

On the sizes of BDDs and ZDDs representing matroids

Hiromi Emoto^{*,†}Yuni Iwamasa^{*,‡}Shin-ichi Minato^{*,§}

April 24, 2024

Abstract

Matroids are often represented as oracles since there are no unified and compact representations for general matroids. This paper initiates the study of binary decision diagrams (BDDs) and zero-suppressed binary decision diagrams (ZDDs) as relatively compact data structures for representing matroids in a computer. This study particularly focuses on the sizes of BDDs and ZDDs representing matroids. First, we compare the sizes of different variations of BDDs and ZDDs for a matroid. These comparisons involve concise transformations between specific decision diagrams. Second, we provide upper bounds on the size of BDDs and ZDDs for several classes of matroids. These bounds are closely related to the number of minors of the matroid and depend only on the connectivity function or pathwidth of the matroid, which deeply relates to the classes of matroids called strongly pigeonhole classes. In essence, these results indicate upper bounds on the number of minors for specific classes of matroids and new strongly pigeonhole classes.

Keywords: Binary decision diagram, Zero-suppressed binary decision diagram, Matroid

1 Introduction

Matroids [20–22, 31] are combinatorial structures that abstract linear independence in vector spaces. This concept appears in various fields of mathematics and theoretical computer science such as graph theory, geometry, and combinatorial optimization [23]. In combinatorial optimization, for instance, matroids appear as the discrete structure behind several combinatorial optimization problems solvable in a greedy manner.

The formal definition of matroids is as follows. Let E be a finite set and $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^E$ be a subset family of E . The pair (E, \mathcal{I}) is called a *matroid* if the following conditions (I1)–(I3) hold:

(I1) $\emptyset \in \mathcal{I}$.

(I2) If $I \in \mathcal{I}$ and $I' \subseteq I$, then $I' \in \mathcal{I}$.

(I3) For $I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{I}$ with $|I_1| < |I_2|$, there exists $e \in I_2 \setminus I_1$ such that $I_1 \cup \{e\} \in \mathcal{I}$.

In this context, E is called the *ground set* of M , a member of \mathcal{I} is called an *independent set* of M , and a maximal independent set is called a *basis* of M .

By (I2), the bases contain sufficient information to represent \mathcal{I} . Indeed, the collection \mathcal{B} of bases can characterize a matroid; a subset family $\mathcal{B} \subseteq 2^E$ of the ground set E is the collection of bases of some matroid if and only if the following conditions (B1) and (B2) hold:

*Graduate School of Informatics, Kyoto University

†E-mail: emoto.hiromi.63w@kyoto-u.jp

‡E-mail: iwamasa@i.kyoto-u.ac.jp

§E-mail: minato@i.kyoto-u.ac.jp




Figure 1.1: An undirected graph G

(B1) $\mathcal{B} \neq \emptyset$.

(B2) For $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ and $x \in B_1 \setminus B_2$, there exists $y \in B_2 \setminus B_1$ such that $(B_1 \setminus \{x\}) \cup \{y\} \in \mathcal{B}$.

Hence the pair (E, \mathcal{B}) is also referred to as a matroid. For a matroid M , we denote by $E(M)$, $\mathcal{I}(M)$, and $\mathcal{B}(M)$ the ground set, the collection of independent sets, and that of bases of M , respectively.

The following are examples of matroids.

Example 1.1 (Cycle matroid). For an undirected graph G , let $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ denote the vertex and edge sets of G , respectively. Let $\mathcal{I}(G)$ denote the family of edge subsets $F \subseteq E(G)$ such that the subgraph $(V(G), F)$ of G is a forest. Then $(E(G), \mathcal{I}(G))$ forms a matroid, called the *cycle matroid* $M(G)$ of G . In this case, the collection $\mathcal{B}(M(G))$ of bases of $M(G)$ is the family of edge subsets $F \subseteq E(G)$ such that $F \in \mathcal{I}(G)$ and $|F| = |V(G)| - \omega(G)$, where $\omega(G)$ is the number of connected components of G . For example, we have $E(G) = \{e_1, \dots, e_6\}$, $\mathcal{B}(M(G)) = \{B \subseteq E(G) : |B| = 2, \text{ and } B \text{ is not } \{e_1, e_2\}, \{e_3, e_4\}, \text{ or } \{e_5, e_6\}\}$, and $\mathcal{I}(G) = \mathcal{B}(M(G)) \cup \{\emptyset, \{e_1\}, \dots, \{e_6\}\}$ for the undirected graph G in Figure 1.1. \square

Example 1.2 (\mathbb{F} -representable matroid). Let A be an $m \times |E|$ matrix over a field \mathbb{F} with the set E of column labels and \mathcal{I} be the family of subsets $I \subseteq E$ such that the set of columns labeled by I in A is linearly independent in \mathbb{F}^m . Then (E, \mathcal{I}) forms a matroid, called the *vector matroid* $M[A]$ of A . A matroid M is said to be \mathbb{F} -representable if $M = M[A]$ for some matrix A over \mathbb{F} . In this case, $\mathcal{B}(M[A])$ is the family of subsets $B \subseteq E$ such that $B \in \mathcal{I}$ and $|B| = \text{rank } A$. For example, let $E := \{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\}$, $\mathcal{B} := \{\{e_1, e_2\}, \{e_1, e_4\}, \{e_2, e_4\}\}$, and $\mathcal{I} := \mathcal{B} \cup \{\emptyset, \{e_1\}, \{e_2\}, \{e_4\}\}$. Then (E, \mathcal{I}) and (E, \mathcal{B}) are $\text{GF}(2)$ -representable, where $\text{GF}(2)$ is the finite field of order 2. Indeed, they coincide with the vector matroid arising from the following matrix over $\text{GF}(2)$:

$$\begin{array}{cccc} e_1 & e_2 & e_3 & e_4 \\ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{array} \quad \square$$

Several classes of matroids have polynomial representations in the sizes of their ground sets (see Examples 1.1 and 1.2). However, since the number m_n of matroids whose size of the ground set is n satisfies that $\log_2 \log_2 m_n \geq n - \frac{3}{2} \log_2 n + \frac{1}{2} \log_2 \frac{2}{\pi} - o(1)$ [2], there are no unified and polynomial-size representations for general matroids. In the field of combinatorial optimization, matroids are often represented as oracles as an indirect approach (see [17, 25]). However, when we actually solve a combinatorial optimization problem related to a matroid in a computer, we need to implement the oracle arising from the matroid.

In this paper, we initiate the study of *binary decision diagrams* (BDDs) [8] and *zero-suppressed binary decision diagrams* (ZDDs) [19] as relatively compact data structures for representing matroids uniformly.

BDDs and ZDDs are special types of directed acyclic graphs, which are obtained from binary decision trees by applying certain reductions (see Section 2.2 for the formal definition). Informally, nodes in BDDs/ZDDs are labeled with the elements of the ground set, and a directed




Figure 1.2: Relations of the sizes between different decision diagrams

path in the graph represents a subset family of the ground set. The size of a BDD/ZDD means the number of nodes in the graph. The smaller its size, the better the compression.

In constructing a BDD/ZDD for a subset family of E , we are required to fix a total order on E , and the size of the BDD/ZDD heavily depends on the fixed total order. For a totally ordered set (E, \preceq) and a set family $\mathcal{S} \subseteq 2^E$, we denote by $B(\mathcal{S}, (E, \preceq))$ (resp. $Z(\mathcal{S}, (E, \preceq))$) the BDD (resp. ZDD) for \mathcal{S} with respect to (E, \preceq) . In some contexts, $B(\mathcal{S}, (E, \preceq))$ (resp. $Z(\mathcal{S}, (E, \preceq))$) itself means the family \mathcal{S} . We often abbreviate it to $B(\mathcal{S})$ (resp. $Z(\mathcal{S})$). This study focuses on various properties, especially the size, of BDDs/ZDDs representing a collection of independent sets or bases of a matroid.

Our contribution

In Section 3, we compare different variations of BDDs/ZDDs for a matroid. Since BDDs and ZDDs have different reduction rules, their structures can differ even when they represent the same set family. In addition, as mentioned above, a single matroid M can be represented through various families such as the collection of independent sets $\mathcal{I}(M)$ and bases $\mathcal{B}(M)$. The structure of the decision diagram can differ depending on the choices.

In this paper, we show the following relations on the sizes of the decision diagrams. Here M^* denotes the *dual* matroid of M , whose ground set is $E(M)$ and whose collection of bases is $\{E(M) \setminus B : B \in \mathcal{B}(M)\}$.

Theorem 1.3. *Let M be a matroid on the ground set E and \preceq be a total order on E . Then the following hold:*

- *The sizes of both the ZDD $Z(\mathcal{B}(M))$ and the BDD $B(\mathcal{I}(M))$ are never greater than that of the BDD $B(\mathcal{B}(M))$ (proved by Theorems 3.3 and 3.5).*
- *The BDDs $B(\mathcal{B}(M))$ and $B(\mathcal{B}(M^*))$ are of equal size (proved by Theorem 3.4).*
- *The ZDDs $Z(\mathcal{I}(M))$ and $Z(\mathcal{B}(M))$ and the BDD $B(\mathcal{I}(M^*))$ all have the same size (proved by Theorems 3.5 and 3.6).*

The results in Theorem 1.3 are summarized in Figure 1.2. The proof of this theorem involves concise transformations between specific decision diagrams. In this paper, the four types of BDDs/ZDDs representing either a collection of independent sets or bases of a matroid will be referred to as BDDs/ZDDs for a matroid.

