y_i)$ be the 2-separation of $M$ displayed by $p_i$, where $M_0$ is on the $X_i$-side of the 2-separation. For each $i$, let $y_i \in Y_i$. Then, by repeated application of Lemma 2.5 we deduce that $M$ has, as a minor, the matroid that is obtained from $M_0$ by relabeling $p_i$ by $y_i$ for all $i$ in $\{1, 2, \ldots, d\}$. We denote this matroid by $M_0(y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_d)$ and call it a specially relabeled $M_0$-minor of $M$.

The following result, which is straightforward to prove by repeated application of Lemma 2.2, is well known.

**Lemma 2.6.** Let $N$ be a 3-connected matroid with $|E(N)| \geq 3$. Let $M$ be a 2-connected matroid with canonical tree decomposition $T$. Then there is a unique vertex $M'$ of $T$ such that, for each edge $p$ of $T$, the partition of $V(T)$ induced by $p$
Proposition 3.1. A matroid $M$ is $U_{2,3}$-connected if and only if $M$ is connected and simple.

Proof. Suppose $M$ is $U_{2,3}$-connected. Clearly $M$ is connected and simple. Conversely, if $M$ is connected and simple, and $e$ and $f$ are distinct elements of $M$, then $M$ has a circuit $C$ containing $\{e, f\}$ and $|C| \geq 3$. Hence $M$ has a $U_{2,3}$-minor using $\{e, f\}$, so $M$ is $U_{2,3}$-connected.

Corollary 3.2. A matroid $M$ is $U_{1,3}$-connected if and only if $M$ is connected and cosimple.

We will describe $N$-connectivity for a 3-connected matroid $N$ by first considering the case when $N$ is $U_{2,4}$. We will refer to binary and non-binary matroids that label vertices of a canonical tree decomposition as binary and non-binary vertices.

Theorem 3.3. A matroid $M$ is $U_{2,4}$-connected if and only if $M$ is connected and non-binary, and, in the canonical tree decomposition of $M$,

(i) every binary vertex has at most one element that is not a basepoint; and
(ii) on every path between two binary vertices that each contain a unique element of $E(M)$, there is a non-binary vertex.

Proof. Suppose $M$ is non-binary and connected, and the canonical tree decomposition $T$ of $M$ satisfies the above conditions. Suppose $e$ and $f$ are distinct elements of $M$. If $e$ and $f$ are in the same 3-connected vertex $M_0$ of $T$, then, by (i), $M_0$ is non-binary. Thus, by Theorem 3.1, $M$ has a $U_{2,4}$-minor using $\{e, f\}$.

Next suppose $e$ belongs to a binary vertex $M_1$ of $T$, and $f$ belongs to a non-binary vertex $M_0$ of degree $d$. By Lemma 2.6, $M$ contains a specially labeled $M_0$-minor $M_0(e, y_2, y_3, \ldots, y_d)$ using $\{e, f\}$. Similarly, let $e$ and $f$ belong to binary vertices $M_1$ and $M_2$, and let $M_0$ be a non-binary vertex on the path between them in $T$. Then $M$ contains a specially labeled $M_0$-minor $M_0(e, f, y_3, y_4, \ldots, y_d)$. Thus, by Theorem 3.1, $M$ has a $U_{2,4}$-minor using $\{e, f\}$.

Suppose now that $M$ is $U_{2,4}$-connected. Clearly $M$ is non-binary and connected. If a binary vertex $M_1$ in $T$ contains two non-basepoints $e$ and $f$, then, by Lemma 2.6, a $U_{2,4}$-minor of $M$ using $\{e, f\}$ must be a minor of $M_1$; a contradiction.

Now suppose $e$ and $f$ are the unique non-basepoints of binary vertices $M_1$ and $M_2$, respectively, in $T$, and let $N$ be a $U_{2,4}$-minor of $M$ using $\{e, f\}$. By Lemma 2.6, $T$ has a nonbinary vertex $M_0$ such that, for every edge $p$ of $T$, the partition of $V(T)$
induced by \( p \) has \( M_0 \) on the same side as at least \(|E(N)| - 1\) elements of \( N \). Let \( p_1 \) be the edge incident with \( M_0 \) such that \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) are on opposite sides of the induced partition of \( V(T) \). Then \( M_2 \) must be on the same side of this partition as \( M_0 \). Hence \( M_0 \) lies on the path in \( T \) between \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \). \( \square \)

The last theorem can be generalized as follows.

**Theorem 3.4.** Let \( N \) be a 3-connected matroid with at least four elements. A matroid \( M \) is \( N \)-connected if and only if \( M \) is connected, has \( N \) as a minor, and, in the canonical tree decomposition of \( M \),

(i) every vertex that is not \( N \)-connected has at most one element that is not a basepoint; and

(ii) on every path between two vertices that are not \( N \)-connected and that each have unique non-basepoints, there is an \( N \)-connected vertex.

### 4. Connected matroids

In this section, we consider \( N \)-connected matroids when \( N \) is connected but not 3-connected.

