

MATROIDS WITH MANY SMALL CIRCUITS AND COCIRCUITS

JAMES OXLEY, SIMON PFEIL, CHARLES SEMPLE, AND GEOFF WHITTLE

ABSTRACT. Tutte proved that a non-empty 3-connected matroid with every element in a 3-element circuit and a 3-element cocircuit is either a whirl or the cycle matroid of a wheel. This result led to the Splitter Theorem. More recently, Miller proved that a matroid of sufficient size with every pair of elements in a 4-element circuit and a 4-element cocircuit is a tipless spike. Here we investigate matroids having similar restrictions on their small circuits and cocircuits. In particular, we completely determine the 3-connected matroids with every pair of elements in a 4-element circuit and every element in a 3-element cocircuit, as well as the 4-connected matroids with every pair of elements in a 4-element circuit and every element in a 4-element cocircuit.

1. INTRODUCTION

The study of matroids with many small circuits and cocircuits begins with Tutte's well-known Wheels-and-Whirls Theorem [6]. This theorem was originally stated in terms of *essential* elements of a 3-connected matroid M , that is, elements e of M with the property that neither $M \setminus e$ nor M/e is 3-connected. We present it here in terms of 3-circuits and 3-cocircuits, where, as in the rest of the paper, a k -element circuit and a k' -element cocircuit is denoted as a k -circuit and k' -cocircuit, respectively.

Theorem 1.1. *Let M be a non-empty 3-connected matroid. Then every element of M is in a 3-circuit and a 3-cocircuit if and only if M has rank at least three and is isomorphic to a wheel or a whirl.*

Theorem 1.1 and its well-known extension, Seymour's Splitter Theorem [5], has been instrumental in the analysis of 3-connected matroids. More recently, Miller [2] proved the following result which has conditions similar to those in Tutte's theorem. For all $r \geq 3$, a rank- r *tipless spike* is a matroid

Date: December 13, 2018.

1991 Mathematics Subject Classification. 05B35.

Key words and phrases. Wheels-and-Whirls Theorem, 4-circuits, 3-cocircuits, 4-cocircuits.

The third and fourth authors were supported by the New Zealand Marsden Fund.

M with ground set $E = \{x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2, \dots, x_r, y_r\}$ whose circuits consist of the following sets:

- (i) all sets of the form $\{x_i, y_i, x_j, y_j\}$ with $1 \leq i < j \leq r$,
- (ii) a subset of $\{\{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_r\} : z_i \in \{x_i, y_i\} \text{ for all } i\}$ such that no two members of this subset have more than $r - 2$ common elements, and
- (iii) all $(r + 1)$ -element subsets of E that contain none of the sets in (i) and (ii).

Theorem 1.2. *Let M be a matroid with $|E(M)| \geq 13$. Then every pair of elements of M is in a 4-circuit and a 4-cocircuit if and only if M is a tipless spike.*

In this paper, we continue along a similar line of inquiry. A matroid M has *property (P1)* if every pair of elements is in a 4-circuit and every element is in a 3-cocircuit. Furthermore, a matroid M has *property (P2)* if every pair of elements is in a 4-circuit and every element is in a 4-cocircuit. The next two theorems are the main results of this paper. We denote the rank-3 whirl, the Fano matroid, and the non-Fano matroid by \mathcal{W}^3 , F_7 , and F_7^- , respectively. Also, up to isomorphism, we denote the rank-3 simple matroid with ground set $\{1, 2, \dots, 7\}$ and whose 3-circuits are $\{1, 2, 3\}$, $\{1, 4, 5\}$, $\{1, 6, 7\}$, $\{2, 4, 6\}$, and $\{3, 5, 7\}$ by P_7 .

Theorem 1.3. *Let M be a non-empty 3-connected matroid. Then M has property (P1) if and only if*

- (i) $|E(M)| \leq 8$ and M is isomorphic to one of the matroids $U_{3,5}$, $M(K_4)$, \mathcal{W}^3 , F_7 , $(F_7^-)^*$, and P_7^* , or
- (ii) $|E(M)| \geq 9$ and M is isomorphic to $M(K_{3,n})$ for some $n \geq 3$.

Theorem 1.4. *Let M be a non-empty 4-connected matroid. Then M has property (P2) if and only if*

- (i) $|E(M)| \leq 15$ and M is isomorphic to one of the thirty-five matroids listed in the appendix, or
- (ii) $|E(M)| \geq 16$ and M is isomorphic to $M(K_{4,n})$ for some $n \geq 4$.

It is clear that $M(K_{3,n})$, where $n \geq 3$, and $M(K_{4,n})$, where $n \geq 4$, satisfy (P1) and (P2), respectively. For $|E(M)| \geq 9$ and $|E(M)| \geq 16$, the necessary directions of the proofs of Theorems 1.3 and 1.4 are given in Sections 2 and 3, respectively. The connectivity conditions in Theorems 1.3 and 1.4 prevent an i -element subset of $E(M)$ from being both an i -circuit and an i -cocircuit, for $i = 3$ and $i = 4$, respectively. For the proof of Theorem 1.3 when $|E(M)| \leq 8$ and the proof of Theorem 1.4 when $|E(M)| \leq 15$, we refer the interested reader to Pfeil's PhD thesis [4]. We end the introduction with some preliminaries.

Throughout the paper, notation and terminology follows Oxley [3]. Let M be a matroid. Two subsets X and Y of $E(M)$ *meet* if $X \cap Y$ is non-empty. Referred to as *orthogonality*, it is well known that if C is a circuit and D is a cocircuit of M , then $|C \cap D| \neq 1$.

Lastly, let M_1 and M_2 be two matroids with ground sets E_1 and E_2 , respectively, and let $\varphi : E_1 \rightarrow E_2$ be a bijection. Then φ is a *weak map* from M_1 to M_2 if, for every independent set I in M_2 , we have $\varphi^{-1}(I)$ is independent in M_1 , in which case, M_2 is a *weak-map image* of M_1 . Equivalently, it is easily checked that, φ is a weak map from M_1 to M_2 if, for every circuit C of M_1 , we have $\varphi(C)$ contains a circuit in M_2 . As in this paper, it is typical to assume that E_1 and E_2 are the same sets and φ is the identity map. The following theorem is due to Lucas [1].

Theorem 1.5. *Let M_2 be the weak-map image of a binary matroid M_1 , and suppose that $r(M_2) = r(M_1)$. Then M_2 is binary. Moreover, if M_2 is connected, then $M_2 \cong M_1$.*

2. MATROIDS WITH PROPERTY (P1) AND AT LEAST 9 ELEMENTS

Throughout this section, M is a 3-connected matroid satisfying (P1) and with ground set $E(M) = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$, where $t \geq 4$. Our ability to determine M , for when $|E(M)| \geq 9$, explicitly relies on showing that $E(M)$ can be partitioned into blocks in which each block is a 3-cocircuit and M restricted to any two of these blocks is isomorphic to $M(K_{2,3})$. We first prove that if M has two distinct 3-cocircuits that meet in two elements, then M is isomorphic to $U_{3,5}$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let D_1 and D_2 be two 3-cocircuits of M such that $|D_1 \cap D_2| = 2$. Then $M \cong U_{3,5}$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, let $D_1 = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ and $D_2 = \{x_1, x_2, x_4\}$. Then $M^*(D_1 \cup D_2) \cong U_{2,4}$ since M is 3-connected. This implies that if $|E(M)| = 4$, then M has no 4-circuits; a contradiction, so $|E(M)| \geq 5$. Furthermore, by orthogonality, any circuit meeting $D_1 \cup D_2$ does so in at least three elements. By (P1), M has a 4-circuit C_1 containing $\{x_1, x_5\}$, and there is a unique element x_i in $\{x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ that is not in C_1 . Then, similarly, M has a 4-circuit C_2 containing $\{x_i, x_5\}$. Now $C_1 \cup C_2 = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5\}$ and $r(C_1 \cup C_2) = 3$. Also $r^*(C_1 \cup C_2) \leq 3$. Therefore

$$r(C_1 \cup C_2) + r^*(C_1 \cup C_2) - |C_1 \cup C_2| \leq 3 + 3 - 5 = 1,$$

and so $|E(M)| \leq 6$ as M is 3-connected. Using the fact that M satisfies (P1), a routine check shows that $|E(M)| \leq 5$, and so $M \cong U_{3,5}$. \square

The next three lemmas concern disjoint 3-cocircuits. The first shows that M restricted to two such 3-cocircuits is isomorphic to $M(K_{2,3})$, while the second and third accumulate in showing that if $|E(M)| \geq 9$, then M has three pairwise-disjoint 3-cocircuits.

Lemma 2.2. *Let D_1 and D_2 be two disjoint 3-cocircuits of M . Then $M|(D_1 \cup D_2) \cong M(K_{2,3})$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, let $D_1 = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ and $D_2 = \{x_4, x_5, x_6\}$. By (P1), M has a 4-circuit C_1 containing $\{x_1, x_4\}$. By orthogonality, we may assume $C_1 = \{x_1, x_2, x_4, x_5\}$. Similarly, M has a 4-circuit C_2 containing $\{x_3, x_6\}$. By symmetry, we may assume $C_2 = \{x_1, x_3, x_4, x_6\}$. Lastly, M has a 4-circuit C_3 containing $\{x_2, x_6\}$. We next show that C_3 does not meet either C_1 or C_2 in three elements.

Say $|C_1 \cap C_3| = 3$. Then $C_3 \subseteq (D_1 \cup D_2) - x_3$. As M is 3-connected, $M|(C_1 \cup C_3) \cong U_{3,5}$, and so there exists a 4-circuit in M meeting D_1 in exactly one element; a contradiction. Thus $|C_1 \cap C_3| \neq 3$ and, similarly, $|C_2 \cap C_3| \neq 3$.

By orthogonality with D_1 and D_2 , it now follows that neither x_1 nor x_4 is in C_3 , and so $C_3 = \{x_2, x_3, x_5, x_6\}$. We now apply Theorem 1.5 to complete the proof. Since $M|(D_1 \cup D_2) = M|(C_1 \cup C_2 \cup C_3)$, we have $r(M|(D_1 \cup D_2)) = 4$. Next, consider $K_{2,3}$, and label its edges so that

$$\{\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}, \{x_4, x_5, x_6\}\}$$

is a partition of $E(K_{2,3})$, where each block is a bond of $K_{2,3}$, and $\{x_1, x_2, x_4, x_5\}$, $\{x_1, x_3, x_4, x_6\}$, and $\{x_2, x_3, x_5, x_6\}$ are the 4-cycles of $K_{2,3}$. Then the identity map from $E(M(K_{2,3}))$ to $E(M|(D_1 \cup D_2))$ is a weak map from $M(K_{2,3})$ to $M|(D_1 \cup D_2)$. Moreover, as $M|(D_1 \cup D_2)$ is connected, Theorem 1.5 implies that $M|(D_1 \cup D_2) \cong M(K_{2,3})$. \square

Lemma 2.3. *If $|E(M)| \geq 9$, then M has two disjoint 3-cocircuits.*

Proof. Suppose $|E(M)| \geq 9$ and M has no pair of disjoint 3-cocircuits. Let D_1 and D_2 be distinct 3-cocircuits of M . Then, by Lemma 2.1, $|D_1 \cap D_2| = 1$ and so, without loss of generality, we may assume $D_1 = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ and $D_2 = \{x_1, x_4, x_5\}$. We first show that M has an element contained in three 3-cocircuits.

Assume M has no such element. By (P1), M has a 3-cocircuit D_3 containing x_6 . By assumption, D_3 meets each of D_1 and D_2 and so, without loss of generality, $D_3 = \{x_2, x_4, x_6\}$. But M also has a 3-cocircuit containing x_7 , and such a cocircuit cannot meet each of D_1 , D_2 , and D_3 without using an element shared by two of them. Thus M has an element contained in three 3-cocircuits.