In Section 4, we provide upper bounds on the size (or the *width*) of BDDs/ZDDs in terms of the value of the *connectivity function* for several classes of matroids. Now let E be a set $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ and \preceq be a total order on E such that $e_1 \prec \dots \prec e_n$. For $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, the




Figure 1.3: Upper bounds on the i th width depending only on $\lambda(E_{\preceq,i})$

width of the i th level (i th width) of a BDD/ZDD for a subset family of E with respect to (E, \preceq) is defined as the number of nodes labeled with e_{i+1} . The *width* of a BDD/ZDD is defined as the maximum width among all levels. For a matroid M , its *rank function* $r_M: 2^{E(M)} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is defined by $r_M(X) := \max\{|I| : I \subseteq X \text{ and } I \in \mathcal{I}\}$ for $X \subseteq E(M)$. The *connectivity function* [27, 30] $\lambda_M: 2^{E(M)} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ of M is defined by

$$\lambda_M(X) := r_M(X) + r_M(E(M) \setminus X) - r(M)$$

for $X \subseteq E(M)$.

Theorem 1.4. *Let E be a set $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$, M be a matroid on E , and \preceq be a total order on E such that $e_1 \prec \dots \prec e_n$. We denote $\{e_1, \dots, e_i\}$ by $E_{\preceq,i}$. Then the following hold for the i th width of a BDD/ZDD for M with respect to (E, \preceq) :*

- *If M is free, then the i th width is at most 1 (proved by Corollary 4.3).*
- *If M is uniform, then the i th width is at most $\lambda_M(E_{\preceq,i}) + 1$ (proved by Theorem 4.1).*
- *If M is a partition or nested matroid, then the i th width is at most $2^{\lambda_M(E_{\preceq,i})}$ (proved by Theorems 4.5 and 4.7).*

These results, along with others (Theorems 4.9 and 4.10), are summarized in Figure 1.3. The proof of this theorem utilizes the fact that the number of minors of M on $E \setminus E_{\preceq,i}$ bounds the i th width. Actually, we show Theorem 1.4 by providing upper bounds on the number of minors on $E \setminus E_{\preceq,i}$ for specific classes of matroids. Classes of matroids for which the number of minors can be bounded with their connectivity functions are called strongly pigeonhole classes [13, Definition 2.10], and some classes are known to be strongly pigeonhole [14]. Our results reveal new strongly pigeonhole classes.

While the total order \preceq has been arbitrary so far, certain orders may result in relatively smaller sizes of BDDs/ZDDs. We show that, for a partition or nested matroid, a certain total order results in an exponentially smaller upper bound on the width than that given in Theorem 1.4. Here, for a matroid M , the *pathwidth* [16, Section 4] $\text{pw}(M)$ of M on an n -element set E is defined by

$$\text{pw}(M) := \min\{\max\{\lambda_M(E_{\preceq,i}) : i \in \{1, \dots, n\}\} : \preceq \text{ is a total order on } E\}.$$

Theorem 1.5. *There exists a total order on the ground set such that the width of the BDD/ZDD for a partition or nested matroid M is at most $\text{pw}(M) + 1$ (proved by Theorems 4.16 and 4.17).*

2 Preliminaries

Let 2^E denote the power set of a set E , and \mathbb{N} the set of all non-negative integers.

2.1 Matroids

In addition to the definitions of matroids in Section 1, a subset family $\mathcal{B} \subseteq 2^E$ of the ground set E is the collection of bases of some matroid if and only if it satisfies (B1) and the following:

(B3) For $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ and $x \in B_2 \setminus B_1$, there exists $y \in B_1 \setminus B_2$ such that $(B_1 \setminus \{y\}) \cup \{x\} \in \mathcal{B}$.

For a matroid M , an element $e \in E(M)$ is called a *loop* if $\{e\}$ is not independent and called a *coloop* if every basis of M contains e . Recall from Section 1 that $r_M: 2^{E(M)} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ denotes the rank function of M . We often abbreviate $r_M(E(M))$ to $r(M)$ and refer to it as the *rank* of M . For $X \subseteq E$, we write $r_M(X)$ as $r(X)$ if M is clear from the context.

Some operations applied to matroids produce different matroids. Let M be a matroid on the ground set E . For $X \subseteq E$, let $\mathcal{I}|X$ be the collection of independent sets included in X . Then the pair $(X, \mathcal{I}|X)$ forms a matroid, called the *restriction* $M|X$ of M to X or *deletion* $M \setminus (E \setminus X)$ of $E \setminus X$ from M . Similarly, let \mathcal{I}_X be the collection of independent sets I such that $I \cup B \in \mathcal{I}(M)$ for some $B \in \mathcal{B}(M|X)$. Then the pair $(E \setminus X, \mathcal{I}_X)$ forms a matroid, called the *contraction* M / X of X from M . It is known that the resulting matroid is uniquely determined regardless of the order of deletions and contractions, that is, $(M \setminus X) / Y = (M / Y) \setminus X$ for disjoint $X, Y \subseteq E$. Thus a matroid obtained from M by a sequence of deletions and contractions can be represented as $M \setminus X / Y$, which is called the *minor* of M on $E \setminus (X \cup Y)$. Let M_1, M_2 be matroids such that $E(M_1) \cap E(M_2) = \emptyset$. Then $(E(M_1) \cup E(M_2), \{I_1 \cup I_2 : I_1 \in \mathcal{I}(M_1) \text{ and } I_2 \in \mathcal{I}(M_2)\})$ forms a matroid, called the *direct sum* $M_1 \oplus M_2$ of M_1 and M_2 .

In Section 1, cycle matroid and \mathbb{F} -representable matroid are mentioned as classes of matroids. The following are other classes of matroids appearing in this paper.

Example 2.1 (Free matroid). A matroid M is called *free* if its collection of independent sets is $2^{E(M)}$. □

Example 2.2 (Uniform matroid and partition matroid). A matroid M is called *uniform* if its collection of independent sets is $\{I \subseteq E(M) : |I| \leq r(M)\}$. A uniform matroid of rank r on an n -element set is denoted by $U_{r,n}$. Moreover, a matroid that can be expressed as a direct sum of uniform matroids is called a *partition matroid*. □

Example 2.3 (Transversal matroid and nested matroid). A matroid M is called *transversal* [11, Section 1] if there exists a sequence (A_1, \dots, A_m) of subsets of $E(M)$ such that, for all $I \subseteq E(M)$, I is independent in M if and only if there is an injection $\varphi: I \rightarrow \{1, \dots, m\}$ satisfying $e \in A_{\varphi(e)}$ for every $e \in I$. Such a sequence (A_1, \dots, A_m) is called a *presentation* of M . In particular, M is called *nested* [10, Section 8; 6, Section 2] if there exists a presentation (A_1, \dots, A_m) such that $A_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq A_m$. Note that nested matroids are also called *Schubert matroids* [28, Section 3], *shifted matroids* [1, Section 4], *generalized Catalan matroids* [7, Definition 3.7], *freedom matroids* [9, Section 5], and *PI-matroids* [3, Appendix A.1] (see [5, Section 4]). □

Example 2.4 (Laminar matroid). A subset family $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^E$ of a set E is called *laminar* if $A \subseteq B$ or $B \subseteq A$ for all $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ with $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$. A matroid M is called *laminar* (see [12]) if there exists a laminar family $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^{E(M)}$ and a function $c: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that, for all $I \subseteq E(M)$, I is independent in M if and only if $|I \cap A| \leq c(A)$ for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$. □




Figure 2.1: A binary decision tree for $\{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 2, 3\}\}$

2.2 BDDs and ZDDs

Binary decision diagrams (BDDs) [8] and *zero-suppressed binary decision diagrams (ZDDs)* [19] are directed acyclic graphs under specific conditions and represent Boolean functions and set families, respectively. Note that a Boolean function can be viewed as a set family if the set of true variables in an assignment of input variables for which the function evaluates to true belongs to the family.

Let E be a finite set, \preceq be a total order on E , and $\mathcal{S} \subseteq 2^E$ be a subset family of E . The BDD $B(\mathcal{S}, (E, \preceq))$ and ZDD $Z(\mathcal{S}, (E, \preceq))$ for \mathcal{S} with respect to (E, \preceq) are defined as follows. Given the family \mathcal{S} and the totally ordered set (E, \preceq) , a binary decision tree corresponding to them is uniquely determined. For example, when \mathcal{S} is $\{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 2, 3\}\}$ and (E, \preceq) is $(\{1, 2, 3\}, \preceq)$, Figure 2.1 is the corresponding binary decision tree. The directed acyclic graph obtained by applying the following reduction rules to the binary decision tree is a BDD or ZDD. The applied rules differentiate BDDs and ZDDs.

As a common condition, the directed acyclic graph has at most two nodes with outdegree zero, called *terminals*. One of two terminals is called the *0-terminal* \perp and the other the *1-terminal* \top . Each non-terminal node ν has a label $\text{label}(\nu)$ representing an element of E and exactly two arcs whose tails are ν . These arcs are called the *0-arc* and *1-arc*, and their heads are denoted by ν_0 and ν_1 , respectively. Since there is a unique 1-arc (resp. 0-arc) whose tail is the same as a given 0-arc (resp. 1-arc), in this paper, it is referred to as the corresponding 1-arc (resp. 0-arc). The *size* of a BDD/ZDD is the number of non-terminal nodes in it.

The reduction rules are as follows. (NS) is the common rule as shown in Figure 2.2(a):

(NS) Non-terminal nodes ν, ν' whose labels are the same and which satisfy both $\nu_0 = \nu'_0$ and $\nu_1 = \nu'_1$ must be merged into a single node.

Additionally, BDDs (resp. ZDDs) must satisfy the following rule (B-ND) (resp. (Z-ND)) as illustrated in Figure 2.2(b) (resp. Figure 2.2(c)):

(B-ND) A non-terminal node ν with $\nu_0 = \nu_1$ must be removed, and the arcs whose head is ν must be redirected to ν_0 (equal to ν_1).

(Z-ND) A non-terminal node ν with $\nu_1 = \perp$ must be removed, and the arcs whose head is ν must be redirected to ν_0 .

