RANK-WIDTH AND WELL-QUASI-ORDERING

SANG-IL OUM

Abstract. Robertson and Seymour (1990) proved that graphs of bounded tree-width are well-quasi-ordered by the graph minor relation. By extending their arguments, Geelen, Gerards, and Whittle (2002) proved that binary matroids of bounded branch-width are well-quasi-ordered by the matroid minor relation. We prove another theorem of this kind in terms of rank-width and vertex-minors. For a graph \( G = (V, E) \) and a vertex \( v \) of \( G \), a local complementation at \( v \) is an operation that replaces the subgraph induced by the neighbors of \( v \) with its complement graph. A graph \( H \) is called a vertex-minor of \( G \) if \( H \) can be obtained from \( G \) by applying a sequence of vertex deletions and local complementations. Rank-width was defined by Oum and Seymour (2006) to investigate clique-width; they showed that graphs have bounded rank-width if and only if they have bounded clique-width. We prove that graphs of bounded rank-width are well-quasi-ordered by the vertex-minor relation; in other words, for every infinite sequence \( G_1, G_2, \ldots \) of graphs of rank-width (or clique-width) at most \( k \), there exist \( i < j \) such that \( G_i \) is isomorphic to a vertex-minor of \( G_j \). This implies that there is a finite list of graphs such that a graph has rank-width at most \( k \) if and only if it contains no one in the list as a vertex-minor. The proof uses the notion of isotropic systems defined by Bouchet.

1. Introduction

Oum and Seymour [12] defined rank-width to investigate clique-width, which was defined by Courcelle and Olariu [5]. Rank-width is a complexity measure of graph in a kind of tree-structure, called a rank-decomposition. Oum and Seymour showed that graphs have bounded rank-width if and only if they have bounded clique-width and they used it to find an approximation algorithm for clique-width.

Later the author [11] showed that the notion of rank-width of graphs has an interesting intersection with the notion of branch-width of matroids. More specifically, the branch-width of a binary matroid is exactly one more than the rank-width of its fundamental graph.

The branch-width of matroids generalizes the branch-width of graphs, both defined by Robertson and Seymour [14]. Branch-width of graphs is approximately equal to tree-width, also defined by Robertson and Seymour. Informally speaking, tree-width is a measure describing how close a graph is to being a forest.

Both tree-width and branch-width are interesting with respect to the graph minor relation. A contraction of an edge \( e \) is an operation, that deletes \( e \) and identifies the ends of \( e \). A graph \( H \) is a minor of a graph \( G \) if \( H \) can be obtained from \( G \) by a sequence of contractions, vertex deletions, and edge deletions. If \( H \) is a minor of \( G \), then the tree-width of \( H \) is at most that of \( G \) and the same is true for branch-width. This implies that a set of graphs of bounded tree-width is closed under the graph minor relation.

In this paper, we consider vertex-minors of graphs, previously called \( l \)-reductions by Bouchet [4]. For a graph \( G \) and a vertex \( v \) of \( G \), let \( G * v \) be the graph, obtained by
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local complementation at $v$, that is by replacing the subgraph induced by the neighbors of $v$ with its complement graph. We say that $G$ is locally equivalent to $H$ if $H$ can be obtained from $G$ by applying a sequence of local complementations. A graph $H$ is a vertex-minor of $G$ if $H$ can be obtained from $G$ by applying a sequence of vertex deletions and local complementations. A simple fact is that if $H$ is a vertex-minor of $G$, then the rank-width of $H$ is at most that of $G$. For an edge $uv$ of $G$, pivoting on $uv$, denoted by $G \land uv$, is the composition of three local complementations, $G \land uv = G \ast u \ast v \ast u$. It is an easy exercise to show that $G \ast u \ast v \ast u = G \ast v \ast u \ast v$ if $uv$ is an edge of $G$. We say that $H$ is a pivot-minor of $G$ if $H$ can be obtained from $G$ by applying a sequence of vertex deletions and pivots. Every pivot-minor of $G$ is a vertex-minor of $G$, but not vice versa.

In this paper, we prove the following.

Theorem 4.1. Let $k$ be a constant. If $\{G_1, G_2, G_3, \cdots \}$ is an infinite sequence of graphs of rank-width at most $k$, then there exist $i < j$ such that $G_i$ is isomorphic to a pivot-minor of $G_j$, and therefore isomorphic to a vertex-minor of $G_j$.

This theorem is motivated by the following two theorems. The first one is for graphs of bounded tree-width, proved by Robertson and Seymour [13].

Theorem 1.1. Let $k$ be a constant. If $\{G_1, G_2, G_3, \cdots \}$ is an infinite sequence of graphs of tree-width at most $k$, then there exist $i < j$ such that $G_i$ is isomorphic to a minor of $G_j$.

The next one, generalizing the previous one, is due to Geelen, Gerards, and Whittle [8].

Theorem 1.2. Let $k$ be a constant. Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a finite field. If $\{M_1, M_2, M_3, \cdots \}$ is an infinite sequence of $\mathbb{F}$-representable matroids of branch-width at most $k$, then there exist $i < j$ such that $M_i$ is isomorphic to a minor of $M_j$.

It is straightforward to prove (Section 11) that Theorem 1.2 restricted to binary matroids is equivalent to Theorem 4.1 restricted to bipartite graphs. In fact, the main idea of proving Theorem 1.2 remains in our approach, although we have to go through a different technical notion. In the original proof of Theorem 1.2, the authors use “configurations” to represent $\mathbb{F}$-representable matroids, and then convert the matroid problem into a vector space problem. In our proof, we use the similar approach but a different notion. Bouchet defined isotropic systems and developed their minors and their relation to graphs in a series of papers [1, 2, 3]. Informally speaking, an isotropic system can be considered as an equivalence class of graphs by local equivalence. Isotropic systems also generalize pairs of a binary matroid and its dual. A detailed definition will be reviewed in Section 3.

In sections 2 and 3, we review some notions and results. The overview of the proof is given in Section 4. Then in sections 5 till 8, we prove several lemmas, including an extension of Tutte’s linking theorem to isotropic systems, in Section 7. Then in Section 9 we prove that isotropic systems of bounded branch-width are well-quasi-ordered under the “isotropic system minor” order and in Section 10 we prove that the theorem implies the well-quasi-ordering of graphs under the pivot-minor order. In Section 11 we explain why the result restricted to bipartite graphs is the same as Theorem 1.2 restricted to binary matroids.
2. Review on Rank-width

In this paper, we assume that graphs are simple, undirected, and finite. Let us review the definition of rank-width, introduced by Oum and Seymour \[12\]. We will first describe the branch-width of connectivity functions and then use this to define the rank-width.

For a finite set \(V\), an integer-valued function \(c\) on subsets of \(V\) is called a connectivity function if \(c(X) + c(Y) \geq c(X \cap Y) + c(X \cap Y)\) for all \(X, Y \subseteq V\), \(c(X) = c(V \setminus X)\) for all \(X \subseteq V\), and \(c(\emptyset) = 0\). A subcubic tree is a tree such that every vertex has exactly one or three incident edges. We call \((T, \mathcal{L})\) a branch-decomposition of a connectivity function \(c\) on subsets of \(V\) if \(T\) is a subcubic tree and and \(\mathcal{L}\) is a bijection from \(V\) to the set of all leaves of \(T\). For an edge \(e\) of \(T\), connected components of \(T \setminus e\) induce a partition \((X, Y)\) of the set of leaves of \(T\). The width of an edge \(e\) of a branch-decomposition \((T, \mathcal{L})\) is \(c(\mathcal{L}^{-1}(X))\). The width of \((T, \mathcal{L})\) is the maximum width of all edges of \(T\). The branch-width \(bw(c)\) of \(c\) is the minimum width of a branch-decomposition of \(c\). (If \(|V| \leq 1\), we define that \(bw(c) = c(\emptyset)\).)

For a branch-decomposition \((T, \mathcal{L})\) of \(c\), let \(e\) and \(f\) be two edges of \(T\). Let \(E\) be the set of leaves of \(T\) in the component of \(T \setminus e\) not containing \(f\), and let \(F\) be the set of leaves of \(T\) in the component of \(T \setminus f\) not containing \(e\). Let \(P\) be the shortest path in \(T\) containing \(e\) and \(f\). We call \(e\) and \(f\) linked if

\[
\min_{h \in E(P)} (\text{width of } h \text{ of } (T, \mathcal{L})) = \min_{\mathcal{L}^{-1}(E) \subseteq Z \subseteq V \setminus \mathcal{L}^{-1}(F)} c(Z).
\]

We call a branch-decomposition \((T, \mathcal{L})\) is linked if each pair of edges of \(T\) is linked.

For a matrix \(M = (m_{ij} : i \in R, j \in C)\) over a field \(F\), if \(X \subseteq R\) and \(Y \subseteq C\), let \(M[X, Y]\) denote the submatrix \((m_{ij} : i \in X, j \in Y)\). For a graph \(G\), let \(A_G\) be its adjacency matrix over the binary field \(GF(2)\).

For a graph \(G = (V, E)\) and two disjoint subsets \(X, Y \subseteq V\), we define \(\rho_G^*(X, Y) = \text{rk}(A_G[X, Y])\) where \(\text{rk}\) is the matrix rank function; and we define the cut-rank function \(\rho_G\) of \(G\) by \(\rho_G(X) = \rho_G^*(X, V(G) \setminus X)\) for \(X \subseteq V\).

It is well-known that the cut-rank function is an instance of a connectivity function (see \[12\]). A rank-decomposition of a graph is a branch-decomposition of its cut-rank function and the rank-width of a graph is the branch-width of its cut-rank function.

