

CHORDAL MATROIDS ARISING FROM GENERALIZED PARALLEL CONNECTIONS

JAMES DYLAN DOUTHITT AND JAMES OXLEY

ABSTRACT. A graph is chordal if every cycle of length at least four has a chord. In 1961, Dirac characterized chordal graphs as those graphs that can be built from complete graphs by repeated clique-sums. Generalizing this, we consider the class of simple $GF(q)$ -representable matroids that can be built from projective geometries over $GF(q)$ by repeated generalized parallel connections across projective geometries. We show that this class of matroids is closed under induced minors. We characterize the class by its forbidden induced minors; the case when $q = 2$ is distinctive.

1. INTRODUCTION

The notation and terminology in this paper will follow [7] for graphs and [12] for matroids. Unless stated otherwise, all graphs and matroids considered here are simple. This means, for example, that, whenever we contract a set from a matroid, we always simplify the resulting matroid. A *chord* of a cycle C in a graph G is an edge of G that is not in C such that both vertices of e are vertices of C . A graph is *chordal* if every cycle of length at least four has a chord. Such graphs were called *rigid circuit graphs* by Dirac [8] and *triangulated graphs* by Berge [2]. Let G_1 and G_2 be graphs and $V(G_1) \cap V(G_2) = V$, say. Assume that $G_1[V]$ is a complete graph H and $G_2[V]$ has edge set $E(H)$. The *clique-sum* of G_1 and G_2 is the graph with vertex set $V(G_1) \cup V(G_2)$ and edge set $E(G_1) \cup E(G_2)$. Loosely speaking, the clique-sum is obtained by gluing G_1 and G_2 together across the clique H . While there are several characterizations of chordal graphs (see, for example, [13]), we choose to focus on the following one of Dirac [8].

Theorem 1.1. *A graph G is chordal if and only if G can be constructed from complete graphs by repeated clique-sums.*

Let M_1 and M_2 be matroids whose ground sets intersect in a set T such that T is a modular flat of M_1 , and $M_1|T = M_2|T = N$. The

Date: June 12, 2023.

1991 Mathematics Subject Classification. 05B35, 05C75.

generalized parallel connection of M_1 and M_2 across N is the matroid with ground set $E(M_1) \cup E(M_2)$ whose flats are those subsets X of $E(M_1) \cup E(M_2)$ such that $X \cap E(M_1)$ is a flat of M_1 , and $X \cap E(M_2)$ is a flat of M_2 . We denote this matroid by $P_N(M_1, M_2)$ or $P_T(M_1, M_2)$. Note that T may be empty, in which case, $P_T(M_1, M_2) = M_1 \oplus M_2$.

For a prime power q , we will denote the projective geometry $PG(r-1, q)$ by P_r when context makes the field clear. Let \mathcal{M}_q be the class of matroids that can be built from projective geometries over $GF(q)$ by a sequence of generalized parallel connections across projective geometries over $GF(q)$. A matroid M is $GF(q)$ -*chordal* if M is a member of \mathcal{M}_q . By [5], each member of \mathcal{M}_q is $GF(q)$ -representable.

An *induced minor of a graph* G is a graph H that can be obtained from G by a sequence of vertex deletions and edge contractions. Similarly, an *induced minor of a matroid* M is a matroid N that can be obtained from M by a sequence of restrictions to flats and contractions, where each such contraction is followed by a simplification. Evidently, the class of chordal graphs is closed under vertex deletions, that is, it is closed under taking induced subgraphs. The analogous property for the class \mathcal{M}_q is highlighted by the following result.

Theorem 1.2. *For all q , the class \mathcal{M}_q is closed under taking induced minors.*

Our main results are the following characterizations of the forbidden induced minors for the class \mathcal{M}_q , first for $q = 2$ and then for $q > 2$.

Theorem 1.3. *The set of forbidden induced minors for the class \mathcal{M}_2 is $\{M(K_4), U_{3,4}\}$.*

Theorem 1.4. *For each $q > 2$, the set of forbidden induced minors for the class \mathcal{M}_q is $\{U_{2,k} : 2 < k \leq q\} \cup \{U_{3,q+2}\}$.*

Several different notions of chordal matroids have been given over the last forty years [1, 3, 6, 10, 17]. Each of these papers, with the exception of [6, 10], focuses primarily on binary matroids. Following Cordovil, Forge, and Klein [6], we define a simple or non-simple matroid M to be *chordal* if, for each circuit C that has at least four elements, there are circuits C_1 and C_2 and an element e such that $C_1 \cap C_2 = \{e\}$ and $C = (C_1 \cup C_2) - e$.

