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Abstract. We introduce ideas that complement the many known connections between polymatroids and graph coloring. Given a hypergraph that satisfies certain conditions, we construct polymatroids, given as rank functions, that can be written as sums of rank functions of matroids, and for which the minimum number of matroids required in such sums is the chromatic number of the line graph of the hypergraph. This result motivates introducing chromatic numbers and chromatic polynomials for polymatroids. We show that the chromatic polynomial of any 2-polymatroid is a rational multiple of the chromatic polynomial of some graph. We also find the excluded minors for the minor-closed class of polymatroids that can be written as sums of rank functions of matroids that form a chain of quotients.

1. Introduction

The polymatroids that are of interest in this paper are often called integer polymatroids or discrete polymatroids to distinguish them from more general polymatroids. Thus, here, a polymatroid on a finite set \( E \) is a function \( \rho : 2^E \to \mathbb{Z} \) that has the following properties:

1. \( \rho \) is normalized, that is, \( \rho(\emptyset) = 0 \),
2. \( \rho \) is non-decreasing, that is, if \( A \subseteq B \subseteq E \), then \( \rho(A) \leq \rho(B) \), and
3. \( \rho \) is submodular, that is, \( \rho(A \cup B) + \rho(A \cap B) \leq \rho(A) + \rho(B) \) for all \( A, B \subseteq E \).

Herzog and Hibi [5] give some equivalent formulations of this notion.

For a positive integer \( k \), a \( k \)-polymatroid is a polymatroid \( \rho \) on \( E \) for which \( \rho(e) \leq k \) for all \( e \in E \), or, equivalently, \( \rho(A) \leq |A| \) for all \( A \subseteq E \). Thus, matroids are 1-polymatroids. We let \( \mathcal{P}_k \) denote the class of \( k \)-polymatroids. If \( M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_k \) are matroids on \( E \), then the function \( \rho \) on \( 2^E \) given by

\[
\rho(X) = r_{M_1}(X) + r_{M_2}(X) + \cdots + r_{M_k}(X),
\]

for \( X \subseteq E \), is a \( k \)-polymatroid on \( E \). We write this as \( \rho = r_{M_1} + r_{M_2} + \cdots + r_{M_k} \) for brevity. We call the multiset \( \{ M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_k \} \) a \( k \)-decomposition of \( \rho \), and we say that \( \rho \) is \( k \)-decomposable. We let \( \mathcal{D}_k \) be the class of all \( k \)-decomposable polymatroids. Murty and Simon [10] raised the question of which polymatroids are decomposable, and they showed, by example, that not all 2-polymatroids are decomposable.

For a polymatroid \( \rho \) on \( E \) and for \( A \subseteq E \), the deletion \( \rho_{\setminus A} \) and contraction \( \rho_{/A} \), both on \( E \setminus A \), are defined by \( \rho_{\setminus A}(X) = \rho(X) \) and \( \rho_{/A}(X) = \rho(X \cup A) - \rho(A) \) for all \( X \subseteq E \setminus A \). The minors of \( \rho \) are the polymatroids of the form \( (\rho_{\setminus A})_{/B} \) (equivalently, \( (\rho_{/B})_{\setminus A} \)) for disjoint subsets \( A \) and \( B \) of \( E \). It is easy to check that if \( \rho = r_{M_1} + r_{M_2} + \cdots + r_{M_k} \), then

\[
(1.1) \quad \rho_{\setminus A} = r_{M_1 \setminus A} + r_{M_2 \setminus A} + \cdots + r_{M_k \setminus A} \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_{/A} = r_{M_1 / A} + r_{M_2 / A} + \cdots + r_{M_k / A},
\]

so each class \( \mathcal{D}_k \) is minor-closed (i.e., all minors of polymatroids in the class are in the class), as is the union of these classes, which we denote by \( D \). Thus, their excluded minors...
(i.e., the minor-minimal polymatroids that are not in the class) are of interest. (The class \( \mathcal{P}_k \) of \( k \)-polymatroids is also minor-closed; it has one excluded minor for each integer \( t > k \), namely, a polymatroid consisting of a single element of rank \( t \).)

In our first main result, Theorem 2.3, given a hypergraph \( H \) that satisfies certain mild conditions, we construct polymatroids for which the ordered \( k \)-decompositions of each of these polymatroids correspond bijectively to the \( k \)-colorings of the line graph of \( H \).

One corollary is that if the line graph is critical (each single-edge deletion has smaller chromatic number than the graph), then the polymatroids are excluded minors for some of the classes \( \mathcal{D}_k \). We also show that certain truncations of some of these polymatroids are not decomposable. We give examples to illustrate the abundance of excluded minors for the classes \( \mathcal{D}_k \) and \( \mathcal{D}_k \) that result. This casts doubt on the feasibility of characterizing \( \mathcal{D}_k \) and \( \mathcal{D}_k \) by excluded minors, but it motivates the next definition.

**Definition 1.1.** The chromatic polynomial, \( \chi(\rho; x) \), of a polymatroid \( \rho \) is the function that, when \( x \) is a positive integer, gives the number of \( k \)-tuples \( (M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_k) \) of matroids with \( \rho = r_{M_1} + r_{M_2} + \cdots + r_{M_k} \). The chromatic number \( \chi(\rho) \) of \( \rho \) is the least positive integer \( k \) such that \( \chi(\rho; k) > 0 \); we set \( \chi(\rho) = \infty \) if there is no such \( k \).

By Theorem 2.3, for certain hypergraphs \( H \) and any of the polymatroids \( \rho \) that we construct from \( H \), we have \( \chi(\rho) = \chi(G_H) \) and \( \chi(\rho; k) = \chi(G_H; k) \) where \( G_H \) is the line graph of \( H \). We give some basic properties of \( \chi(\rho) \) and \( \chi(\rho; x) \) in Section 3, including showing that \( \chi(\rho; x) \) is a polynomial.

Our second main result, Theorem 3.1, supports the observation that 2-polymatroids have more in common with graphs than do general polymatroids. We show that for any 2-polymatroid \( \rho \), there is a graph \( G \) and a rational number \( s \) for which \( \chi(\rho; x) = s \cdot \chi(G; x) \). The papers of Lemos [6, 7] and Lemos and Mota [8] provide key ingredients in the proof.

In Section 4, we show how, from a \( k \)-decomposition of an \( i \)-polymatroid \( \rho \), where \( k \geq i \), we get a \( k \)-decomposition of the \( i \)-dual \( \rho^* \) of \( \rho \). We apply this result to excluded minors and we identify conditions under which we have \( \chi(\rho; x) = \chi(\rho^*; x) \).

In Section 5, we explore decompositions of polymatroids using matroids that form a chain under the quotient order. In Theorem 5.2 and Corollary 5.3, we give the excluded minors for minor-closed classes of these polymatroids.

Our notation follows Oxley [11], with two additions: we let \( U_{r,E} \) denote the rank-\( r \) uniform matroid on the set \( E \) (so its bases are all \( r \)-subsets of \( E \)), and we let \([n]\) denote the set \( \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \).

2. A CONSTRUCTION OF POLYMATROIDS FROM HYPERGRAPHS

A hypergraph is an ordered pair \( H = (E, \mathcal{E}) \) where \( E \) is a finite set and \( \mathcal{E} \) is a set \( \{X_i : i \in [n]\} \) of nonempty subsets of \( E \); more broadly, \( H \) is a multi-hypergraph if \( \mathcal{E} \) is a finite multiset of subsets of \( E \). The elements of \( E \) are the vertices of \( H \), and the sets \( X_i \) in \( \mathcal{E} \) are the hyperedges of \( H \). The line graph \( G_H \) of \( H \) has \( [n] \) as its vertex set, and \( ij \) is an edge precisely when \( i \neq j \) and \( X_i \cap X_j \neq \emptyset \). Given \( H \), define \( w : 2^E \to \mathbb{Z} \) by letting \( w(e) \), for \( e \in E \), be the number of sets in \( \mathcal{E} \) that contain \( e \), and for \( A \subseteq E \), setting

\[
 w(A) = \sum_{e \in A} w(e) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} |A \cap X_i|.
\]

Some of the results below are limited to hypergraphs that have one or more of the following special properties:

(H1) each vertex is in at least two hyperedges, so \( w(e) \geq 2 \) for all \( e \in E \),
(H2) if \(i, j \in [n]\) with \(i \neq j\), then \(|X_i \cap X_j| \leq 1\),
(H3) no three hyperedges have the form \(\{a, b\}, \{a, c\}, \{b, c\}\) for \(a, b, c \in E\).

Given a multi-hypergraph \(H = (E, \{X_i : i \in [n]\})\), for each \(i \in [n]\), fix an integer \(t_i\) where \(0 \leq t_i \leq |X_i|\). When \(H\) is a hypergraph, we sometimes require that

(T) for each \(i \in [n]\), either \(t_i = 1\) or \(\min\{w(e) : e \in X_i\} \leq t_i < |X_i|\).

Let the polymatroid \(\rho\) be given by

\[
\rho = r_{M_1} + r_{M_2} + \cdots + r_{M_n} \quad \text{where} \quad M_i = U_{t_i, X_i} \oplus U_{0, E - X_i}.
\]

Thus, for \(A \subseteq E\),

\[
\rho(A) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \min\{|A \cap X_i|, t_i\}.
\]

If \(t_i \geq 1\) for all \(i \in [n]\), then \(\rho(e) = w(e)\) for all \(e \in E\).

When \(t_i \geq 1\) for all \(i \in [n]\) and property (H2) holds, two useful observations follow.

First, for each hyperedge \(X_h\) and set \(A \subseteq X_h\),

\[
\rho(A) = \min\{w(A), w(A) - |A| + t_h\}.
\]

Second, if \(e\) and \(f\) are distinct elements of \(E\), then \(\rho([e, f]) = w([e, f]) - \delta\) where \(\delta = 1\) if there is a (unique) hyperedge \(X_i\) with \(e, f \in X_i\) and \(t_i = 1\), and otherwise \(\delta = 0\).

Before turning to our first main result, Theorem 2.3, we make connections with earlier work, give examples, and develop the idea of incidence sets.

For a multi-hypergraph \(H = (E, \mathcal{E})\), let all \(t_i\) be 1 and set \(\psi(e) = \{i : e \in X_i\}\) for each \(e \in E\), so \(\rho(A) = |\cup_{e \in A} \psi(e)|\) for all \(A \subseteq E\). These are the covering polymatroids that Helgason [4] introduced, which are now called Boolean polymatroids or transversal polymatroids. Matuš [9] found the excluded minors for Boolean polymatroids.

**Example 1.** For a graph \(G = (V, E)\) with \(V = \{v_i : i \in [n]\}\) and with no isolated vertices, let \(X_i\) be the set of edges of \(G\) that are incident with vertex \(v_i\). If \(G\) is simple (i.e., has no loops and no parallel edges) and no component is a 3-cycle, then the hypergraph \(H = (E, \{X_i : i \in [n]\})\) satisfies properties (H1)-(H3). The line graph \(G_H\) is isomorphic to \(G\) and \(w(e) = 2\) for all \(e \in E\). Property (T) holds if either \(t_i = 1\) or \(0 < t_i < |X_i|\) for each \(i \in [n]\). The most-studied case is the Boolean 2-polymatroid \(\rho_G\) of \(G\), which is when \(t_i = 1\) for all \(i \in [n]\). In that case, for \(X \subseteq E\), we have \(\rho_G(X) = |V(X)|\) where \(V(X)\) is the set of vertices that are incident with at least one edge in \(X\). Thus, \(X\) is a matching if and only if \(\rho_G(X) = 2|X|\). Oxley and Whittle [12] found the excluded minors for Boolean 2-polymatroids.