By Lemma 2.1, we may now assume that M has a 3-cocircuit $D_3 = \{x_1, x_6, x_7\}$. Consider a 3-cocircuit D_4 of M containing x_8 . Since D_4 meets each of D_1 , D_2 , and D_3 , we have $x_1 \in D_4$ and so, by Lemma 2.1, we may assume $D_4 = \{x_1, x_8, x_9\}$. However, by (P1), M has a 4-circuit C containing $\{x_1, x_2\}$. By orthogonality, each of $|C \cap D_2|$, $|C \cap D_3|$, and $|C \cap D_4|$ is at least 2 which is impossible as $|C| = 4$. This contradiction establishes the lemma. \square

Lemma 2.4. *If $|E(M)| \geq 9$, then M has three pairwise-disjoint 3-cocircuits.*

Proof. Suppose $|E(M)| \geq 9$. By Lemma 2.3, M has disjoint 3-cocircuits, $D_1 = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ and $D_2 = \{x_4, x_5, x_6\}$ say. By Lemma 2.2, we have $M|(D_1 \cup D_2) \cong M(K_{2,3})$. Therefore, without loss of generality, we may assume that M has circuits $C_1 = \{x_1, x_2, x_4, x_5\}$, $C_2 = \{x_1, x_3, x_4, x_6\}$, and $C_3 = \{x_2, x_3, x_5, x_6\}$. By (P1), M has a 3-cocircuit D_3 containing x_7 . If M does not contain three pairwise-disjoint 3-cocircuits, then D_3 meets $D_1 \cup D_2$ and, by orthogonality, it must do so in one of the pairs $\{x_1, x_4\}$, $\{x_2, x_5\}$, $\{x_3, x_6\}$. Therefore, by symmetry, we may assume $D_3 = \{x_1, x_4, x_7\}$. Similarly, if D_4 is a 3-cocircuit of M containing x_8 , then, by Lemma 2.1, we may assume $D_4 = \{x_2, x_5, x_8\}$. Finally, applying the same argument again, if D_5 is a 3-cocircuit of M containing x_9 , we have $D_5 = \{x_3, x_6, x_9\}$. But then D_3 , D_4 , and D_5 are disjoint, thereby completing the proof of the lemma. \square

We next show that $E(M)$ can be partitioned into 3-cocircuits provided $|E(M)| \geq 9$.

Lemma 2.5. *If $|E(M)| \geq 9$, then $E(M)$ can be partitioned into 3-element blocks, where each block is a 3-cocircuit.*

Proof. Suppose $|E(M)| \geq 9$, and let $S = \{D_1, D_2, \dots, D_n\}$ be the largest collection of pairwise-disjoint 3-cocircuits of M . By Lemma 2.4, we have $n \geq 3$. Suppose there is an element x in M not in any of the sets D_1, D_2, \dots, D_n . By (P1), M has a 3-cocircuit D containing x . Now D has a non-empty intersection with a 3-cocircuit in S ; otherwise, S is not of maximum size. Without loss of generality, $D \cap D_1 \neq \emptyset$ and so, by Lemma 2.1, $|D \cap D_1| = 1$. By Lemma 2.2, $M|(D_1 \cup D_i) \cong M(K_{2,3})$ for all $i \in \{2, 3, \dots, n\}$. Thus, by orthogonality, D meets each of D_2, D_3, \dots, D_n . But then $|D| \geq 4$ as $n \geq 3$; a contradiction. Thus, the lemma is proved. \square

We are now ready to prove the necessary direction of Theorem 1.3 when $|E(M)| \geq 9$.

Proof of Theorem 1.3 for $|E(M)| \geq 9$. Suppose $|E(M)| \geq 9$. Then, by Lemma 2.5, there is a partition of $E(M)$ into 3-cocircuits D_1, D_2, \dots, D_n

where $D_i = \{x_i, y_i, z_i\}$ for all i . By Lemma 2.2, $M|(D_1 \cup D_i) \cong M(K_{2,3})$ for all $i \in \{2, 3, \dots, n\}$, so we may assume that M has 4-circuits $\{x_1, x_i, y_1, y_i\}$, $\{x_1, x_i, z_1, z_i\}$, and $\{y_1, y_i, z_1, z_i\}$ for all such i . Consider the circuits $\{x_1, x_i, y_1, y_i\}$ and $\{x_1, x_j, y_1, y_j\}$, where i and j are distinct. By circuit elimination and orthogonality, $\{x_i, y_i, x_j, y_j\}$ is a 4-circuit of M . Similarly, for all distinct $i, j \in \{2, 3, \dots, n\}$, we have $\{x_i, z_i, x_j, z_j\}$ and $\{y_i, z_i, y_j, z_j\}$ are 4-circuits of M .

We next show that each set of the form

$$\{x_i, y_i, y_j, z_j, z_k, x_k\},$$

where i, j , and k are distinct elements in $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, is a 6-circuit of M . Using circuit elimination on $\{x_i, y_i, x_j, y_j\}$ and $\{x_j, z_j, x_k, z_k\}$, it follows that $\{x_i, y_i, y_j, x_k, z_j, z_k\}$ contains a circuit of M . By orthogonality and as each of $M|(D_i \cup D_j)$, $M|(D_i \cup D_k)$, and $M|(D_j \cup D_k)$ is isomorphic to $M(K_{2,3})$, it is easily checked that $\{x_i, y_i, y_j, x_k, z_j, z_k\}$ is itself a 6-circuit of M .

Now consider $K_{3,n}$, where $n \geq 3$. Label the edge set of $K_{3,n}$ so that

$$\{\{x_1, y_1, z_1\}, \{x_2, y_2, z_2\}, \dots, \{x_n, y_n, z_n\}\}$$

is a partition of $E(K_{3,n})$, where each block is a bond of $K_{3,n}$, and $\{x_i, y_i, x_j, y_j\}$, $\{x_i, z_i, x_j, z_j\}$, and $\{y_i, z_i, y_j, z_j\}$ are 4-cycles of $K_{3,n}$ for all distinct $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Then the identity map φ from $E(M(K_{3,n}))$ to $E(M)$ is a weak map from $M(K_{3,n})$ to M since, for each circuit C of $M(K_{3,n})$, we have $\varphi(C)$ is a circuit of M by above.

We next prove that $r(M) = r(M(K_{3,n}))$. To do this, we show, by induction, that for all 3-connected matroids M' satisfying (P1) and whose ground set can be partitioned into m 3-cocircuits, where $m \geq 3$, we have $r(M') = r(M(K_{3,m}))$. If $n = 3$, then, by Lemma 2.2 and the 4-circuits established above, $r(M) = r(M(K_{3,3}))$. Therefore suppose $n \geq 4$ and that, for all matroids M' as described above, with $3 \leq m \leq n - 1$, we have $r(M') = r(M(K_{3,m}))$. Let M^- denote the matroid $M|(D_1 \cup D_2 \cup \dots \cup D_{n-1})$. We first show that M^- satisfies (P1). Evidently, every element of M^- is in a 3-cocircuit. Let x and y be distinct elements of M^- . If x and y are in distinct 3-cocircuits D_i and D_j of M^- , then, by orthogonality and M satisfying (P1), M^- has a 4-circuit containing $\{x, y\}$. Say x and y are in the same 3-cocircuit, D_i say, of M^- . By considering D_i with either D_1 if $i \neq 1$ or D_2 if $i = 1$, it follows by Lemma 2.2 that M^- has a 4-circuit containing $\{x, y\}$. Lastly, it remains to show that M^- is 3-connected. If M^- is not 3-connected, then it has a 2-separation (A, B) . Since $n - 1 \geq 3$, it follows that, for some $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n - 1\}$, there is a 3-cocircuit D_i such that for one of A and B , say A , we have $D_i \subseteq A$, or $|D_i \cap A| = 2$ and $|B| \geq 3$. Thus, we may assume that $D_1 \subseteq A$. But then, by the 4-circuits above,

$r(A \cup D_n) = r(A) + 1$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} r(A \cup D_n) + r(B) - r(M) &= r(A) + 1 + r(B) - (r(M^-) + 1) \\ &= r(A) + r(B) - r(M^-), \end{aligned}$$

and so $(A \cup D_n, B)$ is a 2-separation in M ; a contradiction. Thus M^- is 3-connected. By induction,

$$r(M^-) = r(M|(D_1 \cup D_2 \cup \cdots \cup D_{n-1})) = r(M(K_{3,n-1})),$$

and so, as D_n is a cocircuit of M ,

$$r(M) = r(M|(D_1 \cup D_2 \cup \cdots \cup D_{n-1})) + 1 = r(M(K_{3,n})).$$

Finally, M is connected and so, by Theorem 1.5, $M \cong M(K_{3,n})$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.3. \square

3. MATROIDS WITH PROPERTY (P2) AND AT LEAST 16 ELEMENTS

Throughout this section, M is a 4-connected matroid satisfying (P2). Unless stated otherwise, M has ground set $E(M) = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$, where $t \geq 4$. The approach is similar to that of the last section. In particular, most of the work is in establishing that if $|E(M)| \geq 16$, then there is partition of $E(M)$ into blocks in which each block is a 4-cocircuit. However, because of the freedom of 4-cocircuits in comparison to 3-cocircuits, the case analysis is much more involved. We begin with a lemma analogous to Lemma 2.1.

Lemma 3.1. *Let D_1 and D_2 be 4-cocircuits of M such that $|D_1 \cap D_2| = 3$. Then $M \cong U_{3,6}$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, let $D_1 = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ and $D_2 = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_5\}$. Then $M^*(D_1 \cup D_2) \cong U_{3,5}$ as M is 4-connected. Therefore, if $|E(M)| = 5$, then M has no 4-circuits; a contradiction, so $|E(M)| \geq 6$. Furthermore, by orthogonality, any circuit meeting $D_1 \cup D_2$ does so in at least three elements.

By (P2), M has a 4-circuit C_1 containing $\{x_1, x_6\}$. Similarly, M has a 4-circuit C_2 containing $\{x_i, x_6\}$, where $x_i \in (D_1 \cup D_2) - C_1$. Since $C_1 - x_6 \subseteq D_1 \cup D_2$ and $C_2 - x_6 \subseteq D_1 \cup D_2$, it follows by circuit elimination that M has a circuit $C_3 \subseteq D_1 \cup D_2$. Since M is 4-connected and $|E(M)| \geq 6$, we have $|C_3| \in \{4, 5\}$. Now

$$r(C_3) + r^*(C_3) - |C_3| = 2,$$

so, as M is 4-connected, $|E(M)| \leq 7$. As M satisfies (P2), a routine check shows that $|E(M)| \leq 6$, and so $M \cong U_{3,6}$. \square

We next establish an analogue of Lemma 2.2. In particular, Lemma 3.5 states that if M has two disjoint 4-cocircuits, then M restricted to these 4-cocircuits is isomorphic to $M(K_{2,4})$. This lemma requires three preliminary results. In each of these preliminary results as well as Lemma 3.5, we suppose that $X = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ and $Y = \{y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4\}$ are disjoint 4-cocircuits of M . Observe that orthogonality and the 4-connectedness of M imply that every 4-circuit contained in $X \cup Y$ meets each of X and Y in exactly two elements.