Removed nodes are referred to as redundant nodes. The resulting BDD/ZDD is uniquely determined regardless of the order in which these rules are applied¹, though a BDD and ZDD

¹Actually, a BDD where the reduction rules are fully applied is originally called a *reduced ordered binary decision diagram (ROBDD)*, and a directed acyclic graph obtained by applying the reduction rules to the binary decision tree partially is also originally called a BDD. However, it is common to refer to ROBDDs as BDDs, and this paper follows that convention.




Figure 2.2: Reduction rules for BDDs and ZDDs

representing the same set family may not have the same structure.

A directed path in the BDD/ZDD represents a subset (family) of E . Now there is only one node with indegree zero, called the *root*. We denote the root of a BDD $\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{S})$ (resp. ZDD $\mathbf{Z}(\mathcal{S})$) as $\text{root}(\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{S}))$ (resp. $\text{root}(\mathbf{Z}(\mathcal{S}))$). Moreover, for all non-terminal nodes ν , both $\text{label}(\nu) \prec \text{label}(\nu_0)$ and $\text{label}(\nu) \prec \text{label}(\nu_1)$ are satisfied, where $\text{label}(\perp)$ and $\text{label}(\top)$ are special labels that are larger than any element of E . These conditions ensure that the sequence of elements in any directed path from the root to a terminal is strictly monotonically increasing with respect to \preceq . In particular, a path from the root to 1-terminal is called a *1-path*, and a set (family) in \mathcal{S} is represented by a 1-path. Precisely, for ZDDs, a set corresponding to a 1-path is defined as the label set of the tails of the traversed 1-arcs, and such a set is considered to belong to \mathcal{S} . The same holds for BDDs, but a single 1-path often represents multiple sets due to (B-ND). A 1-path in the ZDD represents the set

$$\{e \in E : e \text{ is the tail label of some 1-arc in the 1-path}\}.$$

On the other hand, that in the BDD represents the family of subsets $X \subseteq E$ such that

$$\{e \in E : e \text{ is the tail label of some 1-arc in the 1-path}\} \subseteq X$$

and X has no member of

$$\{e \in E : e \text{ is the tail label of some 0-arc in the path}\}.$$

In other words, the redundancy in BDDs means don't-care. For example, Figure 2.3 shows a BDD and ZDD representing $\{\{1, 2, 5\}, \{4, 5\}, \{5\}\}$ with respect to $(\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}, \leq)$. In this paper, a directed path is treated as a sequence of labeled arcs.

The subgraph rooted by a node in a BDD $\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{S})$ (resp. ZDD $\mathbf{Z}(\mathcal{S})$) is also a BDD (resp. ZDD), called the *sub-BDD* of $\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{S})$ (resp. *sub-ZDD* of $\mathbf{Z}(\mathcal{S})$). In particular, if the root of $\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{S})$ is non-terminal, the sub-BDD rooted by $\text{root}(\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{S}))_0$ (resp. $\text{root}(\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{S}))_1$) is called the *0-child* $\text{child}_0(\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{S}))$ (resp. *1-child* $\text{child}_1(\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{S}))$) of $\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{S})$. The same definitions apply to ZDDs for 0-child and 1-child. For a ZDD $\mathbf{Z}(\mathcal{S})$ with a non-terminal root, given the conditions described above, the




Figure 2.3: Decision diagrams for $\{\{1, 2, 5\}, \{4, 5\}, \{5\}\}$

0-child and 1-child of $Z(S)$ represent $\{S \in \mathcal{S} : \text{label}(\text{root}(Z(S))) \notin S\}$, $\{S \setminus \{\text{label}(\text{root}(Z(S)))\} : \text{label}(\text{root}(Z(S))) \in S \in \mathcal{S}\}$, respectively.

The following property is known for BDDs/ZDDs:

Proposition 2.5. *Every non-terminal node in a BDD/ZDD can reach 1-terminal.*

Proof. Suppose that there exist non-terminal nodes that cannot reach 1-terminal. Let ν be one of such nodes with the largest label. Since $\text{label}(\nu) \prec \text{label}(\nu_0)$ and $\text{label}(\nu) \prec \text{label}(\nu_1)$, we have $\nu_0 = \nu_1 = \perp$. This contradicts (B-ND) for BDDs and (Z-ND) for ZDDs. \square

3 Structural relations between different representations

There are several variations of BDDs and ZDDs representing matroids. In addition to the choice between BDDs and ZDDs, the represented collection of independent sets or bases must be chosen. Moreover, there may be some relations between the BDD/ZDD for a matroid and its dual. This section compares these three choices and proves Theorem 1.3.

Fix a matroid M and a total order \preceq on the ground set of M . In this section, we denote by E , \mathcal{I} , and \mathcal{B} the ground set, the collections of independent sets, and that of bases of M , respectively.

Before moving to the proof, we introduce clutters. A set family is called a *clutter* if no member of it contains another member. We can show that each 1-path corresponds to a member of a clutter one-to-one in a BDD for the clutter.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq 2^E$ be a clutter on E . In the BDD $B(\mathcal{C}, (E, \preceq))$, every 1-path traverses exactly $|E|$ non-terminal nodes.*

Proof. Suppose that there exists a 1-path with redundant nodes. Let $e \in E$ be the label of one of such nodes. Then, for some $C \subseteq E \setminus \{e\}$, both C and $C \cup \{e\}$ are members of \mathcal{C} ; a contraction. \square

Similarly, we can show that the heads of the corresponding 0-arc and 1-arc are different in a ZDD for a clutter.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq 2^E$ be a clutter on E . In the ZDD $Z(\mathcal{C}, (E, \preceq))$, every non-terminal node ν satisfies that $\nu_0 \neq \nu_1$.*

Proof. Suppose that there exists a non-terminal node ν such that $\nu_0 = \nu_1$. Since (Z-ND) implies that $\nu_1 \neq \perp$, there is a 1-path in the ZDD traversing the 1-arc (ν, ν_1) by Proposition 2.5. Let $C \in \mathcal{C}$ be the corresponding set to the 1-path. Since $\nu_0 = \nu_1$, replacing (ν, ν_1) in the 1-path with the 0-arc (ν, ν_0) also results in a 1-path in the ZDD. Thus $C \setminus \{\text{label}(\nu)\} \in \mathcal{C}$; a contraction. \square

A collection of bases is a clutter since each basis has the same size [31, Theorem 6]. Thus Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 can be applied to a collection of bases.

The first comparison focuses on the sizes between a BDD and a ZDD for a collection of bases. This comparison can be generalized to a clutter.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq 2^E$ be a clutter on E . The size of the ZDD $Z(\mathcal{C}, (E, \preceq))$ is never greater than that of the BDD $B(\mathcal{C}, (E, \preceq))$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.1, the BDD $B(\mathcal{C}, (E, \preceq))$ can be interpreted as a ZDD where (Z-ND) is not fully applied. \square

The second comparison focuses on the relation between a matroid and its dual in a BDD for a collection of bases. This comparison can also be generalized to a clutter.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq 2^E$ be a clutter on E and \mathcal{C}^* be the subset family $\{E \setminus C : C \in \mathcal{C}\}$ of E . The BDD $B(\mathcal{C}^*, (E, \preceq))$ can be obtained from $B(\mathcal{C}, (E, \preceq))$ by updating $(\nu_0, \nu_1) \leftarrow (\nu_1, \nu_0)$, that is, swapping the 0- and 1-arc for every non-terminal node ν .*


Proof. The structure of the BDD remains unchanged except for the labels after the update. By Lemma 3.1, let $C \in \mathcal{C}$ be the corresponding set to some 1-path in $B(\mathcal{C}, (E, \preceq))$. After the update, this 1-path changes to represent only $E \setminus C$. Therefore, the updated BDD represents $\{E \setminus C : C \in \mathcal{C}\}$, which is precisely \mathcal{C}^* . \square

The third comparison focuses on the relation between decision diagrams for a collection of independent sets and those for a collection of bases. Here the lexicographic order on \mathcal{B} with respect to the total order \preceq is defined as follows. For $B \in \mathcal{B}$, let $S(B)$ be the sequence of elements in B arranged in ascending order with respect to \preceq and $S(B)_j$ be the j th element of $S(B)$. For $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}$, we say that B_1 is lexicographically smaller than B_2 if there exists $k \in \{1, \dots, r(M)\}$ such that $S(B_1)_k \prec S(B_2)_k$ and $S(B_1)_j = S(B_2)_j$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$.

Theorem 3.5. *Let \mathcal{I}' be a set family represented by the BDD obtained from $B(\mathcal{B}, (E, \preceq))$ by updating $\nu_0 \leftarrow \nu_1$ for every non-terminal node ν with $\nu_0 = \perp$ and then applying the reduction rules for BDDs. In other words, $B(\mathcal{I}')$ is obtained from $B(\mathcal{B}, (E, \preceq))$ by replacing every 0-arc whose head is 0-terminal with the corresponding 1-arc and applying the reduction rules for BDDs. Then \mathcal{I}' is equivalent to \mathcal{I} . The same holds for ZDDs, but the ZDD satisfies the reduction rules immediately after the update.*

Proof. Let B' be the structure obtained from $B(\mathcal{B}, (E, \preceq))$ by updating $\nu_0 \leftarrow \nu_1$ for every non-terminal node ν with $\nu_0 = \perp$ and not applying the reduction rules. Note that B' and $B(\mathcal{I}')$ represent the same set family \mathcal{I}' .

Take any $I \in \mathcal{I}'$. Then, by Lemma 3.1, there is a 1-path P in B' corresponding to I . Since the updated 0-arcs have the same head as their corresponding 1-arcs, there is a 1-path P' in B' obtained by replacing each updated 0-arc (ν, ν_0) in P with the corresponding 1-arc (ν, ν_1) . The corresponding set $B \in \mathcal{I}'$ to P' satisfies that $I \subseteq B$. Moreover, this 1-path P' also exists in $B(\mathcal{B}, (E, \preceq))$, implying $B \in \mathcal{B}$. Therefore, we have $I \in \mathcal{I}$. This implies that $\mathcal{I}' \subseteq \mathcal{I}$.