**Example 2.** Let \(M\) be a finite affine plane, that is, a rank-3 simple matroid in which, given any point \(x\) and line \(L\) with \(x \notin L\), there is exactly one line \(L'\) with \(x \in L'\) and \(L \cap L' = \emptyset\). Let \(E\) be the set of lines of \(M\). For each point \(a\) in \(E(M)\), let \(X_a\) be the set of all lines of \(M\) that contain \(a\), and let \(\mathcal{E}\) be \(\{X_a : a \in E(M)\}\). The hypergraph \(H_M = (E, \mathcal{E})\) satisfies properties (H1)-(H3). For distinct points \(a\) and \(b\) in \(E(M)\), the line \(c_{M}(\{a, b\})\) is in \(X_a \cap X_b\), so the line graph of \(H_M\) is complete. The order of a finite affine plane is the number of points on each line. If \(M\) has order \(q\), then \(w(L) = q\) for all \(L \in E\). Basic counting gives \(|E| = q^2 + q\) as well as \(|\mathcal{E}| = q^2\) and \(|X_a| = q + 1\) for all \(a \in E(M)\). Condition (T) holds if and only if \(t_a \in \{1, q\}\) for all \(a \in E(M)\).

In place of an affine plane, we can use any rank-3 simple matroid other than \(U_{3, 3}\) (if we want property (H3) to hold). The choice of the matroid influences the options for the integers \(t_i\). The line graph is always complete.
Example 3. Let $M$ be a projective plane of order $q$ (i.e., each line has $q + 1$ points). Let $E$ be its set of points and $\mathcal{E}$ its set of lines. The line graph of the hypergraph $(E, \mathcal{E})$ is the complete graph on $q^2 + q + 1$ vertices. Properties (H1)-(H3) hold. Only setting all $t_i = 1$ satisfies condition (T) since $|X_i| = q + 1 = w(e)$ for all $X_i \in \mathcal{E}$ and $e \in E$.

In place of a projective plane, we can use any rank-3 simple matroid, provided that (if property (H3) is to hold) no triple of trivial lines has the form $\{a, b\}, \{a, c\}, \{b, c\}$. The choice of $M$ influences the options for the integers $t_i$. The line graph is complete if and only if $M$ is modular, that is, $M$ is a projective plane or $U_{1,1} \oplus U_{2,n}$ for some $n \geq 3$.

Definition 2.1. An incidence set of a polymatroid $\rho$ on $E$ is a subset $X$ of $E$ with $|X| \geq 2$ for which, for all $Y \subseteq X$ with $|Y| \in [3]$,

\[
\rho(Y) = 1 + \sum_{e \in Y} (\rho(e) - 1).
\]

For example, if $t_h = 1$ and property (H2) holds, then the hyperedge $X_h$ is an incidence set by equation (2.3). In particular, in the Boolean polymatroid of a simple graph, the set of edges that are incident with a given vertex of degree at least two is an incidence set. If $\rho(e) = 0$, then equation (2.4) fails for any set $\{e, f\}$, so all elements in incidence sets have positive rank.

Lemma 2.2. Let $D = \{M_i : i \in [k]\}$ be a decomposition of a polymatroid $\rho$ on $E$.

(1) For any incidence set $X$ of $\rho$, there is exactly one $i \in [k]$ for which all elements in $X$ are parallel in $M_i$. No two elements of $X$ are parallel in any other matroid in $D$. If equation (2.4) also holds for $Y = X$, then the only subsets of $X$ that are circuits of any other matroid in $D$ are singletons (i.e., loops).

(2) Assume that $X$ and $Y$ are incidence sets and that there are elements $a \in X$ and $b \in Y$ with $\rho(\{a, b\}) = \rho(a) + \rho(b)$. If $X \cap Y = \emptyset$, then $|X \cap Y| = 1$, and the matroid in $D$ in which the elements of $Y$ are parallel differs from that for $X$.

Proof. For any $e, f \in X$, there are exactly $\rho(e)$ matroids $M_i$ in $D$ with $r_{M_i}(e) = 1$, and exactly $\rho(f)$ matroids $M_i$ in $D$ with $r_{M_i}(f) = 1$, yet $\rho(\{e, f\}) = \rho(e) + \rho(f) - 1$, so $e$ and $f$ must be parallel in exactly one matroid in $D$. If $|X| \geq 3$, then for any third element $g \in X$, the same conclusion applies to $e$ and $g$, and to $f$ and $g$. If these pairs were parallel in three different matroids, then $\rho(\{e, f, g\}) \leq \rho(e) + \rho(f) + \rho(g) - 3$, contrary to equation (2.4). Thus, two of the pairs are parallel in the same matroid, and so all three are parallel in that matroid. This applies to any triple in $X$, so the first two assertions in part (1) follow. Similar ideas yield the last assertion in part (1).

For part (2), since $\rho(\{a, b\}) = \rho(a) + \rho(b)$, these elements are not parallel in any matroid in $D$. Let $e \in X \cap Y$. The parallel class that $X$ is in contains $a$ and $e$, and the one that $Y$ is in contains $b$ and $e$, so, with $e$ in common, these parallel classes must be in different matroids. If $f \in (X \cap Y) - e$, then $f$ would also be in both of those parallel classes, but this contradicts part (1) since $e$ and $f$ are parallel in just one matroid in $D$. □

Example 4. We define counterparts, for $k$-polymatroids, of the Vámos matroid. Let $E$ be $\{a, b, c, d\}$. For integers $k \geq 2$ and $s$ with $3k - 2 \leq s \leq 4k - 4$, let $\rho_{k,s}$ be given by

\[
\rho_{k,s}(X) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{k}{2} |X|, & \text{if } |X| \leq 1 \text{ or } X = \{a, d\}, \\
2k - 1, & \text{if } |X| = 2 \text{ and } X \neq \{a, d\}, \\
3k - 2, & \text{if } |X| = 3, \\
s, & \text{if } X = E.
\end{cases}
\]
Figure 1 shows $\rho_{2,4}$. It is easy to check that, if $\rho$ is a $j$-polymatroid on $E$ and $k \geq j$, then $\rho^k$, defined by $\rho^k(X) = \rho(X) + (k - j)|X|$ for $X \subseteq E$, is a $k$-polymatroid. Note that $\rho_{k,4k-4} = \rho_{2,4}^k$. This operation appears again in Section 4. Also, $\rho_{k,s}$ is a truncation of $\rho_{k,4k-4}$. Truncations are discussed at greater length at the end of this section. The sets $X = \{a, b, c\}$ and $Y = \{b, c, d\}$ are incidents sets of $\rho_{k,s}$, yet $|X \cap Y| = 2$ and $\rho_{k,s}(\{a, d\}) = \rho_{k,s}(a) + \rho_{k,s}(d)$, so $\rho_{k,s}$ is not decomposable by part (2) of Lemma 2.2. It is easy to check that $\rho_{k,s}$ is an excluded minor for $D$ and for $D_t$ for all $t \geq k$. Variations on this example yield more excluded minors for decomposability.

We turn to our first main result. For a polymatroid $\rho$ on $E$ and a positive integer $k$, let

$$\Delta^k_\rho = \{(N_1, N_2, \ldots, N_k) : N_i \text{ is a matroid on } E \text{ and } \rho = r_{N_1} + r_{N_2} + \cdots + r_{N_k}\}.$$

Thus, $\chi(\rho; k) = |\Delta^k_\rho|$.

**Theorem 2.3.** Assume that the hypergraph $H = (E, \{X_i : i \in [n]\})$ and integers $t_i$ satisfy properties (H2), (H3), and (T). Let $\rho$ be given by equation (2.1). For each positive integer $k$, there is a bijection from the set of $k$-colorings $c : [n] \rightarrow [k]$ of the line graph $G_H$ onto $\Delta^k_\rho$. Thus, the least $k$ with $\rho \in D_k$ is $k = \chi(G_H)$, and $|\Delta^k_\rho| = \chi(G_H; k)$ for all positive integers $k$.

This result follows from the next two, which strengthen different parts of the statement. The next lemma, which is an immediate consequence of the definitions, assumes none of properties (H1)-(H3) and (T).

**Lemma 2.4.** Let $H = (E, \{X_i : i \in [n]\})$ be a multi-hypergraph. Let $\rho$ be given by equation (2.1) where $0 \leq t_i \leq |X_i|$ for each $i \in [n]$. Define a map $\phi$ on the set of $k$-colorings $c : [n] \rightarrow [k]$ of the line graph $G_H$ by $\phi(c) = (N_1, N_2, \ldots, N_k)$ where

$$N_i = \left(\bigoplus_{h : c(h) = i} U_{t_h,X_h}\right) \oplus U_{0,Y} \quad \text{where} \quad Y = E - \bigcup_{h : c(h) = i} X_h.$$

Then $\phi(c) \in \Delta^k_\rho$. Thus, $\chi(\rho) \leq \chi(G_H)$. If $H$ is a hypergraph and, for all $i \in [n]$, either $t_i = 1$ or $0 < t_i < |X_i|$, then $\phi$ is injective.

The heart of the proof of Theorem 2.3 is showing that, when properties (H2), (H3), and (T) hold, the image of the map $\phi$ in Lemma 2.4 is $\Delta^k_\rho$. That is part of the next result, which, for any polymatroid $\sigma$ on $E$ for which $\sigma(A) = \rho(A)$ for certain sets $A$, produces colorings of $G_H$ from decompositions of $\sigma$.

For a $k$-coloring $c$ of a graph, let $c_1^k$ and $c_2^k$ be the number of $i \in [k]$ for which the size of the preimage $c^{-1}(i)$ is, respectively, 1 and at least 2.
Theorem 2.5. Assume that the hypergraph $H = (E, \{X_i : i \in [n]\})$ and integers $t_i$ satisfy properties (H2), (H3), and (T). Let $\rho$ be given by equation (2.1). Let $\sigma$ be any polymatroid on $E$ for which $\sigma(A) = \rho(A)$ if $A \subseteq E$ and

- $|A| \leq 3$, or
- $|A| = 4$ and there are three hyperedges $X_h$, $X_i$, $X_j$ with $t_h = t_i = t_j = 1$ so that some element of $A$ is in exactly one of these hyperedges, and each of the other three elements of $A$ is in exactly two of these hyperedges, or
- $A \subseteq X_i$ and $|A| \leq t_i + 1$ for some $i \in [n]$, or
- $A$ is a subset of the symmetric difference $X_i \triangle X_j$, for some $i, j \in [n]$ with $X_i \cap X_j \neq \emptyset$, where $|A \cap X_i| \leq t_i$ and $|A \cap X_j| \leq t_j$.

From an element in $\Delta^k_h$, we can construct a $k$-coloring $c$ of the line graph $G_H$; moreover, $\sigma(E) \geq c_1 + 2c_2$. If $\sigma = \rho$, then the image of the injection $\phi$ in Lemma 2.4 is $\Delta^k_h$, so $\phi$ is the bijection asserted in Theorem 2.3. If $\sigma(E) < \chi(G_H)$, then $\sigma$ is indecomposable.

Proof. Fix $(N_1, N_2, \ldots, N_k) \in \Delta^k_h$. Since $\sigma(e) = \rho(e) = w(e)$ for each $e \in E$, we have $r_{N_i}(e) = 1$ for exactly $w(e)$ integers $i \in [k]$. Consider a hyperedge $X_h$ with $|X_h| > 1$. If $t_h = 1$, then $X_h$ is an incidence set of $\sigma$, so, by Lemma 2.2, there is exactly one $i \in [k]$ for which $N_i|X_h = U_{i_k}$. We claim that the same holds when $t_h > 1$. To see this, fix $h$ with $t_h > 1$, so $t_h < |X_h|$. From equation (2.3) and the hypothesis, for $A \subseteq X_h$, we have

1. if $|A| \leq t_h$, then $\sigma(A) = \rho(A) = w(A)$, so for all $j \in [k]$, the restriction $N_j|A$ has only loops and coloops, and
2. if $|A| = t_h + 1$, then $\sigma(A) = \rho(A) = w(A) - 1$, so $A$ is a circuit of exactly one matroid $N_i$ with $i \in [k]$.