**Theorem 4.1.** A matroid \( M \) is \( M(W_2) \)-connected if and only \( M \) is connected and non-uniform.

**Proof.** If \( M \) is \( M(W_2) \)-connected, then it is clearly both connected and non-uniform. To prove the converse, suppose \( M \) is connected and non-uniform. We argue by induction that \( M \) is \( M(W_2) \)-connected. This is immediate if \(|E(M)| = 4\), since \( M(W_2) \) is the unique 4-element connected, non-uniform matroid. Assume it holds for \(|E(M)| < n \) and let \(|E(M)| = n > 4\). Distinguish two elements \( x \) and \( y \) of \( E(M) \).

Suppose there is an element \( e \) of \( E(M) - \{x, y\} \) such that \( M/e \) is disconnected. Then \( M \) is the parallel connection, with basepoint \( e \), of two matroids \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \). Now \( M/e \) is connected. We may assume that it is uniform; otherwise, by the induction assumption, \( M/e \) and hence \( M \) has an \( M(W_2) \)-minor using \( \{x, y\} \). Now \( r(E(M_1) - e) + r(E(M_2) - e) - r(M/e) = 1 \). Suppose each of \(|E(M_1) - e|\) and \(|E(M_2) - e|\) has at least two elements. Then \( M/e \) has a 2-separation. Since \( M/e \) is uniform, it follows that \( M/e \) is a circuit or a cocircuit. In the latter case, \( M \) is also a circuit; a contradiction. If \( M/e \) is a circuit, then \( M \) is the parallel connection of two circuits, and \( M \) is easily seen to have an \( M(W_2) \)-minor using \( \{x, y\} \).

Now suppose that \(|E(M_1) - e| = 1\). Thus \( M \) has a circuit, \( \{e, f\} \) say, containing \( e \). As \( M/e \) is uniform but \( M \) is not, \( r(M) \geq 2 \), so \( M/e \) has a circuit containing \( \{f, x, y\} \). It follows that \( M \) has an \( M(W_2) \)-minor with ground set \( \{e, f, x, y\} \).

We may now assume that \( M/e \) is connected for all \( e \) in \( E(M) - \{x, y\} \). Moreover, by replacing \( M \) with \( M^* \) in the argument above, we may also assume that \( M/e \) is connected for all such \( e \). If \( M/e \) or \( M/e \) is non-uniform, then, by the induction assumption, \( M \) has an \( M(W_2) \)-minor using \( \{x, y\} \). Thus both \( M/e \) and \( M/e \) are uniform. Let \( r(M/e) = r \). Then every circuit of \( M/e \) has \( r \) elements. Since \( M \) is not uniform, it has a circuit containing \( e \) that has at most \( r \) elements. Contracting \( e \) from \( M \) produces a rank-\((r - 1)\) matroid having a circuit with at most \( r - 1 \) elements. Since \( M/e \) is uniform, this is a contradiction. \( \square \)

We omit the straightforward proof of the next result.
Lemma 4.2. If $M$, $N$, and $N'$ are matroids such that $M$ is $N$-connected and $N$ is $N'$-connected, then $M$ is $N'$-connected.

If we wish to describe the class of $N$-connected matroids for a 3-connected matroid $N$, it suffices to describe the $N$-connected matroids that are 3-connected and then apply Theorem 3.3. If $N$ is not 3-connected, the task of describing $N$-connected matroids becomes harder, and we omit any attempt to provide a general theorem for $N$-connectivity in this case. We will instead give characterizations for two specific matroids that are not 3-connected, namely $U_{1,4}$ and its dual $U_{3,4}$. We will use the following theorem of Oxley [7].

Theorem 4.3. Let $M$ be a 3-connected matroid having rank and corank at least three, and suppose that $\{x, y, z\} \subseteq E(M)$. Then $M$ has a minor isomorphic to one of $U_{3,6}, P_6, Q_6, W^3$, or $M(K_4)$ that uses $\{x, y, z\}$.

Proposition 4.4. A 3-connected matroid $M$ is $U_{1,4}$-connected if and only if either $M \cong U_{2,n}$ for some $n \geq 5$, or $M$ has rank and corank at least three.

Proof. Clearly if $n \geq 5$, then $U_{2,n}$ is $U_{1,4}$-connected. Now assume that $r(M) \geq 3$ and $r^*(M) \geq 3$. Suppose $\{x, y\} \subseteq E(M)$. Then, by Theorem 4.3, $M$ has an $N$-minor using $\{x, y\}$ where $N$ is $\{U_{3,6}, P_6, Q_6, W^3, M(K_4)\}$. One easily checks that each member of $N$ is $U_{1,4}$-connected. Hence, by Lemma 4.2, $M$ is $U_{1,4}$-connected.

To prove the converse, assume that $M$ is $U_{1,4}$-connected. Since $r^*(U_{1,4}) = 3$, it follows that $r^*(M) \geq 3$. The required result holds if $r(M) \geq 3$. But, since $M$ is 3-connected and $U_{1,4}$-connected, $r(M) \geq 2$. Moreover, if $r(M) = 2$, then $M \cong U_{2,n}$ for some $n \geq 5$. □

Duality gives a corresponding result for $U_{3,4}$-connectivity.

