



ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

## European Journal of Combinatorics

journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/ejc](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/ejc)

## Addendum to matroid tree-width

Petr Hliněný<sup>a</sup>, Geoff Whittle<sup>b</sup><sup>a</sup> Faculty of Informatics, Masaryk University, Botanická 68a, 60200 Brno, Czech Republic<sup>b</sup> School of Mathematical and Computing Sciences, Victoria University, P.O. Box 600, Wellington, New Zealand

## ARTICLE INFO

## Article history:

Received 18 June 2008

Accepted 17 September 2008

Available online 30 November 2008

## ABSTRACT

Hliněný and Whittle have shown that the traditional tree-width notion of a graph can be defined without an explicit reference to vertices, and that it can be naturally extended to all matroids. Unfortunately their original paper [P. Hliněný, G. Whittle, Matroid tree-width, European J. Combin. 27 (2006) 1117–1128], as pointed out by Isolde Adler in 2007, contained some incorrect arguments. It is the purpose of this addendum to correct the affected proofs. (All the theorems and results of the original paper remain valid.)

© 2009 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

In their fundamental work on graph minors, Robertson and Seymour introduced two notions of width for graphs [3], namely *tree-width* and *branch-width*. While the two are qualitatively the same in that a class of graphs has bounded tree-width if and only if it has bounded branch-width, it is undoubtedly tree-width that has proved to be a more popular notion. On the other hand, for matroid theorists, branch-width is the notion since it extends directly from graphs to matroids.

Given that, it is natural to ask if tree-width can also be extended to matroids. It is by no means immediately obvious that this can be done as the definition of graph tree-width makes considerable use of the vertices of a graph. However, Jim Geelen [unpublished] observed that such an extension could be possible. Hliněný and Whittle then proposed in [2] an alternative “matroidal” definition of tree-width. We set forth both these approaches in the next definitions.

**Definition 1.1** (“Traditional Tree-width” [3]). A *tree-decomposition* of a graph  $G$  is a pair  $(T, \beta)$ , where  $T$  is a tree and  $\beta : V(T) \rightarrow 2^{V(G)}$  is a mapping (the “bags”) that satisfies the following:

- For each edge  $e = uv \in E(G)$ , there is  $x \in V(T)$  such that  $\{u, v\} \subseteq \beta(x)$ .

DOI of original article: [10.1016/j.ejc.2006.06.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejc.2006.06.005).E-mail addresses: [hlineny@fi.muni.cz](mailto:hlineny@fi.muni.cz) (P. Hliněný), [whittle@mcs.vuw.ac.nz](mailto:whittle@mcs.vuw.ac.nz) (G. Whittle).

0195-6698/\$ – see front matter © 2009 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

doi:[10.1016/j.ejc.2008.09.028](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejc.2008.09.028)




Fig. 1. An illustration of the definition of a matroid tree-decomposition.

- If  $x \in V(T)$ , and if  $y, z \in V(T)$  are two nodes in distinct components of  $T - x$ , then  $\beta(y) \cap \beta(z) \subseteq \beta(x)$  (“interpolation”).
- $\bigcup_{x \in V(T)} \beta(x) = V(G)$ .

The width of  $(T, \beta)$  is the maximal value of  $|\beta(x)| - 1$  over all  $x \in V(T)$ . The smallest width over all tree-decompositions of the graph  $G$  is the *tree-width* of  $G$ .

**Definition 1.2** (“Matroid Tree-width”).

(a) A *VF-tree-decomposition* of a graph  $G$  is a pair  $(T, \tau)$ , where  $T$  is a tree, and  $\tau : E(G) \rightarrow V(T)$  is an arbitrary mapping of edges to the tree nodes. (VF refers to “vertex-free”, for a distinction from traditional tree-width.)

For a node  $x$  of  $T$ , denote the connected components of  $T - x$  by  $T_1, \dots, T_d$  and set  $F_i = \tau^{-1}(V(T_i))$ . (See in Fig. 1.) The *node-width* of  $x$  is defined by

$$|V(G)| + (d - 1) \cdot c(G) - \sum_{i=1}^d c(G - F_i), \tag{1}$$

where a graph  $G - F$  is obtained by deleting all the edges in  $F$  from  $G$  (while keeping isolated vertices), and  $c(H)$  denotes the number of connected components of a graph  $H$ .