(a) A ZDD for $\{\{1, 2\}, \{1, 4\}, \{3, 4\}\}$

(b) A ZDD for $\{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{3\}, \{4\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 4\}, \{3, 4\}\}$

Figure 3.1: A counterexample to Theorem 3.5 in clutters

Conversely, take any $I \in \mathcal{I}$. Let B be the lexicographically largest basis of M with respect to \preceq such that $I \subseteq B$ and P be the 1-path in $\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{B}, (E, \preceq))$ corresponding to B .

Take any $e \in B \setminus I$. By Lemma 3.1, there exists exactly one non-terminal node ν_e in P such that $e = \text{label}(\nu_e)$. Suppose to the contrary that $(\nu_e)_0 \neq \perp$. By Proposition 2.5, there are 1-paths in $\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{B}, (E, \preceq))$ identical to P up to ν_e but traversing the 0-arc $(\nu_e, (\nu_e)_0)$. Let $B_{\succ} \in \mathcal{B}$ be a basis of M corresponding to such a 1-path so that, among all such bases, $|B_{\succ} \cap I|$ is maximal. Since B_{\succ} is lexicographically larger than B , the choice of B implies $I \not\subseteq B_{\succ}$. By (B3), for some $x \in I \setminus B_{\succ} \subseteq B \setminus B_{\succ}$, there exists $y \in B_{\succ} \setminus B$ such that $(B_{\succ} \setminus \{y\}) \cup \{x\} \in \mathcal{B}$. Since $y \notin I \subseteq B$, we have $|((B_{\succ} \setminus \{y\}) \cup \{x\}) \cap I| = |B_{\succ} \cap I| + 1$. Moreover, $x \neq e$ since $e \notin I$. Hence the maximality of $|B_{\succ} \cap I|$ is contradicted. Thus we obtain that $(\nu_e)_0 = \perp$.

Since $(\nu_e)_0 = \perp$ for each $e \in B \setminus I$, the 1-arcs in P whose tails have labels in $B \setminus I$ satisfy that all corresponding 0-arcs are updated. Thus there is a 1-path in \mathbf{B}' representing I , implying that $I \in \mathcal{I}'$. Therefore, we have $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{I}'$.

Replacing “by Lemma 3.1” with “by definition”, the same result can be obtained for ZDDs. Finally, we show that the updated ZDD $Z(\mathcal{I}')$ satisfies the reduction rules. Since the update only changes 0-arcs whose head is 0-terminal, all non-terminal nodes in $Z(\mathcal{I}')$ are reachable from the root, and no 1-arc ends in 0-terminal. Suppose that there exist different non-terminal nodes ν, ν' in $Z(\mathcal{B}, (E, \preceq))$ that must be shared after the update. Since all 1-arcs are not updated, we have $\nu_1 = \nu'_1$. Thus $\nu_0 \neq \nu'_0$, and either $\nu_0 = \nu_1$ or $\nu'_0 = \nu'_1$ must hold, which contradicts Lemma 3.2. \square

The last sentence of this theorem indicates that the size of the ZDD does not change before and after the update. In other words, the sizes of $Z(\mathcal{B}, (E, \preceq))$ and $Z(\mathcal{I}, (E, \preceq))$ are equal. Note that applying this operation to the BDD/ZDD for a clutter \mathcal{C} does not necessarily yield the BDD/ZDD for $\{X : X \subseteq C \in \mathcal{C}\}$. For example, Figure 3.1 shows that applying this operation to the ZDD for $\{\{1, 2\}, \{1, 4\}, \{3, 4\}\}$ yields the ZDD for $\{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{3\}, \{4\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 4\}, \{3, 4\}\}$, which does not contain $\{2\}$. Therefore, a BDD (resp. ZDD) for the collection of independent sets can be obtained from a BDD (resp. ZDD) for the collection of bases in time proportional to the size of the latter, without general operations to transform it into the former.

Finally, we focus on the relation between a ZDD for the collection of bases and a BDD for the collection of independent sets of its dual. As in Theorem 3.4, the operation of swapping the 0- and 1-arc is also important in this theorem. Let \mathcal{I}^* denote the collection of independent sets of M^* .

Theorem 3.6. *The BDD $B(\mathcal{I}^*, (E, \preceq))$ can be obtained from the ZDD $Z(\mathcal{B}, (E, \preceq))$ by updating $(\nu_0, \nu_1) \leftarrow (\nu_1, \nu_0)$ for every non-terminal node ν .*

Proof. By Lemma 3.2, there are no redundant nodes immediately after the update. Hence the updated structure can be interpreted as a BDD. Let $B(\mathcal{I}')$ be the updated BDD.

Let P be a 1-path in $Z(\mathcal{B}, (E, \preceq))$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}$ be the corresponding basis to P . Assume that $J \subseteq E \setminus B$ is the set of labels that do not appear in P . Then the 1-path in $B(\mathcal{I}')$ corresponding to the updated P represents the family of sets I^* satisfying $E \setminus (B \cup J) \subseteq I^* \subseteq E \setminus B$. Note that $E \setminus (B \cup J)$ means the label set of tails of all 0-arcs traversed by P . Since such I^* belongs to \mathcal{I}^* , we have $\mathcal{I}' \subseteq \mathcal{I}^*$.

Conversely, take any $I^* \in \mathcal{I}^*$. Let B be the lexicographically smallest basis of M with respect to \preceq such that $I^* \subseteq E \setminus B$ and P be the 1-path in $Z(\mathcal{B}, (E, \preceq))$ corresponding to B .

Suppose to the contrary that there exists $e \in E \setminus (B \cup I^*)$ with a non-terminal node ν_e in P with $e = \text{label}(\nu_e)$. Since $(\nu_e)_1 \neq \perp$ by (Z-ND), there are 1-paths in $Z(\mathcal{B}, (E, \preceq))$ identical to P up to ν_e but traversing the 1-arc $(\nu_e, (\nu_e)_1)$ by Proposition 2.5. Let $B_{\prec} \in \mathcal{B}$ be a basis of M corresponding to such a 1-path so that, among all such bases, $|B_{\prec} \cap I^*|$ is minimal. Since B_{\prec} is lexicographically smaller than B , the choice of B implies $I^* \not\subseteq E \setminus B_{\prec}$, that is, $B_{\prec} \cap I^* \neq \emptyset$. By (B2), for some $x \in B_{\prec} \cap I^* \subseteq B_{\prec} \setminus B$, there exists $y \in B \setminus B_{\prec}$ such that $(B_{\prec} \setminus \{x\}) \cup \{y\} \in \mathcal{B}$. Since $y \notin I^* \subseteq E \setminus B$, we have $|((B_{\prec} \setminus \{x\}) \cup \{y\}) \cap I^*| = |B_{\prec} \cap I^*| - 1$. Moreover, $x \neq e$ since $e \notin I^*$. Hence the minimality of $|B_{\prec} \cap I^*|$ is contradicted.

By the above argument, P traverses no non-terminal nodes with label e in $Z(\mathcal{B}, (E, \preceq))$ for all $e \in E \setminus (B \cup I^*)$. Similar to earlier observations, the 1-path in $B(\mathcal{I}')$ corresponding to the updated P represents the set family that contains I^* . Therefore, there is a 1-path in $B(\mathcal{I}')$ representing I^* , and we have $\mathcal{I}^* \subseteq \mathcal{I}'$. \square

Theorems 3.3–3.6 collectively establish Theorem 1.3. Figure 1.2 focuses on the relations of the sizes among the eight different representations.

4 Widths of BDDs and ZDDs

Let E be a set $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$, M be a matroid on E , and \preceq be a total order on E such that $e_1 \prec \dots \prec e_n$. Recall from Section 1 that, for $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, the i th width of a BDD/ZDD for a subset family of E with respect to (E, \preceq) is defined as the number of non-terminal nodes labeled with e_{i+1} , and the width of the BDD/ZDD is defined as the maximum width among all levels. Moreover, we denote $\{e_1, \dots, e_i\}$ by $E_{\preceq, i}$. This section analyzes the widths of BDDs/ZDDs representing matroids.

Before the analysis, we focus on the structure of the ZDD $Z(\mathcal{I}(M), (E, \preceq))$ for the collection $\mathcal{I}(M)$ of independent sets. If the label of the root is e_1 , then the 0-child of $Z(\mathcal{I}(M), (E, \preceq))$ represents

$$\{I \in \mathcal{I}(M) : e_1 \notin I\} = \{I \subseteq E \setminus \{e_1\} : I \in \mathcal{I}(M)\} = \mathcal{I}(M \setminus \{e_1\}).$$

Similarly, the 1-child represents

$$\{I \setminus \{e_1\} : e_1 \in I \in \mathcal{I}(M)\} = \{I \subseteq E \setminus \{e_1\} : I \cup \{e_1\} \in \mathcal{I}(M)\} = \mathcal{I}(M / \{e_1\})$$

since $\{e_1\}$ is a basis of $M \setminus \{e_1\}$ by Proposition 2.5. Thus, for $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, the sub-ZDD of $Z(\mathcal{I}(M), (E, \preceq))$ rooted by some non-terminal node with label e_{i+1} represents the collection of independent sets of some minor of M on $E \setminus E_{\preceq, i}$. Moreover, the sub-ZDDs rooted by different non-terminal nodes with label e_{i+1} represent different collections of independent sets on $E \setminus E_{\preceq, i}$. Therefore, the i th width of $Z(\mathcal{I}(M), (E, \preceq))$ is bounded by the number of minors of M on $E \setminus E_{\preceq, i}$. Similarly, for $Z(\mathcal{B}(M), (E, \preceq))$, $B(\mathcal{I}(M), (E, \preceq))$, and $B(\mathcal{B}(M), (E, \preceq))$, the i th width

is also bounded by the number of minors on $E \setminus E_{\preceq, i}$. Note that, as mentioned in Section 4.1.1, this interpretation generalizes the discussion by Sekine et al. [26] to general matroids.