Corollary 4.5. A 3-connected matroid $M$ is $U_{3,4}$-connected if and only if either $M \cong U_{n-2,n}$ where $n \geq 5$, or $M$ has rank and corank at least 3.

Observe that this fails to fully characterize $U_{3,4}$-connectivity for if we let $M = M(K_{3,3})$, then $M$ is $U_{3,4}$-connected but none of the matroids in its canonical tree decomposition is $U_{3,4}$-connected. We can instead describe $U_{3,4}$-connectivity in terms of forbidden configurations of matroids in the canonical tree decomposition.

Proposition 4.6. Suppose $M$ is not 3-connected. Then $M$ is $U_{3,4}$-connected if and only if $M$ is connected and simple, and, in the canonical tree decomposition $T$ of $M$, there is no vertex of degree at most two that is labeled by some $U_{2,n}$ such that its only neighbors in $T$ are cocircuits that use elements of $E(M)$.

Proof. Let $T$ be the canonical tree decomposition of $M$. Assume $M$ is $U_{3,4}$-connected. Then, by Lemma 4.2, $M$ is $U_{2,3}$-connected, so $M$ is connected and simple. Suppose that $T$ has a vertex $M_0$ whose degree $d$ is at most two such that $M_0$ is labeled by some $U_{2,n}$ and has its only neighbors $M_1, \ldots, M_d$ labeled by cocircuits that use elements of $E(M)$. For each $i$ in $\{1, \ldots, d\}$, suppose $f_i \in E(M_i) \cap E(M)$. Then $M$ can be obtained from a copy of $U_{2,n}$ using $\{f_1, \ldots, f_d\}$ by, for each $i$, adjoining some matroid via parallel connection across the basepoint $f_i$. If $d = 1$, let $f_2$ be an element of $M_0$ other than $f_1$. Clearly $M$ has no circuit using $\{f_1, f_2\}$ that has more than three elements.

Now assume that $M$ is connected and simple and that $T$ satisfies the specified conditions. Let $\{e, f\}$ be a subset of $E(M)$ that is not contained in a $U_{3,4}$-minor.
Assume first that $e$ and $f$ belong to the same vertex $M_1$ of $T$. As $M$ is simple, $M_1$ is not a cocircuit. Now $M$ has a specially relabeled $M_1$-minor using $\{e, f\}$. Thus, by Corollary 1.4, $M_1 \cong U_{2,n}$ for some $n \geq 3$. Let $p$ be an edge of $T$ that meets $M_1$. Consider the 2-sum $N_1 \oplus_2 N_2$ induced by $p$ where $\{e, f\} \subseteq E(N_1)$. Certainly $N_1$ has a circuit containing $\{e, f, p\}$, and $N_2$ has a circuit of size at least three containing $p$. Thus $M$ has a $U_{3,4}$-minor containing $\{e, f\}$; a contradiction.

We now know that $e$ and $f$ belong to distinct vertices $M_1$ and $M_2$ of $T$. Each edge $p$ of the path $P$ in $T$ joining $M_1$ and $M_2$ induces a 2-sum decomposition of $M$ into two matroids, $N_{1p}$ and $N_{2p}$. Moreover, an element $x_i$ of $E(N_{ip})$ is in a circuit of $N_{ip}$ of size at least three containing $p$ unless $x_i$ is parallel to $p$ in $N_{ip}$. Thus $e$ or $f$ is parallel to $p$ in $N_{1p}$ or $N_{2p}$, respectively. Let the edges of $P$, in order, be $p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_k$ where $p_1$ meets $M_1$. We may assume that $e$ is parallel to $p_1$ in $N_{1p_1}$. Then the vertex $M_1$ of $T$ containing $e$ is a cocircuit.

Suppose $k \geq 3$. As no two adjacent vertices of $T$ are cocircuits, neither $e$ nor $f$ is parallel to $p_2$ in $N_{1p_2}$ or $N_{2p_2}$. Hence $M$ has a $U_{3,4}$-minor using $\{e, f\}$. This contradiction implies that $k \in \{1, 2\}$. Suppose $k = 2$. Then $f$ is parallel to $p_2$ in $N_{2p_2}$. Thus $M_2$ is a cocircuit. Since $M$ has no $U_{3,4}$-minor using $\{e, f\}$, the vertex $M_3$ of $T$ that is adjacent to both $M_1$ and $M_2$ is isomorphic to some $U_{2,n}$. By assumption, $M_3$ must have another neighbor in $T$ to which it is joined by the edge $q$, say. Then, for the 2-sum decomposition $Q_1 \oplus Q_2$ of $M$ induced by $q$, there is a circuit of $Q_1$ containing $\{e, f, q\}$ and a circuit of $Q_2$ of size at least three containing $q$. Thus $M$ has a $U_{3,4}$-minor using $\{e, f\}$. This contradiction implies that $k = 1$. Then $M = N_{1p_1} \oplus_2 N_{2p_1}$. Thus the specially relabeled minor $N_{2p_1}(e)$ uses $\{e, f\}$.