Cordovil, Forge, and Klein [6] and Mayhew and Probert [10] study the relation between chordal graphs and supersolvable matroids. Such matroids were originally introduced by Stanley [15]. A rank- r matroid is *supersolvable* if there is a chain of modular flats $F_1 \subseteq F_2 \subseteq \dots \subseteq F_r$ in M where the rank of F_i is i for each i . The class \mathcal{M}_q is given in [10] as an example of a class of matroids whose members are supersolvable

and form a saturated class of matroids, where a matroid M is *saturated* if, for every modular flat F , the restriction $M|F$ has no two disjoint cocircuits.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Before beginning the discussions of forbidden induced minors for the class \mathcal{M}_q , we show that this class is closed under taking induced minors. We shall use the following well-known property of generalized parallel connections (see, for example, [12, 11.23]).

Lemma 2.1. *For every flat F of $P_N(M_1, M_2)$,*

$$r(F) = r(F \cap E(M_1)) + r(F \cap E(M_2)) - r(F \cap E(N)).$$

Lemma 2.2. *The class \mathcal{M}_q of $GF(q)$ -chordal matroids is closed under induced restrictions.*

Proof. It is enough to show that the class \mathcal{M}_q is closed under restricting to a hyperplane. Let M be a minimum-rank matroid in \mathcal{M}_q such that $M|H \notin \mathcal{M}_q$ for some hyperplane H of M . Then M is not a projective geometry, so $M = P_N(M_1, M_2)$ where M_1 and M_2 are in \mathcal{M}_q , and N is a projective geometry over $GF(q)$. Let $H_i = H \cap E(M_i)$ for each i in $\{1, 2\}$ and let $H_N = H \cap E(N)$. Then, since H is a both flat of a generalized parallel connection and a hyperplane of M ,

$$r(M_1) + r(M_2) - r(N) - 1 = r(H) = r(H_1) + r(H_2) - r(H_N). \quad (2.1)$$

Suppose H contains all of $E(N)$. Then $r(H_N) = r(N)$, so, from (2.1), we have

$$r(M_1) + r(M_2) - 1 = r(H_1) + r(H_2).$$

This implies that, for some i and j such that $\{i, j\} = \{1, 2\}$, the hyperplane H contains $E(M_i)$, and H_j is a hyperplane of M_j . It follows by the minimality of M that $M|H$ is in \mathcal{M}_q , a contradiction.

We now assume that H does not contain $E(N)$. Hence H does not contain $E(M_1)$ or $E(M_2)$. By [5], $E(M_1)$ is a modular flat of $P_N(M_1, M_2)$, so

$$r(H) = r(H \cup E(M_1)) + r(H_1) - r(M_1). \quad (2.2)$$

As $E(M_1) \not\subseteq H$, we deduce that $r(H \cup E(M_1)) > r(H)$, so $r(H \cup E(M_1)) = r(H) + 1$. It follows from (2.2) that $r(H_1) = r(M_1) - 1$. By symmetry, $r(H_2) = r(M_2) - 1$. Hence H_i is a hyperplane of M_i for each i in $\{1, 2\}$. Therefore, by (2.1) and (2.2),

$$r(M_1) + r(M_2) - r(N) - 1 = r(M_1) - 1 + r(M_2) - 1 - r(H_N).$$

Thus $r(H_N) = r(N) - 1$. Hence H_N is a hyperplane of N , so H_N is a projective geometry. By [5] (see also [12, Proposition 11.4.15]), $M|H = P_{M|H_N}(M|H_1, M|H_2)$, so $M|H$ is a generalized parallel connection of members of \mathcal{M}_q along a projective geometry and is therefore a member of \mathcal{M}_q , a contradiction. \square

In the next result, where we show that \mathcal{M}_q is closed under contractions, we shall make repeated use of the fact that every contraction is followed by a simplification. We observe that a consequence of this result is that \mathcal{M}_q is closed under parallel minors.