(b) A *tree-decomposition* of a matroid  $M$  on the ground set  $E = E(M)$  is a pair  $(T, \tau)$  where  $T$  is a tree and  $\tau : E \rightarrow V(T)$  is an arbitrary mapping. For a node  $x$  of  $T$ , denote the connected components of  $T - x$  by  $T_1, \dots, T_d$  and set  $F_i = \tau^{-1}(V(T_i)) \subseteq E$ . The *node-width* of  $x$  is given by

$$\sum_{i=1}^d r_M(E - F_i) - (d - 1) \cdot r(M). \tag{2}$$

The *width* of the decomposition  $(T, \tau)$  is the maximal node-width over all the nodes of  $T$ , and the smallest width over all tree-decompositions of  $G$  or  $M$  is the *VF-tree-width* of  $G$  or the *tree-width* of  $M$ , respectively. The width of an empty tree  $T$  is 0.

A straightforward argument shows equivalence between (a) and (b) for graphic matroids.

**Proposition 1.3** ([2, Proposition 3.3]). *Let  $G$  be a graph and  $M(G)$  be the cycle matroid of  $G$ . For any  $F_1, \dots, F_d \subseteq E(G) \neq \emptyset$ , the values of (1) and (2) are equal, and hence the VF-tree-width of  $G$  equals the tree-width of  $M(G)$ .*

One of the main results of our paper [2] asserts that “matroidal” VF-tree-width is the same as traditional tree-width on graphs.

**Theorem 1.4.** *The tree-width of a graph  $G$  equals the VF-tree-width of  $G$ .*

Regarding this statement, we note that there is a natural way of transforming a traditional tree-decomposition into a VF-tree-decomposition, and vice versa: For each edge  $e$  of  $G$  we may pick as  $\tau(e)$  any of the nodes whose bag contains  $e$ , and conversely, we may form bags of the traditional definition from the ends of the mapped edges and some additional vertices to satisfy the interpolation property.

The widths of these decomposition, however, are generally different, and hence this theorem requires a nontrivial proof.

Unfortunately, as pointed out [1] by Isolde Adler in 2007, our original paper [2] used some incorrect arguments supporting [Theorem 1.4](#), namely wrong [2, Claim 5.5] (cf. Section 2). It is the purpose of this addendum to provide alternative correct arguments proving our theorems.

## 2. Correction of Lemma 5.4

The proof of [Theorem 1.4](#) has two directions in view of [Proposition 1.3](#). The easier direction, that the traditional tree-width of a graph  $G$  is not smaller than the tree-width of the cycle matroid  $M(G)$  of  $G$ , has been rigorously proved in [2, Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2]. For the other direction, that the tree-width of a graph  $G$  is not bigger than the tree-width of  $M(G)$ , arguments have been provided in [2, Lemma 5.4]. Unfortunately, there in the proof a wrong intermediate claim appeared, as has been discovered and pointed to us by Adler [1].

To be specific; starting from a tree-decomposition of  $M(G)$  or equivalently from a VF-tree-decomposition of  $G$ , there is the above sketched obvious translation of it into a traditional tree-decomposition of  $G$ . The question is whether the bag at each node of the latter decomposition is not bigger than the respective node-width of the former decomposition plus one. That (false in general) is true if we start from a decomposition possessing certain additional connectivity properties, as proved in [2, Claim 5.6], but preceding [2, Claim 5.5] which originally established the existence of such a decomposition, unfortunately does not hold.

We present an alternative proof for the above assertion in [Theorem 2.5](#) along ideas similar to the original (flawed) one. The new proof is longer, though.

We start first with useful technical results about handling matroid tree-decompositions which did not explicitly appear in [2]. For  $F \subseteq E(G)$  we denote by  $G \upharpoonright F$  the subgraph of  $G$  with edge set  $F$  and those vertices incident with edges from  $F$  (hence ignoring isolated vertices). To simplify our arguments, we introduce the following notation with respect to a tree-decomposition  $(T, \tau)$ : If  $e$  is an edge of  $T$ , then let  $T_e^1, T_e^2$  denote the components of  $T - e$ . Analogously let  $T_v^i, i = 1, \dots, d$  denote the components of  $T - v$  where  $v$  is a node of  $T$  of degree  $d$ . Let moreover  $F_e^i = \tau^{-1}(V(T_e^i))$  and  $F_v^j = \tau^{-1}(V(T_v^j))$ , referring implicitly to the decomposition  $(T, \tau)$  in consideration.