Lemma 3.2. *Let C_1 and C_2 be distinct 4-circuits of M contained in $X \cup Y$ such that $|C_1 \cap C_2 \cap X| \geq 1$. Then $|C_1 \cap C_2 \cap X| = 1$.*

Proof. Since each 4-circuit contained in $X \cup Y$ meets each of X and Y in exactly two elements, it suffices to show that $|C_1 \cap C_2 \cap X| \neq 2$. Suppose $|C_1 \cap C_2 \cap X| = 2$. Then $|C_1 \cap C_2| \in \{2, 3\}$. If $|C_1 \cap C_2| = 3$, then we may assume that $C_1 = \{x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2\}$, and $C_2 = \{x_1, x_2, y_1, y_3\}$. By circuit elimination, M has a circuit contained in $\{x_1, y_1, y_2, y_3\}$, but such a circuit contradicts either the 4-connectivity of M or orthogonality. If $|C_1 \cap C_2| = 2$, then we may assume that $C_1 = \{x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2\}$, and $C_2 = \{x_1, x_2, y_3, y_4\}$. By circuit elimination, M has a circuit contained in $\{x_1, y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4\}$. But again, such a circuit contradicts either the 4-connectivity of M or orthogonality. Thus $|C_1 \cap C_2 \cap X| \neq 2$, thereby completing the proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma 3.3. *Let C_1 , C_2 , and C_3 be distinct 4-circuits of M such that $C_1 \cup C_2 \cup C_3 \subseteq X \cup Y$ and $X \subseteq C_1 \cup C_2 \cup C_3$. Then $Y \subseteq C_1 \cup C_2 \cup C_3$.*

Proof. Suppose $Y - (C_1 \cup C_2 \cup C_3)$ is non-empty. Then, by Lemma 3.2, we may assume that $C_1 \cap Y = \{y_2, y_3\}$, $C_2 \cap Y = \{y_1, y_3\}$, and $C_3 \cap Y = \{y_1, y_2\}$. Furthermore, by Lemma 3.2, we may also assume that $C_1 \cap X = \{x_1, x_2\}$ and $C_2 \cap X = \{x_1, x_3\}$, in which case, $\{x_1, y_1, y_2, y_3\}$ spans X . Now X is independent as M is 4-connected, and so $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\} \subseteq \text{cl}(X)$. But then M has a circuit that contains y_1 and is contained in $X \cup y_1$. This contradiction to orthogonality completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma 3.4. *Let C_1 and C_2 be distinct 4-circuits of M in $X \cup Y$ such that $|C_1 \cap C_2| \geq 1$. Then $|C_1 \cap C_2| = 2$.*

Proof. Assume $|C_1 \cap C_2| \neq 2$. Since

$$|C_1 \cap C_2| = |C_1 \cap C_2 \cap X| + |C_1 \cap C_2 \cap Y|,$$

it follows by Lemma 3.2 and symmetry that we may assume $|C_1 \cap C_2 \cap X| = 1$ and $|C_1 \cap C_2 \cap Y| = 0$. Without loss of generality, let $C_1 = \{x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2\}$ and $C_2 = \{x_1, x_3, y_3, y_4\}$. By Lemma 3.3, any additional 4-circuit of M contained in $X \cup Y$ includes x_4 . By (P2), M has a 4-circuit C_3 containing $\{x_2, y_3\}$. By orthogonality and Lemma 3.2, we may assume $C_3 = \{x_2, x_4, y_1, y_3\}$.

Similarly, M has a 4-circuit C_4 containing $\{x_2, y_4\}$. But then $x_4 \in C_4$ and $|C_3 \cap C_4 \cap X| = 2$, contradicting Lemma 3.2. The lemma now follows. \square

Lemma 3.5. *The restriction $M|(X \cup Y) \cong M(K_{2,4})$.*

Proof. By (P2), M has a 4-circuit C_1 containing x_1 and y_1 . By orthogonality, we may assume $C_1 = \{x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2\}$. Furthermore, M has a 4-circuit C_2 containing x_1 and y_3 . By orthogonality and Lemmas 3.2 and 3.4, we may assume $C_2 = \{x_1, x_3, y_1, y_3\}$. Similarly, M has a 4-circuit C_3 containing x_1 and y_4 and, by Lemmas 3.2 and 3.4, $C_3 = \{x_1, x_4, y_1, y_4\}$.

Continuing this process, M has a 4-circuit C_4 containing x_2 and y_3 . Since $x_2 \in C_1 \cap C_4$, we have $x_1 \notin C_4$ by Lemma 3.2. Therefore, as $y_3 \in C_2 \cap C_4$, Lemma 3.4 implies that $x_3 \in C_4$. Since $x_2 \in C_1 \cap C_4$ and $x_3, y_3 \in C_2 \cap C_4$, it follows by Lemma 3.4 that $y_2 \in C_4$. Hence $C_4 = \{x_2, x_3, y_2, y_3\}$. Similarly, M has a unique 4-circuit containing x_2 and y_4 and it is $C_5 = \{x_2, x_4, y_2, y_4\}$, and M has a unique 4-circuit containing x_3 and y_4 and it is $C_6 = \{x_3, x_4, y_3, y_4\}$.

We now show that $\mathcal{C}(M|(X \cup Y)) = \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_6\}$. First observe that, since every 2-element subset of each of X and Y is in one of C_1, C_2, \dots, C_6 , Lemma 3.2 implies that $M|(X \cup Y)$ has no other 4-circuits. Clearly, $r(X \cup Y) = 5$. Suppose there is a circuit $C \in \mathcal{C}(M|(X \cup Y)) - \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_6\}$. If $|C| = 6$, then C contains C_i for some $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 6\}$; a contradiction. Therefore, $|C| = 5$. To maintain orthogonality, either $|C \cap X| = 2$ or $|C \cap Y| = 2$. Thus to avoid containing one of the six 4-circuits, we may assume that $C = \{x_1, x_2, y_2, y_3, y_4\}$. But then, $\text{cl}(\{x_1, y_2, y_3, y_4\}) = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4\}$, so $r(X \cup Y) = 4$; a contradiction. Thus $\mathcal{C}(M|(X \cup Y)) = \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_6\}$. It is now easily checked that $M|(X \cup Y) \cong M(K_{2,4})$. \square

The next main step in the proof of Theorem 1.4 is to show that if $|E(M)| \geq 11$, then M has two disjoint 4-cocircuits. Stated as Lemma 3.15, its proof is long and consists of a sequence of preliminary lemmas. Except for the first, these preliminary lemmas concern the way 4-cocircuits intersect if M has no two disjoint 4-cocircuits.

Lemma 3.6. *Let D_1, D_2 , and D_3 be 4-cocircuits of M such that $|D_1 \cap D_2 \cap D_3| = 1$ and $|D_i \cap D_j| = 1$ for all distinct $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Then $E(M) = D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3$, that is, $|E(M)| = 10$.*

Proof. Suppose that $E(M) - (D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3) \neq \emptyset$. Let $y \in E(M) - (D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3)$ and $D_1 \cap D_2 \cap D_3 = \{x\}$. By (P2), M has a 4-circuit C containing $\{x, y\}$ and, by orthogonality, $|C \cap D_i| \geq 2$ for all i . But then $|C| \geq 5$; a contradiction. \square

The next two lemmas show that if $|E(M)| \geq 11$ and M has no two disjoint 4-cocircuits, then M has two 4-cocircuits meeting in exactly two elements and that every other 4-cocircuit of M meets the union of two such 4-cocircuits in at least two elements. These two lemmas underlie the approach taken to establish Lemma 3.15.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $|E(M)| \geq 11$, and suppose that M has no two disjoint 4-cocircuits. Then M has 4-cocircuits D_1 and D_2 such that $|D_1 \cap D_2| = 2$.*

Proof. Suppose the lemma does not hold. By (P2), M has a 4-cocircuit D_1 containing x_1 . Without loss of generality, we may assume $D_1 = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$. Also, M has a 4-cocircuit D_2 that contains x_5 and, as M has no two disjoint 4-cocircuits, meets D_1 . By Lemma 3.1, $|D_1 \cap D_2| = 1$, and so we may assume $D_2 = \{x_1, x_5, x_6, x_7\}$. Similarly, M has a 4-cocircuit D_3 that contains x_8 and $|D_1 \cap D_3| = |D_2 \cap D_3| = 1$. As $|E(M)| \geq 11$, it follows by Lemma 3.6 that $x_1 \notin D_3$. Therefore, without loss of generality, $D_3 = \{x_2, x_5, x_8, x_9\}$. Lastly, M has a 4-cocircuit D_4 containing x_{10} and

$$|D_1 \cap D_4| = |D_2 \cap D_4| = |D_3 \cap D_4| = 1.$$

By Lemma 3.6, we may assume $D_4 = \{x_3, x_6, x_8, x_{10}\}$. But then, a similar argument implies that M has the 4-cocircuit $D_5 = \{x_4, x_7, x_9, x_{11}\}$, in which case D_4 and D_5 are disjoint; a contradiction. \square

Lemma 3.8. *Let $|E(M)| \geq 10$, and suppose that M has no two disjoint 4-cocircuits. Let D_1, D_2 , and D_3 be 4-cocircuits of M such that $|D_1 \cap D_2| = 2$. Then $|D_3 \cap (D_1 \cup D_2)| \geq 2$.*

Proof. If the lemma does not hold, then $|D_3 \cap (D_1 \cup D_2)| = 1$. More specifically, as M has no two disjoint 4-cocircuits, $|D_1 \cap D_2 \cap D_3| = 1$. Let $\{x\} = D_1 \cap D_2 \cap D_3$. By circuit elimination, M has a cocircuit $D_4 \subseteq (D_1 \cup D_2) - \{x\}$. Since $D_3 \cap D_4 = \emptyset$, it follows that $|D_4| \neq 4$. Therefore, as M is 4-connected, $D_4 = (D_1 \cup D_2) - \{x\}$.

Since $|E(M)| \geq 10$, we have $|E(M) - (D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3)| \geq 1$. Let $y \in E(M) - (D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3)$, and let C be a 4-circuit containing $\{x, y\}$. To preserve orthogonality, C contains an element in $D_3 - \{x\}$ and the unique element in $(D_1 \cap D_2) - \{x\}$. But then $|C \cap D_4| = 1$. This contradiction to orthogonality proves the lemma. \square

Lemma 3.9. *Let $|E(M)| \geq 9$, and suppose that M has no two disjoint 4-cocircuits. Let D_1, D_2 , and D_3 be distinct 4-cocircuits of M such that $|D_1 \cap D_2| = 2$. Then $D_1 \cap D_2 \not\subseteq D_3$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, let $D_1 = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ and $D_2 = \{x_1, x_2, x_5, x_6\}$. Suppose that $\{x_1, x_2\} \subseteq D_3$. By Lemma 3.1, we may assume that $D_3 = \{x_1, x_2, x_7, x_8\}$. Using circuit elimination on each pair

of cocircuits in $\{D_1, D_2, D_3\}$ and eliminating x_2 , we find that each of $\{x_1, x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6\}$, $\{x_1, x_3, x_4, x_7, x_8\}$, and $\{x_1, x_5, x_6, x_7, x_8\}$ contains a cocircuit. Noting that M has no cocircuits of size at most three, each such cocircuit must contain x_1 ; otherwise, M has two disjoint 4-cocircuits. Moreover, for each of these 5-element sets, every 4-element subset containing x_1 meets D_1 , D_2 , or D_3 in exactly three elements. Thus, by Lemma 3.1, none of these subsets is a 4-cocircuit. Hence each of these 5-element sets is a cocircuit, which we refer to as D_5 , D_6 , and D_7 , respectively.

By (P2), M has a 4-circuit C_1 containing $\{x_1, x_9\}$. By considering the intersection of C_1 with each of D_1 , D_2 , and D_3 , we see that $x_2 \in C_1$. But then, regardless of the choice for the remaining element in C_1 , it follows that C_1 meets one of D_5 , D_6 , and D_7 in exactly one element, contradicting orthogonality. This contradiction proves the lemma. \square

Lemma 3.10. *Let $|E(M)| \geq 11$, and suppose that M has no two disjoint 4-cocircuits. Let D_1 , D_2 , and D_3 be 4-cocircuits of M such that $|D_1 \cap D_2 \cap D_3| = 1$. Then $|D_i \cap D_j| = 1$ for some distinct elements $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.*

Proof. Suppose the lemma does not hold. Then, by Lemmas 3.1 and 3.9, we may assume, without loss of generality, that $D_1 = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$, $D_2 = \{x_1, x_2, x_5, x_6\}$, and $D_3 = \{x_1, x_3, x_5, x_7\}$. Let C_1 be a 4-circuit of M containing $\{x_8, x_9\}$. If C_1 meets $D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3$, then, by orthogonality, it does so in at least three elements. Therefore $C_1 \cap (D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3) = \emptyset$, so $|E(M)| \geq 11$ and we may assume $C_1 = \{x_8, x_9, x_{10}, x_{11}\}$.

Now let D_4 be a 4-cocircuit of M containing x_8 . By orthogonality, we may assume $x_9 \in D_4$. Since M has no two disjoint 4-cocircuits, D_4 meets each of D_1 , D_2 , and D_3 . Furthermore, by Lemma 3.8, D_4 contains at least two elements from each of $D_1 \cup D_2$, $D_1 \cup D_3$, and $D_2 \cup D_3$. If $x_1 \in D_4$, then, by Lemma 3.9, none of x_2 , x_3 , and x_5 are in D_4 . It follows that $x_1 \notin D_4$. Therefore, without loss of generality, $D_4 = \{x_2, x_3, x_8, x_9\}$.