Lemma 2.3. *The class \mathcal{M}_q of $GF(q)$ -chordal matroids is closed under taking contractions.*

Proof. Let M be a $GF(q)$ -chordal matroid. We argue by induction on $|E(M)|$ that M/e is a $GF(q)$ -chordal matroid for all e in $E(M)$. The result is certainly true if $|E(M)| \leq 2$. Suppose the result holds when $|E(M)| < k$ and let $|E(M)| = k$. The result holds if M is a projective geometry, so we may assume that $M = P_N(M_1, M_2)$, where M_1 and M_2 are in \mathcal{M}_q and N is a projective geometry over $GF(q)$. Suppose that $e \in E(M_1) - E(N)$. Then M_1/e is in \mathcal{M}_q by the induction hypothesis and M_1/e has N as a restriction. As $M/e = P_N(M_1/e, M_2)$, we deduce that M/e is in \mathcal{M}_q . We may now assume that $e \in E(N)$. This implies that e is in both $E(M_1)$ and $E(M_2)$, and, by the induction hypothesis, M_1/e and M_2/e are in \mathcal{M}_q and contain the projective geometry N/e as a restriction. By [5], $M/e = P_{N/e}(M_1/e, M_2/e)$, and we again get that M/e is in \mathcal{M}_q . \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2. This is an immediate consequence of combining Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3. \square

3. CHARACTERIZING $GF(q)$ -CHORDAL MATROIDS

In this section, we prove Theorems 1.3 and 1.4. An *induced-minor-minimal non- $GF(q)$ -chordal matroid* is a $GF(q)$ -representable matroid that is not a $GF(q)$ -chordal matroid such that every proper induced minor of M is a $GF(q)$ -chordal matroid. When $q = 2$, the only rank-2 binary matroids are $U_{2,2}$ and $U_{2,3}$ both of which are $GF(2)$ -chordal. Clearly, neither $M(K_4)$ nor $U_{3,4}$ is $GF(2)$ -chordal. It follows that each is an induced-minor-minimal non- $GF(2)$ -chordal matroid. When $q > 2$, the matroids in $\{U_{2,3}, U_{2,4}, \dots, U_{2,q}\}$ are induced-minor-minimal non- $GF(q)$ -chordal matroids.

For the remainder of this paper, it will be convenient to view a rank- r $GF(q)$ -representable matroid M as a restriction of P_r by coloring the elements of $E(M)$ *green* and coloring the other elements *red*. Note that

when we contract an element e from M , we can obtain M/e as follows. Take a hyperplane H of P_r that avoids e . Then project from e onto H ; an element z of H is green in the contraction precisely when there are at least two green points on the line $\text{cl}_{P_r}(\{e, z\})$ of P_r .

For a positive integer k , a partition (X, Y) of the ground set of a matroid M is a *vertical k -separation* of M if $r(X) + r(Y) - r(M) \leq k - 1$ and $\min\{r(X), r(Y)\} \geq k$. This vertical k -separation is *exact* if $r(X) + r(Y) - r(M) = k - 1$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let (X, Y) be a 2-separation in a matroid M such that each of $M|_{\text{cl}(X)}$ and $M|_{\text{cl}(Y)}$ is in \mathcal{M}_q . Then either*

- (i) $|\text{cl}(X) \cap \text{cl}(Y)| = 1$ and $M \in \mathcal{M}_q$; or
- (ii) $|\text{cl}(X) \cap \text{cl}(Y)| = 0$ and M has $U_{3,4}$ and $U_{2,3}$ as induced minors.

Proof. Observe that if $|\text{cl}(X) \cap \text{cl}(Y)| = 1$, then M is the parallel connection of $M|_{\text{cl}(X)}$ and $M|_{\text{cl}(Y)}$, so $M \in \mathcal{M}_q$. Now suppose that $\text{cl}(X) \cap \text{cl}(Y) = \emptyset$. Let C and D be circuits of M each of which meets both X and Y such that $|C \cap X|$ is a minimum and $|D \cap Y|$ is a minimum. Because M can be written as a 2-sum with basepoint b of matroids with ground set $X \cup b$ and $Y \cup b$, it follows that $(C \cap X) \cup (D \cap Y)$ is a circuit of M . Clearly both $M|_{\text{cl}(C \cap X)}$ and $M|_{\text{cl}(D \cap Y)}$ are in \mathcal{M}_q . Let X_1 and Y_1 be subsets of $C \cap X$ and $D \cap Y$, respectively, such that $|X_1| = |C \cap X| - 2$ and $|Y_1| = |D \cap Y| - 2$. Then each of $(M|_{\text{cl}(C \cap X)})/X_1$ and $(M|_{\text{cl}(D \cap Y)})/Y_1$ is a rank-2 matroid in \mathcal{M}_q . Moreover, in M/X_1 , there is no element x of X that is in the closure of Y otherwise $(X_1 \cup x) \cup (D \cap Y)$ contains a circuit of M that contains $x \cup (D \cap Y)$ and violates the choice of C . Hence $(M|_{\text{cl}(C \cap X)})/X_1$ has at most q points. Since $M|_{\text{cl}(C \cap X)} \in \mathcal{M}_q$, it follows that $(M|_{\text{cl}(C \cap X)})/X_1 \cong U_{2,2}$. By symmetry, $(M|_{\text{cl}(D \cap Y)})/Y_1 \cong U_{2,2}$. Hence $(M|_{\text{cl}((C \cap X) \cup (D \cap Y))})/(X_1 \cup Y_1) \cong U_{3,4}$. Thus both $U_{3,4}$ and $U_{2,3}$ are induced minors of M . \square