3. Review on the Isotropic System

In this section, the notion of the isotropic system and a few useful theorems will be reviewed. All material is from Bouchet’s papers \[11\ \[2\ \[3\]. We change some notations. The author’s thesis \[10\] also contains the proofs of all theorems in this section.

3.1. Definition of the isotropic system. For a vector space \(W\) with a bilinear form \(\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle\), a subspace \(L\) of \(W\) is called totally isotropic if and only if \(\langle x, y \rangle = 0\) for all \(x, y \in L\).

Let \(K = \{0, \alpha, \beta, \gamma\}\) be the 2-dimensional vector space over \(GF(2)\). So this means that \(\alpha + \beta + \gamma = \alpha + \alpha = \beta + \beta = \gamma + \gamma = 0\). Moreover, let \(\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle\) be the bilinear form on \(K\) defined by

\[
\langle x, y \rangle = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } x \neq y \text{ and } x, y \neq 0, \\
0 & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]
Let $V$ be a finite set. Let $K^V$ be the set of functions from $V$ to $K$, and so $K^V$ is a vector space over $\text{GF}(2)$. We attach the following bilinear form to $K^V$:

$$\langle x, y \rangle = \sum_{v \in V} \langle x(v), y(v) \rangle.$$  

**Definition 3.1** (Bouchet [1]). An *isotropic system* is a pair $S = (V, L)$ of a finite set $V$ and a totally isotropic subspace $L$ of $K^V$ with $\dim(L) = |V|$. $V$ is called the *element set* of $S$.

For $X \subseteq V$, let $p_X : K^V \to K^X$ be the *canonical projection* such that

$$(p_X(a))(v) = a(v) \text{ for all } v \in X.$$  

For $a \in K^V$ and $X \subseteq V$, $a[X]$ is the vector in $K^V$ such that

$$a[X](v) = \begin{cases} a(v) & \text{if } v \in X, \\ 0 & \text{if } v \notin X. \end{cases}$$

Let $L$ be a subspace of $K^V$ and $v \in V$. Let $x \in K \setminus \{0\} = \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$.

- Let $L^\perp$ be the subspace of $K^V$ such that $L^\perp = \{z \in K^V : \langle z, y \rangle = 0 \text{ for all } y \in L\}$.
- Let $L|_x^u$ be the subspace of $K^{V \setminus \{v \}}$ such that $L|_x^u = \{p_{V \setminus \{v \}}(a) : a \in L, a(v) = 0 \text{ or } x\}$.
- Let $L|_{\subseteq X}, L|_X$ be the subspaces of $K^X$ such that

$$L|_{\subseteq X} = \{p_X(a) : a \in L, a(v) = 0 \text{ for all } v \notin X\}$$

$$L|_X = \{p_X(a) : a \in L\}$$

Two vectors $a, b \in K^V$ are called *supplementary* if $\langle a(v), b(v) \rangle = 1$ for all $v \in V$. We call $a \in K^V$ *complete* if $a(v) \neq 0$ for all $v \in V$. For $X \subseteq V$ and a complete vector $a$ of $K^X$, $L|_a^X$ is the subspace of $K^{V \setminus X}$ such that

$$L|_a^X = \{p_{V \setminus X}(b) : b \in L, b(v) \in \{a(v), 0\} \text{ for all } v \in X\}.$$  

Note that $L|_{x_1}^{v_1}|_{x_2}^{v_2}|_{x_3}^{v_3} \cdots |_{x_k}^{v_k} = L|_x^{v_1,v_2,\ldots,v_k}$ where $x \in K^{\{v_1,v_2,\ldots,v_k\}}$ such that $x(v_i) = x_i$.

**Definition 3.2.** Let $S = (V, L)$ be an isotropic system and $v \in V$. For $x \in K \setminus \{0\}$, $S|_x^v = (V \setminus \{v\}, L|_x^v)$ is called an *elementary minor* of $S$. An isotropic system $S'$ is called a *minor* of $S$ if $S'$ can be obtained from $S$ by applying a sequence of elementary minor operations; in other words, $S' = S|_{x_1}^{v_1}|_{x_2}^{v_2}|_{x_3}^{v_3} \cdots |_{x_k}^{v_k}$ for $v_i \in V$ and $x_i \in K \setminus \{0\}$.

Bouchet [1] (8.1) proved that an elementary minor of an isotropic system is again an isotropic system and therefore a minor of an isotropic system is an isotropic system.

### 3.2. Fundamental basis and fundamental graphs

The connection between isotropic systems and graphs was also studied by Bouchet [2].

**Definition 3.3.** We call $x \in K^V$ an *Eulerian vector* of an isotropic system $S = (V, L)$ if $x[P] \notin L$ for every nonempty subset $P$ of $V$.

**Proposition 3.4** (Bouchet [2] (4.1)). For every complete vector $c$ of $K^V$, there is an Eulerian vector $a$ of $S$, supplementary to $c$.

**Proposition 3.5** (Bouchet [2] (4.3)). Let $a$ be an Eulerian vector of an isotropic system $S = (V, L)$. For every $v \in V$, there exists a unique vector $b_v \in L$ such that

1. $b_v(v) \neq 0$. 

Corollary 3.8. Suppose of the following proposition, proved in [11].

Proposition 3.7 ([2, (9.1)]) is a graphic presentation of an isotropic system \(S = (V, L)\) by letting \(L\) be the subspace of \(K^V\) spanned by

\[\{a[n_G(v)] + b[\{v\}] : v \in V\}\].

We call \((G, a, b)\) a graphic presentation of \(S\).

It is interesting that the reverse direction also works. Suppose an isotropic system \(S = (V, L)\) is given with an Eulerian vector \(a\). Let \(\{b_v : v \in V\}\) be the fundamental basis of \(L\) with respect to \(a\). Let \(G = (V, E)\) be the graph such that \(vw \in E\) if and only if \(v \neq w\) and \(b_v(w) \neq 0\). Since \(\langle b_v, b_w \rangle = 0\) implies \(b_v(w) \neq 0 \Leftrightarrow b_w(v) \neq 0\), \(G\) is undirected. We call \(G\) the fundamental graph of \(S\) with respect to \(a\). In fact, if \(S\) has a graphic presentation \((G, a, b)\), then \(G\) is the fundamental graph of \(S\) with respect to \(a\).

Bouchet [2, (7.6)] showed that if \((G, a, b)\) is a graphic presentation of an isotropic system \(S = (V, L)\) and \(v \in V\), then

\[(G \ast v, a + b[\{v\}], a[n_G(v)] + b)\]

is also a graphic presentation of \(S\). Thus, local complementations preserve the associated isotropic system. If \(G\) and \(H\) are locally equivalent, associated isotropic systems can be chosen to be same by an appropriate choice of supplementary vectors. We note that if \(uv \in E(G)\), then

\[(G \wedge uv, a[V \setminus \{u, v\}] + b[\{u, v\}], b[V \setminus \{u, v\}] + a[\{u, v\}])\]

is a graphic presentation of \(S\). This fact will be used in Section 10.

Proposition 3.6 ([2 (4.5) and (7.1)]). If \(G_1\) and \(G_2\) are fundamental graphs of an isotropic system \(S\), then \(G_1\) and \(G_2\) are locally equivalent.

A minor of an isotropic system is closely related to a vertex-minor of its fundamental graph as follows.

Proposition 3.7 ([2 (9.1)]). Let \(G = (V, E)\) be a graph. Let \(v \in v(G)\) and \(x \in K \setminus \{0\}\). If \((G, a, b)\) is a graphic presentation of an isotropic system \(S = (V, L)\), then the elementary minor \(S'\) has a graphic presentation, that is

(i) \((G \setminus v, p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(a), p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(b))\) if either \(x = a(v)\), \(x = b(v)\) and \(v\) is an isolated vertex of \(G\),
(ii) \((G \wedge vw \setminus v, p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(a[V \setminus \{v, w\}] + b[\{v, w\}], p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(b[V \setminus \{v, w\}] + a[\{v, w\}]))\) if \(x = b(v)\) and \(v\) has a neighbor \(w\) in \(G\),
(iii) \((G \ast v \setminus v, p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(a), p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(b + a[n_G(v)]))\) otherwise.

Corollary 3.8. Suppose \(G_1\) and \(G_2\) are fundamental graphs of isotropic systems \(S_1\) and \(S_2\) respectively. If \(S_1\) is a minor of \(S_2\), then \(G_1\) is a vertex-minor of \(G_2\).

Note that the choice of \(w\) in Proposition 3.7 does not affect the isotropic system because of the following proposition, proved in [11].
Proposition 3.9. If $v_1, v_2 \in E(G)$ are two distinct edges incident with $v$, then, $G \land v_1 \land v_2 = G \land v_1 \setminus v$ and therefore $G \land v_1 \setminus v$ is locally equivalent to $G \land v_2 \setminus v$.

3.3. Connectivity. For a subspace $L$ of $K^V$, let $\lambda(L) = |V| - \dim(L)$.

Definition 3.10. For an isotropic system $S = (V, L)$, we call $c : V \to \mathbb{Z}$ the connectivity function of $S$ if $c(X) = \lambda(L|\subseteq X) = |X| - \dim(L|\subseteq X)$.

If $L$ is a totally isotropic subspace of $K^V$, then $L|\subseteq X$ is also a totally isotropic subspace of $K^X$. Thus, $\dim(L|\subseteq X) \leq |X|$, and therefore $c(X) \geq 0$.

Bouchet [3] observed that the connectivity function of an isotropic system is equal to the cut-rank function of its fundamental graph.