The claim follows if $|X_h| = t_h + 1$. When $|X_h| \geq t_h + 2$, fix $A \subseteq X_h$ with $|A| = t_h + 2$ and containing an element $f$ with $w(f) \leq t_h$. The set $A$ has $t_h + 1$ subsets of size $t_h + 1$ that contain $f$. Each such subset of $A$ is a circuit of some matroid $N_i$. Now $w(f) \leq t_h$, so $r_{N_i}(f) = 1$ for at most $t_h$ matroids $N_i$. Thus, there are two elements $a$ and $a'$ in $A - f$ and an integer $i \in [k]$ so that both $A - a$ and $A - a'$ are circuits of $N_i$. Applying circuit elimination to these two circuits of $N_i$ and using deduction (1) above shows that all $(t_h + 1)$-element subsets of $A$ are circuits of $N_i$, that is, $N_i|A = U_{i_k}$. If $|X_h| \geq t_h + 3$ and $b \in X_h - A$, then fix $x \in A - f$ and let $A' = (A \cup b) - x$. By the same argument, $N_j|A' = U_{i_k}$, for some $j \in [n]$; since $|A \cap A'| = t_h + 1$, we have $j = i$ by deduction (2).

Sequences of such exchanges give $N_i|X_h = U_{t_h}$. Define $c : [n] \to [k]$ by, for each $h \in [n]$, setting $c(h) = i$ where

- if $|X_h| > 1$, then $i$ is the unique integer in $[k]$ for which $N_i|X_h = U_{t_h}$, and
- if $X_h = \{e\}$, then $i$ is the unique element in the difference $\{j : r_{N_j}(e) = 1\} - \{c(s) : e \in X_s \text{ and } |X_s| > 1\}$.

We next show that $c$ is a coloring of $G_H$. The argument implies that if $X_h = \{e\}$, then $|\{c(s) : e \in X_s \text{ and } |X_s| > 1\}| = w(e) - 1$, so the difference above contains exactly one element, and so $c$ is well-defined.

Let vertices $p$ and $q$ be adjacent in $G_H$, so $X_p \cap X_q \neq \emptyset$. Assumption (H2) gives $X_p \cap X_q = \{e\}$ for some $e \in E$. We show by contradiction that, as required of a coloring, $c(p) \neq c(q)$. We may assume that $X_p \neq \{e\}$ and $X_q \neq \{e\}$, for otherwise the conclusion follows by the definition of $c$. Assume that $c(p) = c(q) = i$. Let $C_p$ and $C_q$ be circuits of the uniform matroids $N_i|X_p$ and $N_i|X_q$, respectively, with $e \in C_p \cap C_q$. There is a circuit $C$ of $N_i$ with $C \subseteq (C_p \cup C_q) - e$ by circuit elimination. Let $\alpha$ be the number of pairs of elements in $C$, one in $X_p$ and one in $X_q$, that are also in some other hyperedge, say $X_j$, then
that has \( t_j = 1 \). By property (H2), each such pair is in just one hyperedge and no two such pairs are in the same hyperedge. Since \(|C \cap X_p| \leq t_p\) and \(|C \cap X_q| \leq t_q\), equation (2.2) and the hypotheses give \( \sigma(C) = \rho(C) = w(C) - \alpha \). First assume that \( |C| > 2 \). Thus, either \( t_p > 1 \) or \( t_q > 1 \). Also, no two elements of \( C \) are parallel in \( N_i \), so the pairs that \( \alpha \) counts are parallel in matroids \( N_j \) with \( j \in [k] - i \). Furthermore, no two pairs that \( \alpha \) counts and that share an element are parallel in the same matroid, for if \( \{a, b\} \) and \( \{a, c\} \) are two such pairs with, say \( b, c \in X_q \), and both are circuits of \( N_m \), then \( b \) and \( c \) are parallel in \( N_m \) and so, by the observation after equation (2.3), are in a hyperedge \( X_h \) with \( t_h = 1 \); however, since \( b, c \in X_q \), we have \( h = q \), but \( 2 \leq |C \cap X_q| \leq t_q \), so \( t_q \neq 1 \). We now get

\[
\frac{r_{N_1}(C) + r_{N_2}(C) + \cdots + r_{N_k}(C)}{w(C) - 1 - \alpha} < \rho(C).
\]

This contradiction shows that \( C = \{e_p, e_q\} \) for some \( e_p \in X_p \) and \( e_q \in X_q \).

By the observation after equation (2.3), since \( C \) is a circuit of \( N_i \), there is a hyperedge \( X_s \) with \( C \subseteq X_s \) and \( t = 1 \). Also, \( s \not\in \{p, q\} \). Since \( t_s = 1 \), the elements in \( X_s \) are parallel in exactly one matroid, which \( C \) shows is \( N_i \).

Since \( C \) is a circuit of \( N_i \), if either \( \{e, e_p\} \) or \( \{e, e_q\} \) is a circuit of \( N_i \), then both are. Thus, \( t_i = 1 \) if and only if \( t_i = 1 \). The sublemma below implies that \( t_p > 1 \) and \( t_q > 1 \).

2.5.1. Assume that \( \{a, b, c\} \subseteq [n] \) with \( t_a = t_b = t_c = 1 \). If \( F = \{f_a, f_b, f_c\} \) is a set of three vertices with \( \{f_a, f_c\} \subseteq X_a \), \( \{f_a, f_c\} \subseteq X_b \), and \( \{f_a, f_c\} \subseteq X_c \), then there is no \( i \in [k] \) with \( N_i[F] = U_1.F \).

Proof. Assume instead that \( N_i[F] = U_1.F \). Thus, \( N_j[X_a] = U_1.X_a \) if and only if \( j = i \) by Lemma 2.2, and likewise for \( X_b \) and \( X_c \). By property (H3) and symmetry, we may assume that \( \{f_b, f_c\} \subseteq X_a \). Let \( F' = F \cup f \) where \( f \in X_a - \{f_b, f_c\} \). Now \( \sigma(X) = \rho(X) \) if \( X \subseteq F' \). We will derive the contradiction that \( \sigma \) and \( r_{N_1} + r_{N_2} + \cdots + r_{N_k} \) differ on \( F' \).

We first consider the 3-element subsets of \( F' \). By the hypotheses, equation (2.2) applies to all subsets of \( F' \), so, since \( t_a = 1 \),

\[
\sigma(\{f_a, f_c, f\}) = 1 + (w(f_a) - 1) + (w(f_c) - 1) + (w(f) - 1) = w(\{f_a, f_c, f\}) - 2.
\]

Thus, since \( r_{N_i}(\{f_a, f_c, f\}) = 1 \), the restriction of each other matroid \( N_j \) to \( \{f_a, f_c, f\} \) has only loops and coloops. Equation (2.2) also gives

\[
\sigma(F) = 3 + (w(f_a) - 2) + (w(f_b) - 2) + (w(f_c) - 2) = w(F) - 3,
\]

since each of \( X_a, X_b, \) and \( X_c \) contains exactly two of \( f_a, f_b, f_c \). Thus, since \( r_{N_i}(F) = 1 \), the set \( F \) is a circuit of exactly one other matroid \( N_j \). Since \( f_a \) and \( f_c \) are parallel in \( N_i \), some hyperedge \( X_d \) with \( t_d = 1 \) must contain \( f_a \) and \( f_c \). Thus, the same argument also shows that \( \{f_a, f_c, f\} \) is a circuit of exactly one of the matroids other than \( N_i \), as is \( \{f_a, f_b, f\} \). No two of \( F', \{f_a, f_c, f\} \), and \( \{f_a, f_b, f\} \) can be circuits of the same matroid \( N_j \) since that would give the contradiction that either \( \{f_b, f_c, f\} \) or one of its two-element subsets is a circuit of \( N_j \). Since \( t_a = t_b = t_c = t_d = 1 \), equation (2.2) gives

\[
\sigma(F') = 4 + (w(f_a) - 3) + (w(f_b) - 2) + (w(f_c) - 2) + (w(f) - 2) = w(F') - 5.
\]

Thus, since \( F \), \( \{f_a, f_c, f\} \), and \( \{f_a, f_b, f\} \) are circuits of three different matroids and \( N_i[F'] = U_1.F' \), we get the claimed contradiction,

\[
r_{N_1}(F') + r_{N_2}(F') + \cdots + r_{N_k}(F') \leq w(F') - 6 < \sigma(F').
\]

Thus, \( t_p > 1 \). Fix \( A \subseteq X_p \) with \(|A| = t_p \) and \( e_p \not\in A \). Thus, \( A \cup e_p \) is a circuit of \( N_i \), as is \( A \cup e_q \) since \( e_p \) and \( e_q \) are parallel in \( N_i \). Since \( t_p > 1 \), the only element of \( X_p \) that is parallel to \( e_q \) in \( N_i \) is \( e_p \). Thus,

\[
r_{N_1}(A \cup e_q) + r_{N_2}(A \cup e_q) + \cdots + r_{N_k}(A \cup e_q) \leq w(A) + w(e_q) - 1 - \delta
\]
where $\delta$ is the number of elements $a \in A$ for which $a$ and $e_q$ are in another hyperedge, say $X_m$, with $t_m = 1$ (so $a$ and $e_q$ are parallel in $N_j$ for some $j \neq i$). This is a contradiction since $\sigma(A \cup e_q) = \rho(A \cup e_q) = w(A) + w(e_q) - \delta$ by the hypothesis and equation (2.2).

Thus, $c$ is a coloring of $G_H$. If $|c^{-1}(i)| = 1$, then $r(N_i) \geq 1$. Assume that $|c^{-1}(i)| \geq 2$; say $c(p) = c(q) = i$ with $p \neq q$. If $r(N_i) = 1$, then any $x \in X_p$ and $y \in X_q$ are parallel in $N_i$, so they are in some hyperedge $X_j$ with $t_j = 1$. The elements in $X_j$ are parallel in exactly one matroid, which $x$ and $y$ show is $N_i$, so $c(j) = i$, but this is impossible since $c$ is a coloring of $G_H$ and $X_p \cap X_q \neq \emptyset$. Thus, $r(N_i) \geq 2$. Therefore $\sigma(E) \geq c_1 + 2c_2^j \geq c_1 + c_2^j \geq \chi(G_H)$. Finally, $\rho(E) = t_1 + t_2 + \cdots + t_n$ by equation (2.2), so when $\sigma = \rho$, each $N_i$ must be the direct sum of its maximal restrictions to uniform matroids, so equation (2.5) holds and $\phi(c) = (N_1, N_2, \ldots, N_k)$. \hfill $\square$

**Corollary 2.6.** The hypergraph $H$ can be obtained from the polymatroid $\rho$.

**Proof.** Given a decomposition $\{N_i : i \in [k]\}$ of $\rho$, for each $i \in [k]$, delete the loops of $N_i$; the ground sets of the connected components of these matroids are the hyperedges. \hfill $\square$

Recall that a $(k + 1)$-critical graph has chromatic number $k + 1$ but each deletion of one edge has chromatic number $k$.

**Corollary 2.7.** Assume, in addition to the hypotheses of Theorem 2.3, that property (H1) holds. If the line graph $G_H$ is $(k + 1)$-critical, then $\rho$ is an excluded minor for $D_k$.