The width can vary depending on the total order \preceq on E . For several classes of matroids, Section 4.1 provides upper bounds on widths with respect to any total order, and Section 4.2 provides for orders that make the width small. Moreover, Section 4.3 shows how to implement a rank oracle using the ZDD structure described above.

4.1 Upper bounds on widths depending only on connectivity functions

A trivial upper bound for the number of minors on $E \setminus E_{\preceq, i}$ is 2^i . In this section, we provide more precise upper bounds in terms of connectivity functions of matroids by proving Theorem 1.4. Recall from Section 1 that the connectivity function $\lambda_M: 2^E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ of a matroid M is defined by $\lambda_M(X) := r_M(X) + r_M(E \setminus X) - r(M)$ for $X \subseteq E$. We write λ_M as λ if M is clear from the context. This section finds upper bounds on the number of minors that depends only on $\lambda(E_{\preceq, i})$.

4.1.1 Related work

Sekine et al. [26] provided an upper bound for cycle matroids. In the BDD for the family of spanning trees for a simple connected undirected graph G with the edge set E , each node with label e_i corresponds to a certain minor of G on $E \setminus E_{\preceq, i}$. Moreover, limited 2-isomorphic minors correspond to the same node. Thus the i th width of the BDD for all spanning trees of G is equal to the number of minors of G on $E \setminus E_{\preceq, i}$. This result can be interpreted regarding to BDDs for the collection of bases of the cycle matroid $M(G)$. Eventually, the number of minors of $M(G)$ on $E \setminus E_{\preceq, i}$ is bounded by the $(V(G[E_{\preceq, i}]) \cap V(G[E \setminus E_{\preceq, i}]))$ -th Bell number, where $G[X]$ denotes the induced subgraph of G on $X \subseteq E$.

The class of matroids known as the strongly pigeonhole class is closely related to this study. For a matroid M and $S \subseteq E(M)$, define the equivalence relation $\sim_{M,S}$ on 2^S as follows. For $X_1, X_2 \subseteq S$, the sets X_1 and X_2 are equivalent, written $X_1 \sim_{M,S} X_2$, if and only if the independence of $X_1 \cup Y$ and $X_2 \cup Y$ are equivalent in M for all $Y \subseteq E(M) \setminus S$. A class \mathcal{M} of matroids is called *strongly pigeonhole* [13, Definition 2.10] if there is a function $f: \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ such that, for any matroid $M \in \mathcal{M}$, positive integer λ' , and $S \subseteq E(M)$ with $\lambda_M(S) \leq \lambda'$, the size of the quotient set by $\sim_{M,S}$ is always at most $f(\lambda')$. Thus, if a class \mathcal{M} of matroids is strongly pigeonhole, then the width of BDDs/ZDDs for a matroid $M \in \mathcal{M}$ can be bounded by a value depending only on the connectivity function of M . Funk et al. [14, Proposition 10 and Theorems 18, 22, and 34] showed that several classes of matroids are strongly pigeonhole such as fundamental transversal matroids, 3-connected bicircular matroids, and 3-connected H -gain-graphic matroids for a finite group H .

As a folklore, for a prime power q , the number of minors of a $\text{GF}(q)$ -representable matroid M on $E \setminus E_{\preceq, i}$ is at most $\sum_{d=0}^{\lambda_M(E_{\preceq, i})} \left[\lambda_M(E_{\preceq, i})_d \right]_q$ (see [18, Theorem 2] and [14, Theorems 18]). Here the Gaussian binomial coefficient $\left[\begin{smallmatrix} n \\ k \end{smallmatrix} \right]_q$ is defined by

$$\left[\begin{smallmatrix} n \\ k \end{smallmatrix} \right]_q := \frac{(q^n - 1)(q^{n-1} - 1) \cdots (q^{n-k+1} - 1)}{(q - 1)(q^2 - 1) \cdots (q^k - 1)}$$

for $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $0 \leq k \leq n$.

4.1.2 Proof of Theorem 1.4

The following holds for uniform matroids (see Example 2.2):

Theorem 4.1. *Let M be a uniform matroid on the ground set E . The number of minors of M on $E \setminus E_{\prec,i}$ is $\lambda_M(E_{\prec,i}) + 1$.*

Proof. For $X \subseteq E_{\prec,i}$, the collection of bases of $M|X$ is the family of subsets $B \subseteq X$ of size $\min\{|X|, r(M)\}$. Hence the collection of independent sets of $M|X$ is the family of subsets $I \subseteq E \setminus E_{\prec,i}$ such that $|I| + \min\{|X|, r(M)\} \leq r(M)$, that is, $|I| \leq \max\{r(M) - |X|, 0\}$. The collection of independent sets on $E \setminus E_{\prec,i}$ depends on the size of X :

- If $|E \setminus E_{\prec,i}| \leq r(M) - |X|$, then the collection is $2^{E \setminus E_{\prec,i}}$.
- If $r(M) - |E \setminus E_{\prec,i}| < |X| < r(M)$, then the collection is $\{I \subseteq E \setminus E_{\prec,i} : |I| \leq r(M) - |X|\}$. Note that $E \setminus E_{\prec,i}$ is not independent in $M \setminus (E_{\prec,i} \setminus X) / X$ since $|X| > r(M) - |E \setminus E_{\prec,i}|$, and all subsets of $E \setminus E_{\prec,i}$ of size one are independent in $M \setminus (E_{\prec,i} \setminus X) / X$ since $|X| < r(M)$.
- If $|X| \geq r(M)$, then the only independent set in $M \setminus (E_{\prec,i} \setminus X) / X$ is \emptyset .

Therefore, the number of minors on $E \setminus E_{\prec,i}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} & \min\{|E_{\prec,i}|, r(M)\} - \max\{r(M) - |E \setminus E_{\prec,i}|, 0\} + 1 \\ &= \min\{|E_{\prec,i}|, r(M)\} + \min\{|E \setminus E_{\prec,i}|, r(M)\} - r(M) + 1 \\ &= r_M(E_{\prec,i}) + r_M(E \setminus E_{\prec,i}) - r(M) + 1 = \lambda_M(E_{\prec,i}) + 1. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Remark 4.2. This theorem can be derived from Funk et al. [14, Proposition 10]. However, the proposition focuses on strongly pigeonhole classes and does not directly imply the number of minors. Theorem 4.1 explicitly evaluates the number of minors of uniform matroids. \square

For a free matroid (see Example 2.1) M on the ground set E and all $X \subseteq E$, the value $\lambda_M(X)$ is zero. Thus we obtain the following since all free matroids are uniform:

Corollary 4.3. *Let M be a free matroid on the ground set E . The number of minors of M on $E \setminus E_{\prec,i}$ is one.*

Now the following holds regarding the direct sum of matroids:

Lemma 4.4. *Let M_1 and M_2 be matroids with $E(M_1) \cap E(M_2) = \emptyset$. For $X_1 \subseteq E(M_1)$ (resp. $X_2 \subseteq E(M_2)$), let m_1 (resp. m_2) be the number of minors of M_1 (resp. M_2) on $E(M_1) \setminus X_1$ (resp. $E(M_2) \setminus X_2$). Then the number of minors of $M_1 \oplus M_2$ on $(E(M_1) \cup E(M_2)) \setminus (X_1 \cup X_2)$ is $m_1 m_2$.*

Proof. The number of minors on $(E(M_1) \cup E(M_2)) \setminus (X_1 \cup X_2)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} & |\{\mathcal{I}(M_1 \oplus M_2 \setminus ((X_1 \cup X_2) \setminus (Y_1 \cup Y_2)) / Y_1 \cup Y_2) : Y_1 \subseteq X_1 \text{ and } Y_2 \subseteq X_2\}| \\ &= \left| \left\{ \left\{ \begin{array}{l} I_1 \cup I_2 \subseteq (E(M_1) \cup E(M_2)) \setminus (X_1 \cup X_2) \\ : M_1|Y_1 \text{ has a basis } B_1 \text{ such that } I_1 \cup B_1 \in \mathcal{I}(M_1) \text{ and} \\ M_2|Y_2 \text{ has a basis } B_2 \text{ such that } I_2 \cup B_2 \in \mathcal{I}(M_2) \end{array} \right\} : Y_1 \subseteq X_1 \text{ and } Y_2 \subseteq X_2 \right\} \right| \\ &= \left| \left\{ \{I_1 \subseteq E(M_1) \setminus X_1 : M_1|Y_1 \text{ has a basis } B_1 \text{ such that } I_1 \cup B_1 \in \mathcal{I}(M_1)\} : Y_1 \subseteq X_1 \right\} \right. \\ & \quad \times \\ & \quad \left. \left\{ \{I_2 \subseteq E(M_2) \setminus X_2 : M_2|Y_2 \text{ has a basis } B_2 \text{ such that } I_2 \cup B_2 \in \mathcal{I}(M_2)\} : Y_2 \subseteq X_2 \right\} \right| \\ &= m_1 m_2. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

By this lemma, we can show the result for partition matroids (see Example 2.2):

Theorem 4.5. *Let M be a partition matroid on the ground set E . The number of minors of M on $E \setminus E_{\prec,i}$ is at most $2^{\lambda_M(E_{\prec,i})}$.*

Proof. There exist uniform matroids $U_{r_1, n_1}, \dots, U_{r_k, n_k}$ such that $M = U_{r_1, n_1} \oplus \dots \oplus U_{r_k, n_k}$. Let G_j be the ground set of size n_j of U_{r_j, n_j} for $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. By Theorem 4.1 and Lemma 4.4, the number m of minors on $E \setminus E_{\preceq, i}$ satisfies that

$$\begin{aligned} \log_2 m &= \sum_{j=1}^k \log_2 (\lambda_{U_{r_j, n_j}}(E_{\preceq, i} \cap G_j) + 1) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^k \log_2 (\min\{|E_{\preceq, i} \cap G_j|, r_j\} + \min\{n_j - |E_{\preceq, i} \cap G_j|, r_j\} - r_j + 1) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^k (\min\{|E_{\preceq, i} \cap G_j|, r_j\} + \min\{n_j - |E_{\preceq, i} \cap G_j|, r_j\} - r_j) \\ &= r_M(E_{\preceq, i}) + r_M(E \setminus E_{\preceq, i}) - r(M) = \lambda_M(E_{\preceq, i}). \end{aligned}$$