Proposition 3.11 ([3, Theorem 6]). Let $a$ be an Eulerian vector of an isotropic system $S = (V, L)$ and let $c$ be the connectivity function of $S$. Let $G$ be the fundamental graph of $S$ with respect to $a$. Then, $c(X) = \rho_{G}(X)$ for all $X \subseteq V$.

By Proposition 3.11 the connectivity function of an isotropic system $S = (V, L)$ is indeed a connectivity function, as defined in Section 2. A branch-decomposition and the branch-width of an isotropic system are defined as a branch-decomposition and the branch-width of its connectivity function, respectively. By Proposition 3.11 the branch-width of an isotropic system is equal to the rank-width of its fundamental graph.

4. Overview of the Main Proof

Our main objective is to prove the following.

Theorem 4.1. Let $k$ be a constant. If $\{G_1, G_2, G_3, \cdots\}$ is an infinite sequence of graphs of rank-width at most $k$, then there exist $i < j$ such that $G_i$ is isomorphic to a pivot-minor of $G_j$, and therefore isomorphic to a vertex-minor of $G_j$.

In general, we say that a binary relation $\leq$ on a set $X$ is a quasi-order if it is reflexive and transitive. For a quasi-order $\leq$, we say “$\leq$ is a well-quasi-ordering” or “$X$ is well-quasi-ordered by $\leq$” if for every infinite sequence $a_1, a_2, \ldots$ of elements of $X$, there exist $i < j$ such that $a_i \leq a_j$. We may reiterate Theorem 4.1 as follows: a set of graphs of bounded rank-width is well-quasi-ordered up to isomorphism by the vertex-minor relation and also by the pivot-minor relation.

Here is a corollary of Theorem 4.1. Note that this corollary has an elementary proof in [11], and is used [6] to show the existence of the polynomial-time algorithm to decide whether rank-width is at most $k$ for a fixed $k$.

Corollary 4.2. For a fixed $k$, there is a finite list of graphs $G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_m$ such that for every graph $H$, the rank-width of $H$ is at most $k$ if and only if $G_i$ is not isomorphic to a vertex-minor of $H$ for all $i$.

Proof. Let $X = \{G_1, G_2, \ldots\}$ be a set of graphs satisfying that for every graph $H$, the rank-width of a graph $H$ is at most $k$ if and only if $G_i$ is not isomorphic to a vertex-minor of $H$ for all $i$. We choose $X$ minimal by set inclusion. There are no $G_i, G_j \in S$ such that $G_i$ is isomorphic to a vertex-minor of $G_j$, because if so, then we may remove $G_j$ from $X$. By assumption, the rank-width of $G \setminus v$ for $v \in V(G)$ is at most $k$, and therefore the rank-width of $G_i$ is at most $k + 1$. By Theorem 4.1 $X$ is finite. \qed
We say that an isotropic system $S_1 = (V_1, L_1)$ is simply isomorphic to another isotropic system $S_2 = (V_2, L_2)$ if there exists a bijection $\mu : V_1 \to V_2$ such that $L_1 = \{a \circ \mu : a \in L_2\}$. A bijection $\mu$ is called a simple isomorphism. It is clear that if $S_1$ is simply isomorphic to $S_2$, then every fundamental graph of $S_1$ is isomorphic to a graph locally equivalent to a fundamental graph of $S_2$.

We say that an isotropic system $S_1$ is an $\alpha\beta$-minor of an isotropic system $S$ if there is $a \in K_X$ with $S_1 = S'|_a$ and $a(v) \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$ for all $v \in X$. Every $\alpha\beta$-minor of an isotropic system $S$ is a minor of $S$, but not vice versa. Pivot-minors of graphs are closely related to $\alpha\beta$-minors of isotropic systems as the follows.

Lemma 10.2. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let $S_i$ be an isotropic system with a graphic presentation $(G_i, a_i, b_i)$ such that

$$a_i(v), b_i(v) \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$$

for all $v \in V(G_i)$. If $S_1$ is an $\alpha\beta$-minor of $S_2$, then $G_1$ is a pivot-minor of $G_2$.

Instead of dealing with graphs, we show the following stronger proposition on isotropic systems.

Proposition 9.1. Let $k$ be a constant. If $\{S_1, S_2, S_3, \ldots\}$ is an infinite sequence of isotropic systems of branch-width at most $k$, then there exist $i < j$ such that $S_i$ is simply isomorphic to an $\alpha\beta$-minor of $S_j$.

We deduce Theorem 4.1 from Proposition 9.1.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Let $S_i$ be the isotropic system with the graphic presentation $(G_i, a_i, b_i)$ where $a_i(v) = \alpha$, $b_i(v) = \beta$ for all $v \in V(G_i)$. Each $S_i$ has branch-width at most $k$, since its branch-width is equal to the rank-width of $G_i$. By Proposition 9.1, there exist $i < j$ such that $S_i$ is simply isomorphic to an $\alpha\beta$-minor of $S_j$, and therefore by Lemma 10.2, $G_i$ is isomorphic to a pivot-minor of $G_j$. □

The following theorem was shown by Geelen, Gerards, and Whittle [8]. It was the first step to prove well-quasi-ordering of matroids representable over a fixed finite field having bounded branch-width. Its analogous result by Thomas [15] was used to prove well-quasi-ordering of graphs of bounded tree-width in [13].

Theorem 4.3 (Geelen et al. [8, 9, Theorem (2.1)]). A connectivity function with branch-width $n$ has a linked branch decomposition of width $n$.

Corollary 4.4. An isotropic system of branch-width $n$ has a linked branch-decomposition of width $n$. Equivalently, a graph of rank-width $n$ has a linked rank-decomposition of width $n$.

We also use Robertson and Seymour’s “lemma on trees,” proved in [13]. It enabled them to prove that a set of graphs of bounded tree-width is well-quasi-ordered by the graph minor relation. Geelen, Gerards, and Whittle [8] used it to prove that a set of matroids representable over a fixed finite field and having bounded branch-width is well-quasi-ordered by the matroid minor relation. We need a special case of the “lemma on trees,” namely for subcubic forests, that was also used in [8].

The following definitions are as in [8]. A rooted tree is a finite directed tree where all but one of the vertices have indegree 1. A rooted forest is a collection of countably many vertex-disjoint rooted trees. Its vertices with indegree 0 are called roots and those with outdegree 0 are called leaves. Edges leaving a root are root edges and those entering a leaf are leaf edges.
An $n$-edge labeling of a graph $F$ is a map from the set of edges of $F$ to the set $\{0, 1, \ldots, n\}$. Let $\lambda$ be an $n$-edge labeling of a rooted forest $F$ and let $e$ and $f$ be edges in $F$. We say that $e$ is $\lambda$-linked to $f$ if $F$ contains a directed path $P$ starting with $e$ and ending with $f$ such that $\lambda(g) \geq \lambda(e) = \lambda(f)$ for every edge $g$ on $P$.

A binary forest is a rooted orientation of a subcubic forest with a distinction between left and right outgoing edges. More precisely, we call a triple $(F, l, r)$ a binary forest if $F$ is a rooted forest where roots have outdegree 1 and $l$ and $r$ are functions defined on non-leaf edges of $F$, such that the head of each non-leaf edge $e$ of $F$ has exactly two outgoing edges, namely $l(e)$ and $r(e)$.

**Lemma 4.5** ([F (3.2) Lemma on Subcubic Trees]). Let $(F, l, r)$ be an infinite binary forest with an $n$-edge labeling $\lambda$. Moreover, let $\leq$ be a quasi-order on the set of edges of $F$ with no infinite strictly descending sequences, such that $e \leq f$ whenever $f$ is $\lambda$-linked to $e$. If the set of leaf edges of $F$ is well-quasi-ordered by $\leq$ but the set of root edges of $F$ is not, then $F$ contains an infinite sequence $(e_0, e_1, \ldots)$ of non-leaf edges such that

1. $(i) \{e_0, e_1, \ldots\}$ is an antichain with respect to $\leq$,
2. $(ii) l(e_0) \leq l(e_1) \leq l(e_2) \leq \cdots$,
3. $(iii) r(e_0) \leq r(e_1) \leq r(e_2) \leq \cdots$.

Informally speaking, at the last stage of proving Proposition 9.1, we need an object describing a piece of isotropic systems such that the number of ways to merge two of such objects into one isotropic system is finite up to simple isomorphisms. More precisely, we call a triple $P = (V, L, B)$ a scrap if $V$ is a finite set, $L$ is a totally isotropic subspace of $K^V$, and $B$ is an ordered basis of $L^\perp /L$. An ordered basis is a basis with a linear ordering, and therefore $B$ is of the form $\{b_1 + L, b_2 + L, \ldots, b_k + L\}$ with $b_i \in L^\perp$. We denote $V(P) = V$. Note that $L^\perp /L$ is a vector space containing vectors of the form $a + L$ with $a \in L^\perp$ and $a + L = b + L$ if and only if $a - b \in L$. Also note that $|B| = \dim(L^\perp /L) = \dim(L^\perp) - \dim(L) = 2(|V| - \dim(L)) = 2\lambda(L)$.

Two scraps $P_1 = (V, L, B)$ and $P_2 = (V', L', B')$ are called isomorphic if there exists a bijection $\mu : V \to V'$ such that $L = \{a \circ \mu : a \in L'\}$ and $b_i + L = (b_i' \circ \mu) + L$ where $B = \{b_1 + L, b_2 + L, \ldots, b_k + L\}$ and $B' = \{b_1' + L', b_2' + L', \ldots, b_k' + L'\}$.