**Proposition 2.1.** *Consider a tree-decomposition  $(T, \tau)$  of a matroid  $M$ .*

(a) *If a tree  $T'$  is obtained by splitting a node  $x$  into two nodes  $x, x'$  (i.e. contracting  $xx'$  in  $T'$  gives  $T$ ), then the width of  $(T', \tau)$  is not larger than the width of  $(T, \tau)$ .*

(b) *Assume that  $e$  is an edge of  $T$ , and  $C \subseteq F_e^2$  is a union of connected components of the matroid restriction  $M \setminus F_e^1$ . If  $\tau'$  is obtained from  $\tau$  by arbitrarily re-mapping the elements of  $C$  into the nodes of  $T_e^1$ , then the node-width of each node of  $T_e^2$  in  $(T, \tau')$  is not larger than its width in  $(T, \tau)$ .*

Notice that, according to [Proposition 1.3](#), we may restate this proposition in a special form suited for our later application to graphs. (Though graph connectivity is not the same as matroid connectivity, “ $C$  being a union of edge sets of graph-connected components” is a stronger assumption than “ $C$  being a union of matroid-connected components”.)

**Proposition 2.1'.** *Consider a VF-tree-decomposition  $(T, \tau)$  of a graph  $G$ .*

(a) *If a tree  $T'$  is obtained by splitting a node  $x$  into two nodes  $x, x'$ , then the width of  $(T', \tau)$  is not larger than the width of  $(T, \tau)$ .*

(b) *Assume that  $e$  is an edge of  $T$ , and  $C \subseteq F_e^2$  is a union of edge sets of some connected components of the graph  $G \upharpoonright F_e^1$ . If  $\tau'$  is obtained from  $\tau$  by arbitrarily re-mapping the elements of  $C$  into the nodes of  $T_e^1$ , then the node-width of each node of  $T_e^2$  in  $(T, \tau')$  is not larger than its width in  $(T, \tau)$ .*

It is, however, more natural to prove [Proposition 2.1](#) in matroidal terms. For a matroid  $M$  and arbitrary subsets  $F_1, \dots, F_d, d \geq 2$  of its elements, let  $\eta_M(F_1, \dots, F_d) = \sum_{i=1}^d r_M(E(M) - F_i) - (d - 1)r(M)$ , cf. the node-width formula (2). [Proposition 2.1](#) (a) follows by repeated application of the following:

**Lemma 2.3.** *If  $F_1, \dots, F_d, d \geq 2$ , are subsets of elements of a matroid  $M$  such that  $F_1 \cap F_2 = \emptyset$ , then  $\eta_M(F_1, F_2, F_3, \dots, F_d) \geq \eta_M(F_1 \cup F_2, F_3, \dots, F_d)$ .*

**Proof.** By submodularity of the matroid rank function,

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_M(F_1, F_2, \dots, F_d) &= \sum_{i=1}^d r_M(E(M) - F_i) - (d - 1)r(M) \\ &\geq r_M(E(M) - (F_1 \cup F_2)) + r(M) + \sum_{i=3}^d r_M(E(M) - F_i) - (d - 1)r(M) \\ &= \eta_M(F_1 \cup F_2, F_3, \dots, F_d). \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 2.1(b), on the other hand, follows by an application of the next claim to each node of  $T_e^2$  separately.

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $F_1, \dots, F_d, d \geq 2$  be pairwise disjoint subsets of elements of a matroid  $M$ . Assume  $C \subseteq E(M) - F_1$  is such that  $r_M(C) + r_M(E - (F_1 \cup C)) = r_M(E - F_1)$ , i.e.  $C$  is a union of connected components in the matroid  $M \setminus F_1$ . Then  $\eta_M(F_1, F_2, \dots, F_d) \geq \eta_M(F_1 \cup C, F_2 - C, \dots, F_d - C)$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $E = E(M)$ . By the exchange axiom of matroids there exist independent sets  $X_i \subseteq C \cap F_i$  such that it holds  $r_M((E - F_i) \cup X_i) = r_M(E - (F_i - C)) = r_M(E - F_i) + r_M(X_i)$ , for  $i = 2, \dots, d$ . Now we can write