Now the canonical tree decomposition $T'$ of $N_{2p_1}(e)$ can be obtained from the component of $T \setminus p_1$ using $N_{2p_1}$ by replacing $M_2$ by $M_2(e)$. As $e$ and $f$ are contained in the same vertex of $T'$, we deduce from the second paragraph that $N_{2p_1}(e)$, and hence $M$, has a $U_{3,4}$-minor using $\{e, f\}$; a contradiction. \qed

5. Disconnected matroids

We now turn our attention to $N$-connectivity where $N$ is disconnected. The following is essentially immediate.

**Proposition 5.1.** Let $n$ be an integer exceeding one. A matroid $M$ is $U_{n,n}$-connected if and only if $M$ is simple with rank at least $n$.

Recall that elements $x$ and $y$ of a matroid $M$ are clones if the bijection on $E(M)$ that interchanges $x$ and $y$ but fixes every other element yields the same matroid. Next we prove Theorem 1.4 showing that a matroid is $U_{0,1} \oplus U_{1,1}$-connected if and only if no element has a clone. The proof will use the well-known fact (see, for example, [2]) that two elements in a matroid are clones if and only if they are in precisely the same cyclic flats.

**Proof of Theorem 1.4** Suppose every clonal class of $M$ is trivial and let $x$ and $y$ be distinct elements of $M$. Then $M$ has a cyclic flat $F$ that contains exactly one of $x$ and $y$, say $x$. In $M/(F-x)$, the element $x$ is a loop but $y$ is not. Thus $M$ has a $U_{0,1} \oplus U_{1,1}$-minor using $\{x, y\}$, so $M$ is $U_{0,1} \oplus U_{1,1}$-connected.

Conversely, assume $M$ is $U_{0,1} \oplus U_{1,1}$-connected, but $M$ has elements $x$ and $y$ that are in the same cyclic flats. Suppose that $M/C \setminus D \cong U_{0,1} \oplus U_{1,1}$ and $E(M/C \setminus D) = \{x, y\}$. Let $x$ be the loop of $M/C \setminus D$. Then $x \in \mathcal{C}_M(C)$. Thus $y \in \mathcal{C}_M(C)$, so $y$ is a loop in $M/C \setminus D$; a contradiction. \qed
Recall, for the next result, that an element is free in a matroid if it is not a coloop and every circuit that contains it is spanning.

**Theorem 5.2.** A matroid $M$ is $U_{1,2} \oplus U_{1,1}$-connected if and only if $M$ is loopless, has at most one coloop, and has at most one free element.

**Proof.** Clearly if $M$ is $U_{1,2} \oplus U_{1,1}$-connected, then it obeys the specified conditions. Conversely, suppose $M$ is loopless, has at most one coloop, and has at most one free element. Let $e$ and $f$ be elements of $M$. Suppose first that $M$ is disconnected. If $e$ and $f$ are in the same component, then they are in a $U_{1,2}$-minor of that component, so $M$ has a $U_{1,2} \oplus U_{1,1}$-minor using $\{e, f\}$. If $e$ and $f$ are in different components, then one of these components is not a coloop. That component has a $U_{1,2}$-connection of $g$ as $C$.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. First we consider the case when $N \nsubseteq U_{1,2}$. By duality, it suffices to deal with the case when $N \cong U_{2,2}$. Suppose $M$ is $U_{2,2}$-connected, and $|E(M)| \geq 3$. By Proposition 5.1 $M$ is simple with rank at least two. Therefore if $M$ is $U_{2,2}$-connected and $r(M) > 2$, we can delete any element $e$ of $M$ and still have an $N$-connected matroid. Observe that if $r(M) = 2$, then $M$ must be connected since it is simple. Therefore $M$ has no coloops, so $r(M \setminus e) = 2$ for all $e \in E(M)$. Thus $M \setminus e$ is $U_{2,2}$-connected.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. First we consider the case when $N$ is connected. Then $N$ is $U_{1,2}$-connected. Thus, by Lemma 6.1 every $N$-connected matroid is $U_{1,2}$-connected and so is connected. Suppose $M$ is an $N$-connected matroid with $|E(M)| > |E(N)|$. Assume $N$ is simple. Then, by Proposition 5.1 and Lemma 4.1, $N$, and hence $M$, is $U_{2,2}$-connected. Let $M_1$ and $M_2$ be isomorphic copies of $M$ with disjoint ground sets. Pick arbitrary elements $g_1$ and $g_2$ in $M_1$ and $M_2$, and let $M_3$ be the parallel connection of $M_1$ and $M_2$ with respect to the basepoints $g_1$ and $g_2$, which we relabel as $g$ in $M_3$. Then one easily sees that $M_3$ is $N$-connected. Let $e, f \in E(M_1) - g$. 6. $N$-Connectivity as Compared to Connectivity
By assumption, we can remove all the elements of \( E(M_1) - \{e,f,g\} \) from \( M_3 \) via deletion or contraction to obtain a matroid \( M_4 \) that is still \( N \)-connected. Since \( M_4 \) is \( U_{2,3} \)-connected, it follows that \( \{e,f,g\} \) is a triangle in \( M_4 \). Moreover, \( \{e,f\} \) is a series pair in \( M_4 \). However, neither \( M_4 \setminus e \) nor \( M_4/e \) is \( U_{2,3} \)-connected since \( M_4 \setminus e \) is disconnected, and \( M_4/e \) has \( f \) and \( g \) in parallel. We deduce that \( N \) is not simple. Dually, \( N \) is not cosimple. The only uniform matroid that is neither simple nor cosimple is \( U_{1,2} \), so either \( N \cong U_{1,2} \) or \( N \) is non-uniform.