In the next result, we denote by $P_{r+1} \setminus P_{r-i}$ the matroid that is obtained from P_{r+1} by deleting the elements of a rank- $(r-i)$ flat. Clearly this matroid does not depend on the choice of the rank- $(r-i)$ flat.

Lemma 3.2. *Let M be a binary rank- $(r+1)$ matroid. Then $M/e \cong P_r$ for all e in $E(M)$ if and only if $M \cong P_{r+1} \setminus P_{r-i}$ for all i in $\{0, 1, \dots, r\}$.*

Proof. If $M \cong P_{r+1} \setminus P_{r-i}$ for some i in $\{0, 1, \dots, r\}$, then, by, for example, [12, Corollary 6.2.6], $M/e \cong P_r$ for all e in $E(M)$.

Now suppose $M/e \cong P_r$ for each e in $E(M)$. We may assume that $|E(P_{r+1}) - E(M)| \geq 2$ otherwise the result certainly holds. Let x and y be distinct elements of $E(P_{r+1}) - E(M)$. Then the third

element, z , on the line of P_{r+1} that is spanned by $\{x, y\}$ must also be in $E(P_{r+1}) - E(M)$ otherwise M/z is not isomorphic to P_r . It follows that, for a basis X of $P_{r+1} \setminus E(M)$, by [11, Theorem 1], $\text{cl}_{P_{r+1}}(X) = E(P_{r+1}) - E(M)$. Since M has rank $r + 1$, we deduce that $\text{cl}_{P_{r+1}}(X)$ is a projective geometry of rank at most r . The lemma follows. \square

We omit the straightforward proof of the next result.

Lemma 3.3. *For $r \geq 3$, if M is the binary matroid $P_r \setminus P_{r-i}$ for some i in the set $\{1, 2, \dots, r-1\}$, then M has a flat isomorphic to either $M(K_4)$ or $U_{3,4}$.*

For all $q > 2$, the only rank-2 members of \mathcal{M}_q are $U_{2,2}$ and $U_{2,q+1}$. Natural obstructions to membership of \mathcal{M}_q are the lines that contain more than two but fewer than $q + 1$ points, that is, the collection $\{U_{2,i} : 3 \leq i \leq q\}$. In rank three, the only matroid that is not in \mathcal{M}_q and has no member of $\{U_{2,i} : 3 \leq i \leq q\}$ as an induced minor is $U_{3,q+2}$. By Bose [4], we note that $U_{3,q+2}$ is representable over $GF(q)$ if and only if q is even. Therefore, the collection $\mathcal{N} = \{U_{2,3}, U_{2,4}, \dots, U_{2,q}, U_{3,q+2}\}$ is contained in the collection of forbidden induced minors for the class \mathcal{M}_q . The next result highlights some structure in matroids that have members of \mathcal{N} as induced minors.

Lemma 3.4. *For some $q > 2$, let M be a $GF(q)$ -representable matroid having rank at least three. Suppose that $M \not\cong P_r$ but that $M/e \cong P_{r-1}$ for all e in $E(M)$. Then M has a member of \mathcal{N} as an induced minor.*

Proof. Suppose M has no member of \mathcal{N} as an induced minor. Suppose $r(M) = 3$ and e is an element of $E(M)$. Then M/e is a $(q + 1)$ -point line. Thus, in M , there are exactly $q + 1$ lines containing e . Let $\{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{q+1}\}$ be a set of points other than e with one being chosen from each of the $q + 1$ lines containing e . Since M does not have a $U_{3,q+2}$ as an induced minor, there must be a triangle in $\{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{q+1}\}$.