$$\begin{aligned} &\eta_M(F_1, F_2, \dots, F_d) - \eta_M(F_1 \cup C, F_2 - C, \dots, F_d - C) \\ &= r_M(E - F_1) - r_M(E - (F_1 \cup C)) + \sum_{i=2}^d [r_M(E - F_i) - r_M(E - (F_i - C))] \\ &= r_M(C) + \sum_{i=2}^d [r_M(E - F_i) - r_M(E - F_i) - r_M(X_i)] = r_M(C) - \sum_{i=2}^d r_M(X_i). \end{aligned}$$

Hence it remains to argue that  $r_M(X_2) + \dots + r_M(X_d) \leq r_M(C)$ , which immediately follows if  $X_2 \cup \dots \cup X_d$  is independent. The latter is a consequence of our assumption  $r_M((E - F_i) \cup X_i) = r_M(E - F_i) + r_M(X_i)$  since  $E - F_i \supseteq X_2 \cup \dots \cup X_{i-1} \cup X_{i+1} \cup \dots \cup X_d$ .  $\blacksquare$


Now we are ready for the main task—to repair the proof of [2, Lemma 5.4].

**Theorem 2.5** ([2, Lemma 5.4]). *Let  $G$  be a graph with at least one edge. Then the tree-width of  $G$  is not larger than the VF-tree-width of  $G$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $(T, \tau)$  be a VF-tree-decomposition of  $G$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $G$  is a connected simple graph. We also recall the notation  $F_v^i$  and  $F_e^j$  with respect to (now fixed)  $(T, \tau)$  from the beginning of this section.

For any edge  $e = v_2v_2$  of  $T$  we define a bipartite component incidence graph  $J_e$  at  $e$  (Fig. 2): The parts  $A_e^1, A_e^2$  of vertices of  $J_e$  are the connected components of  $G \upharpoonright F_e^1$  and of  $G \upharpoonright F_e^2$ , respectively, and the edges of  $J_e$  are formed by those pairs of components sharing a vertex. Since  $G$  is connected, so is the graph  $J_e$  for every  $e \in E(T)$ . If the part  $A_e^1$  has more than one vertex, then we say that the edge  $e$  of the decomposition disconnects the graph  $G$  as from  $v_2$ —the other end of  $e$ . We denote by  $k_j$  the number of edges  $e$  of  $T$  such that  $|V(J_e)| = j$ , and by  $s$  the largest index such that  $k_s \neq 0$ . Among all optimal VF-tree-decompositions of  $G$  we assume the one with the lexicographically smallest possible component vector  $(s, k_s, k_{s-1}, \dots, k_3)$ .

Our aim is to show that the selected decomposition  $(T, \tau)$  must be connected, i.e. that no edge of  $T$  disconnects  $G$  as from either end. In other words, we aim at showing  $s = 2$ . Then, as straightforwardly proved in [2, Claim 5.6], there is a derived ordinary tree-decomposition of  $G$  of width equal to that of  $(T, \tau)$ . (Though [2, Claim 5.6] spoke about matroid connectivity, graph connectivity is enough in the proof.)



**Fig. 2.** An illustration of a bipartite component incidence graph (the connected components of  $G \upharpoonright F_e^1$  are  $K, L, M$ , and the components of  $G \upharpoonright F_e^2$  are  $X, Y, Z$ ).

So, seeking a contradiction, we assume that  $s > 2$ . Since  $T$  is a tree, there is an edge  $e = uv \in E(T)$  disconnecting  $G$  as from  $v$ , such that all other edges incident with node  $u$  in  $T$  do not disconnect  $G$  as from  $u$ . Let (up to symmetry)  $F_e^1$  be the part of  $E(G)$  mapped to the subtree of  $T - e$  with root  $u$ , and denote by  $d$  the degree of  $u$  in  $T$ . Recall that  $F_u^1, \dots, F_u^d$  denote the parts of  $E(G)$  mapped into the components of  $T - u$ . We claim that, without loss of generality, one can assume the following:

- (i) No element is mapped to  $u$  in  $(T, \tau)$ , i.e.  $\tau^{-1}(u) = \emptyset$ .
- (ii) The connected components of  $G \upharpoonright F_e^1$  coincide with  $F_u^1, \dots, F_u^{d-1}$ . (Notice that also  $F_u^d = F_e^2$ , not necessarily connected.)