Here we use the fact that every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfies $n + 1 \leq 2^n$. □

Now we introduce the Gale order. For a set E and $k \in \{0, \dots, |E|\}$, the *Gale order* \preceq_G on a family of k -element subsets of E with respect to a total order \preceq on E is defined as follows. For k -element subset $X \subseteq E$, let $S(X)$ be the sequence of elements in X arranged in ascending order with respect to \preceq and $S(X)_j$ be the j th element of $S(X)$. Then, for k -element subsets $X_1, X_2 \subseteq E$, define \preceq_G such that $X_1 \preceq_G X_2$ if and only if $S(X_1)_j \preceq S(X_2)_j$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. For a matroid M and a total order \preceq on $E(M)$, it is known that there uniquely exists a maximal basis $\text{gb}(M, \preceq) \in \mathcal{B}(M)$ with respect to \preceq_G [15, Theorem 3], and hence $B \preceq_G \text{gb}(M, \preceq)$ for all bases $B \in \mathcal{B}(M)$. This is called the *Gale basis*. In this paper, we denote by $\text{gb}(M, \preceq)$ the Gale basis of a matroid M with respect to a total order \preceq .

For a nested matroid (see Example 2.3) M , there exists a total order \trianglelefteq on $E(M)$ such that, for all $B \subseteq E(M)$ with $|B| = r(M)$, the set B is a basis of M if and only if $B \trianglelefteq_G \text{gb}(M, \trianglelefteq)$ (see [4, Section 2.2]). In this paper, we call such an order \trianglelefteq a *left-justified order* of M . Any left-justified order preserves its properties in the minors of M . Here, for a totally ordered set (E, \preceq) and $X \subseteq E$, we denote by (X, \preceq) the totally ordered set induced from (E, \preceq) .

Lemma 4.6. *Let M be a nested matroid and \trianglelefteq be a left-justified order of M . Then, for all disjoint $X, Y \subseteq E(M)$ and all $B \subseteq E(M) \setminus (X \cup Y)$ with $|B| = r(M \setminus X / Y)$, the set B is a basis of $M \setminus X / Y$ if and only if $B \trianglelefteq_G \text{gb}(M \setminus X / Y, \trianglelefteq)$.*

Proof. Since every minor of nested matroids is nested [24, Lemma 6 and 9], it suffices to show that both (i) $M / \{e\}$ and (ii) $M \setminus \{e\}$ satisfy the condition for any $e \in E(M)$. Note that we only need to show the necessity since the sufficiency is achieved directly by the properties of the Gale basis.

- (i) If e is a loop of M , then we have $\mathcal{B}(M / \{e\}) = \mathcal{B}(M)$. If not, then $\text{gb}(M / \{e\}, \trianglelefteq) \cup \{e\}$ is a basis of M since $\{e\}$ is a basis of $M / \{e\}$. Thus, for all $B \subseteq E(M) \setminus \{e\}$ with $B \trianglelefteq_G \text{gb}(M / \{e\}, \trianglelefteq)$, we have $B \cup \{e\} \trianglelefteq_G \text{gb}(M / \{e\}, \trianglelefteq) \cup \{e\} \trianglelefteq_G \text{gb}(M, \trianglelefteq)$, implying that $B \cup \{e\}$ is a basis of M .
- (ii) If e is a coloop of M , then $M \setminus \{e\} = M / \{e\}$ (see [23, Corollary 3.1.24]). Hence the necessity can be shown by (i). If not, then the rank of $M \setminus \{e\}$ is the same as that of M . Since the collection of bases of $M \setminus \{e\}$ is the family of all maximal elements of $\{B \setminus \{e\} : B \in \mathcal{B}(M)\}$, we have $\mathcal{B}(M \setminus \{e\}) = \{B \in \mathcal{B}(M) : e \notin B\}$. Thus, for all $B \subseteq E(M) \setminus \{e\}$ with $B \trianglelefteq_G \text{gb}(M \setminus \{e\}, \trianglelefteq)$, we have $B \trianglelefteq_G \text{gb}(M \setminus \{e\}, \trianglelefteq) \trianglelefteq_G \text{gb}(M, \trianglelefteq)$, implying that B is a basis of M . □

This lemma allows us to test the equivalence of minors solely with respect to their Gale bases. We can show the same upper bound for nested matroids as for partition matroids:

Theorem 4.7. *Let M be a nested matroid on the ground set E . The number of minors of M on $E \setminus E_{\preceq, i}$ is at most $2^{\lambda_M(E_{\preceq, i})}$.*

Proof. Let \preceq be a left-justified order of M . By Lemma 4.6, the number of minors of M on $E \setminus E_{\preceq, i}$ coincides with the size of $\{\text{gb}(M \setminus (E_{\preceq, i} \setminus X) / X, \preceq) : X \subseteq E_{\preceq, i}\}$.

Now we show that $\text{gb}(M / \{e\}, \preceq) \subseteq \text{gb}(M \setminus \{e\}, \preceq)$ for all $e \in E$. If e is either a loop or coloop of M , then we have $M \setminus \{e\} = M / \{e\}$. Hence assume that e is neither a loop nor a coloop. Let $\text{gb}(M, \preceq) := \{g_1, \dots, g_{r(M)}\}$ such that $g_1 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft g_{r(M)}$. Since e is not a loop, we can define $\ell \in \{1, \dots, r(M)\}$ as $\min\{j : e \preceq g_j\}$. We find the Gale bases of (i) $M / \{e\}$ and (ii) $M \setminus \{e\}$ with ℓ . Note that $r(M) = r(M \setminus \{e\}) = r(M / \{e\}) + 1$. Here, for $X \subseteq E$, we denote by $S(X)$ the sequence of elements in X arranged in ascending order with respect to \preceq and by $S(X)_j$ the j th element of $S(X)$.

- (i) Since $e \preceq g_\ell$, we have $(\text{gb}(M, \preceq) \setminus \{g_\ell\}) \cup \{e\} \preceq_G \text{gb}(M, \preceq)$. Hence $\text{gb}(M, \preceq) \setminus \{g_\ell\}$ is a basis of $M / \{e\}$. Assume that B is a basis of $M / \{e\}$. We can show that $B \cup \{e\} \preceq_G \text{gb}(M, \preceq)$, and there exists exactly one $j \in \{1, \dots, r(M)\}$ such that $S(B \cup \{e\})_j = e$. If $j < \ell$, then $e \preceq g_j$ contradicts the choice of ℓ . If $j = \ell$, then considering the sequences $S(B \cup \{e\})$ and $S(\text{gb}(M, \preceq))$ without the j th element, we have $B \preceq_G \text{gb}(M, \preceq) \setminus \{g_\ell\}$. If $j > \ell$, then $S(B)_\ell \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft S(B)_{j-1} \triangleleft e \preceq g_\ell \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft g_j$ implies that $(S(B)_\ell, \dots, S(B)_{j-1}) \preceq_G (g_{\ell+1}, \dots, g_j)$. Thus $\text{gb}(M, \preceq) \setminus \{g_\ell\}$ is the Gale basis of $M / \{e\}$.
- (ii) Since $\mathcal{B}(M \setminus \{e\}) = \{B \in \mathcal{B}(M) : e \notin B\}$, if $e \triangleleft g_\ell$, then $\text{gb}(M, \preceq)$ is the Gale basis of $M \setminus \{e\}$. Assume that $e = g_\ell$ below.

Let E be a set $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ such that $e_1 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft e_n$ and $m \in \{\ell, \dots, n\}$ be a positive integer such that $e_m = g_\ell$. If $m = \ell$, then $\text{gb}(M, \preceq) = \{e_1, \dots, e_m, g_{\ell+1}, \dots, g_{r(M)}\}$ implies that every basis of M contains e_m , which contradicts that $e = e_m$ is not a coloop. Hence we have $m > \ell$. Now let $k := \min\{j \in \{1, \dots, \ell\} : g_j = e_{m-(\ell-j)}\}$. Then, for $j \in \{1, \dots, r(M)\}$, we can define h_j by

$$h_j := \begin{cases} e_{m-(\ell-j)-1} & \text{if } j \in \{k, \dots, \ell\}, \\ g_j & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By the definition of k , we have $h_1 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft h_{r(M)}$. Let $H := \{h_1, \dots, h_{r(M)}\}$, and then we show that H is the Gale basis of $M \setminus \{e\}$. Note that $e = e_m \notin H$.

Since $h_j \preceq g_j$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, r(M)\}$, the set H is a basis of $M \setminus \{e\}$. Now suppose that there exists a basis $B \in \mathcal{B}(M \setminus \{e\})$ such that $H \triangleleft_G B$. Since B is also a basis of M , every $j \in \{1, \dots, r(M)\}$ satisfies that $S(B)_j \preceq g_j$. Hence there exists $x \in \{k, \dots, \ell - 1\}$ such that $h_x = e_{m-(\ell-x)-1} \triangleleft S(B)_x = g_x = e_{m-(\ell-x)}$. By the definition of H , we can show that $h_j \triangleleft S(B)_j = g_j$ for all $j \in \{x, \dots, \ell - 1\}$. In particular, for $j = \ell - 1$, we deduce that $S(B)_{\ell-1} = e_{m-1}$. However, since $e_m \notin B$, there is no element $S(B)_\ell$ such that $S(B)_{\ell-1} = e_{m-1} \triangleleft S(B)_\ell \preceq g_\ell = e_m$; a contradiction. Thus H is the Gale basis of $M \setminus \{e\}$. Note that H can be expressed as $(\text{gb}(M, \preceq) \setminus \{g_\ell\}) \cup \{e_{m-(\ell-k)-1}\}$.