Suppose that $\{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{q+1}\}$ is a line of M . Then $E(M)$ is not equal to $\{e, p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{q+1}\}$, otherwise $M/p_1 \cong U_{2,2}$, a contradiction. Without loss of generality suppose there is a third point on the line $\text{cl}(\{e, p_1\})$. Since every line has either 2 or $q + 1$ points, the line $\text{cl}(\{e, p_1\})$ must be a $(q + 1)$ -point line. Therefore, we have two full lines meeting at the point p_1 . If this were the entire matroid, then M/p_1 would again consist of only two points. Hence there is an additional element f in M not on either of the lines $\text{cl}(\{e, p_1\})$ or $\{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{q+1}\}$. Each point of the line $\text{cl}(\{e, p_1\})$ together with f defines a line that meets the line $\{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{q+1}\}$ in a distinct point and so each of these lines is also full. This gives that every line is full except possibly the

line $\text{cl}(\{p_1, f\})$. In particular, every line through e is full. Thus, M is a projective geometry, a contradiction. We deduce that $\{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{q+1}\}$ is not a line. Since this set contains a triangle, that triangle must be contained in a full line and we argue as before to get a contradiction. Thus the result holds when $r(M) = 3$.

If $\{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{q+1}\}$ is not a full projective line, then without loss of generality suppose $\{p_1, p_2, p_3\}$ forms a triangle. Then this line must be a full line and we may revert to the previous case. Therefore, the result holds when $r(M) = 3$.

Now suppose the result holds for $r(M) < k$ and let $r(M) = k \geq 4$. Let e be an element of M . Since $M/e \cong P_{r-1}$, each of the lines of P_r that contains e must contain a second point of M . There must be such a line, say L , that contains exactly two points of M otherwise every such line has exactly $q+1$ points and $M \cong P_r$, a contradiction. Let $L = \{e, f\}$. Take a point g in $E(M) - L$ and consider the plane $Q = \text{cl}_M(\{e, f, g\})$. Since $M/h \cong P_r$ for every point h of this plane, it follows that $Q/h \cong U_{2, q+1}$. It follows by the induction assumption that $Q \cong P_3$. Hence L is a $(q+1)$ -point line, a contradiction. We conclude, by induction, that the lemma holds. \square

Lemma 3.5. *Let M be a GF(q)-representable matroid and let (X, Y) be an exact vertical k -separation of M . Suppose that both $M|_{\text{cl}_M(X)}$ and $M|_{\text{cl}_M(Y)}$ are GF(q)-chordal. Then $\text{cl}_M(X) \cap \text{cl}_M(Y)$ is a projective geometry of rank $k - 1$.*

Proof. This is immediate if $k = 1$ and follows by Lemma 3.1 when $k = 2$, so we may assume that $k \geq 3$. Let M be an induced-minor-minimal counterexample and let $r(M) = r$. Suppose first that $\text{cl}_M(X) \cap \text{cl}_M(Y)$ is empty. Then in the green-red coloring of P_r corresponding to M , all of the elements of $\text{cl}_{P_r}(X) \cap \text{cl}_{P_r}(Y)$ are red. Take e in X and suppose that $r(X) > k$. Then M/e has an exact vertical k -separation (X', Y') corresponding to $(X - e, Y)$. By the minimality of M , we deduce that $\text{cl}_{M/e}(X') \cap \text{cl}_{M/e}(Y')$ is a projective geometry of rank $k - 1$.

Since $k \geq 3$, there is a projective line L contained in $\text{cl}_{P_r}(X) \cap \text{cl}_{P_r}(Y)$. In the green-red coloring of P_r , every element of L is red. But every element of L is green in the coloring of P_r/e . Thus, in P_r , for each of the points z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{q+1} of L , there is a green point on the line $\text{cl}_{P_r}(\{e, z_i\})$ other than e . Thus, when $q = 2$, we see that the four green points in $\text{cl}_{P_r}(L \cup e)$ form a 4-circuit, a contradiction as $M|_{\text{cl}_M(X)}$ is GF(2)-chordal. When $q > 2$, because all of the elements of L are red, the set of points in $\text{cl}_{P_r}(L \cup e)$ contains no line with more than q points. Since $M|_{\text{cl}_M(X)}$ is in \mathcal{M}_q , it follows that each line in $\text{cl}_{P_r}(L \cup e)$ that

contains at least two green points contains exactly two green points. It follows that M has $U_{3,q+2}$ as an induced restriction, a contradiction.