For $x \in K \setminus \{0\}$ and $v \in V$, let $\delta_v^x \in K^V$ such that $\delta_v^x(v) = x$ and $\delta_v^x(w) = 0$ for all $w \neq v$. We often write $\delta_v^x$ without referring to $V$ if that is not ambiguous. If $P = (V, L, B)$ is a scrap and $\delta_x^v \notin L^\perp \setminus L$, we define

$$P|_x^v = (V \setminus \{x\}, L|_x^v, \{p_{v \setminus \{x\}}(b_i) + L|_x^v\})$$

where each $b_i \in L^\perp$ is chosen to satisfy that $B = \{b_i + L\}_1$ and $b_i(v) \in \{0, x\}$. We will prove that $P|_x^v$ is a well-defined scrap in Proposition 6.2. Note that $P|_x^v$ is only defined when $\delta_x^v \notin L^\perp \setminus L$.

A scrap $P'$ is called a minor of a scrap $P$ if $P' = P|_{x_1}^{v_1} |_{x_2}^{v_2} \cdots |_{x_i}^{v_i}$ for some $v_i$ and $x_i$. Similarly a scrap $P'$ is called an $\alpha \beta$-minor of a scrap $P$ if $P' = P|_{x_1}^{v_1} |_{x_2}^{v_2} \cdots |_{x_i}^{v_i}$ for some $v_i$ and $x_i \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$.

Two scraps $P_1 = (V, L, B)$ and $P_2 = (V', L', B')$ are called disjoint if $V \cap V' = \emptyset$. A scrap $P = (V, L, B)$ is called a sum of two disjoint scraps $P_1 = (V_1, L_1, B_1)$ and $P_2 = (V_2, L_2, B_2)$ if

$$V = V_1 \cup V_2, \quad L_1 = L|_{\subseteq V_1}, \text{ and } L_2 = L|_{\subseteq V_2}. $$
A sum of two disjoint scraps is not uniquely determined; we, however, will define the connection types that will determine a sum of two disjoint scraps such that there are only finitely many connection types. Moreover, we will prove the following.

**Lemma 8.5.** Let $P_1$, $P_2$, $Q_1$, $Q_2$ be scraps. Let $P$ be the sum of $P_1$ and $P_2$ and $Q$ be the sum of $Q_1$ and $Q_2$. If $P_i$ is a minor of $Q_i$ for $i = 1, 2$ and the connection type of $P_1$ and $P_2$ is equal to the connection type of $Q_1$ and $Q_2$, then $P$ is a minor of $Q$.

Moreover, if $P_i$ is an $\alpha\beta$-minor of $Q_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and the connection type of $P_1$ and $P_2$ is equal to the connection type of $Q_1$ and $Q_2$, then $P$ is an $\alpha\beta$-minor of $Q$.

Another requirement to apply Lemma 8.5 is that $e \leq f$ whenever $f$ is $\lambda$-linked to $e$. This condition will be satisfied by the following lemma, which is an extension of Tutte’s linking theorem. Tutte’s linking theorem for matroids was used by Geelen, Gerards, and Whittle and is an extension of Menger’s theorem. Robertson and Seymour also used Menger’s theorem in [13].

**Theorem 7.2.** Let $V$ be a finite set and $X$ be a subset of $V$. Let $L$ be a totally isotropic subspace of $K^V$. Let $k$ be a constant. Let $b$ be a complete vector of $K^V \setminus X$.

Then $\lambda(L|_{\leq Z}) \geq k$ for all $Z \supseteq X$ if and only if there is a complete vector $a \in K^V \setminus X$ such that $\lambda(L^a|_{\leq X}) \geq k$ and $a(v) \neq b(v)$ for all $v \in V \setminus X$.

The actual proof of Proposition 9.1 is based on a construction of a forest with a certain $k$-labeling from branch-decompositions of isotropic systems, and applying the lemmas described above. In the subsequent sections, we will prove these lemmas.

## 5. Lemmas on Totally Isotropic Subspaces

In this section, $L$ is a totally isotropic subspace of $K^V$, not necessarily $\dim(L) = |V|$. We prove some general results on totally isotropic subspaces.

**Lemma 5.1.** Let $L$ be a totally isotropic subspace of $K^V$ and $v \in V$, $x \in K \setminus \{0\}$. Then, 

$$(L^v|_x)^\perp = L^x|_v.$$  

**Proof.** Suppose that $y \in L^x|_v$. There exists $\bar{y} \in L^x$ such that $\bar{y}(v) \in \{0, x\}$ and $y = p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(\bar{y})$. For every $z \in L^v|_x$, there exists $\bar{z} \in L$ such that $\bar{z}(v) \in \{0, x\}$ and $p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(\bar{z}) = z$. Since $\langle y, z \rangle = \langle \bar{y}, \bar{z} \rangle - \langle \bar{y}(v), \bar{z}(v) \rangle = 0$, we have $y \notin (L^v|_x)^\perp$.

Conversely, suppose that $y \notin L^x|_v$. Let $y \oplus x \in K^V$ be such that $p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(y \oplus x) = y$ and $(y \oplus x)(v) = x$. By assumption, $y \oplus x \notin L^x$. Therefore, there exists $z \in L$ such that

$$\langle y, p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(z) \rangle + \langle x, z(v) \rangle = \langle y \oplus x, z \rangle = 1.$$  

If $\langle x, z(v) \rangle = 0$, then $p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(z) \in L^v|_x$ and $\langle y, p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(z) \rangle = 1$, and therefore $y \notin (L^v|_x)^\perp$. So, we may assume that $\langle x, z(v) \rangle = 1$.

Let $y \oplus 0 \in K^V$ such that $p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(y \oplus 0) = y$ and $(y \oplus 0)(v) = 0$. By assumption, $y \oplus 0 \notin L^x$. Therefore, there exists $w \in L$ such that $\langle y, p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(w) \rangle = \langle y \oplus 0, w \rangle = 1$. If $w(v) \in \{0, x\}$, then $p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(w) \in L^v|_x$ and $y \notin (L^v|_x)^\perp$. Hence we may assume that $\langle x, w(v) \rangle = 1$.

Now, we obtain that $\langle x, w(v) + z(v) \rangle = 0$, and so $w(v) + z(v) \in \{0, x\}$. Therefore $p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(w + z) \in L^v|_x$. Furthermore $\langle p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(w + z), y \rangle = 1$. So, $y \notin (L^v|_x)^\perp$. \(\square\)
Lemma 5.2. If $L$ is a totally isotropic subspace of $K^V$ and $X \subseteq V$, then

$$(L|_{X})^\perp = L^\perp|_X.$$ 

Proof. We use induction on $|V \setminus X|$. If $|X| < |V| - 1$, then we pick $v \notin X$, and deduce that $(L|_{V \setminus \{v\}})^\perp|_X = (L|_{V \setminus \{v\}})^\perp|_X = L^\perp|_{V \setminus \{v\}} = L^\perp|_X$. Therefore we may assume that $V \setminus X = \{v\}$.

For $x \in K^X$ and $y \in K$, let $x \oplus y$ denote the vector in $K^V$ such that $p_X(x \oplus y) = x$ and $(x \oplus y)(v) = y$.

1. We claim that $L^\perp|_X \subseteq (L|_{X})^\perp$.

Suppose that $a \in L^\perp|_X$. Then there exists $b \in K$ such that $a \oplus b \in L^\perp$. For any $c \in L|_{X}$, $\langle a \oplus b, c \rangle = 0$, and therefore $\langle a, c \rangle = 0$. Thus, $a \in (L|_{X})^\perp$.

2. We claim that $(L|_{X})^\perp \subseteq L^\perp|_X$.

Suppose that $a \in (L|_{X})^\perp$ and $a \notin L^\perp|_X$. We have $a \oplus x \notin L^\perp$ and therefore for every $x \in K$, there exists $a_x \oplus c_x \in L$ such that $\langle a_x, a \rangle + \langle c_x, x \rangle = \langle a_x \oplus c_x, a \oplus x \rangle = 1$. In particular, $\langle a_0, a \rangle = 1$.

If $c_x = 0$, then $a_x \in L|_{X}$ and so $\langle a_x, a \rangle = 0$ and $\langle c_x, x \rangle = 0$, contrary to the fact that $\langle a_x, a \rangle + \langle c_x, x \rangle = 1$. Therefore $c_x \neq 0$ for all $x \in K$.

If $c_x = c_y$ for $x \neq y$, then $a_x + a_y \in L|_{X}$. Thus, $\langle c_x, x + y \rangle = 1 + \langle c_y, y \rangle = \langle a_x + a_y, a \rangle = 0$. Since $c_x \neq 0$ and $x + y \neq 0$, we have $c_x = c_y = x + y$ and $\langle a_x, a \rangle = 1 + \langle x + y, x \rangle = 1 + \langle x, y \rangle$.

If $c_x = c_y = c_z$ for distinct $x, y, z$, then $x + y = y + z = z + x$. So, $x = y = z$, which is a contradiction.

If $c_x = c_y, c_z = c_w$ for distinct $x, y, z, w$, then $c_x = x + y = z + w = c_z$. So, $x = y = z = w$. This is a contradiction.

Therefore, there is exactly one pair $x, y \in K$ such that $c_x = c_y$. Let $\{z, w\} = K \setminus \{x, y\}$.

Since $c_z \neq c_w$ and $c_z, c_w \in K \setminus \{0, x + y\}$, we have $c_z + c_w = x + y = c_x = c_y$. Therefore, $c_z + c_w \in L|_{X}$ and $\langle c_z + c_w, a \rangle = 0$. Since $\langle a_z, a \rangle + \langle a_w, a \rangle = \langle c_z, z \rangle + \langle c_w, w \rangle$, we have $\langle c_z, z \rangle + \langle c_w, w \rangle = \langle a_z + a_w, a \rangle + \langle a_x, a \rangle = 1 + \langle x, y \rangle$.