Finally, let C_2 be a 4-circuit of M containing $\{x_4, x_{10}\}$. By orthogonality, $|C_2 \cap D_1| \geq 2$. If $x_1 \notin C_2$, then, without loss of generality, we may assume that $x_2 \in C_2$. But then $C_2 \cap D_2 \neq \emptyset$ and $C_2 \cap D_4 \neq \emptyset$, and it follows by orthogonality that $|C_2 \cap D_2| \geq 2$ and $|C_2 \cap D_4| \geq 2$, which is not possible. Thus $x_1 \in C_2$. Therefore $C_2 \cap D_2 \neq \emptyset$ and $C_2 \cap D_3 \neq \emptyset$, and so $C_2 = \{x_1, x_4, x_5, x_{10}\}$. Similarly, M has a unique 4-circuit C_3 containing $\{x_4, x_{11}\}$ and it is $C_3 = \{x_1, x_4, x_5, x_{11}\}$. As M is 4-connected, $M|(C_2 \cup C_3)$ is isomorphic to $U_{3,5}$. In turn, this implies that M has a circuit, namely, $\{x_4, x_5, x_{10}, x_{11}\}$ meeting D_1 in exactly one element. This contradiction completes the proof of the lemma. \square

For the rest of the lemmas leading to the proof that M has two disjoint 4-cocircuits if $|E(M)| \geq 11$, we frequently refer to the way in which a 4-cocircuit intersects two other 4-cocircuits which share two elements. For ease of reading, we introduce the following terminology.

Let D_1 , D_2 , and D_3 be 4-cocircuits of M such that $|D_1 \cap D_2| = 2$. With respect to (D_1, D_2) , we say that D_3 is

- (i) *Type-1* if $|D_3 \cap (D_1 \cap D_2)| = 1$, and $|D_3 \cap (D_1 - D_2)| = 1$, and $|D_3 \cap (D_2 - D_1)| = 0$,
- (ii) *Type-2* if $|D_3 \cap (D_1 \cap D_2)| = 0$, and $|D_3 \cap D_1| = |D_3 \cap D_2| = 1$, and
- (iii) *Type-3* if $|D_3 \cap (D_1 \cap D_2)| = 0$, and $|D_3 \cap D_1| = 2$, and $|D_3 \cap D_2| = 1$.

Set diagrams of the three types are shown in Fig. 1.




FIGURE 1. Set diagrams of Types-1, -2, and -3 intersections.

Note that Type-2 intersections are symmetric, and therefore we will denote this intersection by $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-2. There will be occasions in which it is sufficient to specify that D_3 is either (D_1, D_2) -Type- i or (D_2, D_1) -Type- i for a fixed $i \in \{1, 3\}$. In these instances, we will say that D_3 is $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type- i . The previous lemmas ensure that any 4-cocircuit not contained in $D_1 \cup D_2$ intersects $D_1 \cup D_2$ in one of the above types if M has no two disjoint 4-cocircuits and $|E(M)| \geq 11$. We prove this in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.11. *Let $|E(M)| \geq 11$, and suppose that M has no two disjoint 4-cocircuits. Let D_1 and D_2 be 4-cocircuits of M such that $|D_1 \cap D_2| = 2$. If D_3 is a 4-cocircuit of M such that $D_3 \not\subseteq D_1 \cup D_2$, then D_3 is $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type- i for some $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.*

Proof. Let D_3 be a 4-cocircuit of M not contained in $D_1 \cup D_2$. By Lemma 3.9, $|D_3 \cap (D_1 \cap D_2)| \in \{0, 1\}$. Suppose that $|D_3 \cap (D_1 \cap D_2)| = 1$. By Lemma 3.8, $|D_3 \cap (D_1 \cup D_2)| \geq 2$, so we may assume $|D_3 \cap (D_1 - D_2)| = 1$. Since $|D_1 \cap D_2| = 2$ and $|D_1 \cap D_3| = 2$, it follows by Lemma 3.10 that $|D_2 \cap D_3| = 1$. Therefore $|D_3 \cap (D_2 - D_1)| = 0$, and D_3 is (D_1, D_2) -Type-1.

Now suppose that $|D_3 \cap (D_1 \cap D_2)| = 0$. As M has no two disjoint 4-cocircuits, we have $D_1 \cap D_3 \neq \emptyset$ and $D_2 \cap D_3 \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, without loss of generality, as $D_3 \not\subseteq D_1 \cup D_2$, either $|D_1 \cap D_3| = |D_2 \cap D_3| = 1$, or $|D_1 \cap D_3| = 2$ and $|D_2 \cap D_3| = 1$. In particular, D_3 is $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-2 or (D_1, D_2) -Type-3, respectively. \square

For when $|E(M)| \geq 11$, the next three lemmas show that if M has no two disjoint 4-cocircuits, and D_1, D_2 , and D_3 are 4-cocircuits of M such that $|D_1 \cap D_2| = 2$ and $D_3 \not\subseteq D_1 \cup D_2$, then D_3 is neither $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-2 nor $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-3.

Lemma 3.12. *Let $|E(M)| \geq 11$, and suppose that M has no two disjoint 4-cocircuits. Let D_1, D_2, D_3 , and D_4 be distinct 4-cocircuits of M such that $|D_1 \cap D_2| = 2$ and D_3 is $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-2. If $D_4 \not\subseteq D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3$, then D_4 is $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-1.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, let $D_1 = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$, $D_2 = \{x_1, x_2, x_5, x_6\}$, and $D_3 = \{x_3, x_5, x_7, x_8\}$, and suppose $x_9 \in D_4$. If D_4 is not $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-1, then, by Lemma 3.11, it is either $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-2 or $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-3. First assume that D_4 is $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-3. Then, without loss of generality, either $D_4 = \{x_3, x_4, x_5, x_9\}$ or $D_4 = \{x_3, x_4, x_6, x_9\}$. If $D_4 = \{x_3, x_4, x_5, x_9\}$, then $|D_3 \cap D_4| = 2$ and $|D_2 \cap (D_3 \cup D_4)| < 2$, contradicting Lemma 3.8. Similarly, if $D_4 = \{x_3, x_4, x_6, x_9\}$, then $|D_1 \cap D_4| = 2$ and $|D_3 \cap (D_1 \cup D_4)| < 2$, again contradicting Lemma 3.8. Thus D_4 is not $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-3.

Now assume that D_4 is $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-2. Then $|D_4 \cap \{x_3, x_5\}| \leq 1$; otherwise, $\{x_3, x_5\} \subseteq D_4$ and $|D_1 \cap (D_3 \cup D_4)| < 2$, contradicting Lemma 3.8. If $|D_4 \cap \{x_3, x_5\}| = 1$, then, without loss of generality, $x_3 \in D_4$. Since D_4 is $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-2, we have $x_6 \in D_4$. Furthermore, either x_7 or x_8 is in D_4 ; otherwise, $|D_1 \cap D_3 \cap D_4| = 1$ and $|D_i \cap D_j| = 1$ for all distinct $i, j \in \{1, 3, 4\}$, and so we contradict Lemma 3.6 as $|E(M)| \geq 11$. Hence, by Lemma 3.1, we may assume $D_4 = \{x_3, x_6, x_7, x_9\}$. But then $|D_3 \cap D_4| = 2$ and $|D_1 \cap (D_3 \cup D_4)| < 2$, contradicting Lemma 3.8.

It now follows that D_4 avoids $\{x_3, x_5\}$, and so $x_4, x_6 \in D_4$. Furthermore, as M has no disjoint 4-cocircuits, we may assume $x_7 \in D_4$. Thus $D_4 = \{x_4, x_6, x_7, x_9\}$. By (P2), M has a 4-cocircuit D_5 containing x_{10} .

By Lemma 3.11, D_5 is $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type- i for some $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. By applying the argument that showed D_4 is not $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-3 to D_5 , we have that D_5 is not $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-3. If D_5 is $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-2, then, by the analysis of the previous paragraph, $\{x_4, x_6\} \subseteq D_5$ and $\{x_7, x_8\} \cap D_5 \neq \emptyset$. If $D_5 = \{x_4, x_6, x_7, x_{10}\}$, then $|D_4 \cap D_5| = 3$, and so, by Lemma 3.1, M is isomorphic to $U_{3,6}$; a contradiction. If $D_5 = \{x_4, x_6, x_8, x_{10}\}$, then $|D_4 \cap D_5| = 2$ and $|D_1 \cap (D_4 \cup D_5)| < 2$, contradicting Lemma 3.8. Therefore D_5 is $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-1. It is easily checked that, by symmetry, we may assume that D_5 is (D_1, D_2) -Type-1.

By symmetry, we may assume $\{x_1, x_3\} \subseteq D_5$. Furthermore, D_5 contains either x_7 or x_9 ; otherwise, $D_4 \cap D_5 = \emptyset$. But, if $D_5 = \{x_1, x_3, x_7, x_{10}\}$, then $|D_3 \cap D_5| = 2$ and $|D_4 \cap (D_3 \cup D_5)| < 2$, contradicting Lemma 3.8. Similarly, if $D_5 = \{x_1, x_3, x_9, x_{10}\}$, then $|D_1 \cap D_5| = 2$ and $|D_3 \cap (D_1 \cup D_5)| < 2$, again contradicting Lemma 3.8. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma 3.13. *Let $|E(M)| \geq 11$, and suppose M has no two disjoint 4-cocircuits. Let D_1, D_2 and D_3 be distinct 4-cocircuits of M such that $|D_1 \cap D_2| = 2$ and $D_3 \not\subseteq D_1 \cup D_2$. Then D_3 is not $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-2.*

Proof. Suppose D_3 is $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-2. Then, without loss of generality, let $D_1 = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$, $D_2 = \{x_1, x_2, x_5, x_6\}$, and $D_3 = \{x_3, x_5, x_7, x_8\}$. By (P2), M has a 4-cocircuit D_4 containing x_9 . By symmetry and Lemma 3.12, we may assume that D_4 is (D_1, D_2) -Type-1, in which case, D_4 meets $\{x_3, x_4\}$ but avoids $\{x_5, x_6\}$. Since $|D_1 \cap D_4| = 2$, it follows by Lemma 3.8 that $|D_3 \cap (D_1 \cup D_4)| \geq 2$, so $D_4 \cap \{x_7, x_8\} \neq \emptyset$. Hence, without loss of generality, either $D_4 = \{x_1, x_3, x_7, x_9\}$ or $D_4 = \{x_1, x_4, x_7, x_9\}$. First assume that $D_4 = \{x_1, x_3, x_7, x_9\}$.

3.13.1. *Let D be a 4-cocircuit of M such that $D \not\subseteq D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3 \cup D_4$. Then $|\{x_1, x_3\} \cap D| = 1$.*

By Lemma 3.12, D is $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-1. Furthermore, as $|D_3 \cap D_4| = 2$ and D_2 is (D_3, D_4) -Type-2, it follows by Lemma 3.12 that D is $\{D_3, D_4\}$ -Type-1. Also, as $D_1 \cap D_4 = \{x_1, x_3\}$, Lemma 3.9 implies that $\{x_1, x_3\} \not\subseteq D$.

If $\{x_1, x_3\} \cap D = \emptyset$, then, as D is $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-1 and $\{D_3, D_4\}$ -Type-1, we have $\{x_2, x_7\} \subseteq D$ as well as $x_5 \in D$. Hence $D \cap (D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3 \cup D_4) = \{x_2, x_5, x_7\}$. Now $|D_2 \cap D| = 2$ and $|D_3 \cap D| = 2$. Furthermore, D_4 is $\{D_2, D\}$ -Type-2, D_1 is $\{D_3, D\}$ -Type-2, and D is $\{D_1, D_4\}$ -Type-2. Therefore, by Lemma 3.12, if D' is a 4-cocircuit of M such that $D' \not\subseteq (D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3 \cup D_4 \cup D)$, then D' is $\{D_2, D\}$ -Type-1, $\{D_3, D\}$ -Type-1, and $\{D_1, D_4\}$ -Type-1. As $|E(M)| \geq 11$, M has such a cocircuit D' . By Lemma 3.9, if $x_1 \in D'$, then $x_2 \notin D'$ and $x_3 \notin D'$. Since D' is a $\{D_2, D\}$ -Type-1 and $\{D_3, D\}$ -Type-1, we have $x_5 \in D'$ and, further, $x_7 \notin D'$. Since D' is $\{D_3, D\}$ -Type-1 and $\{D_1, D_4\}$ -Type-1, we also have $|D' \cap ((D_3 \cup D) -$

$(D_3 \cap D)$ and $|D' \cap ((D_1 \cup D_4) - (D_1 \cap D_4))| = 1$. But $((D_3 \cup D) - (D_3 \cap D)) \cap ((D_1 \cup D_4) - (D_1 \cap D_4)) = \{x_2, x_3, x_7\}$, so $D' \subseteq (D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3 \cup D_4 \cup D)$; a contradiction. Thus $x_1 \notin D'$. A similar argument shows $x_3 \notin D'$. But then D' is not $\{D_1, D_4\}$ -Type-1; a contradiction. Hence 3.13.1 holds.