We may now assume that $r(X) = k = r(Y)$. Since (X, Y) is an exact k -separation, $r(X) + r(Y) - r(M) = k - 1$, so $r(M) = k + 1$. As M has at least $2k$ elements, it has an element f that is not a coloop. Then the construction of members of \mathcal{M}_q implies that f is on a $(q+1)$ -point green line of M . This line must meet $\text{cl}_{P_r}(X) \cap \text{cl}_{P_r}(Y)$ so $\text{cl}_{P_r}(X) \cap \text{cl}_{P_r}(Y)$ is not entirely red, a contradiction.

We conclude $\text{cl}_M(X) \cap \text{cl}_M(Y)$ contains at least one point, say z . In M/z , there is an exact vertical $(k-1)$ -separation (X'', Y'') corresponding to $(X-z, Y-z)$. By the induction assumption, $\text{cl}_{P_r/z}(X'') \cap \text{cl}_{P_r/z}(Y'')$ is a projective geometry of rank $k-2$. By Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4, we deduce that $M|(\text{cl}_M(X) \cap \text{cl}_M(Y))$ must have, as an induced minor, a matroid that is not in \mathcal{M}_q . \square

Corollary 3.6. *For all $k \geq 1$, an induced-minor-minimal non- $GF(q)$ -chordal matroid has no k -vertical separations.*

A matroid M is *round* if M has no two disjoint cocircuits. Equivalently, M is round if there is no k for which M has a vertical k -separation (see, for example, [12, Lemma 8.6.2]). The following result is immediate from the constructive definition of $GF(q)$ -chordal matroids.

Lemma 3.7. *A rank- r matroid M in \mathcal{M}_q is round if and only if $M \cong P_r$.*

The following is a straightforward consequence of the definition.

Lemma 3.8. *A simple binary matroid is chordal if and only if it does not have $U_{3,4}$ as an induced minor.*

Lemma 3.9. *All $GF(2)$ -chordal matroids are chordal matroids.*

Proof. Let M be a $GF(2)$ -chordal matroid. Since the class of $GF(2)$ -chordal matroids is closed under induced minors, $U_{3,4}$ is not an induced minor of M , so M is a chordal matroid. \square

Since $M(K_4)$ is chordal but not $GF(2)$ -chordal, it is clear that the class of binary matroids that are chordal properly contains the class of $GF(2)$ -chordal matroids.

We now give a common proof of the two main results of the paper.

Proof of Theorems 1.3 and 1.4. Let M be an induced-minor-minimal non- $GF(q)$ -chordal matroid. By Corollary 3.6, M is round. By Geelen, Gerards, and Whittle [9], M/e is also round for all e in $E(M)$. Thus by Lemma 3.7, $M/e \cong P_{r-1}$ where $r(M) = r$.

First, let $q = 2$. Then, by Lemma 3.2, $M \cong P_r \setminus P_{r-i}$ for some i in $\{1, 2, \dots, r-1\}$. Moreover, since M is not a $GF(2)$ -chordal matroid, $r \geq 3$. Then, by Lemma 3.3, M has $M(K_4)$ or $U_{3,4}$ as an induced restriction. As each of these matroids is an induced-minor-minimal non- $GF(2)$ -chordal matroid, we deduce that M is isomorphic to $M(K_4)$ or $U_{3,4}$.

Now assume that $q > 2$. Since each member of \mathcal{N} is an induced-minor-minimal non- $GF(q)$ -chordal matroid, we may assume that M has no member of \mathcal{N} as an induced minor. Thus $r(M) \geq 3$. By Lemma 3.4, we get a contradiction. \square

4. DIRAC'S OTHER CHARACTERIZATION

In [8], another characterization is given of chordal graphs. In a graph G , a *vertex separator* is a set of vertices whose deletion produces a graph with more connected components than G .

Theorem 4.1. *A graph is chordal if and only if every minimal vertex separator induces a clique.*