In summary, $\text{gb}(M, \preceq) \setminus \{g_\ell\}$ is the Gale basis of $M / \{e\}$, and $\text{gb}(M, \preceq)$ or $(\text{gb}(M, \preceq) \setminus \{g_\ell\}) \cup \{e_{m-(\ell-k)-1}\}$ is the Gale basis of $M \setminus \{e\}$. This implies that $\text{gb}(M / \{e\}, \preceq) \subseteq \text{gb}(M \setminus \{e\}, \preceq)$ for all $e \in E$. Then it follows that $\text{gb}(M / E_{\preceq, i}, \preceq) \subseteq \text{gb}(M \setminus (E_{\preceq, i} \setminus X) / X, \preceq) \subseteq \text{gb}(M \setminus E_{\preceq, i}, \preceq)$ for all $X \subseteq E_{\preceq, i}$. Therefore, the number of minors on $E \setminus E_{\preceq, i}$ is at most

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{|\text{gb}(M \setminus E_{\preceq, i}, \preceq) \setminus \text{gb}(M / E_{\preceq, i}, \preceq)|} &= 2^{|\text{gb}(M \setminus E_{\preceq, i}, \preceq)| - |\text{gb}(M / E_{\preceq, i}, \preceq)|} \\ &= 2^{r_M(E \setminus E_{\preceq, i}) - (r(M) - r_M(E_{\preceq, i}))} = 2^{\lambda_M(E_{\preceq, i})}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

So far, we have discussed classes of matroids where the width can be bounded by a value depending only on $\lambda(E_{\preceq,i})$. However, some classes can not be bounded. Before showing such classes, we can show the following:

Lemma 4.8. *The i th width of the ZDD $Z(\mathcal{I}(M), (E, \preceq))$ is equal to the number of minors of M on $E \setminus E_{\preceq,i}$ for which e_i is not a loop.*

Proof. As mentioned above, the sub-ZDDs of $Z(\mathcal{I}(M), (E, \preceq))$ rooted by a non-terminal node with label e_i represent the collections of independent sets of some minors of M on $E \setminus E_{\preceq,i}$. Conversely, there is a sub-ZDD representing the collection of independent sets for every minor on $E \setminus E_{\preceq,i}$. If e_i is not a loop, that is, $\{e_i\}$ is independent in a certain minor, then the corresponding sub-ZDD contains non-terminal nodes with label e_i , implying that the root label of this sub-ZDD is e_i . On the other hand, if e_i is a loop, then the label e_i does not appear in non-terminal nodes of the sub-ZDD. \square

We also show that the i th width of the BDD/ZDD for a transversal (see Example 2.3) or laminar (see Example 2.4) matroid cannot be bounded by a value depending only on $\lambda(E_{\preceq,i})$.

Theorem 4.9. *There does not exist a function $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that, for any transversal matroid M on the ground set E , total order \preceq on E , and $i \in \{0, \dots, |E| - 1\}$, the i th width of the ZDD $Z(\mathcal{I}(M), (E, \preceq))$ is at most $f(\lambda_M(E_{\preceq,i}))$.*

Proof. Since the class of transversal matroids is not strongly pigeonhole [14, Proposition 20], there exists a positive integer μ such that, for all positive integers $g(\mu)$ depending only on μ , there are a transversal matroid M' and $S \subseteq E(M')$ with $\lambda_{M'}(S) \leq \mu$ satisfying that the size of the quotient set by $\sim_{M',S}$ is greater than $g(\mu)$. Suppose that $f(\mu)$ is an upper bound on the width. There exist a transversal matroid M' on the ground set $E^{(1)}$ and $S \subseteq E^{(1)}$ with $\lambda_{M'}(S) \leq \mu$ such that the size of the quotient set by $\sim_{M',S}$ is at least $f(\mu) + 2$. Let $d := \mu - \lambda_{M'}(S)$. Then, since the direct sum $M' \oplus U_{1,1} \oplus U_{d,2d}$ of the matroid M' , a free matroid $U_{1,1}$ on the ground set $E^{(2)}$, and a uniform matroid $U_{d,2d}$ on the ground set $E^{(3)} \cup E^{(4)}$ is transversal (see [23, Proposition 4.2.11]), it suffices to show that the $(m+d)$ -th width of the ZDD $Z(\mathcal{I}(M' \oplus U_{1,1} \oplus U_{d,2d}), (E^{(1)} \cup E^{(2)} \cup E^{(3)} \cup E^{(4)}, \preceq))$ is greater than $f(\mu)$. Here let $S := \{s_1, \dots, s_m\}$, $E^{(1)} \setminus S := \{\bar{s}_1, \dots, \bar{s}_{n-m}\}$, $E^{(2)} := \{e_{2,1}\}$, $E^{(3)} := \{e_{3,1}, \dots, e_{3,d}\}$, $E^{(4)} := \{e_{4,1}, \dots, e_{4,d}\}$, and \preceq be a total order on $E^{(1)} \cup E^{(2)} \cup E^{(3)} \cup E^{(4)}$ such that $s_1 \preceq \dots \preceq s_m \preceq e_{3,1} \preceq \dots \preceq e_{3,d} \preceq e_{2,1} \preceq \bar{s}_1 \preceq \dots \preceq \bar{s}_{n-m} \preceq e_{4,1} \preceq \dots \preceq e_{4,d}$.

By Theorem 4.1 and Lemma 4.4, the number of minors of $M' \oplus U_{1,1} \oplus U_{d,2d}$ on $(E^{(1)} \setminus S) \cup E^{(2)} \cup E^{(4)}$ is the product of the number of minors of M' on $E^{(1)} \setminus S$, of $U_{1,1}$ on $E^{(2)}$, and of $U_{d,2d}$ on $E^{(4)}$. Moreover, $E^{(2)}$ is independent in all minors of $M' \oplus U_{1,1} \oplus U_{d,2d}$ on $(E^{(1)} \setminus S) \cup E^{(2)} \cup E^{(4)}$. Thus, by Lemma 4.8, the $(m+d)$ -th width of $Z(\mathcal{I}(M' \oplus U_{1,1} \oplus U_{d,2d}), (E^{(1)} \cup E^{(2)} \cup E^{(3)} \cup E^{(4)}, \preceq))$ is at least $(f(\mu) + 1) \cdot 1 \cdot (\lambda_{U_{d,2d}}(E^{(3)}) + 1) = (f(\mu) + 1)(d + 1)$. However, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{M' \oplus U_{1,1} \oplus U_{d,2d}}(S \cup E^{(3)}) &= (r_{M'}(S) + d) + (r_{M'}(E^{(1)} \setminus S) + 1 + d) - (r(M') + 1 + d) \\ &= \lambda_{M'}(S) + d = \mu; \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. \square

Theorem 4.10. *There does not exist a function $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that, for any laminar matroid M on the ground set E , total order \preceq on E , and $i \in \{0, \dots, |E| - 1\}$, the i th width of the ZDD $Z(\mathcal{I}(M), (E, \preceq))$ is at most $f(\lambda_M(E_{\preceq,i}))$.*

Proof. Suppose that there exists a constant upper bound $f(2)$. Let E be a set $\{e_1, \dots, e_{2(f(2)+2)}\}$, \preceq be a total order on E such that $e_1 \prec e_3 \prec \dots \prec e_{2f(2)+3} \prec e_2 \prec e_4 \prec \dots \prec e_{2(f(2)+2)}$, and M be a laminar matroid on E whose collection of independent sets is

$$\{I \subseteq E : |I \cap \{e_{2j-1}, e_{2j}\}| \leq 1 \text{ and } |I \cap \{e_1, \dots, e_{2j}\}| \leq 2 \text{ for all } j \in \{1, \dots, f(2) + 2\}\}.$$

Then, for $j \in \{1, 3, \dots, 2f(2)+3\}$, the collection $\mathcal{I}(M \setminus (E_{\preceq, i} \setminus \{e_j\}) / \{e_j\})$ equals $\{\emptyset, \{e_2\}, \{e_4\}, \dots, \{e_{2(f(2)+2)}\}\} \setminus \{e_{j+1}\}$. Thus, by Lemma 4.8, the $(f(2) + 2)$ -th width of $Z(\mathcal{I}(M), (E, \preceq))$ is at least $f(2) + 1$. On the other hands, we have $\lambda_M(E_{\preceq, i}) = 2 + 2 - 2 = 2$; a contradiction. \square

Theorems 4.1, 4.5, and 4.7 and Corollary 4.3 collectively establish Theorem 1.4. These results, along with Theorems 4.9 and 4.10, are illustrated as in Figure 1.3. Note that the relations between the classes of matroids can be structured with reference to the following three examples.