**Proof.** Since $\chi(G_H) = k + 1$, Theorem 2.3 gives $\rho \notin D_k$. For $e \in E$, let $G_e$ be the subgraph of $G_H$ obtained by deleting all edges $ij$ with $X_i \cap X_j = \{e\}$. By properties (H1) and (H2), at least one edge of $G_H$ is deleted to get $G_e$. With equation (1.1) and Lemma 2.4, we get $\chi(\rho/e) \leq \chi(G_e)$ and $\chi(\rho/e) \leq \chi(G_e)$, so $\rho/e \in D_k$ and $\rho/e \in D_k$. \hfill $\square$

**Example 1 (continued).** By Corollary 2.7, if $G$ is a $(k + 1)$-critical graph other than the 3-cycle, then each 2-polymatroid that we obtain from it is an excluded minor for $D_k$. Thus, finding all 2-polymatroids that are excluded minors for $D_k$ is at least as hard as finding all $(k + 1)$-critical graphs. The 3-cycle $C_3$ shows the need for property (H3): while $\chi(C_3) = 3$, the set $\{U_1, E, U_2, E\}$ is a decomposition of $\rho_{C_3}$, so $\chi(\rho_{C_3}) = 2$.

The next two examples show, in contrast to the case of graphs, that when $\chi(\rho)$ is finite, the differences $\chi(\rho) - \chi(\rho/e)$ and $\chi(\rho) - \chi(\rho/e)$ can be arbitrarily large. A famous open problem asks: are there finite affine or projective planes of orders that are not powers of primes? Thus, these examples also confirm the difficulty of characterizing $D_k$ by excluded minors.

**Example 2 (continued).** In the example from an affine plane of order $q$, the line graph of the hypergraph $H = (E, E)$ is complete, so $\chi(\rho) = q^2$. For an element (i.e., line) $L \in E$, the hypergraph for $\rho_{\setminus L}$ and $\rho/L$ is $H_L = (E - \{L\}, \{X - \{L\} : X \in E\})$. The $q$ hyperedges of $H$ that contain $L$ give $q$ disjoint hyperedges in $H_L$, so $\rho_{\setminus L}$ and $\rho/L$ are in $D_{q^2 - q + 1}$ by Lemma 2.4. Thus, $\rho$ is an excluded minor for $D_k$ if $q^2 - q < k < q^2$. The extension of this example to rank-3 simple matroids yields more excluded minors for some classes $D_k$.

**Example 3 (continued).** In the example from a projective plane of order $q$, the line graph is complete, so $\chi(\rho) = q^2 + q + 1$. The argument in the previous example, now using the $q + 1$ hyperedges that contain a fixed element (i.e., point) $e$, shows that $\rho_{\setminus e}$ and $\rho/e$ are in $D_{q^2 + 1}$. Thus, $\rho$ is an excluded minor for $D_k$ if $q^2 < k < q^2 + q + 1$. The extension of this example to some rank-3 simple matroids yields more excluded minors for some classes $D_k$ if the line graph (which need not be complete) is critical.
We end this section by exploring some of the polymatroids $\sigma$ that Theorem 2.5 treats. For simplicity we focus on truncations. For a polymatroid $\rho$ on $E$ and nonnegative integer $s$ with $s \leq \rho(E)$, the truncation of $\rho$ to rank $s$ is the polymatroid $T(\rho, s)$ on $E$ that is given by $T(\rho, s)(X) = \min\{\rho(X), s\}$ for $X \subseteq E$. The next corollary of Theorem 2.5 identifies many truncations that are indecomposable.

**Corollary 2.8.** Let the hypergraph $H$ satisfy properties (H2) and (H3). Let $\rho$ be given by equation (2.1) where each $t_i$ is 1. Fix $s$ with $\max\{\rho(A) : A \subseteq E, |A| \leq 4\} \leq s < \rho(E)$. If the truncation $T(\rho, s)$ is $k$-decomposable, then there is a $k$-coloring $c$ of the line graph $G_H$ and $s \geq c_1 + 2c^+$. If $s < \chi(G_H)$, then $T(\rho, s)$ is indecomposable.

We now give examples and results that show that special features of some polymatroids allow one to deduce indecomposability for a wider range of truncations.

In the special case of the Boolean polymatroid $\rho_{C}$ of a simple graph $G = (V, E)$, no component of which is a 3-cycle, routine graph arguments show that, when $4 \leq s \leq |V|$, one can determine the incidence sets of $\rho_{C}$ and deduce that they are parallel classes of the matroids in any decomposition of the truncation $T(\rho, s)$. Thus, if $4 \leq s \leq |V|$, then the conclusions in Corollary 2.8 hold for $T(\rho, s)$, using $G$ in place of $G_H$.

**Example 5.** Let $\rho$ be the truncation to rank 4 of the Boolean polymatroid of the cycle $C_{2t+1}$ on $2t + 1$ edges, where $t \geq 2$. We claim that $\rho$ is an excluded minor for $D_k$ for all $k \geq 2$. For any coloring $c$ of $C_{2t+1}$ with $t \geq 2$, we have (i) $c_1 + c^+_2 \geq 5$, or (ii) $c_1 + c^+_2 = 4$ and $c^+_2 \geq 1$, or (iii) $c_1 + c^+_2 = 3$ and $c^+_2 \geq 2$. Thus, $c_1 + 2c^+_2 \geq 5$, so $\rho \notin D_k$. A single-element contraction of $\rho$ has rank two and has two rank-one elements; it is easy to check that it is in $D_2$. A single-element deletion is the truncation, to rank 4, of the Boolean polymatroid of a path, say with vertices $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{2t+1}$, in order. A decomposition of the deletion has two rank-2 matroids, one with parallel classes (in the notation of Example 1) $X_i$ with $i$ odd, and the other with parallel classes $X_i$ with $i$ even.

The next example treats a truncation of the Boolean polymatroid of a tree with $n$ edges and $n - 1$ leaves. Note that property (H2) fails.

**Example 6.** For a set $E$ with $|E| = n \geq 4$, let $\{A, B, C\}$ be a partition of $E$ with $|C| = 1$. Let the decomposition $\{U_{1,A,C} \oplus U_{0,B}, U_{1,B,C} \oplus U_{0,A}, U_{n-2,A,B} \oplus U_{0,C}\}$ define $\rho$. We claim that $\rho$ is an excluded minor for $D_2$. With equation (1.1), it follows that $\rho_{\sigma}$ and $\rho_{\sigma(e)}$ are in $D_2$ for all $e \in E$. To see that $\rho \notin D_2$, assume instead that $\rho = r_{M_1} + r_{M_2}$. Both $A \cup C$ and $B \cup C$ are incidence sets of $\rho$, and $\rho(\{a, b\}) = \rho(a) + \rho(b)$ for all $a \in A$ and $b \in B$. Thus, Lemma 2.2 implies that $A \cup C$ is a parallel class of one of the matroids, say $M_1$, and $B \cup C$ is a parallel class of $M_2$. Since $\rho(A \cup C) = |A| + 1$; likewise, $r_{M_1}(B \cup C) = |B| + 1$. This gives the contradiction 

$$r(M_1) + r(M_2) \geq |A| + 1 + |B| + 1 > n = \rho(E).$$

Among the many hypergraphs to which the next result applies are those that we obtain from affine planes as in Example 2.

**Theorem 2.9.** Assume that the hypergraph $H = (E, \{X_i : i \in [n]\})$ satisfies property (H2), that $G_H$ is complete, and that whenever $p$ and $q$ are distinct elements of $[n]$, there are elements $a \in X_p$ and $b \in X_q$ for which no $i \in [n]$ has $\{a, b\} \subseteq X_i$. Let $\rho$ be given by equation (2.1) where each $t_i$ is 1. Let $\sigma$ be any polymatroid on $E$ for which $\sigma(A) = \rho(A)$ whenever either (i) $|A| \leq 2$ or (ii) $|A| = 3$ and $A \subseteq X_i$ for some $i \in [n]$. If $\sigma(E) < n$, then $\sigma$ is indecomposable. In particular, the truncation $T(\rho, s)$ is indecomposable if

$$\max\{\rho(A) : |A| \leq 2 \text{ or } A \text{ is a 3-element subset of a hyperedge}\} \leq s < n.$$
Proof. Assume that the multiset $D$ is a decomposition of $\sigma$. Fix $p, q \in [n]$ with $p \neq q$. The hypotheses imply that each of $X_p$ and $X_q$ has at least two elements and is an incidence set of $M$, so, by Lemma 2.2, the elements of $X_p$ are parallel in exactly one matroid $N_i$ in $D$, and those in $X_q$ are parallel in exactly one matroid $N_j$ in $D$. For elements $a \in X_p$ and $b \in X_q$ for which no hyperedge contains $\{a, b\}$, we have $\sigma(\{a, b\}) = \sigma(a) + \sigma(b)$. Since $X_p \cap X_q \neq \emptyset$, part (2) of Lemma 2.2 gives $i \neq j$. Therefore $\sigma(E) \geq n$. However, $\sigma(E) < n$. Thus, $\sigma$ is indecomposable.

We now return to projective planes.

Example 3 (continued). Let $M$ be a projective plane of order $q$ on the set $E$ and let $H$ be the hypergraph $(E, E)$ in Example 3, so $|E| = |E| = q^2 + 1$. Let $\rho$ be given by equation (2.1) where each $t_i$ is 1. Let $\sigma$ be any polymatroid on $E$ for which $\sigma(A) = \rho(A)$ for all $A \subseteq E$ with $|A| \leq 3$. We claim that if $\sigma(E) \leq q^2 + q$, then $\sigma$ is indecomposable. When $q = 2$, each line $L$ has $|L| = 3$ and $\rho(L) = 7$, so, in order to have $\sigma(E) \leq q^2 + q$, we assume that $q > 2$. Let the multiset $D$ of matroids be a decomposition of $\sigma$. For a subset $X$ of a line $L$ of $M$, we have $\rho(X) = 1 + q|X|$. It follows that $L$ is an incidence set of $\sigma$.

By Lemma 2.2, the points in $L$ are in parallel in exactly one matroid in $D$. Any two lines of $M$ intersect in a point, so that $\sigma(E) \leq q^2 + q$, it follows that there are distinct lines $L$ and $L'$ of $M$ for which the points in $L \cup L'$ are parallel in the same matroid $N_i$. For any point $a \in E - (L \cup L')$, some line $L''$ that contains $a$ intersects $L$ and $L'$ in two different points; since the points in $L''$ are parallel in exactly one matroid in $D$, and two points in $L''$ are in $L \cup L'$ and so are parallel in $N_i$, it follows that $a$ is in that parallel class of $N_i$. Thus, $N_i = X_{V_i}^L$. For $A \subseteq E$ with $|A| = 3$, if $r_M(A) = 2$, then $\sigma(A) = 1 + 3q = w(A) - 2$, otherwise $\sigma(A) = 3q = w(A) - 3$. Thus, $A$ is a circuit in some (necessarily unique) matroid in $D$ if and only if $r_M(A) = 3$. Let $L = \{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{q+1}\}$ be a line of $M$. For any $x \in E - L$, the circuits $\{a_1, a_2, x\}, \{a_1, a_3, x\}, \ldots, \{a_1, a_{q+1}, x\}$ are contained in lines $L_2, L_3, \ldots, L_{q+1}$ of matroids $N_{j_2}, N_{j_3}, \ldots, N_{j_{q+1}}$ in $D$. No three points in $L$ are in such a line, so $j_2, j_3, \ldots, j_{q+1}$ are distinct. Since $w(a_1) = q + 1$, these $q$ matroids along with $N_i$ are the only ones in which $a_1$ has positive rank. This applies for any $x \in E - L$, so $L_h = (E - L) \cup \{a_1, a_h\}$ for $2 \leq h \leq q + 1$. Since $q > 2$, the line $L_h$ of $N_{j_h}$ then has subsets $A$ with $|A| = 3$ and $r_M(A) = 2$, which is a contradiction, so $\sigma$ is indecomposable.