It is shown in Lemma 3.5 that, if M is a $GF(q)$ -chordal matroid, then, for every exact vertical k -separation (X, Y) of M , the restriction $M|(\text{cl}(X) \cap \text{cl}(Y)) \cong P_{k-1}$. However, the converse of this is not true. For example, the matroid $P_{U_{2,3}}(M(K_4), M(K_4))$ is not $GF(2)$ -chordal, but the only exact vertical k -separation has $k = 3$ and has $U_{2,3}$ as the intersection of the closures of the two sides of the vertical 3-separation. A *divider* in a matroid is an exact vertical k -separation for some k . A divider (X, Y) is *minimal* if there is no vertical k' -separation (X', Y') such that $\text{cl}(X') \cap \text{cl}(Y') \subsetneq \text{cl}(X) \cap \text{cl}(Y)$. Recall that, for sets X and Y in a matroid M , the *local connectivity* between X and Y , denoted $\square(X, Y)$ or $\square_M(X, Y)$, is given by $\square(X, Y) = r(X) + r(Y) - r(X \cup Y)$. Let \mathcal{N}_q be the class of $GF(q)$ -representable matroids N such that, for every minimal divider (X, Y) of N , the matroid $N|(\text{cl}(X) \cap \text{cl}(Y))$ is a projective geometry of rank $\square(X, Y)$. Since round matroids have no vertical k -separations, all $GF(q)$ -round matroids are in \mathcal{N}_q .

Lemma 4.2. *Let (X, Y) be a minimal divider of a matroid N . Then $\text{cl}(X) \cap \text{cl}(Y) = \text{cl}(X) \cap \text{cl}(Y - \text{cl}(X))$.*

Proof. Suppose $y \in \text{cl}(X) \cap Y$. Then $r(Y) = r(Y - y)$; otherwise, y is a coloop of $N|Y$ and $(X \cup y, Y - y)$ is a divider with $\text{cl}(X \cup y) \cap \text{cl}(Y - y)$ properly contained in $\text{cl}(X) \cap \text{cl}(Y)$, a contradiction. We deduce that $\text{cl}(Y) = \text{cl}(Y - \text{cl}(X))$. \square

The next theorem is an analog of Theorem 4.1.

Theorem 4.3. *A matroid M is in \mathcal{N}_q if and only if M can be constructed from round $GF(q)$ -representable matroids by a sequence of generalized parallel connections across projective geometries.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{R}_q be the class of matroids that can be constructed from round $GF(q)$ -representable matroids by a sequence of generalized parallel connections across projective geometries. It suffices to prove that a connected matroid $M \in \mathcal{N}_q$ if and only if it is in \mathcal{R}_q . Suppose $M \in \mathcal{N}_q$. If M has no dividers, then M is round, so $M \in \mathcal{R}_q$. Hence, we may assume M has a minimal divider (X, Y) . Then $M|(\text{cl}(X) \cap \text{cl}(Y))$ is a projective geometry, N , of rank $\cap(X, Y)$, and $M = P_N(M|_{\text{cl}(X)}, M|_{\text{cl}(Y)})$. Letting $M_X = M|_{\text{cl}(X)}$, we see that M_X is either round or has a minimal divider (U, V) , where $M_X|(\text{cl}(U) \cap \text{cl}(V))$ is a projective geometry, N' , of rank $\cap_{M_X}(U, V)$, and M_X is equal to $P_{N'}(M_X|_{\text{cl}(U)}, M_X|_{\text{cl}(V)})$. Continuing in this way, we see that every matroid in \mathcal{N}_q can be obtained in the manner prescribed. Hence $\mathcal{N}_q \subseteq \mathcal{R}_q$.

We will prove that $\mathcal{R}_q \subseteq \mathcal{N}_q$ by induction on the number, n , of round matroids used to construct a connected member M of \mathcal{R}_q . If $n = 1$, then M is round and so M is in \mathcal{N}_q . Now suppose that the result holds when $n \leq t - 1$ and assume that M is constructed by using exactly t round matroids. Then $M \cong P_N(M_1, M_2)$, where M_2 is a round matroid and N is a projective geometry. Let (X, Y) be a minimal divider of M and let $F = \text{cl}(X) \cap \text{cl}(Y)$. We need to show that $M|_F \cong P_k$ where $r(F) = k$. Let $X_N = X \cap E(N)$ and $Y_N = Y \cap E(N)$. Also let $X_i = (X \cap E(M_i)) - X_N$ and $Y_i = (Y \cap E(M_i)) - Y_N$ for each i in $\{1, 2\}$. Since N is a projective geometry, we may suppose that X_N spans Y_N . Therefore $\text{cl}(Y_N) \subseteq F$. As M_2 is round and has $(X_N \cup Y_N \cup X_2, Y_2)$ as a partition, either $X_N \cup X_2$ spans Y_2 , or Y_2 spans M_2 . In the latter case, Y spans $E(N)$, so $E(N) \subseteq F$. Now, $(E(M_1), E(M_2) - E(N))$ is a divider of M and $\text{cl}(E(M_1)) \cap \text{cl}(E(M_2) - E(N)) = E(N)$. Because (X, Y) is a minimal divider, we have $F = E(N)$, so $M|_F \cong P_k$ where $r(F) = k$.