Next we show that \( N \) cannot be non-uniform. Suppose, instead, that \( N \) is non-uniform. Then, as \( N \) is connected, by Theorem \[\text{1.1}\] \( N \) is \( M(W_2) \)-connected.

Recall that \( M \) is \( N \)-connected with \( |E(M)| > |E(N)| \). Let \( n = |E(N)| + 1 \) and distinguish elements \( e, f \) of \( E(M) \). Let each of \( M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_n \) be a copy of \( M \) and let \( e_i \) and \( f_i \) be the elements of \( M_i \) corresponding to \( e \) and \( f \). Let \( M' \) be the parallel connection of \( M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_n \) with respect to the basepoints \( e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_n \) where these elements are relabeled as \( e \) in \( M' \). By assumption, for each \( M_i \), we can remove \( E(M_i) - \{e_i,f_i\} \) from \( M' \) in such a way that the resulting matroid \( M'' \) is \( N \)-connected. Since \( M'' \) is connected, it must be isomorphic to \( U_{1,n+1} \), which is clearly not \( M(W_2) \)-connected; a contradiction. We conclude that \( N \) cannot be non-uniform, and hence the theorem holds when \( N \) is connected.

Next we consider the case when \( N \) is disconnected, first showing the following.

**6.2.1. If each element of \( N \) is a loop or a coloop, then \( N \cong U_{0,2} \) or \( U_{2,2} \).**

Suppose \( n \geq 3 \) and let \( N \cong U_{n,n} \). Let \( M = U_{2,3} \oplus U_{n-2,n-2} \). Then \( M \) is \( N \)-connected, but if \( e \) is a coloop of \( M \), then neither \( M \setminus e \) nor \( M/e \) has a \( U_{n,n} \)-minor. Therefore \( N \not\cong U_{n,n} \); dually, \( N \not\cong U_{0,n} \).

If \( N = U_{0,1} \oplus U_{1,1} \), then let \( M = M(K_4) \). By Theorem \[\text{1.3}\] \( M \) is \( N \)-connected, but for every \( e \) of \( E(M) \), both \( M \setminus e \) and \( M/e \) have nontrivial clonal classes and are therefore not \( N \)-connected. Now assume \( N \cong U_{0,n} \oplus U_{m,m} \) for some \( n \geq 2 \) and \( m \geq 1 \). Then \( U_{n,n+1} \oplus U_{m,m} \) is an \( N \)-connected matroid, say \( M \). But if \( e \) is a coloop, then neither \( M \setminus e \) nor \( M/e \) has an \( N \)-minor. On combining this contradiction with duality, we conclude that \( \text{6.2.2} \) holds.

Now assume that \( N \) has \( k + s \) components \( N_1, N_2, \ldots, N_{k+s} \) where those with at least two elements are \( N_1, N_2, \ldots, N_k \). Then \( k \geq 1 \). For each \( i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, k\} \), choose an element \( e_i \) of \( N_i \) and relabel it as \( p \). Let \( M' \) be the parallel connection of \( N_1, N_2, \ldots, N_k \) with respect to the basepoint \( p \) where we take \( M' = N_1 \) if \( k = 1 \). Let \( N' \) be a copy of \( N \) whose ground set is disjoint from \( E(N) \), and let \( n'_i \) be the component of \( N' \) corresponding to \( N_i \). Let \( M_1 = N' \oplus M' \). We show next that \( M_1 \) is \( N \)-connected.

**6.2.2. \( M_1 \) is \( N \)-connected.**

Suppose \( \{e,f\} \subseteq E(M_1) \). Certainly \( M_1 \) has an \( N \)-minor using \( \{e,f\} \) if \( \{e,f\} \subseteq E(N') \). Next suppose that \( e \in E(M') \). Then, since \( M' \) is a connected parallel connection, we see that, for each \( i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, k + s\} \), there is an \( N_i \)-minor of \( M' \) using \( e \). Thus, if \( f \in E(N') \), say \( f \in E(N'_j) \), then we can choose \( i \neq j \) and get an \( N \)-minor of \( M_1 \) using \( \{e,f\} \) unless \( k = 1 = j \). In the exceptional case, \( M' \) has an \( N_2 \)-minor with ground set \( \{e\} \) and again we get an \( N \)-minor of \( M_1 \) using \( \{e,f\} \). We may now assume that \( f \in E(M') \), say \( f \in E(N_j) \). Then \( M' \) has an \( N_j \)-minor using \( \{e,f\} \), so \( M_1 \) has an \( N \)-minor using \( \{e,f\} \). Thus \( \text{6.2.2} \) holds.