3. Chromatic numbers and chromatic polynomials

After noting some basic properties of the chromatic number and chromatic polynomial of a polymatroid, we prove our second main result, Theorem 3.1: the chromatic polynomial of a 2-polymatroid is a rational multiple of the chromatic polynomial of a graph.

Note that $\chi(\rho; x)$ is a polynomial since, when $k$ is a positive integer, $\chi(\rho; k)$ is the following sum of multinomial coefficients, which are polynomials in $k$:

$$\chi(\rho; k) = \sum_{i=\chi(\rho)}^{\rho(E)} \sum_{\{M_r : x \in [i]\}} \binom{k}{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_h, k-i},$$

where the inner sum is over all decompositions of $\rho$ with $i$ matroids, all of positive rank, and $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \cdots \geq a_h$ are the multiplicities of the distinct matroids in the decomposition. If $\rho$ is indecomposable, then the sum is empty. If $k < \chi(\rho) < \infty$, then the multinomial coefficients are zero. The degree of $\chi(\rho; x)$ is the largest number of matroids of positive rank in a decomposition of $\rho$. If $\rho$ is the Boolean polymatroid of a graph $G$ with no isolated vertices, then the degree of $\chi(\rho; x)$ is the number of vertices of $G$. 

The direct sum $\rho_1 \oplus \rho_2$ of polymatroids $\rho_1$ and $\rho_2$ on disjoint sets $E_1$ and $E_2$ is defined by extending the definition for matroids: specifically, for $X \subseteq E_1 \cup E_2$,

$$(\rho_1 \oplus \rho_2)(X) = \rho_1(X \cap E_1) + \rho_2(X \cap E_2).$$

Polymatroids that are not direct sums of other polymatroids are connected. It follows that if $\rho = r_{M_1} + r_{M_2} + \cdots + r_{M_k}$, then $\rho$ is disconnected if and only if there is a set $X$ with $\emptyset \subseteq X \subseteq E$ so that $M_i = M_i|X \oplus M_i|(E - X)$ for all $i \in [k]$. It is easy to see that

$$\chi(\rho_1 \oplus \rho_2) = \max\{\chi(\rho_1), \chi(\rho_2)\}$$

and

$$\chi(\rho_1 \oplus \rho_2; x) = \chi(\rho_1; x) \cdot \chi(\rho_2; x).$$

By equations (1.1), if $\rho'$ is a minor of $\rho$, then $\chi(\rho') \leq \chi(\rho)$. (In contrast, for a graph, such as an even cycle, we can have $\chi(G/e) > \chi(G).$

**Example 7.** Unlike the chromatic polynomial of a graph, $\chi(\rho; x)$ need not be monic. This follows from an attractive observation in [7, Section 3]. Let $M$ be a paving matroid on $E$ with at least two hyperplanes that are cyclic (that is, unions of circuits). Let $\rho$ be given by the decomposition $\{M, U_{r,E}\}$. No proper, nonempty cyclic flat of $M$ contains another, so we can relax any subset of these flats, thereby turning all $r$-subsets of the cyclic hyperplanes that we relax into bases. If we partition the set of cyclic hyperplanes of $M$ into two sets $\{X_1, X_2\}$ (allowing one to be empty), then the corresponding set $\{M_1, M_2\}$ of relaxations of $M$ is a decomposition of $\rho$. If $M$ has $s$ cyclic hyperplanes, then there are $2^{s-1}$ such decompositions $\{M_1, M_2\}$; furthermore, they are all of the decompositions of $\rho$ using matroids of positive rank. Thus, $\chi(\rho; x) = 2^{s-1}x(x-1)$, which is not monic. (This idea can be adapted to any matroid whose proper, nonempty cyclic flats are incomparable.)

The coefficients of $\chi(\rho; x)$ might not be integers. For example, if $M$ is a connected matroid on $E$, then the decompositions of $\rho = r_M + r_M$ are $\{M, M, U_{0,E}, \ldots, U_{0,E}\}$, so $\chi(\rho; x) = x(x-1)/2$.

The next example shows that $\chi(\rho; x)$ need not be a scalar multiple of the chromatic polynomial of a graph.

**Example 8.** Let $\rho$ be the 3-polymatroid on $E = \{a, b, c, d\}$ in which each element has rank three, each pair of elements has rank five, and each set of three or four elements has rank six. In any decomposition of $\rho$, each element has rank one in three matroids, each pair of elements is parallel in one matroid, and no matroid has a coloop. We now determine all decompositions of $\rho$ using matroids of positive rank.

First assume that one of the matroids is $U_{1,E}$. The other matroids in the decomposition have no coloops and no parallel elements, and their ranks, which all exceed one, add to five, so they are $U_{2,E}$ and $U_{3,E}$. There is just one such decomposition of $\rho$.

Now assume that the largest parallel class in any of the matroids has three elements. One of the four options is $\{a, b, c\}$, in which case $\{a, d\}$, $\{b, d\}$, and $\{c, d\}$ are parallel classes in three different matroids. Also, each of $a$, $b$, and $c$ is a non-loop and non-coloop in one more matroid, so the remaining matroid must be $U_{2,\{a,b,c\}} \oplus U_{0,\{d\}}$. There are four such decompositions of $\rho$, each with five different matroids of positive rank.

If all parallel classes have size two, then each matroid in the decomposition of $\rho$ is $U_{1,X} \oplus U_{0,E-X}$ or $U_{1,X} \oplus U_{1,E-X}$ for some $X \subseteq E$ with $|X| = 2$. This accounts for

- one decomposition with six matroids of positive rank,
- three decomposition with five matroids of positive rank,
- three decomposition with four matroids of positive rank, and
- one decomposition with three matroids of positive rank.
Thus, letting \((x)_i = x(x-1) \cdots (x-i+1)\), we have
\[
\chi(\rho; k) = (x)_a + 7(x)_5 + 3(x)_4 + 2(x)_3 \\
= x^6 - 8x^5 + 18x^4 - 4x^3 - 49x^2 + 34x.
\]

This is not the chromatic polynomial of any graph.

The next result, which stands in contrast to Example 8, supports the observation that 2-polymatroids have more in common with graphs than do \(k\)-polymatroids for \(k > 2\).

**Theorem 3.1.** If \(\rho\) is a 2-polymatroid, then \(\chi(\rho; x) = s \cdot \chi(G; x)\) for some graph \(G\) and rational number \(s\).

The paper of Lemos [7] provides many tools that we use in the proof, so we start by outlining his results and explaining how they give Theorem 3.1 for many 2-polymatroids. This reduces the proof to treating 2-polymatroids with very special decompositions, which we address in Lemma 3.6, with the aid of results of Lemos [6] and Lemos and Mota [8].

If \(\rho\) is not decomposable, then Theorem 3.1 holds with \(s = 0\), so we may assume that \(\rho\) is decomposable. By equation (3.2), we may assume that \(\rho\) is connected.

Lemos [7] defines two decompositions of a 2-polymatroid to be *equivalent* if one can be obtained from the other by applying a sequence of the following operations or their inverses:

1. remove a matroid of rank zero and
2. replace a disconnected matroid \(M \oplus N\) by \(M \oplus U_{0,E(M)} \oplus N \oplus U_{0,E(N)}\).

Assume, first, that all decompositions of \(\rho\) are equivalent. Let \(D = \{M_i : i \in [n]\}\) be the unique decomposition of \(\rho\) so that, for all \(i \in [n]\), exactly one connected component \(A_i\) of \(M_i\) has positive rank. Let \(G\) be the graph on the vertex set \([n]\) in which \(ij\) is an edge if \(i \neq j\) and \(A_i \cap A_j \neq \emptyset\). We can replace \(M_{i_1}, M_{i_2}, \ldots, M_{i_t}\) by a direct sum that reverses operation (2) above if and only if the vertex set \(\{i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_t\}\) is independent in \(G\). Therefore, if \(m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_h\) are the multiplicities of the distinct matroids in \(D\), then
\[
\chi(\rho; x) = \frac{\chi(G; x)}{m_1! m_2! \cdots m_h!}.
\]

Now assume that \(\rho\) has inequivalent decompositions. As defined by Lemos [7], a pair \(\{(M_i : i \in [k]), \{N_j : j \in [h]\}\}\) of decompositions of \(\rho\) on \(E\) is *preserving* if for all \(X \subseteq E\) with \(|X| > 1\), there are as many integers \(i \in [k]\) for which \(X\) is a circuit of \(M_i\) as integers \(j \in [h]\) for which \(X\) is a circuit of \(N_j\); otherwise the (necessarily inequivalent) decompositions are *non-preserving*. The Boolean 2-polymatroid of the 3-cycle \(C_3\) on the edge set \(E\) has the non-preserving pair \(\{(U_{1,E}, U_{2,E}), \{U_{1,E-i} \oplus U_{0,i} : i \in E\}\}\). Theorem 1 of [7], stated next as Theorem 3.2, shows that, when combined with 2-sums, this accounts for all non-preserving pairs of decompositions of connected 2-polymatroids. (Here, 2-sums with \(U_{1,2}\) just relabel points, so Theorem 3.2 includes \(\rho_{C_3}\).)

**Theorem 3.2.** Let \(\rho\) be a connected 2-polymatroid on \(E\). Fix a set \(A = \{a, b, c\}\) with \(A \cap E = \emptyset\). A pair of decompositions of \(\rho\) is non-preserving if and only if, for some partition \(\{E_a, E_b, E_c\}\) of \(E\) and connected matroids \(P_a, P_b, P_c\) with \(E(P_i) = E_i \cup i\) for each \(i \in A\), the decompositions are \(\{U_{1,A} \oplus 2 P_a, \ldots, P_c, \ U_{2,A} \oplus 2 P_a \oplus 2 P_b \oplus 2 P_c\}\) and \(\{(U_{1,\{i,j\}} \oplus 2 P_i, \ldots, P_j) \oplus U_{0,A-\{i,j\}} : \{i, j\} \subseteq A\}\).

It follows that if \(\rho\) has a pair of non-preserving decompositions, then, up to adjoining rank-0 matroids, the decompositions of \(\rho\) are those given above, and so
\[
\chi(\rho; x) = x(x-1)(x-2) + x(x-1) = x(x-1)^2,
\]
which is the chromatic polynomial of a path on three vertices.

We now focus on connected 2-polymatroids that have inequivalent decompositions but all pairs of decompositions are preserving. Theorem 2 of [7], stated next as Theorem 3.3, treats such 2-polymatroids.

**Theorem 3.3.** If \( \rho \) has inequivalent preserving decompositions, then each decomposition of \( \rho \) is equivalent to one that contains exactly two matroids.

Corollary 1 of [7], stated next as Theorem 3.4, further limits the options.

**Theorem 3.4.** If a connected 2-polymatroid \( \rho \) has a decomposition in which at least four matroids have positive rank, then all decompositions of \( \rho \) are equivalent.

As shown above, in this case the conclusion of Theorem 3.1 holds. Two cases remain: \( \rho \) has inequivalent decompositions and either

1. all decompositions have exactly two matroids of positive rank, or
2. some decomposition has a connected matroid and one with exactly two connected components.

Option (1) was illustrated in Example 7. As in that example, the chromatic polynomial of \( \rho \) is a rational multiple of the chromatic polynomial \( x(x-1) \) of the complete graph \( K_2 \).

We turn to option (2). In [6, (2.12)], Lemos proves that when option (2) applies, only one decomposition of \( \rho \) has a disconnected matroid. Building on results in [8], below we complete the proof of Theorem 3.1 by analyzing how many decompositions such a connected 2-polymatroid has.