We deduce that $X_N \cup X_2$ spans Y_2 . Then $\text{cl}(X)$ contains $E(M_2)$ and, by Lemma 4.2, we may assume that $Y \subseteq E(M_1) - E(N)$. Thus

$$F = \text{cl}(X) \cap \text{cl}(Y) = \text{cl}_{M_1}(X \cap E(M_1)) \cap \text{cl}_{M_1}(Y). \quad (4.1)$$

We show next that $(X \cap E(M_1), Y)$ is a minimal divider of M_1 . It is a divider of M_1 unless $X \cap E(M_1)$ or Y spans M_1 . In the exceptional case, as X does not span M , we see that $X \cap E(M_1)$ does not span M_1 . Thus Y spans M_1 , so $E(N) \subseteq F$. Hence $E(N) = F$, and $M|_F \cong P_k$ as desired. Thus $(X \cap E(M_1), Y)$ is a divider of M_1 . Suppose it is not minimal. Then, by (4.1), M_1 has a minimal divider (X_1, Y_1) such that

$\text{cl}_{M_1}(X_1) \cap \text{cl}_{M_1}(Y_1) \subsetneq F$. Now we may assume that $\text{cl}_{M_1}(X_1) \supseteq E(N)$, so $(\text{cl}_{M_1}(X_1), Y_1 - \text{cl}_{M_1}(X_1))$ is a minimal divider of M_1 . It follows that $(E(M_2) \cup \text{cl}_{M_1}(X_1)) \cap \text{cl}_M(Y_1 - \text{cl}_{M_1}(X_1)) = \text{cl}_{M_1}(X_1) \cap \text{cl}_{M_1}(Y_1) \subsetneq F$, a contradiction. Hence $(X \cap E(M_1), Y)$ is a minimal divider of M_1 . By the induction assumption, $M_1|F \cong P_k$, so $M|F \cong P_k$, as desired. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Barahona, F. and Grötschel, M., On the cycle polytope of a binary matroid, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **40** (1986), 40–62.
- [2] Berge, C., Some classes of perfect graphs, *Graph Theory and Theoretical Physics*, Academic Press, London, pp.155–165, 1967
- [3] Bonin, J. and de Mier, A., T -uniqueness of some families of k -chordal matroids, *Adv. in Appl. Math.* **32** (2004), 10–30.
- [4] Bose, R.C., Mathematical theory of the symmetrical factorial design, *Sankhyā* **8** (1947), 107–166.
- [5] Brylawski, T.H., Modular constructions for combinatorial geometries, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **203** (1975), 1–44.
- [6] Cordovil, R., Forge, D., and Klein, S., How is a chordal graph like a supersolvable binary matroid?, *Discrete Math.* **288** (2004), 167–172.
- [7] Diestel, R., *Graph Theory*, Third Edition, Springer, Berlin, 2005.
- [8] Dirac, G.A., On rigid circuit graphs, *Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg* **25** (1961), 71–76.
- [9] Geelen, J., Gerards, B., and Whittle, G., Disjoint cocircuits in matroids with large rank, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, **87** (2003), 270–279.
- [10] Mayhew, D. and Probert, A., Supersolvable saturated matroids and chordal graphs, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.03776>.
- [11] Murty, U.S.R., Matroids with Sylvester property, *Aequationes Math.* **4** (1970), 44–50.
- [12] Oxley, J., *Matroid Theory*, Second Edition, Oxford University Press, New York, 2011.
- [13] Rose, D.J., Triangulated graphs and the elimination process, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **32** (1970), 597–609.
- [14] Seymour, P.D. and Weaver, R.W., A generalization of chordal graphs, *J. Graph Theory* **8** (1984), 241–251.
- [15] Stanley, R.P., Supersolvable lattices, *Algebra Univ.* **2** (1972), 197–217.
- [16] Tutte, W.T., Menger’s Theorem for matroids, *J. Res. Nat. Bur. Standards Sect. B* **69B** (1965), 49–53.
- [17] Ziegler, G.M., Binary supersolvable matroids and modular constructions, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **113** (1991), 817–829.

MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY, BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA

Email address: jdouth5@lsu.edu

MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY, BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA

Email address: oxley@math.lsu.edu