Since \( M_1 \) is \( N \)-connected, by assumption, we may delete or contract elements of \( M_1 \) until we obtain an \( N \)-connected matroid \( M_2 \) with \( |E(M_2)| = |E(N)| + 1 \). In particular, we may remove elements from \( M' \) in \( M_1 \) until a single element \( g \) remains.
Now choose $e$ in $E(N')$. Then $M_2 \setminus e$ or $M_2/e$ is isomorphic to $N$. But both $M_2 \setminus e$ and $M_2/e$ have more one-element components than $N'$; a contradiction. □

Recall that we say that a matroid $N$ has the transitivity property if, for every matroid $M$ and every triple $\{e, f, g\} \subseteq E(M)$, if $e$ is in an $N$-minor with $f$, and $f$ is in an $N$-minor with $g$, then $e$ is in an $N$-minor with $g$. Clearly $N$ has the transitivity property if and only if $N^*$ has the transitivity property.

**Lemma 6.3.** Suppose $N$ is a matroid having the transitivity property. Let $N'$ be obtained from $N$ by adding an element $f$ in parallel to a non-loop element $e$ of $N$. Then there is an element $g$ of $E(N')$ such that $N' \setminus g$ is isomorphic to $N$ and has $\{e, f\}$ as a 2-circuit. Moreover, $g$ is in a 2-circuit in $N$.

**Proof.** The transitivity property implies that $\{e, f\}$ is in an $N$-minor of $N'$. Since $r^*(N') > r^*(N)$, there must be an element $g$ of $E(N') - \{e, f\}$ such that $N' \setminus g \cong N$. Since we have introduced a new 2-circuit in constructing $N'$, when we delete $g$, we must destroy a 2-circuit. □

By the last lemma and duality, we obtain the following result.

**Corollary 6.4.** If $N$ is a matroid having the transitivity property, then $N$ has a component with more than one element.

The following elementary observation and its dual will be used repeatedly in the proof of Theorem 2.2

**Lemma 6.5.** Suppose $N$ is a matroid with the transitivity property. Let $N_0$ be a component of $N$ with the largest number of elements. Suppose $f$ is added in parallel to an element $e$ of $N_0$. Let $N_0'$ and $N'$ be the resulting extensions of $N_0$ and $N$, respectively. Suppose $g \in E(N')$ such that $N' \setminus g \cong N$. Then $g \in E(N_0')$.

Recall that a set $S$ of elements of a matroid $M$ is a fan if $|S| \geq 3$ and there is an ordering $(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n)$ of the elements of $S$ such that, for all $i$ in $\{1, 2, \ldots, n - 2\}$,

(i) $\{s_i, s_{i+1}, s_{i+2}\}$ is a triangle or a triad; and

(ii) when $\{s_i, s_{i+1}, s_{i+2}\}$ is a triangle, $\{s_{i+1}, s_{i+2}, s_{i+3}\}$ is a triad; and when $\{s_i, s_{i+1}, s_{i+2}\}$ is a triad, $\{s_{i+1}, s_{i+2}, s_{i+3}\}$ is a triangle.

Note that the above extends the definition given in 3 by eliminating the requirement that $M$ be simple and cosimple. We shall follow the familiar practice here of blurring the distinction between a fan and a fan ordering.

**Lemma 6.6.** Let $(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n)$ be a fan $X$ in a matroid $M$ such that each of $\{s_1, s_2\}$ and $\{s_{n-1}, s_n\}$ is a circuit or a cocircuit. Then $X$ is a component of $M$.

**Proof.** By switching to the dual if necessary, we may assume that $\{s_1, s_2, s_3\}$ is a triangle of $M$. Thus $\{s_1, s_2\}$ is a cocircuit. Observe that $\{s_i : i \text{ is odd}\}$ spans $X$. If $n$ is odd, this is immediate, and if $n$ is even, it follows from the fact that $\{s_{n-1}, s_n\}$ is a circuit in this case. By duality, $\{s_i : i \text{ is even}\}$ spans $X$ in $M^*$. Hence $r(X) + r^*(X) \leq |X|$; that is, $\lambda(X) \leq 0$, so $X$ is a component of $M$. □

We define a special fan to be a fan $(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_k)$ such that $\{s_1, s_2\}$ is a cocircuit of $M$. We will now show that $U_{1,2}$ and $M(W_2)$ are the only connected matroids with the transitivity property.
Proof of Theorem 1.2. It is clear that $U_{1,2}$ has the transitivity property. By Theorem 1.1, two elements of $M$ are in an $M(W_2)$-minor together if and only if they are in a connected, non-uniform component together. It follows that $M(W_2)$ has the transitivity property.

Suppose that $N$ has the transitivity property. Assume that $N$ is not isomorphic to $U_{1,2}$ or $M(W_2)$. Next we show the following.