If $x = 0$, then $c_x + c_w = y$, hence $c_z, c_w \in \{z, w\}$. So, $\langle c_z, z \rangle + \langle c_w, w \rangle = 0$. A contradiction.

So we may assume that $x \neq 0$, $y \neq 0$, $z = 0$, and then $x + y = w$ and $\langle c_w, w \rangle = 0$. But, this implies that $c_w = w = x + y = c_x$. A contradiction. □

Proposition 5.3. Let $V$ be a finite set and $L$ be a totally isotropic subspace of $K^V$ and $v \in V$, $x \in K \setminus \{0\}$. Then,

$$\dim(L|_x^v) = \begin{cases} \dim(L) & \text{if } \delta_x^v \in L^\perp \setminus L, \\ \dim(L) - 1 & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$$

In other words, $\lambda(L|_x^v) = \begin{cases} \lambda(L) & \text{if } \delta_x^v \notin L^\perp \setminus L, \\ \lambda(L) - 1 & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$

Proof. Let $L' = \{a \in L : a(v) \in \{0, x\}\}$. Then clearly $L' = L$ if $a(v) \in \{0, x\}$ for each $a \in L$, and $\dim(L) = \dim(L) - 1$ otherwise. Also, $\dim(L|_x^v) = \dim(L')$ when $\delta_x^v \notin L'$, and $\dim(L|_x^v) = \dim(L') - 1$ otherwise. Moreover, obviously, “$a(v) \in \{0, x\}$ for each $a \in L^v$ is equivalent with “$\delta_x^v \in L^{v, n}$” and “$\delta_x^v \notin L^v$” is equivalent with “$\delta_x^v \notin L^v$”. As $L \subseteq L^\perp$, all this implies this proposition. □
Corollary 5.4. Let $V$ be a finite set and $L$ be a totally isotropic subspace of $K^V$ and $v \in V$. Let $C \subseteq K \setminus \{0\}$, $|C| = 2$. Then, either there is $x \in C$ such that $\lambda(L|^v_x) = \lambda(L)$ or for all $y \in K \setminus \{0\}$,
\[ L|^v_y = |L|_{\subseteq V \setminus \{v\}} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda(L|^v_y) = \lambda(L) - 1. \]

Proof. Let $C = \{a, b\}$. Suppose there is no such $x \in C$. Then $\delta|^v_a, \delta|^v_b$ are in $L^\perp \setminus L$. Therefore, $z(v) = 0$ for all $z \in L$. Thus, $L|^v_y = |L|_{\subseteq V \setminus \{v\}}$ and $\lambda(L|^v_y) = \lambda(L) - 1$ for all $y \in K \setminus \{0\}$. \qed

6. Scraps

In this section, we prove that a minor of a scrap is well-defined. From Section 4, we recall that a scrap is a triple $P = (V, L, B)$ of a finite set $V$, a totally isotropic subspace $L$ of $K^V$, and an ordered basis $B$ of $L^\perp/L$.

Lemma 6.1. Let $P = (V, L, B)$ be a scrap and $v \in V$, $x \in K \setminus \{0\}$. If $\delta|^v_x \notin L^\perp \setminus L$, then there is a sequence $b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_m \in L^\perp$ such that $b_i(v) \in \{0, x\}$ and $B = \{b_1 + L, b_2 + L, \ldots, b_m + L\}$.

Proof. Let $B = \{a_1 + L, a_2 + L, \ldots, a_m + L\}$ with $a_i \in L^\perp$. If $\delta|^v_x \in L^\perp$, then $a_i(v) \in \{0, x\}$ for all $i$. Hence we may assume that $\delta|^v_x \notin L$ and so $\delta|^v_x \notin L^\perp$. Therefore there is $y \in L$ such that $\langle y, \delta|^v_x \rangle = 1$. Thus, $y(v) \notin \{0, x\}$. Let
\[ b_i = \begin{cases} a_i & \text{if } a_i(v) \in \{0, x\}, \\ a_i + y & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \]
Then, $b_i + L = a_i + L$ and $b_i(v) \in \{0, x\}$. \qed

Proposition 6.2. Let $P = (V, L, B)$ be a scrap. If $\delta|^v_x \notin L^\perp \setminus L$, then $P|^v_x$ is well-defined and is a scrap.

Proof. Let us first show that it is well-defined. Let $b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_k \in L^\perp$ be such that $b_i(v) \in \{0, x\}$ and $B = \{b_i + L : i = 1, 2, \ldots, k\}$. We claim that the choice of $b_i$ does not change $P|^v_x$. Suppose $b_i - b'_i \in L$ and $b_i(v), b'_i(v) \in \{0, x\}$. Since $b_i, b'_i \in L$ and $(b_i - b'_i)(v) \in \{0, x\}$, we have $p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(b_i) - b'_i \in L|^v_x$. Therefore, $p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(b_i) + L|^v_x = p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(b'_i) + L|^v_x$.

Now, we claim that $P|^v_x$ is a scrap.

First, we show that $L|^v_x$ is a totally isotropic subspace of $K^V \setminus \{v\}$. For all $a, b \in L|^v_x$, there are $\tilde{a}, \tilde{b} \in L$ such that $\tilde{a}(v), \tilde{b}(v) \in \{0, x\}$, $p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(\tilde{a}) = a$, $p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(\tilde{b}) = b$, and $\tilde{a}, \tilde{b} \in L$. Hence $\langle a, b \rangle = \langle \tilde{a}, \tilde{b} \rangle = 0$.

Next, we show that $\{p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(b_i) + L|^v_x : i = 1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ is a basis of $(L|^v_x)^\perp/(L|^v_x)$. Since $b_i(v) \in \{0, x\}$, we have $p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(b_i) \in (L|^v_x)^\perp = (L^\perp)|^v_x$. Suppose that there exists $C \neq \emptyset$ such that
\[ \sum_{i \in C}(p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(b_i) + L|^v_x) = 0 + L|^v_x. \]

Since $\sum_{i \in C} p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(b_i) \in L|^v_x$, there exists $z \in L \subseteq L^\perp$ such that $z(v) \in \{0, x\}$ and $p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(z) = \sum_{i \in C} p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(b_i)$. By assumption, $\sum_{i \in C} b_i \notin L$. Since $p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(\sum_{i \in C} b_i - z) = 0$, we have $\sum_{i \in C} b_i - z = \delta|^v_x \in L^\perp \setminus L$, a contradiction. Therefore, $\{p_{V \setminus \{v\}}(b_i) + L|^v_x : i = 1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ is linearly independent. Moreover, $\dim((L|^v_x)^\perp/(L|^v_x)) = 2(\dim V - 1 - \dim(L|^v_x)) = 2(|V| - \dim(L)) = \dim(L^\perp/L)$ because $\delta|^v_x \notin L^\perp \setminus L$. \qed
7. **Generalization of Tutte’s linking theorem**

In this section, we show a generalization of Tutte’s linking theorem [16].

**Lemma 7.1.** Let $V$ be a finite set and $v \in V$. Let $L$ be a totally isotropic subspace of $K^V$. Let $X_1, Y_1 \subseteq V \setminus \{v\}$. Let $x, y \in K \setminus \{0\}$, $x \neq y$. Then,

$$\dim(L|_{\subseteq X_1 \cap Y_1}) + \dim(L|_{\subseteq X_1 \cup Y_1 \cup \{v\}}) \geq \dim(L|_{\subseteq X_1}) + \dim(L|_{\subseteq Y_1}).$$

In other words,

$$\lambda(L|_{\subseteq X_1}) + \lambda(L|_{\subseteq Y_1}) \geq \lambda(L|_{\subseteq X_1 \cap Y_1}) + \lambda(L|_{\subseteq X_1 \cup Y_1 \cup \{v\}}) - 1.$$

**Proof.** We may assume that there is at most one vector in $C$ such that $p(X_1 \cap Y_1) \subseteq L|_{\subseteq X_1 \cup Y_1 \cup \{v\}}$. Let $C$ be a minimum set of vectors in $L$ such that $p(X_1 \cap Y_1) \subseteq L|_{\subseteq X_1 \cup Y_1 \cup \{v\}}$. Let $C$ be a minimum set of vectors in $L$ such that $p(X_1 \cap Y_1) \subseteq L|_{\subseteq X_1 \cup Y_1 \cup \{v\}}$. We may assume that $C$ has $x$ on $v$.

Let $D$ be a minimum set of vectors in $L$ such that $p(X_1 \cap Y_1) \subseteq L|_{\subseteq Y_1}$ and for every $z \in D$, $z(v) = 0$ for all $w \notin X_1 \cap Y_1$. We may assume that at most one vector in $C$ has $x$ on $v$.

Now, we translate Tutte’s linking theorem into isotropic subspaces.

**Theorem 7.2.** Let $V$ be a finite set and $X$ be a subset of $V$. Let $L$ be a totally isotropic subspace of $K^V$. Let $k$ be a constant. Let $b$ be a complete vector of $K^{V \setminus X}$.

Then $\lambda(L|_{\subseteq Z}) \geq k$ for all $Z \supseteq X$ if and only if there is a complete vector $a \in K^{V \setminus X}$ such that $\lambda(L|_{\subseteq X}) \geq k$ and $a(v) \neq b(v)$ for all $v \in V \setminus X$.