By [8, Lemma 2.3], if \( M_1, M_2, N_1, N_2 \) are matroids on \( E \) with \( r_{M_1} + r_{M_2} = r_{N_1} + r_{N_2} \) and this polymatroid is connected, then \( \{r_{M_1}(A), r_{M_2}(A)\} = \{r_{N_1}(A), r_{N_2}(A)\} \) for each subset \( A \) of \( E \). Thus, if \( M_1 \neq M_2 \), then \( N_1 \neq N_2 \). Also, given \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \), one can find all pairs of matroids \( N_1 \) and \( N_2 \) for which \( r_{M_1} + r_{M_2} = r_{N_1} + r_{N_2} \) by “mixing” in the sense that there is a subset \( \mathcal{R} \) of \( 2^E \) for which, for \( i \in [2] \),

\[
(3.3) \quad r_{N_i}(A) = \begin{cases} 
  r_{M_i}(A) & \text{if } A \in \mathcal{R}, \\
  r_{M_{i-1}}(A) & \text{if } A \notin \mathcal{R}.
\end{cases}
\]

This leads to the mixing graph \( G_{M_1, M_2} \) of \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) that is defined in [8, Section 3]: its vertex set is \( \mathcal{X} = \{A \subseteq E : r_{M_1}(A) \neq r_{M_2}(A)\} \), and \( AB \) is an edge of \( G_{M_1, M_2} \) if and only if either

(i) \( A \subseteq B \) or \( B \subseteq A \), or
(ii) \( A \cap B \notin \mathcal{X}, A \cup B \notin \mathcal{X}, \) and \( |A \Delta B| = 2 \).

Let \( \mathcal{R} \) be any union of the vertex sets of connected components of \( G_{M_1, M_2} \), and define \( N_1 \) and \( N_2 \) by equation (3.3). Lemos and Mota [8, Lemma 3.1] show that \( r_{N_1} \) and \( r_{N_2} \) are the rank functions of matroids. By construction, \( r_{M_1} + r_{M_2} = r_{N_1} + r_{N_2} \). In [8, Theorem 4.1], they show all matroids \( N_1 \) and \( N_2 \) with \( r_{M_1} + r_{M_2} = r_{N_1} + r_{N_2} \) are obtained in this way. Note that \( \mathcal{X} - \mathcal{R} \) gives the same decomposition as \( \mathcal{R} \), but \( N_1 \) and \( N_2 \) are switched.

To address option (2), we prove in Lemma 3.6 below that if \( M_1 \) is connected and \( M_2 \) has two connected components, \( P \) and \( Q \), then the graph \( G_{M_1, M_2} \) has at most two components. Since \( \rho \) has inequivalent decompositions, \( G_{M_1, M_2} \) has two components. That completes the proof of Theorem 3.1 since then \( \rho \) has just two inequivalent decompositions: if \( \mathcal{R} \) is \( \emptyset \) or \( \mathcal{X} \), equation (3.3) gives \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \), otherwise it gives two connected matroids, \( N_1 \) and \( N_2 \). Thus, the decompositions of \( \rho \) into matroids of positive rank are \( \{M_1, M_2\} \), \( \{M_1, (M_2|P) \oplus U_0, Q, (M_2|Q) \oplus U_0, P\} \), and \( \{N_1, N_2\} \), so

\[
\chi(\rho; x) = 2x(x-1) + x(x-1)(x-2) = x^2(x-1),
\]
Either

\[ V_i = \{ Z \in \mathcal{X} : r_1(Z) > r_2(Z) \} \quad \text{and} \quad V_2 = \{ Z \in \mathcal{X} : r_2(Z) > r_1(Z) \}. \]

Either \( V_1 \) or \( V_2 \) must contain vertices from different components of \( G \). Take \( X, Y \in \mathcal{X} \) that are in different components of \( G \) but in the same set \( V_i \), for some \( i \in [2] \), and so that \( |X \triangle Y|, |X|, \) and \( |Y| \) are minimized, in that order.

Extend a basis of \( M_i \) to bases \( B_X \) of \( M_i \) and \( B_Y \) of \( M_i \). Then \( B_X, B_Y \in V_i \). By minimality, \( X = B_X \) and \( Y = B_Y \). For \( y \in Y - X \), since \([X \cup y] \triangle Y < |X \triangle Y|\), minimality gives \( X \cup y \notin V_i \). Thus, for all \( y \in Y - X \),

\[ r_i(X) = r_i(X \cup y) = r_{3-i}(X \cup y) = r_{3-i}(X) + 1. \]

Thus, \( X \) is a basis of \( M_i \) and a flat of \( M_{3-i} \). The same holds for \( Y \). Now \( r_{3-i}(X \cup Y) = r_i(X \cup Y) \) since \( X \cup Y \) is a path in \( G \), so \( X \) and \( Y \) are hyperplanes of \( M_{3-i} \). Thus, each of \( M_{3-i} \) contains exactly one circuit, say \( C_X \) and \( C_Y \), respectively. If \( x \in X - (C_X \cup C_Y) \), then \( X - x \) and \( Y - x \) would both be in \( V_i \) and \( |X - x \triangle (Y - x)| \leq |X \triangle Y| \), contrary to the minimality of \( |X \triangle Y| \) or \( |X| \). Thus, \( X \subseteq C_X \cup C_Y \), and by symmetry, \( X \cup Y \subseteq C_X \cup C_Y \). We summarize this information in the following sublemma.

3.6.1. The following assertions hold:

(1) \( X \) and \( Y \) are bases of \( M_i \) and \( M_{3-i} \).

(2) \( X \) and \( Y \) are hyperplanes of \( M_{3-i} \).

(3) \( C_X \) and \( C_Y \) are the unique circuits of \( M_{3-i} \) and \( M_{3-i} \), respectively.

(4) \( X \cup Y = C_X \cup C_Y \), so \( X - Y \subseteq C_X \) and \( Y - X \subseteq C_Y \).

Now \( X \cup Y \) is not a path in \( G \), so \( E \notin \mathcal{X} \), and so \( r_1(E) = r_2(E) \). Therefore,

\[ r_2(P) + r_2(Q) = r_2(E) = r_1(E) < r_1(P) + r_1(Q). \]

Thus, either \( P \) or \( Q \) is in \( V_i \). By symmetry, we may assume that \( P \in V_1 \). Next we show that \( i = 1 \).

3.6.2. \( i = 2 \). Let \( X_P = X \cap P \), and likewise for \( X_Q, Y_P, \) and \( Y_Q \).

Since \( M_2 = M_2 \cup M_2 \), by 3.6.1(1) both \( X_P \) and \( Y_P \) are bases of \( M_2 \), as are \( X_Q \) and \( Y_Q \) for \( M_2 \). Thus, \( |X| = |Y|, |X_P| = |Y_P|, \) and \( |X_Q| = |Y_Q| \). Therefore \( |X_R - Y_R| = |Y_R - X_R| \) for \( R = P \) and \( R = Q \). Thus, since \( X \neq Y \), for either...
There are elements \( x_R \in X_R - Y_R \) and \( y_R \in Y_R - X_R \). Since \( X_R \) and \( Y_R \) are bases of \( M_2 \), both \( X_R \cup y_R \) and \( Y_R \cup x_R \) are dependent in \( M_2 \).

If \( X_R \) and \( Y_R \) were independent in \( M_1 \), then \( X_R \cup y_R \) and \( Y_R \cup x_R \) would be independent in \( M_1 \) by 3.6.1(2). Then \( X_R \cup y_R \) and \( Y_R \cup x_R \) would be in \( V_1 \), but this contradicts minimality. Thus, either \( C_X \subseteq X_R \) or \( C_Y \subseteq Y_R \) by 3.6.1(3). By symmetry, we may assume that \( C_X \subseteq X_R \). Then \( X - Y \subseteq C_X \subseteq X_R - Y_R \), so \( X - Y = X_R - Y_R \). Thus \( |Y_R - X_R| = |X_R - Y_R| = |X - Y| = |Y - X| \), so \( X \triangle Y = X_R \triangle Y_R \).

We claim that \( Y_R \) is dependent in \( M_1 \). Suppose instead that \( Y_R \) is independent in \( M_1 \), so \( Y_R \cup x_R \in V_1 \). If \( R = P \), then the set \( X_Q = Y_Q \) is not empty since \( X \cup P \neq Y \). Let \( \mathcal{F} \) be a minimum-sized set \( \forall Y \setminus X \in P \). If \( P \in \mathcal{F} \), then since \( M_2 = M_2 \cup \mathcal{P} \) and hence \( M_2 \cup \mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{Q} \) are bases of \( M_2 \cup \mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{Q} \) and \( P \cup \mathcal{Q} \) and \( \mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{Q} \) are dependent in \( M_2 \), this gives the contradiction that \( x \in X \cup \mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{Q} \) is independent in \( G \). Thus \( P \notin \mathcal{F} \). Now \( \mathcal{P} \) is independent in \( M_2 \), as well as in \( M_1 \) since \( C_X \subseteq X \). Thus, by minimality, \( \mathcal{P} \) is independent in \( M_1 \) and contains a unique circuit of \( M_2 \), and that circuit contains \( P' - P \). Thus, for any element \( p \in P' - P \), both \( P' - p \) and \( P' - p \cup Y_Q \) are dependent in \( M_2 \). Also, \( P' - p \cup X_Q \) and \( P' - p \cup Y_Q \) and \( P' - p \cup X \) and \( P' - p \cup Y \) contain \( X \) and \( Y \), respectively, and so are dependent in \( M_1 \); thus, these sets are in \( V_2 \).

Furthermore, \( r_1(P' \cup X_Q) = r_1((P' \cup X_Q) - x_Q) \) since \( x_Q \in M_2 \), but \( r_2(P' \cup X_Q) > r_2((P' \cup X_Q) - x_Q) \). Hence either \( P' \cup X_Q \) or \( P' \cup X_Q - x_Q \) is in \( \mathcal{F} \). Likewise, either \( P' \cup Y_Q \) or \( P' \cup Y_Q - y_Q \) is in \( \mathcal{F} \). Thus, one of the following is a path in \( G \) by Lemma 3.5.

\[
\begin{align*}
&X((P' - p) \cup X_Q)P'((P' \cup X_Q) - x_Q)P'((P' \cup Y_Q) - y_Q)P'((P' - p) \cup Y_Q)Y \\
&X((P' - p) \cup X_Q)(P' \cup X_Q)P'((P' \cup Y_Q) - y_Q)(P' \cup Y_Q)Y \\
&X((P' - p) \cup X_Q)(P' \cup X_Q) - x_Q)P'((P' \cup Y_Q) - y_Q)P'((P' - p) \cup Y_Q)Y \\
&X((P' - p) \cup X_Q) - x_Q)P'((P' \cup Y_Q) - y_Q)(P' \cup Y_Q)Y
\end{align*}
\]

This contradiction proves that \( Y_R \) is dependent in \( M_1 \).

Thus, \( C_Y \subseteq Y_R \). Since \( C_X \subseteq X_R \), we have \( X \cup Y = C_X \cup C_Y \subseteq X_R \cup Y_R \), so \( X = X_R \) and \( Y = Y_R \). Now \( X \cup P \) is not a path in \( G \), so \( R \neq P \). Thus, \( X = X_Q \) and \( Y = Y_Q \), so \( X \cup Y \subseteq Q \).