Let D_5 be a 4-cocircuit of M that contains x_{10} . Now let φ be the permutation of $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_9\}$ defined by

$$(x_1, x_3)(x_2, x_7)(x_4, x_9)(x_5)(x_6, x_8).$$

Noting that $\varphi(D_1) = D_4$, $\varphi(D_2) = D_3$, $\varphi(D_3) = D_2$, and $\varphi(D_4) = D_1$, it follows by 3.13.1 that we may assume $x_1 \in D_5$ and $x_3 \notin D_5$. Since D_2 is (D_3, D_4) -Type-2, it follows by Lemma 3.12 that D_5 is $\{D_3, D_4\}$ -Type-1, and so $x_7 \in D_5$ but $x_5 \notin D_5$. Therefore, as D_5 is $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-1, it follows by Lemma 3.8 that D_5 contains one of x_4 and x_6 .

If $x_4 \in D_5$, then $|D_1 \cap D_4 \cap D_5| = 1$ and

$$|D_1 \cap D_4| = |D_1 \cap D_5| = |D_4 \cap D_5| = 2,$$

contradicting Lemma 3.10. Thus $x_6 \in D_5$ and so $D_5 = \{x_1, x_6, x_7, x_{10}\}$. By (P2), M has a 4-cocircuit D_6 containing x_{11} . By 3.13.1, either $x_1 \in D_6$ or $x_3 \in D_6$. If $x_1 \in D_6$, then, by the previous argument concerning D_5 and now applied to D_6 , we get $D_6 = \{x_1, x_6, x_7, x_{11}\}$. But then $|D_5 \cap D_6| = 3$ and so, by Lemma 3.1, $M \cong U_{3,6}$; a contradiction. Therefore $x_1 \notin D_6$ and so $x_3 \in D_6$. Observe that $|D_2 \cap D_5| = 2$ and D_3 is $\{D_2, D_5\}$ -Type-2 and so, by Lemma 3.12, D_6 is $\{D_2, D_5\}$ -Type-1. But D_6 is also $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-1 and $\{D_3, D_4\}$ -Type 1 by Lemma 3.12. Therefore D_6 contains an element from each of the sets $\{1, 6\}$, $\{1, 2\}$, and $\{1, 5, 8, 9\}$. This is impossible as D_6 has exactly four elements and $x_1 \notin D_6$. We conclude that $D_4 \neq \{x_1, x_3, x_7, x_9\}$.

We may now assume that $D_4 = \{x_1, x_4, x_7, x_9\}$. Now $|D_1 \cap D_4| = 2$ and D_3 is $\{D_1, D_4\}$ -Type-2. Therefore, by Lemma 3.12,

3.13.2. *if D is a 4-cocircuit of M such that $D \not\subseteq D_1 \cup D_3 \cup D_4$, then D is $\{D_1, D_4\}$ -Type-1.*

We next show that

3.13.3. *M has a 4-cocircuit containing x_1 and an element not in $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_9\}$.*

Let D_5 be a cocircuit containing x_{10} . If $x_1 \notin D_5$, then, as D_5 is $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-1 and, by 3.13.2, $\{D_1, D_4\}$ -Type-1, it follows that $\{x_2, x_4\} \subseteq D_5$ and $\{x_3, x_5, x_6, x_7, x_9\} \cap D_5 = \emptyset$. Further, as M has no disjoint 4-cocircuits, $D_5 \cap D_3 \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, $D_5 = \{x_2, x_4, x_8, x_{10}\}$. As $|E(M)| \geq 11$, M has a 4-cocircuit D_6 containing x_{11} . By the same reasoning, $\{x_2, x_4, x_8\} \subseteq D_6$, so $|D_5 \cap D_6| = 3$; a contradiction. Thus 3.13.3 holds.

By 3.13.3, we may assume that M has a 4-cocircuit D_5 containing x_1 and x_{10} . We show that

3.13.4. $x_3 \notin D_5$.

If $x_3 \in D_5$, then, as D_5 is $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-1 and $\{D_1, D_4\}$ -Type-1, we have $\{x_2, x_4, x_5, x_6, x_7, x_9\} \cap D_5 = \emptyset$. Furthermore, $|D_1 \cap D_5| = 2$ and so, by Lemma 3.8, the existence of the cocircuit D_3 implies that $x_8 \in D_5$. Therefore $D_5 = \{x_1, x_3, x_8, x_{10}\}$. By (P2), M has a 4-cocircuit D_6 containing x_{11} . Since $|D_3 \cap D_5| = 2$ and D_4 is $\{D_3, D_5\}$ -Type-2, it follows by Lemma 3.12 that D_6 is $\{D_3, D_5\}$ -Type-1. As D_6 is also $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-1 and, by 3.13.2, $\{D_1, D_4\}$ -Type-1, it is easily checked that $x_1 \in D_6$, in which case $\{x_2, x_4, x_5, x_7, x_{10}\} \cap D_6 = \emptyset$. This implies that each of $D_6 \cap \{3, 8\}$, $D_6 \cap \{3, 6\}$, and $D_6 \cap \{3, 9\}$ is non-empty, and so $x_3 \in D_6$. But then $D_1 \cap D_5 \cap D_6 = \{1, 3\}$, contradicting Lemma 3.9. Thus $x_3 \notin D_5$, thereby establishing 3.13.4.

Since D_5 is $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-1 and $\{D_1, D_4\}$ -Type-1, but does not contain x_3 , it follows that $|\{x_5, x_6\} \cap D_5| = 1$ and $|\{x_7, x_9\} \cap D_5| = 1$. In turn this implies D_5 contains either x_5 or x_7 ; otherwise, it is disjoint from D_3 . If $x_6 \in D_5$, then $x_7 \in D_5$, in which case, $|D_4 \cap D_5| = 2$. But then $|D_3 \cap (D_4 \cup D_5)| = 1$, contradicting Lemma 3.8. Therefore $x_6 \notin D_5$, so $x_5 \in D_5$. Then $|D_2 \cap D_5| = 2$, and so, by Lemma 3.8, $|D_3 \cap (D_2 \cup D_5)| \geq 2$, which implies $x_7 \in D_5$. By (P2), M has a 4-cocircuit D_6 containing x_{11} . If $x_1 \in D_6$, then, by an argument analogous to that which determined D_5 , we have $D_6 = \{x_1, x_5, x_7, x_{11}\}$ and so $|D_5 \cap D_6| = 3$; a contradiction. Thus $x_1 \notin D_6$. Since D_6 is $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-1 and $\{D_1, D_4\}$ -Type 1, it is easily checked that $D_6 = \{x_2, x_3, x_4, x_{11}\}$. But then $|D_1 \cap D_6| = 3$; a contradiction to Lemma 3.1. This completes the proof of Lemma 3.13. \square

Lemma 3.14. *Let $|E(M)| \geq 11$, and suppose M has no two disjoint 4-cocircuits. Let D_1 , D_2 , and D_3 be distinct 4-cocircuits of M such that $|D_1 \cap D_2| = 2$ and $D_3 \not\subseteq D_1 \cup D_2$. Then D_3 is not $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-3.*

Proof. Suppose that D_3 is $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-3. Then, without loss of generality, let $D_1 = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$, $D_2 = \{x_1, x_2, x_5, x_6\}$, and $D_3 = \{x_3, x_4, x_5, x_7\}$. Note that D_2 is (D_1, D_3) -Type-3.

3.14.1. *Let D be a 4-cocircuit of M such that $D \not\subseteq D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3$. Then D is neither $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-3 nor $\{D_1, D_3\}$ -Type-3.*

Without loss of generality, we may assume $x_8 \in D$. First suppose that D is $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-3. If D is (D_1, D_2) -Type-3, then $D_1 \cap D_3 \cap D = \{x_3, x_4\}$, contradicting Lemma 3.9. Therefore assume that D is (D_2, D_1) -Type-3. By symmetry, we may assume $D = \{x_3, x_5, x_6, x_8\}$.

By (P2), M has a 4-cocircuit D' containing x_9 . Since D' is not $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-2 by Lemma 3.13, it follows by Lemmas 3.9 and 3.13 that D' is neither $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-3 nor $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-2. Therefore, by Lemma 3.11, D' is $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-1. By considering the way in which D_1 , D_2 , D_3 , and D relate to each other, we may assume, by symmetry, that $x_1 \in D'$ and that $|D' \cap \{x_3, x_4\}| = 1$ and $|D' \cap \{x_5, x_6\}| = 0$. If $x_4 \in D'$, then $x_8 \in D'$; otherwise, $D \cap D' = \emptyset$. But then, D' is $\{D_3, D\}$ -Type-2, contradicting Lemma 3.13 as $|D_3 \cap D| = 2$.

Therefore $x_3 \in D'$. Now $x_8 \in D'$; otherwise D' is $\{D_2, D\}$ -Type-2, contradicting Lemma 3.13 as $|D_2 \cap D| = 2$. Hence $D' = \{x_1, x_3, x_8, x_9\}$. By (P2), M has a 4-cocircuit D'' containing x_{10} . As above, D'' is $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-1, and $|\{x_1, x_2\} \cap D''| = 1$ by Lemma 3.9. By Lemma 3.13, D'' is not $\{D_3, D\}$ -Type-2. Furthermore, as either $\{x_1, x_{10}\} \subseteq D''$ or $\{x_2, x_{10}\} \subseteq D''$, it follows that D'' is not $\{D_3, D\}$ -Type-3. Thus, by Lemma 3.11, D'' is $\{D_3, D\}$ -Type-1, and so $|\{x_3, x_5\} \cap D''| = 1$. Say $x_1 \in D''$. Then, by Lemma 3.9, $x_3 \notin D''$, so $x_5 \in D''$. But then D'' is $\{D_1, D_3\}$ -Type-3 and $\{D, D'\}$ -Type-3, by Lemma 3.11 and Lemma 3.13, and so $|\{x_2, x_7\} \cap D''| = 1$ and $|\{x_6, x_9\} \cap D''| = 1$; a contradiction. Thus $x_1 \notin D''$ and so $x_2 \in D''$. If $x_3 \in D''$, then D'' is $\{D_2, D\}$ -Type-3, and so $D'' = \{x_2, x_3, x_8, x_{10}\}$. But then $D \cap D' \cap D'' = \{x_3, x_8\}$, contradicting Lemma 3.9. Therefore $x_3 \notin D''$ and $x_5 \in D''$. So D'' is $\{D_1, D'\}$ -Type-3, in which case $|\{x_4, x_8, x_9\} \cap D''| = 2$; a contradiction. Hence D is not $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-3. Since D_2 is (D_1, D_3) -Type-3, it follows by symmetry that D is not $\{D_1, D_3\}$ -Type-3. Thus 3.14.1 holds.

By Lemma 3.13 and 3.14.1, every 4-cocircuit D of M such that $D \not\subseteq D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3$ is both $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-1 and $\{D_1, D_3\}$ -Type-1. In fact, we show that

3.14.2. D is both (D_1, D_2) -Type-1 and (D_1, D_3) -Type-1.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $x_8 \in D$. Note that D is (D_1, D_2) -Type-1 if and only if it is (D_1, D_3) -Type-1. Suppose D is neither (D_1, D_2) -Type-1 nor (D_1, D_3) -Type-1. Then D is (D_2, D_1) -Type-1 and (D_3, D_1) -Type-1. But the former implies that $D \cap \{x_3, x_4\} = \emptyset$, while the latter implies $D \cap \{x_3, x_4\} \neq \emptyset$; a contradiction. Thus 3.14.2 holds.