To show (i), see in the definition that creating a new leaf adjacent to  $u$  for each element in  $\tau^{-1}(u)$  does not change the width of  $u$  and of the whole decomposition. Ad (ii), notice that no  $F_u^j$  may intersect two of the components of  $G \upharpoonright F_e^1$  since the edges from  $u$  other than  $e$  do not disconnect  $G$ . Hence each component is a union of some  $F_u^j$ 's, and via applying Proposition 2.1 (a) we may assume that each component of  $G \upharpoonright F_e^1$  actually is a single part among  $(F_u^1, \dots, F_u^{d-1})$ .

As noted above, the bipartite component incidence graph  $J_e$  at  $e$  is connected. Recall that  $A_e^1 \cup A_e^2 = V(J_e)$  are the vertex parts of  $J_e$  where  $A_e^1$  is in correspondence with the  $u$ -end of  $e$ .

If  $A_e^2$  has only one vertex, i.e.  $G \upharpoonright F_e^2$  is connected, then we make a new VF-tree-decomposition by contracting  $e$  in  $T$ . Denoting by  $h$  the degree of  $v$  in  $T$ , we can simply estimate the node-width of  $v$  in the new decomposition as

$$\begin{aligned}
 & |V(G)| + (h + d - 2) - 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} c(G - F_u^i) - \sum_{i=1}^{h-1} c(G - F_v^i) \\
 &= |V(G)| + h + d - 3 - [d - 2 + c(G - (F_u^1 \cup \dots \cup F_u^{d-1}))] - \sum_{i=1}^{h-1} c(G - F_v^i) \\
 &= |V(G)| + h - 1 - c(G - F_v^h) - \sum_{i=1}^{h-1} c(G - F_v^i), \tag{3}
 \end{aligned}$$


which is the node-width of  $v$  in the former decomposition  $(T, \tau)$ . Hence we have found a new optimal VF-tree-decomposition of  $G$  having strictly smaller component vector. This contradiction to our least choice of  $(T, \tau)$  finishes the proof in the particular case.

Hence  $A_e^2$  has more than one vertex. We first consider the case that

- (iii) no vertex of  $A_e^1$  is a cutvertex of  $J_e$ .

See that  $|A_e^1| \geq 2$ . Since  $G \upharpoonright F_e^2$  is not connected in this case, we find an arbitrary nontrivial partition  $F_e^2 = F_3 \cup F_4$  such that  $G \upharpoonright F_3$  is disjoint from  $G \upharpoonright F_4$ , i.e. that  $F_3$  is a union of some components of  $G \upharpoonright F_e^2$ .

Let  $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{d-1}, u_d = v$  denote the neighbours of  $u$  in  $T$ . For  $T_3 = T_e^2$  in  $T$ , we make  $T_4$  a disjoint copy of  $T_3$ . Then we delete  $u$  from  $T$ , and for  $i = 1, \dots, d - 1$  we add a new vertex  $w_i$  adjacent to  $u_i$ . We add an edge  $w_1v$ , edges  $w_iw_{i+1}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, d - 2$ , and an edge  $w_{d-1}v'$  where  $v'$  is the copy of



**Fig. 3.** How to modify a decomposition  $(T, \tau)$  into new  $(T', \tau')$  on the right.

$v$  in  $T_4$ . This results in a tree  $T'$ , see Fig. 3. We define  $\tau'$  as follows: If  $x \in E(G) - F_4$ , then  $\tau'(x) = \tau(x)$ . For  $x \in F_4$ , we set  $\tau'(x) = t'$  where  $t'$  is the copy of  $t = \tau(x) \in V(T_3)$  in the subtree  $T_4$ .

We again aim for a contradiction, showing that the width of  $(T', \tau')$  is not larger than the width of  $(T, \tau)$ , and that the component vector decreases.

**Claim 2.6.** *The width of  $(T', \tau')$  is at most the width of  $(T, \tau)$ .*

**Proof.** First of all, notice that Proposition 2.1(b) is applicable to both subtrees  $T_3$  and  $T_4$  (as “copies of”  $T_e^2$ , for  $C = F_4$  and  $C = F_3$ , respectively). So the node-widths of nodes of  $T_3 \cup T_4$  in  $(T', \tau')$  do not exceed the width of  $(T, \tau)$ .