**Proof.** ($\Leftarrow$) Let $Z$ be a subset of $V$ such that $X \subseteq Z$. Let $a_1 = p_{V \setminus Z}(a)$, $a_2 = p_Z(a)$. Since $L|_{\subseteq Z} \subseteq L|_{\subseteq a_1}$, we have $\lambda(L|_{\subseteq Z}) \geq \lambda(L|_{\subseteq a_1})$. So

$$\lambda(L|_{\subseteq Z}) \geq \lambda(L|_{\subseteq a_1}) \geq \lambda(L|_{\subseteq a_2}) = \lambda(L|_{\subseteq X}) \geq k.$$

($\Rightarrow$) Induction on $|V \setminus X|$. Suppose that there is no such complete vector $a \in K^{V \setminus X}$. We may assume that $|V \setminus X| \geq 1$. 

---
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Pick \( v \in V \setminus X \). Let \( K \setminus \{ 0, b(v) \} = \{ x, y \} \). Since there is no complete vector \( a' \in K^{V \setminus \{v\} \setminus X} \) such that \( \lambda(L|_{a'})^{V \setminus \{v\} \setminus X} \geq k \), there exists \( X_1 \) such that \( X \subseteq X_1 \subseteq V \setminus \{v\} \) and \( \lambda(L|_{a'})^{X_1} < k \). Similarly, there exists \( Y_1 \) such that \( X \subseteq Y_1 \subseteq V \setminus \{v\} \) and \( \lambda(L|_{a'})^{Y_1} < k \). By Lemma 7.1, either \( \lambda(L|_{X \cap Y_1}) < k \) or \( \lambda(L|_{X \cup Y_1 \cup \{v\}}) < k \), a contradiction. \( \square \)

Corollary 7.3. Let \( V \) be a finite set and \( X \) be a subset of \( V \). Let \( L \) be a totally isotropic subspace of \( K^V \). Let \( b \) be a complete vector of \( K^V \).

If \( \lambda(L|_{\subseteq Z}) \geq \lambda(L|_{\subseteq X}) \) for all \( Z \supseteq X \), then there is a complete vector \( a \in K^V \) such that \( L|_{a}^{\subseteq X} = L|_{X} \) and \( a(v) \neq b(v) \) for all \( v \in V \setminus X \).

Proof. By Theorem 7.2 there exists a complete vector \( a \in K^V \) such that
\[
\lambda(L|_{a})^{\subseteq X} = \lambda(L|_{X}) \quad \text{and} \quad a(v) \neq b(v) \quad \text{for all} \quad v \in V \setminus X.
\]
Since \( L|_{X} \subseteq L|_{a}^{\subseteq X} \) and \( \dim(L|_{X}) = \dim(L|_{a}^{\subseteq X}) \), we have \( L|_{X} = L|_{a}^{\subseteq X} \). \( \square \)

Corollary 7.4. Let \( P = (V, L, B) \) be a scrap and \( X \subseteq V \). If
\[
\lambda(P) = \lambda(L|_{X}) = \min_{X \subseteq Z \subseteq V} \lambda(L|_{Z}),
\]
then there is an ordered set \( B' \) such that \( Q = (X, L|_{X}, B') \) is a scrap and an \( \alpha \beta \)-minor of \( P \).

Proof. By applying Corollary 7.3 with \( b(v) = \gamma \) for all \( v \in V \setminus X \), there is a complete vector \( a \in K^V \) such that \( L|_{a}^{\subseteq X} = L|_{X} \) and \( a(v) \in \{ \alpha, \beta \} \) for all \( v \in V \setminus X \). Let \( V \setminus X = \{ y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_m \} \) and \( a_i = a(y_i) \). Then, \( L|_{X} = L|_{a_1}^{y_1} \cdots L|_{a_m}^{y_m} \). Let \( L_0 = L \) and \( L_i = L_{i-1} \cap \lambda_{a_i}^{y_i} \). By Proposition 5.3 \( \lambda(L|_{X}) = \lambda(L) = \lambda(L_i) \) implies \( \delta_{a_{i+1}}^{y_{i+1}} \notin L_i \). So, \( P|_{a_1}^{y_1} \cdots L|_{a_m}^{y_m} = (X, L|_{X}, B') \) is well-defined and is an \( \alpha \beta \)-minor of \( P \). \( \square \)

8. Sum

A scrap \( P = (V, L, B) \) is called a sum of two disjoint scraps \( P_1 = (V_1, L_1, B_1) \) and \( P_2 = (V_2, L_2, B_2) \) if
\[
V = V_1 \cup V_2, \quad L = L|_{\subseteq V_1}, \quad \text{and} \quad L = L|_{\subseteq V_2}.
\]
For given two disjoint scraps, there could be many scraps that are sums of those. In this section, we define the connection type, which determines a sum uniquely.

Let \( [n] \) denote the set \( \{1, 2, 3, \ldots, n\} \).

Definition 8.1. Let \( P = (V, L, B) \) be a sum of two disjoint scraps \( P_1 = (V_1, L_1, B_1) \) and \( P_2 = (V_2, L_2, B_2) \) where \( B = \{ b_1 + L_2 + L_2, \ldots, b_n + L_2 \}, B_1 = \{ b_1 + L_1, b_1^2 + L_1, \ldots, b_n^2 + L_1 \}, \) and \( B_2 = \{ b_1^2 + L_2, b_2^2 + L_2, \ldots, b_n^2 + L_2 \} \). For \( x_i \in K^{V_i} \) and \( x_2 \in K^{V_2} \), let \( x_1 \oplus x_2 \) denote the vector in \( K^V \) such that \( p_{V_i}(x_1 \oplus x_2) = x_i \) for \( i = 1, 2 \). Let
\[
C_0 = \left\{ (X, Y) : X \subseteq [m], Y \subseteq [l], \left( \sum_{i \in X} b_i^2 \right) \oplus \left( \sum_{j \in Y} b_j^2 \right) \in L \right\},
\]
\[
C_s = \left\{ (X, Y) : X \subseteq [m], Y \subseteq [l], \left( \sum_{i \in X} b_i^2 \right) \oplus \left( \sum_{j \in Y} b_j^2 \right) - b_s \in L \right\} \quad s = 1, \ldots, n
\]
The sequence \( C(P, P_1, P_2) = (C_0, C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_n) \) is called the connection type of this sum.
It is easy to see that if \( \lambda(P), \lambda(P_1), \lambda(P_2) \leq k \), then the number of distinct connection types is bounded by a function of \( k \), because \( |B| = 2\lambda(P) \leq 2k \) and \( |B_1| = 2\lambda(P_i) \leq 2k \) for \( i = 1 \) and \( 2 \).

**Proposition 8.2.** The connection type is well-defined.

**Proof.** It is enough to show that the choice of \( b_i, b_1^i, \) and \( b_2^i \) does not affect \( C_i \). Suppose \( b_1 + L = d_1 + L, b_1^i + L_1 = d_1^i + L_1, \) and \( b_2^i + L_2 = d_2^i + L_2 \). For any \((X, Y)\) such that \( X \subseteq [m], Y \subseteq [l] \), we have \( \sum_{i \in X}(b_1^i - d_1^i) \oplus \sum_{j \in Y}(b_2^j - d_2^j) \in L \) and \( b_s - d_s \in L \), and therefore \( C_0 \) and \( C_s \) are well-defined. \( \square \)

**Proposition 8.3.** The connection type uniquely determines the sum of two disjoint scraps \( P_1 \) and \( P_2 \).

**Proof.** Suppose not. Let \( P = (V, L, B) \), \( Q = (V, L', B') \) be two distinct sums of \( P_1 = (V_1, L_1, B_1) \) and \( P_2 = (V_2, L_2, B_2) \) by the same connection type \((C_0, C_1, \ldots, C_n)\). Let \( B_1 = \{b_1^1 + L_1, b_2^1 + L_1, \ldots, b_m + L_1\} \), and \( B_2 = \{b_1^2 + L_2, b_2^2 + L_2, \ldots, b_k + L_2\} \).

We claim that \( L = L' \). To show this, it is enough to show that \( L \subseteq L' \). For any \( a \in L, \)

\[
x_1 = \sum_{i \in X} b_1^i - p_{V_1}(a) \| L_1 \text{ and } x_2 = \sum_{i \in Y} b_2^i - p_{V_2}(a) \| L_2.
\]

Since \( x_1 \oplus 0, 0 \oplus x_2 \in L \), we have \( x_1 \oplus x_2 \in L \). We deduce that \( \sum_{i \in X} b_1^i \oplus \sum_{i \in Y} b_2^i = a + (x_1 \oplus x_2) \in L \). Therefore, \((X, Y)\) is \( C_0 \) and \( a + (x_1 \oplus x_2) \in L' \). Since \( x_1 \oplus 0, 0 \oplus x_2 \in L' \), we have \( x_1 \oplus x_2 \in L' \), and so \( a \in L' \).

Now, we show that \( B = B' \). Let \( b_j + L \) be the \( j \)-th element of \( B \) with \( b_j \in L \). Let \( b_j^i + L \) be the \( j \)-th element of \( B' \) with \( b_j^i \in L \). Since \( p_{V_1}(b_j) \in (L|_{\subseteq V_1})^\perp \), there is \((X, Y)\) such that

\[
x_1 = \sum_{i \in X} b_1^i - p_{V_1}(b_j) \| L_1 \text{ and } x_2 = \sum_{i \in Y} b_2^i - p_{V_2}(b_j) \| L_2.
\]

Since \( x_1 \oplus 0, 0 \oplus x_2 \in L \), we have \( x_1 \oplus x_2 \in L \), and therefore \( \sum_{i \in X} b_1^i \oplus \sum_{i \in Y} b_2^i - b_j \in L \). Thus, \((X, Y)\) is \( C_s \), and so

\[
\sum_{i \in X} b_1^i \oplus \sum_{i \in Y} b_2^i - b_j \in L' = L.
\]

Thus, \( b_j + L = b_j^i + L = b_j^i + L' \). \( \square \)

**Proposition 8.4.** Let \( P_1 = (V_1, L_1, B_1) \), \( P_2 = (V_2, L_2, B_2) \) be two disjoint scraps. Let \( P \) be the sum of \( P_1 \) and \( P_2 \) by connection type \( C(P, P_1, P_2) \). If \( v \in V_1 \) and \( \delta^v \notin L^1 \setminus L_1 \), then \( \delta^v \notin L^1 \setminus L \) and \( P^v \) is the sum of \( P_1^v \) and \( P_2 \) by connection type \( C(P, P_1, P_2) \).