6.7.1. Let $N_0$ be a largest component of $N$. Then $N_0$ is isomorphic to $U_{1,2}$ or $M(W_2)$.

Assume that this assertion fails. Then, by Corollary 6.7.2, $N_0$ has at least two, and hence at least three, elements. Take an element $e$ of $N_0$ and add an element $f$ in series with it. Let the resulting coextensions of $N_0$ and $N$ be $N'_0$ and $N'$, respectively. Then, by the transitivity property, $N'/a \cong N$ for some element $a$ of $E(N') - \{e, f\}$. Furthermore, by the dual of Lemma 6.5, $a \in E(N_0)$. We deduce that $N_0$ has a 2-cocircuit, say $\{a, b\}$. In $N_0$, add an element $c$ in parallel to $a$ to get $N_1$. Then, by transitivity and Lemma 6.7, there is an element $s_1$ of $E(N_1) - \{a, c\}$ such that $N_1 \setminus s_1 \cong N_0$. Since $N_1 \setminus b$ has $\{a, c\}$ as a component, the component sizes of $N_1 \setminus b$ and $N_0$ do not match, so $s_1 \neq b$. Thus $s_1 \in E(N) - \{a, b, c\}$, so $N_1 \setminus s_1$ has $\{c, a, b\}$ as a cocircuit. Next add an element $d$ to $N_1 \setminus s_1$, putting it in series with $c$. Let the resulting matroid be $N_2$. By the dual of Lemma 6.5, there is an element $s_2$ of $E(N_2) - \{c, d\}$ such that $N_2/d \cong N_0$. Moreover, $s_2$ must be in a 2-cocircuit of $N_2$, and $s_2$ is in a triangle in $N_2$ as $N_2/s_2$ must have a 2-circuit that is not present in $N_2$ since adding $d$ destroyed the 2-circuit $\{a, c\}$. Now $s_2 \neq a$ since $N_2/a$ has $\{c, d\}$ as a component.

Suppose $s_2 = b$. Then $b$ is in a 2-cocircuit $\{b, e\}$ in $N_2$. Moreover, $N_2$ has a triangle $T$ containing $b$. By orthogonality, $T = \{b, e, a\}$. Then $(d, c, a, e)$ is a fan $X$ in $N_2/b$ having $\{c, d\}$ as a cocircuit and $\{a, e\}$ as a circuit. By Lemma 6.6, $X = E(N_2/b)$, so $N_0 \cong N_2/b \cong M(W_2)$; a contradiction.

We now know that $s_2 \neq b$, so $s_2 \notin \{a, b, c, d\}$. Thus $N_0$ has $(d, c, a, b)$ as a special fan. Among all the special fans of $N_0$ and $N_0^*$, take one, $(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_k)$, with the maximum number of elements. Then $k \geq 4$. First assume $\{a_{k-2}, a_{k-1}, a_k\}$ is a triad. Suppose $\{a_{k-1}, a_k\}$ is a 2-circuit of $N_0$. Then, by Lemma 6.6, the special fan is the whole component $N_0$. As $N_0 \not\cong M(W_2)$, we see that $k \geq 6$. Add an element $f$ in parallel to $a_3$ to form a new matroid $N'_0$. Then $\{a_1, a_3\}$ is in an $N_0$-minor of $N_0'$, and so is $\{a_1, f\}$. By the transitivity property, $N'_0$ has $\{a_3, f\}$ in an $N_0$-minor. Since $N_0$ has $\{a_3, f\}$ and $\{a_{k-1}, a_k\}$ as its only 2-circuits, while $N_0$ has a single 2-circuit, we deduce that $N'_0 \setminus a_k \cong N_0$. But every element of $N_0$ is in a cocircuit of size at most three, yet $f$ is in no such cocircuit of $N'_0 \setminus a_k$; a contradiction.

It remains to deal with the cases when, in $N_0$, either $\{a_{k-2}, a_{k-1}, a_k\}$ is a triad and $\{a_{k-1}, a_k\}$ is not a circuit, or $\{a_{k-2}, a_{k-1}, a_k\}$ is a triangle. In these cases, add $a_0$ in parallel with $a_1$ to produce $N_3$. To obtain an $N_0$-minor of $N_3$ using $\{a_0, a_1\}$, we must delete an element $z$ of $N_3$ that belongs to a 2-circuit. Now $z$ is not in $\{a_2, a_3, \ldots, a_k\}$ as none of these elements is in a 2-circuit, so $N_3 \setminus z$ is isomorphic to $N_0$ and has $(a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_k)$ as a special fan. This contradicts our assumption that a special fan in $N_0$ or $N_0^*$ has at most $k$ elements. We conclude that 6.7.1 holds.

6.7.2. $N$ has no single-element component.