We claim that \( G \) has an \( X \cup P \)-path. Since \( P \in \mathcal{P} \), some subset \( P' \) of \( P \) is independent in \( M_1 \) and is a circuit of \( M_2 \). If \( P' \cup X \in \mathcal{F} \), then \( P' \cup X \cup X \) is a path in \( G \), as claimed, so assume that \( P' \cup X \notin \mathcal{F} \). Since \( P' \) and \( X \) are subsets of different components of \( M_2 \), and \( X \) is independent in \( M_2 \), the only circuit of \( M_2 \) is \( P' \). Thus, since \( P' \cup X \notin \mathcal{F} \),

\[
r_1(P' \cup X) = r_2(P' \cup X) = |P'| + |X| - 1.
\]

It follows that \( P' \cup X \) contains exactly one circuit of \( M_1 \), that is \( C_X \) since \( C_X \subseteq X \). Thus, if \( p \in P' \), then

\[
r_1((P' - p) \cup X) < r_1(P' \cup X) = r_2(P' \cup X) = r_2((P' - p) \cup X),
\]

and if \( x \in C_X \), then

\[
r_1(P' \cup (X - x)) = r_1(P' \cup X) = r_2(P' \cup X) > r_2(P' \cup (X - x)).
\]
Thus, $PP'(P' \cup (X - x))(P' - p) \cup X$ is a path in $G$ by Lemma 3.5, as desired. By symmetry, $G$ has a $Y, P$-path. This contradiction to $X$ and $Y$ being in different components of $G$ completes the proof of 3.6.2.

3.6.3. We have $X \cup Y \not\subseteq P$ and $X \cup Y \not\subseteq Q$.

Indeed, $X \cup Y \not\subseteq P$ since $XPY$ is not a path in $G$. Also, $X(X \cup Y \cup P)Y$ is not a path in $G$, so $X \cup Y \cup P \notin \mathcal{X}$. Hence $r_1(X \cup Y \cup P) = r_2(X \cup Y \cup P)$. Conclusion 3.6.1(1) gives $r_1(X) = r_1(Y) = r_1(X \cup Y)$, while $r_2(X) = r_2(Y) = r_2(X \cup Y) - 1$ by 3.6.1(2). If $X \cup Y$ were contained in the component $Q$ of $M_2$, then we would have

$r_2(X \cup P) = r_2(Y \cup P) \leq r_2(X \cup Y \cup P) = r_1(X \cup Y \cup P) = r_1(X \cup P) = r_1(Y \cup P)$,

so $X \cup P, Y \cup P \in \mathcal{X}$, and $X(X \cup P)P(Y \cup P)Y$ would be a path in $G$; this contradiction completes the proof of 3.6.3.

By 3.6.1(2), the sets $X - Y$ and $Y - X$ are cocircuits of $M_2|X \cup Y$, so each is a subset of either $P$ or $Q$. Thus, $X_R - Y_R = \emptyset$ and $Y_S - X_S = \emptyset$ for some $R, S \in \{P, Q\}$. We claim that $R \neq S$. Suppose not, so $X_R = Y_R$. Submodularity gives

$$r_1(X_P) + r_1(X_Q) \geq r_1(X) > r_2(X) = r_2(X_P) + r_2(X_Q)$$

and, similarly, $r_1(Y_P) + r_1(Y_Q) > r_2(Y_P) + r_2(Y_Q)$. If $R = P$, then $X_P \notin \mathcal{X}$ since $XX_PY$ is not a path in $G$, and so inequality (3.4) gives $X_Q \in V_1$; similarly, $Y_Q \in V_1$. Likewise, if $R = Q$, then $X_P \in V_1$ and $Y_P \in V_1$. By 3.6.3, both options contradict minimality, so, as claimed, $R \neq S$.

The order in the minimality assumption is the only asymmetry between $X$ and $Y$. That plays no role below, so, of the two ways to have $R \neq S$, we may assume that

3.6.4. $Y_P \subseteq X_P$ and $X_Q \subseteq Y_Q$. Thus, $X_P = C_X$ and $Y_Q = C_Y$ by 3.6.1(4).

Since $G$ has at least three components, take $W \in \mathcal{X}$ so that $G$ has no $X, W$-path and no $Y, W$-path, and $|Y \triangle W|$ and $|W|$ are minimized, in that order. Then $W \in V_j$ for some $j \in [2]$. Since $Y(Y \cap W)W$ is not a path, $Y \cap W \notin \mathcal{X}$. Likewise, $Y \cap W \notin \mathcal{X}$. Since $Y \cap W$ is independent in $M_1$, it is also independent in $M_2$. The minimality assumption now implies that $W$ is independent in $M_1$ and has nullity one in $M_{3-j}$. Also, $W - Y$ is a subset of the unique circuit $C_W$ of $M_{3-j}|W$. By the minimality of $|Y \triangle W|$, if $y \in Y - W$, then $W \cup y \notin \mathcal{X}$, so $r_y(W) = r_y(W \cup y) = r_{3-j}(W \cup y) = r_{3-j}(W) + 1$. Hence $W$ is a basis of $M_j|W \cup Y$ and, since $Y \cup W \notin \mathcal{X}$, a hyperplane of $M_{3-j}|W \cup Y$.

We show that

3.6.5. $Y \triangle W \subseteq Q$.

First note that $C_Y \not\subseteq Y \cap W$ since $C_Y$ is a circuit of $M_2$ while $Y \cap W$ is independent. Thus, $C_Y \cap (Y \cap W) \neq \emptyset$, so $Q \cap (Y \cap W) \neq \emptyset$ by 3.6.4.

Assume that $j = 1$. The circuit $C_W$ is then a subset of $P$ or $Q$. Now $WC_W PC_X X$ is not a path in $G$, so $C_W \not\subseteq P$. Thus, $W - Y \subseteq C_W \subseteq Q$. The cocircuit $Y - W$ of $M_2|Y \cup W$ is a subset of $P$ or $Q$. Since $Q \cap (Y - W) \neq \emptyset$, we get $Y \triangle W \subseteq Q$.

Now take $j = 2$. Fix $y \in Y - W$. Since $W$ is a basis of $M_2|W \cup Y$, the set $W \cup y$ contains a unique circuit $C_y$ of $M_2$. Now $W$ is a hyperplane of $M_1|W \cup Y$ and $C_W$ is the unique circuit of $M_1|W \cup y$. If there were an element $w$ in $(W - Y) - C_y$, then $(W - w) \cup y$ would contain the circuit $C_y$ of $M_2$, but contain no circuit of $M_1$ since $W - Y \subseteq C_W$, so $(W - w) \cup y \in V_1$. This contradicts the minimality of $|Y \triangle W|$ since there would be a path from $(W - w) \cup y$ to $W$ by Lemma 3.5. Thus, $(W - Y) \cup y \subseteq C_y$. The circuit $C_y$ of $M_2$ is a subset of either $P$ or $Q$, and so $(W - Y) \cup y$
is a subset of either $P$ or $Q$. This holds for all $y \in Y - W$, so $(W - Y) \cup (Y - W)$ is a subset of either $P$ or $Q$. Now 3.6.5 follows since $(Y - W) \cap Q \neq \emptyset$.

Now $Y \triangle W \subseteq Q$ by 3.6.5, so $(Y \cup W) \cap P = Y_P$. Now $X_P \not\subseteq \text{cl}_2(Y_P)$ by 3.6.1(2) and 3.6.4. Thus, $X_P \not\subseteq \text{cl}_2((Y \cup W) \cap P)$, and so $X_P \not\subseteq \text{cl}_2(Y \cup W)$ since $P$ is a component of $M_2$.

Finally, $X_P \subseteq \text{cl}_1(Y)$ by 3.6.1(1). Now $Y \cup W \cup X_P \notin \mathcal{X}$ since $Y(Y \cup W \cup X_P)W$ is not a path in $G$. We now get $Y \cup W \in \mathcal{X}$ since, using $X_P \not\subseteq \text{cl}_2(Y \cup W)$, we have $r_2(Y \cup W) < r_2(Y \cup W \cup X_P) = r_1(Y \cup W \cup X_P) = r_1(Y \cup W)$.

Thus, $Y(Y \cup W)W$ is a path in $G$. This contradiction completes the proof. \hfill $\Box$

4. Duals and Chromatic Numbers

The $i$-dual of an $i$-polymatroid $\rho$ on $E$ is the $i$-polymatroid $\rho^*$ on $E$ that is given by

\begin{equation}
\rho^*(X) = i|X| - \rho(E) + \rho(E - X)
\end{equation}

for $X \subseteq E$. In this section, we show that under certain conditions, an $i$-polymatroid and its $i$-dual have the same chromatic number or the same chromatic polynomial.

Before treating the basic result in this section, Theorem 4.1, we note that if $i = 1$, then $\rho$ is a matroid and equation (4.1) gives the dual matroid. It is easy to check that $(\rho^*)^* = \rho$, and that $(\rho_A)^* = (\rho^*)_A$ and $(\rho_A)^* = (\rho^*)_A$. The $i$-dual depends on $i$. That is relevant since an $i$-polymatroid is a $j$-polymatroid for each $j \geq i$ and so has a $j$-dual. The $i$-dual $\rho^*$ and $j$-dual $\rho^*$ are related by $\rho^*(X) = \rho^*(X + (j - i)|X|$ for all $X \subseteq E$.

**Theorem 4.1.** Let $\rho^*$ be the $i$-dual of an $i$-polymatroid $\rho$ on $E$. If $\{M_s : s \in [i]\}$ is a decomposition of $\rho$, then $\{M^*_s : s \in [i]\}$ is a decomposition of $\rho^*$. More generally, if $k \geq i$ and $\{M_s : s \in [k]\}$ is a decomposition of $\rho$, then $\rho^*$ has a decomposition $\{M^*_s : s \in [k]\}$ where, for all $s \in [k]$, deleting the loops and coloops from $M^*_s$ gives the dual of $M_s$ with its loops and coloops deleted. Thus, if $\min(\chi(\rho), \chi(\rho^*)) \geq i$, then $\chi(\rho^*) = \chi(\rho^*)$.

**Proof.** Since $\rho(e) \leq i$ for all $e \in E$, there are at most $i$ integers $s \in [k]$ with $r_{M_s}(e) = 1$. Thus, since $k \geq i$, there are subsets $E_1, E_2, \ldots, E_k$ of $E$ such that (i) if $r_{M_s}(e) = 1$, then $e \in E_s$, and (ii) each element of $E$ is in exactly $i$ of the sets $E_1, E_2, \ldots, E_k$. For $X \subseteq E$,

\[
\rho^*(X) = i|X| - \rho(E) + \rho(E - X)
\]

\[
= \sum_{s=1}^{k} |E_s \cap X| - \sum_{s=1}^{k} r_{M_s}(E_s) + \sum_{s=1}^{k} r_{M_s}(E_s) - (X \cap E_s))
\]

\[
= \sum_{s=1}^{k} \left(|E_s \cap X| - r_{M_s}(E_s) + r_{M_s}(E_s) - (X \cap E_s))\right).
\]

The summand in the last line is the rank of $E_s \cap X$ in the dual of the restriction $M_s|E_s$, which is the rank of $X$ in the direct sum, $(M_s|E_s)^* \oplus U_{0, E - E_s}$. This gives the claimed decomposition of $\rho^*$. If $k = i$, then $E_i = E$ for all $s \in [i]$, so $M^*_i = M^*_i$. Finally, when $\min(\chi(\rho), \chi(\rho^*)) \geq i$, what we proved applies to all decompositions of $\rho$ and $\rho^*$, so, since $(\rho^*)^* = \rho$, the last assertion follows. \hfill $\Box$
By Theorem 4.1, if \( i \leq j \leq k \) and an \( i \)-polymatroid is in \( D_k \), then its \( j \)-dual is in \( D_k \).

Corollary 4.2. For \( i \leq k \), if \( \rho \) is an \( i \)-polymatroid that is an excluded-minor for \( D_k \), then, for each \( j \) with \( i \leq j \leq k \), the \( j \)-dual of \( \rho \) is also an excluded-minor for \( D_k \), as is the \( j \)-polymatroid \( \rho^j \) that is given by \( \rho^j(X) = \rho(X) + (j - i)|X| \).