**Proof.** If \( \delta^v \in L^1 \setminus L \), then \( \delta^v \in (L^1)|_{V_1} = (L|_{\subseteq V_1})^\perp = L^1 \) and \( \delta^v \notin L|_{\subseteq V_1} \). This contradicts \( \delta^v \notin L^1 \setminus L_1 \). So, \( \delta^v \notin L^1 \setminus L \).

First, we claim that \( P^v \) is a sum of \( P_1^v \) and \( P_2 \). This is equivalent with

\[
L^v_{|_{\subseteq V_1 \setminus \{v\}}} = L|_{\subseteq V_1}^v \text{ and } L^v_{|_{\subseteq V_2}} = L|_{\subseteq V_2}.
\]

So, as clearly \( L^v_{|_{\subseteq V_1 \setminus \{v\}}} = L|_{\subseteq V_1}^v \) and \( L^v_{|_{\subseteq V_2}} \subseteq L^v_{|_{\subseteq V_2}} \), it suffices to show that

\[
L^v_{|_{\subseteq V_2}} \subseteq L|_{\subseteq V_2}.
\]
Suppose \( z \in L_{|x|}^{w} \subseteq V_{2} \). Let \( z \in K^{V} \) such that \( p_{V_{2}}(z) = z, z(v) \in \{0, x\} \), and \( p_{V_{1}\setminus\{v\}}(z) = 0 \). If \( z(v) = 0 \), then \( z \in L_{|x|}^{w} \subseteq V_{2} \). If \( z(v) = x \), then \( p_{V_{1}}(z) = \delta_{x}^{v} \in L_{1}^{+} = L_{1}^{+} \), and therefore \( \delta_{x}^{v} \in L_{1} \). So, \( \delta_{x}^{v} \in L \) and \( z + \delta_{x}^{v} \in L \). Since \( (z + \delta_{x}^{v})(v) = 0 \), we have \( z \in L_{|x|}^{w} \subseteq V_{2} \). This proves that \( P_{|x|}^{w} \) is a sum of \( P_{|x|}^{v} \) and \( P_{2} \).

Now, let us show that \( C(P, P_{1}, P_{2}) = C(P_{|x|}^{w}, P_{|x|}^{v}, P_{2}) \). Let \( B_{1} = \{b_{1}^{1} + L_{1}, b_{2}^{1} + L_{1}, \ldots, b_{n_{1}}^{1} + L_{1}\} \), and \( B_{2} = \{b_{2}^{2} + L_{2}, b_{2}^{3} + L_{2}, \ldots, b_{n_{2}}^{2} + L_{2}\} \). For \( s \in K^{V_{1}} \) and \( t \in K^{V_{2}} \), let \( s \oplus t \) denote the vector in \( K^{V} \) such that \( p_{V_{1}}(s \oplus t) = s \) and \( p_{V_{2}}(s \oplus t) = t \). We may assume that \( b_{i}^{1}(v) \in \{0, x\} \) for all \( i \) by Lemma 6.1. Let \( b \in L_{+}^{1} \) be such that \( b(v) \in \{0, x\} \). Let \( a(X, Y) = (\sum_{i \in X} b_{i}^{1}) \oplus (\sum_{j \in Y} b_{j}^{2}) - b \). Suppose we have \((X, Y)\) such that \( X \subseteq [m], Y \subseteq [k], \) and \( a(X, Y) \in L \). Since \((\sum_{i \in X} b_{i}^{1}(v)) - b(v) \in \{0, x\} \), we have

\[
p_{V_{1}\setminus\{v\}}(a(X, Y)) = \left(\sum_{i \in X} p_{V_{1}\setminus\{v\}}(b_{i}^{1})\right) \oplus \left(\sum_{j \in Y} b_{j}^{2}\right) - p_{V_{1}\setminus\{v\}}(b) \in L_{|x|}^{w}.
\]

Conversely, let us suppose that there is \((X, Y)\) such that \( X \subseteq [m], Y \subseteq [k], \) and \((\sum_{i \in X} p_{V_{1}\setminus\{v\}}(b_{i}^{1})) \oplus (\sum_{j \in Y} b_{j}^{2}) - p_{V_{1}\setminus\{v\}}(b) \in L_{|x|}^{w} \). Then, either \( a(X, Y) \in L \) or \( a(X, Y) + \delta_{x}^{v} \in L \). If \( \delta_{x}^{v} \in L \), then \( a(X, Y) \in L \). If \( \delta_{x}^{v} \not\in L \), then \( a(X, Y) + \delta_{x}^{v} \not\in L \) because \( a(X, Y) \in L_{1} \), and therefore \( a(X, Y) \in L \). This proves that \( C(P, P_{1}, P_{2}) = C(P_{|x|}^{w}, P_{|x|}^{v}, P_{2}) \).

**Lemma 8.5.** Let \( P_{1}, P_{2}, Q_{1}, Q_{2} \) be scraps. Let \( P \) be a sum of \( P_{1} \) and \( P_{2} \) and \( Q \) be a sum of \( Q_{1} \) and \( Q_{2} \). If \( P_{1} \) is a minor of \( Q_{1} \), for each \( i = 1, 2 \) and the connection type of \( P_{1} \) and \( P_{2} \) is equal to the connection type of \( Q_{1} \) and \( Q_{2} \), then \( P \) is a minor of \( Q \).

Moreover, if \( P_{i} \) is an \( \alpha\beta \)-minor of \( Q_{i} \) for each \( i \in \{1, 2\} \) and the connection type of \( P_{1} \) and \( P_{2} \) is equal to the connection type of \( Q_{1} \) and \( Q_{2} \), then \( P \) is an \( \alpha\beta \)-minor of \( Q \).

**Proof.** Induction on \( |V(Q_{1}) \setminus V(P_{1})| + |V(Q_{2}) \setminus V(P_{2})| \). We may assume \( |V(Q_{1}) \setminus V(P_{1})| + |V(Q_{2}) \setminus V(P_{2})| > 0 \) and \( V(Q_{1}) \neq V(P_{1}) \) by symmetry. There are \( v \in V(Q_{1}) \setminus V(P_{1}) \), \( x \in K^{\setminus\{0\}}, X = V(Q_{1}) \setminus V(P_{1}) \setminus \{v\} \), and a complete vector \( a \in K^{X} \) such that \( P_{1} = Q_{1}^{w}_{|x|}^{X} \).

If \( P_{1} \) is an \( \alpha\beta \)-minor of \( Q_{1} \), then we may assume \( x \in \{\alpha, \beta\} \) and \( a(w) \in \{\alpha, \beta\} \) for all \( w \in X \).

By Proposition 8.4, \( Q_{1}^{w} \) is the sum of \( Q_{1}^{w} \) and \( Q_{2} \) with the connection type \( C(Q_{1}^{w}, Q_{1}^{v}, Q_{2}) = C(Q, Q_{1}, Q_{2}) = C(P, P_{1}, P_{2}) \). So, \( P \) is a minor of \( Q_{1}^{w} \) by induction and therefore \( P \) is a minor of \( Q \).

Similarly if \( P_{1} \) is an \( \alpha\beta \)-minor of \( Q_{1} \) and \( P_{2} \) is an \( \alpha\beta \)-minor of \( Q_{2} \), then by induction \( P \) is an \( \alpha\beta \)-minor of \( Q \).

9. WELL-QUASI-ORDERING

**Proposition 9.1.** Let \( k \) be a constant. If \( \{S_{1}, S_{2}, S_{3}, \ldots\} \) is an infinite sequence of isotropic systems of branch-width at most \( k \), then there exist \( i < j \) such that \( S_{i} \) is simply isomorphic to an \( \alpha\beta \)-minor of \( S_{j} \).

**Proof.** By Corollary 4.4, there is a linked branch-decomposition \((T_{i}, L_{i})\) of \( S_{i} = (V_{i}, L_{i}) \) of width at most \( k \) for each \( i \). In \( T_{i} \), we pick an edge and attach a root and direct every edge so that each leaf has a directed path from the root. Let \( F \) be the forest such that the \( i \)-th component is \( T_{i} \).
For each edge $e$ of $T_i$, let $X_e$ be the set of leaves of $T_i$ having a directed path from $e$. Let $A_e = L^{-1}_e(X_e)$. We associate $e$ with a scrap $P_e = (A_e, L_i|_{A_e}, B_e)$ and $\lambda(e) = \lambda(L_i|_{A_e}) \leq k$ where $B_e$ is chosen to satisfy the following:

If $f$ is $\lambda$-linked to $e$, then $P_e$ is an $\alpha\beta$-minor of $P_f$. We claim that we can choose $B_e$ satisfying the above property. We prove it by induction on the length of the directed path from a root edge to $e$. If no other edge is $\lambda$-linked to $e$, let $B_e$ be a basis of $(L_i|_{A_e})/(L_i|_{A_e})$ in an arbitrary order. If $f$, other than $e$, is $\lambda$-linked to $e$, choose $f$ such that the distance between $e$ and $f$ is minimal. By induction, there exists $B_f$ so that whenever $g$ is $\lambda$-linked to $f$, $P_f$ is an $\alpha\beta$-minor of $P_g$. By Corollary 7.4, there is an ordered basis $B_e$ such that $P_e$ is an $\alpha\beta$-minor of $P_f$. Suppose that $g$ is $\lambda$-linked to $e$. Then $f$ is on the path from $g$ to $e$ and therefore $g$ is $\lambda$-linked to $f$. Thus, $P_f$ is an $\alpha\beta$-minor of $P_g$ and therefore $P_e$ is an $\alpha\beta$-minor of $P_g$. We conclude that there is $B_e$ satisfying the property.