By (P2), M has a 4-cocircuit D_4 that contains x_8 . By 3.14.2, we may assume $D_4 = \{x_1, x_3, x_8, x_9\}$. Furthermore, M has a 4-cocircuit D_5 containing x_{10} . By 3.14.2, D_5 is (D_1, D_2) -Type-1 and (D_1, D_3) -Type-1. This implies $|\{x_1, x_2\} \cap D_5| = 1$ and $|\{x_3, x_4\} \cap D_5| = 1$. By Lemma 3.9, $\{x_1, x_3\} \not\subseteq D_5$ and so $D_1 \cap D_5$ is one of $\{x_1, x_4\}$, $\{x_2, x_3\}$, and $\{x_2, x_4\}$.

Say $\{x_1, x_4\} \subseteq D_5$. Then $\{x_8, x_9\} \cap D_5 \neq \emptyset$; otherwise, $|D_2 \cap D_4 \cap D_5| = 1$ and $|D_2 \cap D_4| = |D_2 \cap D_5| = |D_4 \cap D_5| = 1$, and so, by Lemma 3.6,

$|E(M)| = 10$. Therefore, we may assume $D_5 = \{x_1, x_4, x_8, x_{10}\}$. But then $|D_1 \cap D_4 \cap D_5| = 1$ and $|D_1 \cap D_4| = |D_1 \cap D_5| = |D_4 \cap D_5| = 2$, contradicting Lemma 3.10. Similarly $\{x_2, x_3\} \not\subseteq D_5$, and therefore $\{x_2, x_4\} \subseteq D_5$. Now, $D_5 \cap \{x_8, x_9\} \neq \emptyset$; otherwise, D_4 and D_5 are disjoint. Hence, without loss of generality, $D_5 = \{x_2, x_4, x_8, x_{10}\}$. By (P2), M has a 4-cocircuit D_6 containing x_{11} . As the restrictions on D_5 also apply to D_6 , we have $\{x_2, x_4\} \subseteq D_6$, which contradicts Lemma 3.9 as $D_1 \cap D_5 = \{x_2, x_4\}$. This completes the proof of Lemma 3.14. \square

At last we show that M has two disjoint 4-cocircuits if $|E(M)| \geq 11$.

Lemma 3.15. *Let $|E(M)| \geq 11$. Then M has two disjoint 4-cocircuits.*

Proof. Suppose that M has no two disjoint 4-cocircuits. By Lemma 3.7, M has 4-cocircuits D_1 and D_2 with $|D_1 \cap D_2| = 2$. Without loss of generality, let $D_1 = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ and $D_2 = \{x_1, x_2, x_5, x_6\}$. By (P2), M has a 4-cocircuit D_3 containing x_7 . Lemmas 3.13 and 3.14 together with Lemma 3.11 imply that D_3 is $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-1. Therefore, without loss of generality, $D_3 = \{x_1, x_3, x_7, x_8\}$. Let D be a 4-cocircuit of M such that $D \not\subseteq D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3$. Since $|D_1 \cap D_3| = 2$, it again follows by Lemmas 3.11, 3.13, and 3.14 that D is $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-1 as well as $\{D_1, D_3\}$ -Type-1. We next show

3.15.1. *D is not both (D_2, D_1) -Type-1 and (D_3, D_1) -Type-1.*

If D is both (D_2, D_1) -Type-1 and (D_3, D_1) -Type-1, then, without loss of generality, $\{x_5, x_7\} \subseteq D$. In turn, this implies $x_1 \in D$, so we may assume $D = \{x_1, x_5, x_7, x_9\}$. By (P2), M has a 4-cocircuit D' containing x_{10} . As $|D_2 \cap D| = 2$ and $|D_3 \cap D| = 2$, it follows by Lemmas 3.11, 3.13, and 3.14 that D' is $\{D_1, D_2\}$ -Type-1, $\{D_1, D_3\}$ -Type-1, $\{D_2, D\}$ -Type-1, and $\{D_3, D\}$ -Type-1. This implies that $x_1 \in D'$, and it is easily checked that either $\{x_4, x_9\} \subseteq D'$ or $\{x_6, x_8\} \subseteq D'$. If $\{x_4, x_9\} \subseteq D'$, then $D' = \{x_1, x_4, x_9, x_{10}\}$. But then $|D_2 \cap D_3 \cap D'| = 1$ and $|D_2 \cap D_3| = |D_2 \cap D'| = |D_3 \cap D'| = 1$, and so, by Lemma 3.6, $|E(M)| = 10$; a contradiction. Similarly, if $\{x_6, x_8\} \subseteq D'$, then $|D_1 \cap D \cap D'| = 1$ and $|D_1 \cap D| = |D_1 \cap D'| = |D \cap D'| = 1$ and we contradict Lemma 3.6. This proves 3.15.1.

In addition to 3.15.1, we also have

3.15.2. $\{x_2, x_3\} \subseteq D$.

By 3.15.1, D is at least one of (D_1, D_2) -Type-1 and (D_1, D_3) -Type-1. If D is (D_1, D_2) -Type-1, then, since D is $\{D_1, D_3\}$ -Type-1, we have $|\{x_1, x_3\} \cap D| = 1$. If $x_1 \in D$, then $x_4 \in D$ and $D \cap (D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3) = \{x_1, x_4\}$, and so $|D_2 \cap D_3 \cap D| = 1$ and $|D_2 \cap D_3| = |D_2 \cap D| = |D_3 \cap D| = 1$. But then, by Lemma 3.6, $|E(M)| = 10$; a contradiction. Therefore $x_1 \notin D$, and so

$\{x_2, x_3\} \subseteq D$. Similarly, if D is (D_1, D_3) -Type-1, we have $\{x_2, x_3\} \subseteq D$. Thus 3.15.2 holds.

By (P2), M has a 4-cocircuit D_4 containing x_9 . By 3.15.2, $\{x_2, x_3\} \subseteq D_4$. Therefore, as $|E(M)| \geq 11$, we deduce that M has a 4-cocircuit D_5 such that $D_5 \not\subseteq D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3 \cup D_4$. But then, by 3.15.2, we have $\{x_2, x_3\} \subseteq D_5$. Therefore $D_1 \cap D_4 \cap D_5 = \{x_2, x_3\}$, contradicting Lemma 3.9. This last contradiction completes the proof of Lemma 3.15. \square

Having established that M has two disjoint 4-cocircuits if $|E(M)| \geq 11$, the last step before proving the necessary direction of Theorem 1.4 for $|E(M)| \geq 16$ is to show that $E(M)$ can be partitioned into 4-cocircuits if $|E(M)| \geq 16$. Before showing this, we prove two preliminary results.

Lemma 3.16. *Let $X \subseteq E(M)$ such that $M|X \cong M(K_{2,4})$, and let D be a 4-cocircuit of M meeting X . Then either D contains exactly one element from each of the four series pairs of $M|X$, or $D \cap X$ is a series pair of $M|X$.*

Proof. Suppose the lemma does not hold. For all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, let $\{x_i, y_i\}$ denote the series pairs of $M|X$. Since M is 4-connected, $D \cap X \neq \{x_i, y_i, x_j, y_j\}$ for distinct $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Therefore, for some i and j , we have $|D \cap \{x_i, y_i\}| = 1$ and $|D \cap \{x_j, y_j\}| = 0$. But $\{x_i, x_j, y_i, y_j\}$ is a circuit; a contradiction. Thus the lemma holds. \square

Lemma 3.17. *If $|E(M)| \geq 13$, then M has three pairwise-disjoint 4-cocircuits.*

Proof. Suppose that $|E(M)| \geq 13$ and M has no three pairwise-disjoint 4-cocircuits. By Lemma 3.15, M has two disjoint 4-cocircuits, D_1 and D_2 say. Moreover, by Lemma 3.5, $M|(D_1 \cup D_2) \cong M(K_{2,4})$. Without loss of generality, let $D_1 = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ and $D_2 = \{x_5, x_6, x_7, x_8\}$, and let $\{x_1, x_5\}$, $\{x_2, x_6\}$, $\{x_3, x_7\}$, and $\{x_4, x_8\}$ be the series pairs in $M|(D_1 \cup D_2)$. By (P2), M has a 4-cocircuit D_3 containing x_9 . Since $D_3 \cap (D_1 \cup D_2)$ is nonempty, it follows by Lemma 3.16 that $D_3 \cap (D_1 \cup D_2)$ is a series pair of $M|(D_1 \cup D_2)$. Thus, without loss of generality, $D_3 = \{x_1, x_5, x_9, x_{10}\}$. Let D be a 4-cocircuit of M such that $D \not\subseteq D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3$. We next show that

3.17.1. $D_3 \cap D \neq \emptyset$.

If $D_3 \cap D = \emptyset$, then, as $D \cap (D_1 \cup D_2)$ is nonempty, we may assume by Lemma 3.16 that $D = \{x_2, x_6, x_{11}, x_{12}\}$. By Lemma 3.5, $M|(D_3 \cup D) \cong M(K_{2,4})$ and so, by orthogonality, $\{x_1, x_2\}$ and $\{x_5, x_6\}$ are series pairs in $M|(D_3 \cup D)$. Thus, without loss of generality, we may assume $\{x_9, x_{11}\}$ and $\{x_{10}, x_{12}\}$ are also series pairs in $M|(D_3 \cup D)$.

Now M has a 4-cocircuit D' containing x_{13} . Furthermore, $D' \cap (D_1 \cup D_2)$ and $D' \cap (D_3 \cup D)$ are both nonempty. By Lemma 3.16,

$$D' \cap (D_1 \cup D_2) \in \{\{x_1, x_5\}, \{x_2, x_6\}, \{x_3, x_7\}, \{x_4, x_8\}\}$$

and

$$D' \cap (D_3 \cup D) \in \{\{x_1, x_2\}, \{x_5, x_6\}, \{x_9, x_{11}\}, \{x_{10}, x_{12}\}\}.$$

As $|D'| = 4$, the intersections $D' \cap (D_1 \cup D_2)$ and $D' \cap (D_3 \cup D)$ are not disjoint. But then D' meets a circuit of $M|(D_1 \cup D_2)$ in exactly one element; a contradiction. Thus 3.17.1 holds.

We also have

3.17.2. $\{x_1, x_5\} \cap D = \emptyset$.

If $x_1 \in D$, then either $x_5 \in D$, or D meets each of $\{x_2, x_6\}$, $\{x_3, x_7\}$, and $\{x_4, x_8\}$. In the latter case, $D \subseteq D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3$; a contradiction. Then $x_9, x_{10} \notin D$ by Lemma 3.1, so we may assume that $D = \{x_1, x_5, x_{11}, x_{12}\}$. Now $(D_3 \cup D) - x_1$ contains a cocircuit and, by orthogonality, this cocircuit avoids x_5 . Hence, as M is 4-connected, $\{x_9, x_{10}, x_{11}, x_{12}\}$ is a 4-cocircuit of M disjoint from D_1 and D_2 ; a contradiction. Thus $x_1 \notin D$ and, similarly, $x_5 \notin D$, and 3.17.2 holds.

By (P2), M has a 4-cocircuit D_4 containing x_{11} . By 3.17.1 and 3.17.2, we may assume $x_9 \in D_4$. Furthermore, as D_4 meets $D_1 \cup D_2$, we may assume that by Lemma 3.16 that $D_4 = \{x_2, x_6, x_9, x_{11}\}$. Now M has a 4-cocircuit D_5 containing x_{12} . By 3.17.1 and 3.17.2, $D_3 \cap D_5 \neq \emptyset$ and $\{x_1, x_5\} \cap D_5 = \emptyset$. Moreover, replacing D_3 with D_4 in the above argument shows that $D_4 \cap D_5 \neq \emptyset$ and $\{x_2, x_6\} \cap D_5 = \emptyset$. Therefore we may assume that $D_5 = \{x_3, x_7, x_9, x_{12}\}$. Now M has a 4-circuit C containing $\{x_4, x_9\}$. By orthogonality, C meets each of $\{x_1, x_5, x_{10}\}$, $\{x_2, x_6, x_{11}\}$, and $\{x_3, x_7, x_{12}\}$. But then $|C| \geq 5$; a contradiction. This completes the proof of Lemma 3.17. \square

The next lemma extends Lemmas 3.15 and 3.17.