It remains to argue about the node-width of  $w_j$  where  $j = 1, 2, \dots, d - 1$ . We denote by  $U \subseteq V(G)$  the set of those vertices that are incident both with an edge of  $F_e^1$  and an edge of  $F_e^2$ . Notice that by (ii) above, every vertex in  $V(G) - U$  is counted exactly once in  $\sum_{i=1}^d c(G - F_u^i)$  (as an “isolated” component). If we denote by  $G \div F = G \upharpoonright (E(G) - F)$ , then we can write in  $(T, \tau)$  by (1),

$$\begin{aligned} \text{node-width}(u) &= |V(G)| + d - 1 - \sum_{i=1}^d c(G - F_u^i) \\ &= d - 1 + |U| - \sum_{i=1}^d c(G \div F_u^i) \\ &= d - 1 + |U| - \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} 1 - (d - 1) = |U| - d + 1. \end{aligned}$$

The previous equality is the only (1) place where we use the assumption (iii), to argue that  $c(G \div F_u^i) = 1$  for  $1 \leq i < d$ .

To compare the previous with the node-width of new  $w_j$ ,  $1 \leq j < d$ , we have to introduce some notation: Let  $H_{a,b} = F_u^a \cup F_u^{a+1} \cup \dots \cup F_u^b$ , and for  $k = 3, 4$ , let  $\ell_{a,b}^k$  ( $\ell_{a,b}^{-k}$ ) denote the number of those connected components of  $G \upharpoonright F_e^1$  that intersect (are disjoint from, respectively)  $G \upharpoonright F_k$ . Then, by (1) in  $(T', \tau')$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{node-width}(w_j) &= |V(G)| + 2 - c(G - F_u^j) - c(G - (F_3 \cup H_{1,j-1})) - c(G - (F_4 \cup H_{j+1,d-1})) \\ &\leq 2 - 1 + |U| - \ell_{1,j-1}^3 - c(G \div (F_3 \cup H_{1,j-1})) \\ &\quad - \ell_{j+1,d-1}^4 - c(G \div (F_4 \cup H_{j+1,d-1})) \\ &= 1 + |U| - \ell_{1,j-1}^3 - (\ell_{j,d-1}^{-4} + 1) - \ell_{j+1,d-1}^4 - (\ell_{1,j}^{-3} + 1) \\ &= -1 + |U| - (\ell_{1,j-1}^3 + \ell_{1,j}^{-3}) - (\ell_{j+1,d-1}^4 + \ell_{j,d-1}^{-4}) \\ &\leq -1 + |U| - (j - 1) - (d - 1 - j) = |U| - d + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence also the node-widths of new  $w_1, \dots, w_{d-1}$  in  $(T', \tau')$  are not larger than the node-width of former  $u$  in  $(T, \tau)$ . ■

**Claim 2.7.** *The component vector of  $(T', \tau')$  is strictly lexicographically smaller than that of  $(T, \tau)$ .*

**Proof.** Recall that  $J_e$  denotes the component incidence graph at an edge  $e$  of  $(T, \tau)$ . For distinction, we analogously denote by  $J'_e$  the component incidence graph at  $e$  of  $(T', \tau')$ . If  $f$  is an edge of the subtree  $T_e^1$  (the component of  $T - e$ ), explicitly including also the case of  $f$  incident with  $u$  in  $T_e^1$ , then clearly  $J'_f = J_f$ .

Suppose that  $f$  is an edge of the subtree  $T_3 = T_e^2$ , and denote by  $f'$  the corresponding copy in  $T_4$  (of  $T'$ ). Since we have “split” the  $\tau'$ -mapping of elements of  $E(G)$  into  $T_3$  and  $T_4$  in a way that  $G \upharpoonright F_3$  is disjoint from  $G \upharpoonright F_4$ , it holds  $|V(J'_f)|, |V(J'_{f'})| < |V(J_f)|$ , unless  $J'_f = J_f$  and  $J'_{f'}$  is trivial  $K_1$ , or vice versa. The same argument applies with strict inequality also to  $e = uv$ :  $|V(J'_f)|, |V(J'_{f'})| < |V(J_e)|$  where  $f = w_1v$  and  $f' = w_{d-1}v'$  correspond to  $e$  in  $T'$ .