For $e, f \in E(F)$, let $e \leq f$ denote that a scrap $P_e$ is isomorphic to an $\alpha\beta$-minor of a scrap $P_f$. Clearly, $\leq$ has no infinite strictly descending sequences, because there are finitely many scraps of bounded number of elements up to isomorphisms. By construction if $f$ is $\lambda$-linked to $e$, then $e \leq f$.

The leaf edges of $F$ are well-quasi-ordered, because there are only finitely many distinct scraps of one element up to isomorphisms.

Suppose the root edges are not well-quasi-ordered. By Lemma 4.3, $F$ contains an infinite sequence $(e_0, e_1, \ldots)$ of non-leaf edges such that

(i) $\{e_0, e_1, \ldots\}$ is an antichain with respect to $\leq$,
(ii) $l(e_0) \leq l(e_1) \leq \cdots$,
(iii) $r(e_0) \leq r(e_1) \leq \cdots$.

Since $\lambda(e_i) \leq k$ for all $i$, we may assume that $\lambda(e_i)$ is a constant for all $i$, by taking a subsequence.

Since the number of distinct connection types $C(P_{e_i}, P_{l(e_i)}, P_{r(e_i)})$ is finite, we may assume that the connection types are same for all $i$, also by taking a subsequence.

Then, by Lemma 8.5, $P_{e_i}$ is isomorphic to an $\alpha\beta$-minor of $P_{e_i}$, that is $e_0 \leq e_1$. This contradicts that $\{e_0, e_1, \ldots\}$ is an antichain with respect to $\leq$.

Therefore, root edges are well-quasi-ordered, and there exist $i < j$ such that a scrap $(V_i, L_i, \emptyset)$ is isomorphic to an $\alpha\beta$-minor of a scrap $(V_j, L_j, \emptyset)$. Thus, $S_i$ is simply isomorphic to an $\alpha\beta$-minor of $S_j$. □

10. Pivot-minor and $\alpha\beta$-minor

In this section, we shall show a relation between pivot-minors of graphs and $\alpha\beta$-minors of isotropic systems.

**Proposition 10.1.** For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let $S_i$ be an isotropic system with a graphic presentation $(G_i, a_i, b_i)$ such that $a_i(v), b_i(v) \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$ for all $v \in V(G_i)$.

If $S_1 = S_2$, then $G_1$ can be obtained from $G_2$ by applying a sequence of pivots.

**Proof.** Let $V = V(G_1) = V(G_2)$ and let $S = S_1 = S_2 = (V, L)$ be an isotropic system. We show Proposition 10.1 by induction on $N(a_1, a_2) = \{|v \in V : a_1(v) \neq a_2(v)\}|$.

If $N(a_1, a_2) = 0$, then $b_1 = b_2$, so $G_1 = G_2$. Hence we may assume that $N(a_1, a_2) \geq 1$. Let $u \in V$ with $a_1(u) \neq a_2(u)$. This implies that $a_1(u) = b_2(u)$ because $a_i(u), b_i(u) \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$.

By Proposition 3.5, there exists a vector $b_u \in L$ such that $b_u(u) = b_2(u) = a_1(u)$ and
\[ \hat{b}_u(w) \in \{0, a_2(w)\} \text{ for all } w \neq u. \text{ As } a_1 \text{ is Eulerian and as } \hat{b}_u \in L, \text{ there exists } v \in V \text{ such that } \hat{b}_u(v) \notin \{0, a_1(v)\}. \text{ Hence } \hat{b}_u(v) = a_2(v) \text{ and } a_1(v) \neq a_2(v). \]

Since \( \hat{b}_u(u) \neq a_2(u) \), this means that \( v \neq u \). Moreover, since \( \hat{b}_u(v) \neq 0 \), the vertices \( u \) and \( v \) are adjacent in \( G_2 \). Pivoting \((G_2, a_2, b_2)\) on \( uv \) yields \((G_2 \cup uv, a_2[V \setminus \{u, v\}] + b_2[\{u, v\}], b_2[V \setminus \{u, v\}] + a_2[\{u, v\}])\). As \( \mathcal{N}(a_1, a_2[V \setminus \{u, v\}] + b_2[\{u, v\}]) = \mathcal{N}(a_1, a_2) - 2 \), it follows by induction that \( G_2 \cup uv \) can be obtained from \( G_1 \) by a sequence of pivots, hence so can \( G_2 \).

**Lemma 10.2.** For \( i \in \{1, 2\} \), let \( S_i \) be the isotropic system with a graphic presentation \((G_i, a_i, b_i)\) such that \( a_i(v), b_i(v) \in \{\alpha, \beta\} \) for all \( v \in V(G_i) \). If \( S_1 \) is an \( \alpha\beta\)-minor of \( S_2 \), then \( G_1 \) is a pivot-minor of \( G_2 \).

**Proof.** This lemma is a straightforward consequence of Proposition [10.1] and Proposition [3.7].

### 11. Binary Matroids

We would like to show that Theorem [4.1] implies the well-quasi-ordering theorem of Geelen, Gerards, and Whittle [8] for binary matroids. The proof uses the following lemma.

**Lemma 11.1** (Higman’s lemma). Let \( \leq \) be a well-quasi-order on \( X \). For finite subsets \( A, B \subseteq X \), we write \( A \leq B \) if there is an injective mapping \( f : A \to B \) such that \( a \leq f(a) \) for all \( a \in A \). Then \( \leq \) is a well-quasi-ordering on the set of all finite subsets of \( X \). (For proof, see Diestel’s book [7] Lemma 12.1.3.)

For a binary matroid \( M \) with a fixed base \( B \), the *fundamental graph* of \( M \) with respect to \( B \) is a bipartite graph \( \text{Bip}(M, B) \) such that \( V(\text{Bip}(M, B)) = E(M) \) and \( v \in E(M) \setminus B \) is adjacent to \( w \in B \) if and only if \( v \) is in the fundamental circuit of \( v \) with respect to \( B \). For a bipartite graph \( G = (V, E) \) with a bipartition \( V = A \cup B \), \( \text{Bin}(G, A, B) \) is a binary matroid on \( V \), represented by a \( A \times V \) matrix \( (I_A \ A_G[A, B]) \), where \( I_A \) is a \( A \times A \) identity matrix.

**Lemma 11.2.** Let \( M_1, M_2 \) be binary matroids and let \( B_i \) be a fixed base of \( M_i \). If \( M_1 \) is connected and \( \text{Bip}(M_1, B_1) \) is a pivot-minor of \( \text{Bip}(M_2, B_2) \), then \( M_1 \) is a minor of either \( M_2 \) or \( M_2^* \).

**Proof.** Let \( H = \text{Bip}(M_1, B_1) \) and \( G = \text{Bip}(M_2, B_2) \). If \( H \) is a pivot-minor of a bipartite graph \( G \), then there is a bipartition \((A', B')\) of \( H \) such that a binary matroid \( M_3 = \text{Bin}(H, A', B') \) is a minor of \( M_2 = \text{Bin}(G, B_2, V(G) \setminus B_2) \). Since \( M_1 \) is connected, \( H \) is connected and therefore \( H \) has a unique bipartition. So, \( M_1 = M_3 \) if \( A = A' \) or \( M_1 = M_3^* \) if \( A = B' \).

**Corollary 11.3.** Let \( k \) be a constant. If \( \{M_1, M_2, M_3, \cdots\} \) is an infinite sequence of binary matroids of branch-width at most \( k \), then there exist \( i < j \) such that \( M_i \) is isomorphic to a minor of \( M_j \).

**Proof.** First, we claim that if \( M_i \) is connected for all \( i \), then the statement is true. Let \( B_i \) be a fixed base of \( M_i \) and \( G_i = \text{Bip}(M_i, B_i) \) for all \( i \). The rank-width of \( G_i \) is at most \( k - 1 \), since rank-width of \( G_i \) is equal to (branch-width of \( M_i \)) - 1, shown in [11]. By Theorem [4.1] there is an infinite subsequence \( G_{a_1}, G_{a_2}, G_{a_3}, \cdots \) such that \( G_{a_i} \) is isomorphic to a pivot-minor of \( G_{a_{i+1}} \) for all \( i \). By Lemma [11.2] \( M_{a_1} \) is isomorphic to a minor of either \( M_{a_2} \) or \( M_{a_2^*} \), and \( M_{a_2} \)
is isomorphic to a minor of either $M_{a_3}$ or $M_{a_3}^*$. It follows that $M_{a_1}$ is isomorphic to a minor of $M_{a_2}$, or $M_{a_2}$ is isomorphic to a minor of $M_{a_3}$, or $M_{a_1}$ is isomorphic to a minor of $M_{a_3}$. This proves the above claim.

Now, we prove the main statement. We may consider each $M_i$ as a set of disjoint connected matroids and then $M_i$ is isomorphic to a minor of $M_j$ if and only if there is an injective function $f$ from components of $M_i$ to components of $M_j$ such that $a$ is isomorphic to a minor of $f(a)$ for every component $a$ of $M_i$. By Higman’s lemma, there exist $i < j$ such that $M_i$ is isomorphic to a minor of $M_j$. □
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