The second conclusion uses the first, applied to \( \rho^* \), and the remarks before Theorem 4.1. Thus, many excluded minors that we identify yield families of excluded minors.

Corollary 4.3. Let \( \rho^* \) be the \( i \)-dual of an \( i \)-polymatroid \( \rho \) on \( E \). Assume that for all \( e \in E \),

1. \( \rho(E - e) = \rho(E) \); equivalently, \( \rho^*(e) = i \), and
2. \( \rho^*(E - e) = \rho^*(E) \); equivalently, \( \rho(e) = i \).

There is a bijection \( \phi : \Delta^k_{\rho^*} \to \Delta^k_{\rho} \), namely, \( \phi((M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_k)) = (M'_1, M'_2, \ldots, M'_k) \) where, letting \( L_s \) be the set of loops of \( M_s \), we have \( M'_s = (M_s \setminus L_s)^* \oplus U_{0,L_s} \). Thus, \( \chi(\rho; x) = \chi(\rho^*; x) \).

Proof. By the assumptions, \( \min(\chi(\rho), \chi(\rho^*)) \geq i \). The result now follows from Theorem 4.1 and its proof.

Example 1 (continued). The 2-dual of the Boolean polymatroid \( \rho \) of a graph \( G = (V, E) \) with no isolated vertices is given by

\[
\rho^*(A) = 2|A| - \rho(E) + \rho(E - A) = 2|A| - (|V| - \rho(E - A)),
\]

for \( A \subseteq E \). The difference \( |V| - \rho(E - A) \) is the number of vertices that are incident only with edges in \( A \). This comes under the construction in Section 2 if \( G \) has no loops and all vertices of \( G \) have degree at least two: for the set \( X_i \) of edges that are incident with vertex \( v_i \) of \( G \), take \( t_i = |X_i| - 1 \). The sum in equation (2.2) is then

\[
\sum_{i=1}^n \min\{|A \cap X_i|, |X_i| - 1\},
\]

and each term is \( |A \cap X_i| \) unless all edges incident with \( v_i \) are in \( A \), in which case the term is reduced by 1. Thus, the sum is \( 2|A| - (|V| - \rho(E - A)) \) since each edge is in two sets \( X_i \). The equality \( \rho(E - e) = \rho(E) \) in condition (1) of Corollary 4.3 holds when neither endvertex of \( e \) has degree 1; the equality \( \rho(e) = 2 \) in condition (2) excludes loops. Thus, Corollary 4.3 applies to Boolean polymatroids of graphs that have no loops and no vertices of degree less than two.

5. \( k \)-quotient polymatroids

In this section, we consider \( k \)-quotient polymatroids, that is, polymatroids of the form \( \rho = r_{M_1} + r_{M_2} + \cdots + r_{M_k} \) where \( k \geq 2 \) and each \( M_{i+1} \), for \( i \in [k - 1] \), is a quotient (perhaps equal to) \( M_i \). We start by recalling the background on quotients that we need.

For matroids \( Q \) and \( L \) on a set \( E \), the matroid \( Q \) is a quotient of \( L \), or \( L \) is a lift of \( Q \), if there is some matroid \( M \) and set \( A \subseteq E \) such that \( L = M \setminus A \) and \( Q = M/A \). It follows from the definition and from properties of minors that if \( Q \) is a quotient of \( L \) and if \( X \) is a subset of their common ground set, then \( Q \setminus X \) is a quotient of \( L \setminus X \), and likewise for contractions.

Lemma 5.1. For matroids \( Q \) and \( L \) on \( E \), the following are equivalent:

1. \( Q \) is a quotient of \( L \);
2. \( L^* \) is a quotient of \( Q^* \);
It is easy to see that \( \rho \) is the rank function of a matroid, \( M \).

From inequality (5.1), it follows that for \( \rho \in Q_k \), we obtain the rank functions \( r_{M_i} \) recursively from \( \rho \) as follows: \( r_{M_i}(\emptyset) = 0 \) and, for \( X \subseteq E \) and \( y \in E - X \),

\[
(5.2) \quad r_{M_i}(X \cup y) = \begin{cases} r_{M_i}(X) + 1, & \text{if } \rho(X \cup y) \geq \rho(X) + i, \\ r_{M_i}(X), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}
\]

Thus, each polymatroid \( \rho \) in \( Q_k \) has exactly one decomposition \{ \( M_i \) : \( i \in [k] \) \} for which each \( M_{i+1} \), for \( i \in [k-1] \), is a quotient of \( M_i \). There may be other decompositions of \( \rho \) that do not satisfy this condition. For instance, the Boolean 2-polymatroid of the 3-cycle on the edge set \( E \) has two decompositions, \{ \( U_{2,E}, U_{1,E} \) \} and \{ \( U_{1,E-x} \cup U_{0,x} : x \in E \) \}, and only the former satisfies the quotient condition.

We now give the excluded minors for \( Q_k \), which are illustrated in Figure 2.

**Theorem 5.2.** Fix \( k \geq 2 \). Within the class of \( k \)-polymatroids, \( Q_k \) has \( \binom{k+1}{3} \) excluded minors, given as follows: for each subset \( A = \{a, b, c\} \) of \( \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, k\} \) with \( a < b < c \), define \( \rho_A \) on \( \{e, f\} \) by \( \rho_A(\emptyset) = 0 \), \( \rho_A(e) = b \), \( \rho_A(f) = c \), and \( \rho_A(\{e, f\}) = a + c \).

**Proof.** It is easy to see that \( \rho_A \) is a \( k \)-polymatroid and that any \( k \)-polymatroid on a singleton set is in \( Q_k \), so showing that \( \rho_A \notin Q_k \) shows that it is an excluded minor for \( Q_k \). To see that \( \rho_A \notin Q_k \), it suffices to show that recurrence (5.2) gives different values for \( r_{M_i}(\{e, f\}) \).

Now \( r_{M_i}(f) = r_{M_i}(\emptyset) + 1 = 1 \), so \( r_{M_i}(\{e, f\}) = r_{M_i}(f) = 1 \) since \( a < c \). However, \( r_{M_i}(\{e, f\}) = r_{M_i}(e) = r_{M_i}(\emptyset) = 0 \) since \( \rho(\{e, f\}) = \rho(e) = a + c - b < c \) and \( b < c \).

Let \( \rho \) be a \( k \)-polymatroid on \( E \) that has no minor that is isomorphic to any \( \rho_A \). We must prove that (i) the functions \( r_{M_i} \), defined by recurrence (5.2) are well-defined, (ii) each \( r_{M_i} \) is the rank function of a matroid, \( M_i \), and (iii) \( M_{i+1} \) is a quotient of \( M_i \).

We show, by induction on \( |Z| \), that \( r_{M_i}(Z) \) is well-defined. This holds if \( |Z| \leq 1 \), so assume that \( |Z| \geq 2 \) and that the result holds for all sets with fewer elements. Fix distinct elements \( e, f \in Z \) and set \( Z' = Z - \{e, f\} \). We claim that taking \( X = Z - e \) in equation (5.2) yields the same value for \( r_{M_i}(Z) \) as taking \( X = Z - f \). Set \( a = \rho(Z) - \rho(Z-e) \), \( b = \rho(Z-f) - \rho(Z') \), \( c = \rho(Z-e) - \rho(Z') \), \( d = \rho(Z) - \rho(Z-f) \).
Thus, \( a + c = b + d \). The claim follows from equation (5.2) if the two chains from \( Z' \) to \( Z \) yield the same rank increases in some order, that is, if \( \{a, c\} = \{b, d\} \). We now show that the polymatroids \( \rho_A \) account for all ways in which the equality can fail. Indeed, if \( \{a, c\} \neq \{b, d\} \), then, in particular, \( b \neq c \), so we may assume, by symmetry, that \( b < c \). Since \( b \neq a \), submodularity gives \( a < b \). Restricting to \( Z \) and contracting \( Z' \) yields \( \rho_{(a,b,c)} \) as a minor, contrary to our assumption. Thus, \( \{a, c\} = \{b, d\} \), as needed.

To verify that \( r_M \) is a matroid rank function, we use the following axioms: (i) \( r(\emptyset) = 0 \), (ii) if \( X \subseteq E \) and \( e \in E \), then \( r(X) \leq r(X \cup e) \leq r(X) + 1 \), and (iii) for any set \( X \subseteq E \) and elements \( e, f \in E \), if \( r(X \cup e) = r(X \cup f) = r(X) \), then \( r(X \cup \{e, f\}) = r(X) \) (local submodularity). Property (i) holds by construction, and equation (5.2) makes property (ii) evident, so we focus on local submodularity. Since \( r_M(X \cup f) = r_M(X) \) we must have \( \rho(X \cup f) - \rho(X) < i \), so submodularity gives

\[
\rho(X \cup \{e, f\}) - \rho(X \cup e) \leq \rho(X \cup f) - \rho(X) < i,
\]

so \( r_M(X \cup \{e, f\}) = r_M(X \cup e) = r_M(X) \).

Finally, \( M_{t+1} \) is a quotient of \( M_t \) since recurrence (5.2) gives inequality (5.1).

After switching \( e \) and \( f \), the \( k \)-dual of \( \rho_{(a,b,c)} \) is \( \rho_{(k-c,k-a-c+b,k-a)} \).

Note that \( Q_k \) is a proper subclass of \( Q_{k+1} \) and that each excluded minor for \( Q_k \) is an excluded minor for \( Q_{k+1} \). This observation gives the next result.

**Corollary 5.3.** The excluded minors for the class \( Q = \cup_{k \geq 2} Q_k \) are the polymatroids \( \rho_A \) defined above as \( A \) ranges over all \( 3 \)-element sets of nonnegative integers.

D. Chun [2] shows that a \( 2 \)-polymatroid \( \rho \) has the form \( r_{M' \{e\}} + r_{M/e} \) for some matroid \( M \) and element \( e \in E(M') \) if and only if \( \rho \) has no minor isomorphic to the matroid \( U_{2,2} \) or the polymatroid \( \rho_{(0,1,2)} \) in Figure 2 (b). The polymatroid \( \rho_{(0,1,2)} \) enters since \( M' \{e\}, M/e \) is a lift/quotient pair, and \( U_{2,2} \) enters since \( r(M' \{e\}) - r(M/e) \leq 1 \). More generally, for a fixed positive integer \( t \), the class of \( 2 \)-polymatroids \( r_{M_1} + r_{M_2} \) with \( r(M_1) - r(M_2) \leq t \) is minor-closed. The final result identifies the excluded minors for arbitrary \( t \).

**Theorem 5.4.** A \( 2 \)-quotient polymatroid \( \rho = r_{M_1} + r_{M_2} \) satisfies \( r(M_1) - r(M_2) \leq t \) if and only if the uniform matroid \( U_{t+1,t+1} \) is not a minor.

**Proof.** While \( U_{t+1,t+1} \) is a \( 2 \)-quotient polymatroid, it arises only from the lift/quotient pair \( U_{t+1,t+1} \) and \( U_{0,0} \), which fails the inequality \( r(M_1) - r(M_2) \leq t \), while its proper minors satisfy that inequality. Thus, it suffices to show that if, for a \( 2 \)-quotient polymatroid \( \rho = r_{M_1} + r_{M_2} \), we have \( r(M_1) - r(M_2) > t \), then \( U_{t+1,t+1} \) is a minor of \( \rho \). To see this, take a basis \( B \) of \( M_2 \), so \( B \) is independent in \( M_1 \); extend \( B \) to a basis \( B' \) of \( M_1 \); in \( \rho \), contracting \( B \) and deleting \( E - B' \) yields the free matroid on \( t + 1 \) or more elements. \( \square \)
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