Finally, since the order of  $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{d-1}$  has been irrelevant so far, we may assume without loss of generality that  $G \upharpoonright F_u^1$  is incident with  $G \upharpoonright F_3$  and that  $G \upharpoonright F_u^{d-1}$  is incident with  $G \upharpoonright F_4$ . Then particularly, for  $1 \leq i \leq d - 2$ ,  $G \upharpoonright F_u^i$  (the component representing a vertex of  $J_e$ ) is not a separate component of  $G \upharpoonright (F_3 \cup H_{1,i})$ . Therefore, it again holds  $|V(J'_f)| < |V(J_e)|$  where  $f = w_i w_{i+1}$ .

Altogether, we see that the first changed entry of the component vector gets decreased, at least due to edge  $e$  which is in  $T'$  replaced by edges of strictly smaller numbers of components, and so the component vector of  $(T', \tau')$  is strictly lexicographically smaller than that of  $(T, \tau)$ . ■

We are left with the case:

–(iii) There exists a cutvertex  $r \in A_e^1$ , representing a component  $R$  of  $G \upharpoonright F_e^1$ .

In this case we partition  $F_e^2 = F_3 \cup F_4$  such that  $G \upharpoonright F_3$  is disjoint from  $G \upharpoonright F_4$ , and moreover,  $R$  is the only connected component of  $G \upharpoonright F_e^1$  incident both with  $G \upharpoonright F_3$  and  $G \upharpoonright F_4$ . We again consider the decomposition  $(T', \tau')$  defined above, see Fig. 3. Then Claim 2.7 applies here, too, since it does not rely on (iii). Unfortunately, Claim 2.6 cannot be used now, and we have to argue differently that the width of  $(T', \tau')$  is at most the width of  $(T, \tau)$ .

We make a tree  $T''$  from  $T'$  by contracting all  $w_1, \dots, w_{d-1}$  into a single vertex  $w$ . Analogously to (3) we show that the node-width of  $w$  in the decomposition  $(T'', \tau')$  equals the node-width of former  $u$  in  $(T, \tau)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} |V(G)| + d + 1 - 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} c(G - F_u^i) - c(G - F_3) - c(G - F_4) \\ = |V(G)| + d - \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} c(G - F_u^i) - c(G - (F_3 \cup F_4)) - 1 = |V(G)| + d - 1 - \sum_{i=1}^d c(G - F_u^i). \end{aligned}$$

For all other nodes of  $T''$  we argue analogously to Claim 2.6, i.e. referring Proposition 2.1(b), that their node-widths do not exceed the width of  $(T, \tau)$ . See that Proposition 2.1(a) is now enough to show that also all  $w_1, \dots, w_{d-1}$  in  $(T', \tau')$  resulting by splitting of  $w$  have node-widths at most the width of  $(T, \tau)$ , and so we are done here.

Once again, we have got to a contradiction of the new optimal decomposition  $(T', \tau')$  of  $G$  with the former least choice of  $(T, \tau)$ . The whole proof is now finished. ■

### 3. Correction of Claim 4.3

There is yet another unfortunate small bug in our original paper [2] that has gone unnoticed so far: In the proof of [2, Claim 4.3], an “obvious” inequality was used in the wrong direction. Although this is not a serious problem, and a reader familiar with matroid theory could easily find the correct argument, we take an opportunity to clear out every detail in the addendum. We restate the affected statement and its complete proof now.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Although the correction is added in short Claim 3.3, we have to repeat the preceding arguments here because of their specific context and notation.

**Theorem 3.1** ([2, Theorem 4.2]). *Let  $M$  be a matroid of tree-width  $k$  and branch-width  $b$ . Then  $b - 1 \leq k \leq \max(2b - 2, 1)$ .*

**Proof.** The (easier) right-hand inequality is proved as in [2].

To prove the left-hand inequality, we have to modify the tree of an optimal tree-decomposition  $(T, \tau)$  of  $M$ , so that elements of  $M$  are mapped to leaves of a new subcubic tree. Let  $T'$  be obtained from  $T$  by subdividing each edge with a new node. We construct a branch-decomposition  $(W, \omega)$  of  $M$  from  $T'$  using the following local modifications at each node  $x \in V(T)$  of degree  $d$ :