Lemma 3.18. *If $|E(M)| \geq 16$, then $E(M)$ can be partitioned into 4-element blocks, where each block is a 4-cocircuit.*

Proof. Suppose that $|E(M)| \geq 16$. We first show that M has four pairwise-disjoint 4-cocircuits. By Lemma 3.17, M has three pairwise-disjoint 4-cocircuits, D_1 , D_2 , and D_3 say. Moreover, by Lemma 3.5, we have $M|(D_i \cup D_j) \cong M(K_{2,4})$ for all distinct $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Let z_1, z_2, z_3 , and z_4 be distinct elements of $E(M) - (D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3)$. By (P2), each of these elements is in a 4-cocircuit, Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 , and Z_4 say, of M . If $Z_i \cap (D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3) = \emptyset$ for some i , then M has four pairwise-disjoint

4-cocircuits. Therefore assume $Z_i \cap (D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3)$ is nonempty for all i . Then, by Lemma 3.16, we have $|Z_i \cap (D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3)| = 3$ and $|Z_i \cap D_1| = |Z_i \cap D_2| = |Z_i \cap D_3| = 1$ for all i . If, for distinct i and j , we have $Z_i \cap Z_j \neq \emptyset$, then it is easily checked that $|Z_i \cap Z_j| = 3$, contradicting Lemma 3.1. It now follows that Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 , and Z_4 are four pairwise-disjoint 4-cocircuits of M .

Now suppose that $E(M)$ cannot be partitioned into 4-cocircuits. Let $\{D_1, D_2, \dots, D_n\}$ be a maximum-sized set of pairwise-disjoint 4-cocircuits of M . Then, by above, $n \geq 4$. Let x be an element of $E(M) - (D_1 \cup D_2 \cup \dots \cup D_n)$. By (P2), M has a 4-cocircuit D containing x . Furthermore, $D \cap (D_1 \cup D_2 \cup \dots \cup D_n) \neq \emptyset$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $D \cap D_1 \neq \emptyset$, and so $D \cap (D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3 \cup D_4) \neq \emptyset$. But, for all distinct $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, we have $M|(D_i \cup D_j) \cong M(K_{2,4})$ and so, by Lemma 3.16, $|D \cap (D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3 \cup D_4)| \geq 4$; a contradiction. The lemma now follows. \square

We are now ready to prove the necessary direction of Theorem 1.4 when $|E(M)| \geq 16$.

Proof of Theorem 1.4 for $|E(M)| \geq 16$. Suppose $|E(M)| \geq 16$. Then, by Lemma 3.18, there is a partition of $E(M)$ into 4-cocircuits D_1, D_2, \dots, D_n , where $D_i = \{w_i, x_i, y_i, z_i\}$ for all i . By Lemma 3.5, $M|(D_1 \cup D_i) \cong M(K_{2,4})$ for all $i \in \{2, 3, \dots, n\}$, so we may assume M has 4-circuits $\{w_1, x_1, w_i, x_i\}$, $\{w_1, y_1, w_i, y_i\}$, $\{w_1, z_1, w_i, z_i\}$, $\{x_1, y_1, x_i, y_i\}$, $\{x_1, z_1, x_i, z_i\}$, and $\{y_1, z_1, y_i, z_i\}$ for all such i . Consider the 4-circuits $\{w_1, x_1, w_i, x_i\}$ and $\{w_1, x_1, w_j, x_j\}$ for some distinct $i, j \in \{2, 3, \dots, n\}$. By circuit elimination and orthogonality, $\{w_i, x_i, w_j, x_j\}$ is a 4-circuit of M . Similarly, for all distinct $i, j \in \{2, 3, \dots, n\}$, we have $\{w_i, y_i, w_j, y_j\}$, $\{w_i, z_i, w_j, z_j\}$, $\{x_i, y_i, x_j, y_j\}$, $\{x_i, z_i, x_j, z_j\}$, and $\{y_i, z_i, y_j, z_j\}$ are 4-circuits of M . In turn, as $M|(D_i \cup D_j) \cong M(K_{2,4})$ for all distinct i and j , we have

3.18.1. $\{w_i, w_j\}$, $\{x_i, x_j\}$, $\{y_i, y_j\}$, and $\{z_i, z_j\}$ are the series pairs in $M|(D_i \cup D_j)$ for all distinct i and j .

Now consider $K_{4,n}$, where $n \geq 4$. Label the edge set of $K_{4,n}$ so that

$$\{\{w_1, x_1, y_1, z_1\}, \{w_2, x_2, y_2, z_2\}, \dots, \{w_n, x_n, y_n, z_n\}\}$$

is a partition of $E(K_{4,n})$, where each block is a bond of $K_{4,n}$, and $\{w_i, x_i, w_j, x_j\}$, $\{w_i, y_i, w_j, y_j\}$, $\{w_i, z_i, w_j, z_j\}$, $\{x_i, y_i, x_j, y_j\}$, $\{x_i, z_i, x_j, z_j\}$, and $\{y_i, z_i, y_j, z_j\}$ are 4-cycles of $K_{4,n}$ for distinct $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. We next show that the identity map φ from $E(M(K_{4,n}))$ to $E(M)$ is a weak map from $M(K_{4,n})$ to M . Let C be a circuit of $M(K_{4,n})$. Then $|C| \in \{4, 6, 8\}$. If C is a 4-circuit, then, by above, $\varphi(C)$ is a 4-circuit of M . Now assume that $|C| = 6$. Then, without loss of generality, we may assume

$$C = \{w_i, x_i, x_j, y_j, y_k, w_k\},$$

where i, j , and k are distinct elements in $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Using circuit elimination on the 4-circuits $\{w_i, x_i, w_j, x_j\}$ and $\{w_j, y_j, w_k, y_k\}$ of M , it follows that $\{w_i, x_i, x_j, y_j, y_k, w_k\}$ contains a circuit of M . By orthogonality and 3.18.1, it is easily checked that

$$\{w_i, x_i, x_j, y_j, y_k, w_k\}$$

is a 6-circuit of M . Thus if C is a 6-circuit of $M(K_{4,n})$, then $\varphi(C)$ is a 6-circuit of M . Lastly, assume that $|C| = 8$. Then, without loss of generality, we may assume

$$C = \{w_i, w_j, x_j, x_k, y_k, y_l, z_l, z_i\},$$

where i, j, k , and l are distinct elements in $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Now $\{w_i, w_j, x_j, x_k, y_k, y_l\}$ and $\{y_l, y_l, z_l, z_i\}$ are circuits of M . By circuit elimination, $\{w_i, w_j, x_j, x_k, y_k, y_l, z_l, z_i\}$ contains a circuit of M . If this last set is not a circuit, then, by orthogonality and 3.18.1, it contains a 6-circuit of M . Without loss of generality, we may assume that this 6-circuit is $\{w_i, w_j, x_j, x_k, y_k, z_i\}$. But then, as $\{x_j, y_j, x_k, y_k\}$ is a 4-circuit of M , it follows by circuit elimination that

$$X = \{w_i, w_j, x_j, x_k, z_i, y_j\}$$

contains a circuit of M . By orthogonality and 3.18.1, X contains no circuit of M . Thus C is an 8-circuit of M . It now follows that if C is a circuit of $M(K_{4,n})$, then $\varphi(C)$ is a circuit of M . Hence M is a weak-map image of $M(K_{4,n})$ under φ .

We next show that

3.18.2. $M|(D_i \cup D_j \cup D_k \cup D_l) \cong M(K_{4,4})$ for all distinct $i, j, k, l \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

By above, $M|(D_i \cup D_j \cup D_k \cup D_l)$ is a weak-map image of $M(K_{4,4})$. Furthermore, as $M|(D_i \cup D_j \cup D_k \cup D_l)$ has an 8-circuit, it follows that $r(M|(D_i \cup D_j \cup D_k \cup D_l)) \geq 7$. Since $M|(D_i \cup D_j) \cong M(K_{2,4})$, we have $r(M|(D_i \cup D_j)) = 5$ and so, by the 4-circuits of M established above,

$$r(M|(D_i \cup D_j \cup D_k)) \leq 6.$$

In turn, as D_l is a cocircuit of $M|(D_i \cup D_j \cup D_k \cup D_l)$, we deduce that $r(M|(D_i \cup D_j \cup D_k \cup D_l)) \leq 7$. Thus $r(M|(D_i \cup D_j \cup D_k \cup D_l)) = 7$, that is, $r(M|(D_i \cup D_j \cup D_k \cup D_l)) = r(M(K_{4,4}))$. Since $M|(D_i \cup D_j \cup D_k \cup D_l)$ is connected, it follows by Theorem 1.5 that $M|(D_i \cup D_j \cup D_k \cup D_l) \cong M(K_{4,4})$. Thus 3.18.2 holds.

We next prove that $r(M) = r(M(K_{4,n}))$. To do this, we show, by induction, that for all 4-connected matroids M' satisfying (P2) and whose ground set can be partitioned into m 4-cocircuits, where $m \geq 4$, we have $r(M') = r(M(K_{4,m}))$. If $n = 4$, then, by 3.18.2, $r(M) = r(M(K_{4,4}))$. Therefore suppose that $n \geq 5$ and that, for all matroids M' as described

above, with $4 \leq m \leq n - 1$, we have $r(M') = r(M(K_{4,m}))$. Let M^- denote the matroid $M|(D_1 \cup D_2 \cup \dots \cup D_{n-1})$. We first show that M^- satisfies (P2). Evidently, every element of M^- is in a 4-cocircuit. Let x and y be distinct elements of M^- . If x and y are in distinct 4-cocircuits D_i and D_j of M^- , then, by orthogonality and M satisfying (P2), M^- has a 4-circuit containing $\{x, y\}$. Thus assume x and y are in the same 4-cocircuit D_i of M^- . By considering D_i with D_1 if $i \neq 1$ or D_2 if $i = 1$, it follows that M^- has a 4-circuit containing $\{x, y\}$. Lastly, if M^- is not 4-connected, then it has a 2- or 3-separation (A, B) . Since $n \geq 5$, it is easily checked that, for distinct i, j, k , and l , there are four 4-cocircuits D_i, D_j, D_k , and D_l of M^- such that $|A \cap (D_i \cup D_j \cup D_k \cup D_l)| \geq 3$ and $|B \cap (D_i \cup D_j \cup D_k \cup D_l)| \geq 3$. Now, by [3, Lemma 8.2.3],

$$\begin{aligned} 2 &\geq r(A) + r(B) - r(M^-) \\ &\geq r(A \cap (D_i \cup D_j \cup D_k \cup D_l)) + r(B \cap (D_i \cup D_j \cup D_k \cup D_l)) \\ &\quad - r(D_i \cup D_j \cup D_k \cup D_l). \end{aligned}$$

But then $M|(D_i \cup D_j \cup D_k \cup D_l)$ is not 4-connected, contradicting 3.18.2. It follows that M^- is 4-connected, and so M^- satisfies (P2). By induction,

$$r(M^-) = r(M|(D_1 \cup D_2 \cup \dots \cup D_{n-1})) = r(M(K_{4,n-1}))$$

and so, as D_n is a cocircuit of M ,

$$r(M) = r(M|(D_1 \cup D_2 \cup \dots \cup D_{n-1})) + 1 = r(M(K_{4,n})).$$

Finally, as M is connected, it now follows by Theorem 1.5 that $M \cong M(K_{4,n})$, thereby completing the proof of Theorem 1.4. \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank the reviewer for their careful reading of this article and thoughtful suggestions regarding its improvement.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Lucas, Weak maps of combinatorial geometries, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 206 (1975) 247–279.
- [2] J. Miller, Matroids in which Every Pair of Elements Belongs to Both a 4-Circuit and a 4-Cocircuit, MSc thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, 2013.
- [3] J. Oxley, *Matroid Theory*, Second edition, Oxford University Press, New York, 2011.
- [4] S. Pfeil, On Properties of Matroid Connectivity, PhD thesis, Louisiana State University, 2016.
- [5] P.D. Seymour, Decomposition of regular matroids, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 28 (1980) 305–359.
- [6] W.T. Tutte, Connectivity in matroids, *Canad. J. Math.* 18 (1966) 1301–1324.