To see this, let $N_0$ be a largest component of $N$. By 6.7.1, $N_0$ is isomorphic to $U_{1,2}$ or $M(W_2)$. Assume that $N$ has a single-element component $N_1$ with $E(N_1) = \{a\}$.
By replacing $N$ by its dual if necessary, we may assume that $a$ is a coloop of $N$. Let $c$ be an element that is in a 2-cocircuit of $N_0$. Now let $N'$ be obtained from $N$ by adding an element $b$ so that $N'$ has $\{a,b,c\}$ as a triangle and $\{a,b\}$ as a cocircuit. Then, by the transitivity property, $N' \setminus g \cong N$ for some element $g$ not in $\{a,b\}$. By the choice of $N_0$, we deduce that $g$ must be in the same component $N_0'$ of $N'$ as $\{a,b,c\}$. Moreover, $g$ must be in a 2-cocircuit of $N_0'$. But $N_0'$ contains no such element. Hence $6.7.2$ holds.

$6.7.3$. $N$ has a single component of maximum size.

Assume that this fails, and let $N_0$ and $N_1$ be components of $N$ of maximum size. Let $\{a_i, b_i\}$ be a 2-circuit of $N_i$. Let $N'_i$ be obtained from $N_i$ by adding $c_i$ in series with $b_i$. Now take a copy of $U_{2,3}$ with ground set $\{c_0, z, c_1\}$ and adjoin $N'_0$ and $N'_1$ via parallel connection across $c_0$ and $c_1$, respectively. Truncate the resulting matroid to get $N_{01}$. Then $r(N_{01}) = r(N_0) + r(N_1) + 1$. Let $N''$ be obtained from $N$ by replacing $N_0 \oplus N_1$ by $N_{01}$. Now $N_0/c_0$ and $N_0/c_1$ have $(N_0 \oplus N_1)$-minors using $\{z,c_1\}$ and $\{z,c_0\}$, respectively. Hence $N''/c_0$ and $N''/c_1$ have $N$-minors using $\{z,c_1\}$ and $\{z,c_0\}$. Thus, by transitivity, $N''$ has an $N$-minor $\bar{N}$ using $\{c_0,c_1\}$. As $r(N'') = r(N) + 1$, there are elements $e$, $f$, and $g$ of $E(N'') - \{c_0,c_1\}$ such that $\bar{N} = N'/e \setminus f, g$. Now $N'/e$ must have two disjoint 2-circuits that are not in $N''$. Thus $e \in E(N_{01})$. As $e \notin \{c_0, c_1\}$, it follows that $N_0 \cong N(W_2) \cong N_1$ and, by symmetry, we may assume that $e = a_0$. But $N_{01}/a_0$ does not have an $(M(W_2) \oplus M(W_2))$-minor. Thus $6.7.3$ holds.

By $6.7.1$ and $6.7.3$, $N$ has a single largest component $N_0$ and it is isomorphic to $M(W_2)$. As $N$ is disconnected, we may assume by duality that $N$ has a component $N_1$ that is isomorphic to $U_{1,k}$ for some $k$ in $\{2,3\}$. Now take a copy of $U_{2,3}$ with ground set $\{c_0, z, c_1\}$ and adjoin copies of $U_{2,k+1}$ via parallel connection across $c_0$ and $c_1$, letting the resulting matroid be $N_{01}$. Replacing $N_0 \oplus N_1$ by $N_{01}$ in $N$ to give $N'$, we see that $r(N') = r(N) + 1$. Moreover, $N'/c_0$ and $N'/c_1$ have $N$-minors using $\{c_1,z\}$ and $\{c_0,z\}$, respectively. But $c_0$ and $c_1$ are the only elements $e$ of $N'$ such that $N'/e$ has two disjoint 2-circuits that are not in $N'$. Thus $N'$ has no $N$-minor using $\{c_0,c_1\}$. This contradiction completes the proof of the theorem. □

We conclude this section by proving Corollary $1.3$, which demonstrates how two of the basic properties of matroid connectivity are enough to characterize it.

**Proof of Corollary $1.3$.** Assume that $N \not\cong U_{1,2}$. Then, by Theorem $1.1$ and duality, we may assume that $N \cong U_{2,2}$. But $U_{2,2}$ does not have the transitivity property as the matroid $U_{1,2} \oplus U_{1,1}$ shows. □

7. Three-element sets

The notion of $N$-connectivity defined here relies on sets of two elements. Sets of size three have already been an object of some study. Seymour asked whether every 3-element set in a 4-connected non-binary matroid belongs to a $U_{2,4}$-minor but Kahn [3] and Coullard [3] answered this question negatively. Seymour [12] characterized the internally 4-connected binary matroids that are $U_{2,3}$-connected, but the problem of completely characterizing when every triple of elements in an internally 4-connected matroid is in a $U_{2,3}$-minor remains open [8, Problem 15.9.7].

For a 3-connected binary matroid $M$ having rank and corank at least three, Theorem $4.3$ shows that every triple of elements of $M$ is in an $M(K_4)$-minor. The
next result extends this theorem to connected binary matroids. As the proof, which is based on Lemma 2.6, is so similar to those appearing earlier, we omit the details.

**Proposition 7.1.** Let $M$ be a connected binary matroid. For every triple $\{x, y, z\} \subseteq E(M)$, there is an $M(K_4)$-minor using $\{x, y, z\}$ if and only if every matroid in the canonical tree decomposition of $M$ has rank and corank at least 3.
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