- Let  $Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_d\}$  be the set of neighbours of  $x$  in  $T'$  (yes, not in  $T$ ), and let  $F_0 = \tau^{-1}(x)$ . We define  $U_x$  to be a cubic tree with a set  $L$  of  $d + |F_0|$  leaves, such that  $Y \subseteq L$  and  $U_x - Y$  is disjoint from all other  $U_y$  for  $y \in V(T)$ .
- We define a restriction of a mapping  $\omega$  onto  $F_0$  as an arbitrary bijection from  $F_0$  to  $L - Y$ .
- Altogether, we take the tree  $W' = \bigcup_{y \in V(T')} U_y$ , and denote by  $W$  the cubic tree obtained from  $W'$  by contracting the degree-2 vertices of  $T'$ .

**Claim 3.2.** *The pair  $(W, \omega)$  defined above is a branch-decomposition of  $M$  of width at most  $k + 1$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $f$  be an edge of  $W$  incident with  $V(U_x)$  for some  $x \in V(T)$ . Moreover, let  $T_1, \dots, T_d$  be the connected components of  $T - x$ , and let  $W_i = \bigcup_{y \in V(T_i)} U_y$  for  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . (Hence  $W_i, i = 1, \dots, d$  are the connected components of  $W' - V(U_x)$ .) We denote by  $W^1, W^2$  the connected components of  $W' - f$ . Notice that, without loss of generality, we may write  $W^1 - V(U_x) = W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_c$  and  $W^2 - V(U_x) = W_{c+1} \cup \dots \cup W_d$  for some  $1 \leq c < d$ .

We denote by  $F^1 = \omega^{-1}(V(W^1))$  and  $F_0^i = F^i \cap \omega^{-1}(V(U_x))$  for  $i = 1, 2$  (see that  $F_0^1 \cup F_0^2 = F_0$  above), and by  $F_i = \omega^{-1}(V(W_i))$  for  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . Then  $F^1 \cup F^2 = E = E(M)$ , and  $F^1 = F_0^1 \cup F_1 \cup \dots \cup F_c$  and  $F^2 = F_0^2 \cup F_{c+1} \cup \dots \cup F_d$ . So the width of the edge  $f$  in the branch-decomposition  $(W, \omega)$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_M(F^1) &= r_M(F^1) + r_M(F^2) - r(M) + 1 \\ &= r_M\left(E - F_0^2 - \bigcup_{i=c+1}^d F_i\right) + r_M\left(E - F_0^1 - \bigcup_{i=1}^c F_i\right) - r(M) + 1 \\ &\leq r_M(E - F_0^2) + \sum_{i=c+1}^d r_M(E - F_i) + r_M(E - F_0^1) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^c r_M(E - F_i) - dr(M) - r(M) + 1 \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^d r_M(E - F_i) - (d - 1)r(M) + 1 \leq k + 1, \end{aligned}$$

where the second step holds by the next claim. ■

**Claim 3.3.** *Let  $X_1, \dots, X_m \subset E = E(M)$  be pairwise disjoint subsets of elements of a matroid  $M$ . Then*

$$r_M(E - (X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_m)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^m r_M(E - X_i) - (m - 1)r(M).$$

**Proof.** We proceed by induction on  $m$ , the case of  $m = 1$  being trivial. Using submodularity of rank,

$$\begin{aligned} r_M(E - (X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_{m+1})) &\leq r_M(E - (X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_m)) + r_M(E - X_{m+1}) - r(M) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^m r_M(E - X_i) - (m - 1)r(M) + r_M(E - X_{m+1}) - r(M). \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

**Acknowledgments**

The authors would like to thank to Isolde Adler for reporting the error in our original paper to us, and to Jeffrey Azzato for careful reading and checking all the proofs here. The first author was supported by the Institute for Theoretical Computer Science, project 1M0545, and by the Czech research grant GAČR 201/08/0308. The second author was supported by the Marsden Fund of New Zealand.

**References**

- [1] I. Adler, Personal communication, 2007.
- [2] P. Hliněný, G. Whittle, Matroid tree-width, *European J. Combin.* 27 (2006) 1117–1128.
- [3] N. Robertson, P.D. Seymour, Graph minors X. Obstructions to tree-decomposition, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 52 (1991) 153–190.