APPENDIX

Let M be a 4-connected matroid satisfying (P2) with $|E(M)| \leq 15$. Then M is one of thirty-five matroids. These thirty-five matroids comprise of $U_{3,6}$, twenty-one 8-element paving matroids, ten 9-element paving matroids, R_{10} , a 12-element matroid, and a 14-element matroid. The matroid R_{10} is the unique splitter for the class of regular matroids and for which

$$I_5 \left[\begin{array}{c|ccccc} & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ & 1 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ & 0 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{array} \right]$$

is a representation of it over all fields. Precise descriptions of the 8-, 9-, 12-, and 14-element matroids are given below. For ease of reference, the notation is in keeping with the notation in [4],

8-Element Matroids. If $|E(M)| = 8$, then M is one of twenty-one rank-4 paving matroids. Let $E(M) = \{1, 2, \dots, 8\}$. Up to isomorphism, to describe M , it is sufficient, to list the 4-circuits of M . The first table consists of those matroids M having the property that, for every 4-circuit C , there is another 4-circuit of M meeting C in exactly one element.

M	4-Circuits of M				
$M_{8,1}$	$\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, $\{2, 4, 5, 6\}$	$\{1, 5, 6, 7\}$, $\{1, 4, 7, 8\}$	$\{1, 2, 5, 8\}$, $\{1, 3, 6, 8\}$	$\{3, 4, 5, 8\}$	$\{2, 3, 6, 7\}$
$M_{8,2}$	$\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, $\{2, 4, 5, 6\}$	$\{1, 5, 6, 7\}$, $\{1, 3, 6, 8\}$	$\{1, 2, 5, 8\}$, $\{4, 6, 7, 8\}$	$\{3, 4, 5, 8\}$	$\{2, 3, 6, 7\}$
$M_{8,3}$	$\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, $\{1, 4, 6, 8\}$	$\{1, 5, 6, 7\}$, $\{2, 4, 7, 8\}$	$\{1, 2, 5, 8\}$	$\{3, 4, 5, 8\}$	$\{2, 3, 6, 7\}$
$M_{8,3+}$	$\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, $\{1, 4, 6, 8\}$	$\{1, 5, 6, 7\}$, $\{2, 4, 7, 8\}$	$\{1, 2, 5, 8\}$, $\{1, 3, 7, 8\}$	$\{3, 4, 5, 8\}$	$\{2, 3, 6, 7\}$
$M_{8,4}$	$\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, $\{4, 6, 7, 8\}$	$\{1, 5, 6, 7\}$	$\{1, 2, 5, 8\}$	$\{3, 4, 5, 8\}$	$\{2, 3, 6, 7\}$
$M_{8,4+}$	$\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, $\{4, 6, 7, 8\}$	$\{1, 5, 6, 7\}$, $\{1, 3, 6, 8\}$	$\{1, 2, 5, 8\}$	$\{3, 4, 5, 8\}$	$\{2, 3, 6, 7\}$
$M_{8,5}$	$\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, $\{1, 4, 7, 8\}$	$\{1, 5, 6, 7\}$, $\{3, 5, 7, 8\}$	$\{1, 2, 5, 8\}$, $\{2, 4, 6, 8\}$	$\{2, 3, 6, 8\}$	$\{3, 4, 5, 6\}$
$M_{8,6}$	$\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, $\{2, 4, 7, 8\}$	$\{1, 5, 6, 7\}$, $\{1, 3, 6, 8\}$	$\{1, 2, 5, 8\}$	$\{2, 3, 6, 7\}$	$\{3, 4, 5, 6\}$

The second table consists of those matroids M having a 4-circuit C such that every other 4-circuit of M meets C in exactly two elements. Note that, in the table, F_7^+ denotes the free coextension of F_7 .

M	4-Circuits of M				
F_7^+	$\{1, 2, 3, 4\},$	$\{1, 2, 5, 6\},$	$\{1, 2, 7, 8\}$	$\{1, 3, 5, 7\},$	$\{1, 3, 6, 8\},$ $\{1, 4, 5, 8\}, \{1, 4, 6, 7\}$
$M_{8,7}$	$\{1, 2, 3, 4\},$	$\{1, 2, 5, 6\},$	$\{1, 2, 7, 8\},$	$\{1, 3, 5, 7\},$	$\{1, 3, 6, 8\},$ $\{1, 4, 5, 8\}, \{2, 4, 6, 7\}$
$M_{8,7+}$	$\{1, 2, 3, 4\},$	$\{1, 2, 5, 6\},$	$\{1, 2, 7, 8\},$	$\{1, 3, 5, 7\},$	$\{1, 3, 6, 8\},$ $\{1, 4, 5, 8\}, \{2, 4, 6, 7\}, \{3, 4, 6, 7\}$
$M_{8,8a}$	$\{1, 2, 3, 4\},$	$\{1, 2, 5, 6\},$	$\{1, 2, 7, 8\},$	$\{1, 3, 5, 7\},$	$\{1, 3, 6, 8\},$ $\{2, 4, 5, 8\}, \{3, 4, 6, 7\}$
$M_{8,8b}$	$\{1, 2, 3, 4\},$	$\{1, 2, 5, 6\},$	$\{1, 2, 7, 8\},$	$\{1, 3, 5, 7\},$	$\{1, 3, 6, 8\},$ $\{2, 4, 5, 8\}, \{2, 4, 6, 7\}$
$M_{8,9a}$	$\{1, 2, 3, 4\},$	$\{1, 2, 5, 6\},$	$\{1, 2, 7, 8\},$	$\{1, 3, 5, 7\},$	$\{1, 4, 5, 8\},$ $\{2, 3, 6, 8\}, \{2, 4, 6, 7\}$
$M_{8,9b}$	$\{1, 2, 3, 4\},$	$\{1, 2, 5, 6\},$	$\{1, 2, 7, 8\},$	$\{1, 3, 5, 7\},$	$\{1, 4, 5, 8\},$ $\{2, 3, 6, 8\}, \{3, 4, 6, 7\}$
$M_{8,9b+}$	$\{1, 2, 3, 4\},$	$\{1, 2, 5, 6\},$	$\{1, 2, 7, 8\},$	$\{1, 3, 5, 7\},$	$\{1, 4, 5, 8\},$ $\{2, 3, 6, 8\}, \{3, 4, 6, 7\}, \{2, 4, 5, 7\}$
$M_{8,10}$	$\{1, 2, 3, 4\},$	$\{1, 2, 5, 6\},$	$\{1, 2, 7, 8\},$	$\{1, 3, 5, 7\},$	$\{1, 4, 6, 8\},$ $\{3, 4, 5, 8\}, \{3, 4, 6, 7\}$
$M_{8,10+}$	$\{1, 2, 3, 4\},$	$\{1, 2, 5, 6\},$	$\{1, 2, 7, 8\},$	$\{1, 3, 5, 7\},$	$\{1, 4, 6, 8\},$ $\{3, 4, 5, 8\}, \{3, 4, 6, 7\}, \{2, 3, 6, 8\}$
$M_{8,10++}$	$\{1, 2, 3, 4\},$	$\{1, 2, 5, 6\},$	$\{1, 2, 7, 8\},$	$\{1, 3, 5, 7\},$	$\{1, 4, 6, 8\},$ $\{3, 4, 5, 8\}, \{3, 4, 6, 7\}, \{2, 3, 6, 8\}, \{2, 4, 5, 7\}$
$M_{8,11}$	$\{1, 2, 3, 4\},$	$\{1, 2, 5, 6\},$	$\{1, 2, 7, 8\},$	$\{1, 3, 5, 7\},$	$\{1, 4, 6, 8\},$ $\{3, 4, 5, 8\}, \{2, 3, 6, 7\}, \{2, 4, 5, 7\}$
$M_{8,12}$	$\{1, 2, 3, 4\},$	$\{1, 2, 5, 6\},$	$\{1, 3, 5, 7\},$	$\{1, 4, 5, 8\},$	$\{2, 3, 7, 8\},$ $\{2, 4, 6, 7\}, \{3, 4, 6, 8\}$

9-Element Matroids. If $|E(M)| = 9$, then M is one of ten rank-4 paving matroids. Let $E(M) = \{1, 2, \dots, 9\}$. Again, to describe M , it suffices, up to isomorphism, to list the 4-circuits of M . Here, if M is such a matroid,

then its set of 4-circuits contains every 4-element subset of each the sets $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$, $\{4, 5, 7, 8, 9\}$, and $\{2, 3, 6, 8, 9\}$. The remaining 4-circuits of M are given in the next table.

M	Remaining 4-Circuits of M				
$M_{9,1}$	$\{1, 2, 6, 7\}$,	$\{1, 3, 7, 8\}$,	$\{1, 4, 6, 9\}$,	$\{1, 5, 6, 8\}$	
$M_{9,1a}$	$\{1, 2, 6, 7\}$,	$\{1, 3, 7, 8\}$,	$\{1, 4, 6, 9\}$,	$\{1, 5, 6, 8\}$,	$\{3, 4, 6, 7\}$
$M_{9,1b}$	$\{1, 2, 6, 7\}$,	$\{1, 3, 7, 8\}$,	$\{1, 4, 6, 9\}$,	$\{1, 5, 6, 8\}$,	$\{3, 5, 6, 7\}$
$M_{9,2}$	$\{1, 2, 6, 7\}$,	$\{1, 3, 7, 8\}$,	$\{1, 4, 6, 9\}$	$\{3, 5, 6, 7\}$	
$M_{9,3}$	$\{1, 4, 6, 8\}$,	$\{1, 2, 7, 8\}$,	$\{1, 5, 6, 9\}$,	$\{1, 3, 7, 9\}$,	$\{2, 4, 6, 7\}$
$M_{9,3+}$	$\{1, 4, 6, 8\}$,	$\{1, 2, 7, 8\}$,	$\{1, 5, 6, 9\}$,	$\{1, 3, 7, 9\}$,	$\{2, 4, 6, 7\}$,
	$\{3, 5, 6, 7\}$				
$M_{9,4}$	$\{1, 4, 6, 8\}$,	$\{1, 2, 7, 8\}$,	$\{1, 5, 6, 9\}$,	$\{1, 3, 7, 9\}$,	$\{2, 5, 6, 7\}$
$M_{9,4+}$	$\{1, 4, 6, 8\}$,	$\{1, 2, 7, 8\}$,	$\{1, 5, 6, 9\}$,	$\{1, 3, 7, 9\}$,	$\{2, 5, 6, 7\}$,
	$\{3, 4, 6, 7\}$				
$M_{9,5}$	$\{1, 4, 6, 8\}$,	$\{1, 2, 7, 8\}$,	$\{1, 5, 6, 9\}$,	$\{3, 4, 6, 7\}$	
$M_{9,6}$	$\{1, 4, 6, 8\}$,	$\{1, 2, 7, 9\}$,	$\{3, 5, 6, 7\}$		

12- and 14-Element Matroids. The unique 4-connected 12-element matroid satisfying (P2) and the unique 4-connected 14-element matroid satisfying (P2) have $GF(4)$ -representations

$$\left[\begin{array}{c|ccccccc} & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ I_5 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & \alpha & 1 & \alpha \\ & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & \alpha^2 & 1 & \alpha^2 \\ & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right]$$

and

$$\left[\begin{array}{c|cccccccc} & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \alpha & \alpha \\ I_6 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & \alpha^2 & \alpha^2 \\ & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right],$$

respectively, where $\alpha^2 + \alpha + 1 = 0$.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY, BATON ROUGE,
LOUISIANA, USA

E-mail address: `oxley@math.lsu.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ANGELO STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN ANGELO, TEXAS,
USA

E-mail address: `spfeil@angelo.edu`

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF CANTERBURY,
CHRISTCHURCH, NEW ZEALAND

E-mail address: `charles.semple@canterbury.ac.nz`

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, STATISTICS AND OPERATIONS RESEARCH, VICTORIA UNI-
VERSITY OF WELLINGTON, WELLINGTON, NEW ZEALAND

E-mail address: `geoff.whittle@mcs.vuw.ac.nz`