Example 4.11 (Transversal matroid that is not laminar). For $r \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1, 2\}$, let $E_r := \{e_1, \dots, e_{2r-1}\}$ and

$$\mathcal{I}_r := \{I \subseteq E : |I| \leq r, I \neq \{e_1, \dots, e_r\}, \text{ and } I \neq \{e_r, \dots, e_{2r-1}\}\}.$$

Then Y_r is a transversal matroid, where $Y_r := (E_r, \mathcal{I}_r)$. Indeed, Y_r has the presentation $\{\{e_1, \dots, e_{r-1}\}, \{e_2, \dots, e_{r+1}\}, \{e_3, \dots, e_{r+2}\} \dots, \{e_{r-1}, \dots, e_{2r-2}\}, \{e_{r+1}, \dots, e_{2r-1}\}\}$. On the other hands, Y_r is not laminar [12, Theorem 1.2]. \square

Example 4.12 (Laminar matroid that is not transversal). For the undirected graph G in Figure 1.1, the cycle matroid $M(G)$ of G is not transversal (see [23, Example 1.6.3]). On the other hand, the collection of independent sets of $M(G)$ can be represented as

$$\left\{ I \subseteq \{e_1, \dots, e_6\} : \begin{array}{l} |I \cap \{e_1, e_2\}| \leq 1, |I \cap \{e_3, e_4\}| \leq 1, |I \cap \{e_5, e_6\}| \leq 1, \\ \text{and } |I \cap \{e_1, \dots, e_6\}| \leq 2 \end{array} \right\}.$$

Thus $M(G)$ is laminar. \square

Example 4.13 (Matroid that is not nested but both transversal and laminar). Let $E := \{e_1, \dots, e_6\}$ and

$$\mathcal{I} := \{I \subseteq E : |I \cap \{e_1, e_2, e_3\}| \leq 2, |I \cap \{e_4, e_5, e_6\}| \leq 2, \text{ and } |I \cap E| \leq 3\}.$$

Then N^3 is a laminar matroid, where $N^3 := (E, \mathcal{I})$. Moreover, N^3 is transversal because it has the presentation $(\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}, \{e_4, e_5, e_6\}, E)$. On the other hands, N^3 is not nested [24, Theorem 13]. \square

4.2 Upper bounds on widths in good orders

In the previous section, we considered any total order \preceq on E . However, certain orders may result in smaller widths of BDDs/ZDDs. For instance, as discussed in Section 4.1.1, there exists a total order \preceq^* on E such that the width of the BDD/ZDD for the cycle matroid of an undirected graph G with respect to (E, \preceq^*) is at most the $\text{lw}(G)$ -th Bell number, where $\text{lw}(G)$ is the linear-width [29, F9] of G .

In this section, we use the pathwidth of matroids as a parameter of the width and prove Theorem 1.5. Recall from Section 1 that the pathwidth $\text{pw}(M)$ of a matroid M on the n -element set E is defined by

$$\text{pw}(M) := \min\{\max\{\lambda_M(E_{\preceq, i}) : i \in \{1, \dots, n\}\} : \preceq \text{ is a total order on } E\}.$$

Note that we sometimes use the following definition since $\lambda_M(\emptyset) = \lambda_M(E) = 0$:

$$\text{pw}(M) := \min\{\max\{\lambda_M(E_{\preceq, i}) : i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}\} : \preceq \text{ is a total order on } E\}.$$

Recall also from Section 1 that we refer to the four types of BDDs/ZDDs representing either a collection of the independent sets or bases of a matroid as BDDs/ZDDs for a matroid.

We first provide the upper bound for uniform matroids.

Theorem 4.14. *Let M be a uniform matroid on the ground set E . For all total orders \preceq on E , the width of the BDDs/ZDDs for M with respect to (E, \preceq) is at most $\text{pw}(M) + 1$.*

Proof. The pathwidth of M is $\max\{\min\{i, r(M)\} + \min\{n - i, r(M)\} - r(M) : i \in \{0, \dots, n - 1\}\}$. By Theorem 4.1, the width of the BDD/ZDD for M with respect to (E, \preceq) is at most $\max\{\lambda_M(E_{\preceq, i}) + 1 : i \in \{0, \dots, n - 1\}\} = \text{pw}(M) + 1$. \square

The pathwidth of a free matroid is clearly zero. Thus we obtain the following since all free matroids are uniform:

Corollary 4.15. *Let M be a free matroid on the ground set E . For all total orders \preceq on E , the width of the BDDs/ZDDs for M with respect to (E, \preceq) is at most one.*

The last theorem and corollary consider any total order on E . The following theorems show that a certain total order on E can ensure that the width of BDDs/ZDDs is at most $\text{pw}(M) + 1$.

Theorem 4.16. *Let M be a partition matroid on the ground set E . There exists a total order \preceq^* on E such that the width of the BDD/ZDD for M with respect to (E, \preceq^*) is at most $\text{pw}(M) + 1$.*

Proof. It suffices to consider the case when $r(M) \geq 1$. There exist uniform matroids $U_{r_1, n_1}, \dots, U_{r_k, n_k}$ such that $M = U_{r_1, n_1} \oplus \dots \oplus U_{r_k, n_k}$, where $k \geq 1$ and $n = \sum_{j=1}^k n_j$. For $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, let $E^{(j)} := \{e_{j,1}, \dots, e_{j, n_j}\}$ as the ground set of U_{r_j, n_j} and $p := \arg \max_{j \in \{1, \dots, k\}} \{n_j - r_j, r_j\}$.

First, we show the lower bound on the pathwidth of M . For any total order \preceq on E , there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $|E_{\preceq, i} \cap E^{(p)}| = r_p$. Thus we have $\text{pw}(M) \geq r_p + \min\{n_p - r_p, r_p\} - r_p = \min\{n_p - r_p, r_p\}$.

Next, we can define the total order \preceq^* on E such that $e_{1,1} \prec^* \dots \prec^* e_{1, n_1} \prec^* e_{2,1} \prec^* \dots \prec^* e_{2, n_2} \prec^* \dots \prec^* e_{k,1} \prec^* \dots \prec^* e_{k, n_k}$. By Theorem 4.1 and Lemma 4.4, the width of the BDD/ZDD for M with respect to (E, \preceq^*) is at most

$$\begin{aligned} & \max\{\lambda_{U_{r_j, n_j}}(\{e_{j,1}, \dots, e_{j,i}\}) + 1 : i \in \{0, \dots, n_j - 1\} \text{ and } j \in \{1, \dots, k\}\} \\ &= \max\{\min\{i, r_j\} + \min\{n_j - i, r_j\} - r_j + 1 : i \in \{0, \dots, n_j - 1\} \text{ and } j \in \{1, \dots, k\}\} \\ &= \max\{\min\{i - r_j, 0\} + \min\{n_j - i, r_j\} + 1 : i \in \{0, \dots, n_j - 1\} \text{ and } j \in \{1, \dots, k\}\} \\ &= \max\{\min\{n_j - r_j, r_j\} : j \in \{1, \dots, k\}\} + 1 = \min\{n_p - r_p, r_p\} + 1. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Theorem 4.17. *Let M be a nested matroid on the ground set E and \trianglelefteq be a left-justified order of M . Then the width of the BDD/ZDD for M with respect to (E, \trianglelefteq) is at most $\text{pw}(M) + 1$.*

Proof. It suffices to consider the case when $r(M) \geq 1$. Let $E := \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ such that $e_1 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft e_n$ and $\text{gb}(M, \trianglelefteq) := \{g_1, \dots, g_{r(M)}\}$ such that $g_1 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft g_{r(M)}$. Here $\text{gb}(M, \trianglelefteq)$ is the Gale basis of M with respect to \trianglelefteq (see Section 4.1). Moreover, let $p := |\{j \in \{1, \dots, r(M)\} : e_{r(M)} \triangleleft g_j\}|$.

First, we show that $\text{pw}(M) \geq p$. Note that $1 \leq r(M) - p + 1 \leq r(M) + p \leq n$ if $p \geq 1$. For any total order \preceq on E , there exists $i \in \{0, \dots, n - 1\}$ such that $|E_{\preceq, i} \cap \{e_{r(M)-p+1}, \dots, e_{r(M)+p}\}| = p$. Since $e_j \trianglelefteq g_j$ for $j \in \{1, \dots, r(M) - p\}$ and $e_j \trianglelefteq g_{j-p}$ for $j \in \{r(M) + 1, \dots, r(M) + p\}$, we have $r_M(E_{\preceq, i}) \geq |E_{\preceq, i} \cap \{e_1, \dots, e_{r(M)-p}\}| + p$. Similarly, we have $r_M(E \setminus E_{\preceq, i}) \geq |(E \setminus E_{\preceq, i}) \cap \{e_1, \dots, e_{r(M)-p}\}| + p$. Thus we can show that $\text{pw}(M) \geq |\{e_1, \dots, e_{r(M)-p}\}| + 2p - r(M) = p$.

Next, we find the upper bound on the width of the BDD/ZDD for M with respect to (E, \trianglelefteq) . By Lemma 4.6, the size of $\{\text{gb}(M \setminus (E_{\trianglelefteq, i} \setminus X) / X, \trianglelefteq) : X \subseteq E_{\trianglelefteq, i}\}$ bounds the i th width. Now we show that the Gale basis of $M \setminus (E_{\trianglelefteq, i} \setminus X) / X$ equals $\{g_{r(M)-r(M \setminus (E_{\trianglelefteq, i} \setminus X) / X) + 1}, \dots, g_{r(M)}\}$ for all $X \subseteq E_{\trianglelefteq, i}$. It suffices to show that the Gale basis of (i) $M / \{e_1\}$ is $\{g_{r(M)-r(M/\{e_1\})+1}, \dots, g_{r(M)}\}$ and of (ii) $M \setminus \{e_1\}$ is $\{g_{r(M)-r(M \setminus \{e_1\})+1}, \dots, g_{r(M)}\}$.

(i) Since $e_1 \trianglelefteq g_1$, we have $r(M / \{e_1\}) = r(M) - 1$. The same arguments as in (i) of the proof of Theorem 4.7 can be applied.

Algorithm 4.1 Algorithm for a rank oracle

Input: A ZDD $Z(\mathcal{I})$ for a collection \mathcal{I} of independent sets of a matroid M with respect to a totally ordered set $(E(M), \preceq)$ and a set $X \subseteq E(M)$

Output: The rank $r_M(X)$ of X

```
1: function RANK( $Z(\mathcal{I}), X$ )
2:   if  $\text{root}(Z(\mathcal{I})) = \top$  or  $X = \emptyset$  then return 0
3:    $e := \text{label}(\text{root}(Z(\mathcal{I})))$   $\triangleright$  The element  $e$  exists since  $\text{root}(Z(\mathcal{I}))$  is not terminal.
4:   if  $e \prec \min X$  then return RANK( $\text{child}_0(Z(\mathcal{I})), X$ )  $\triangleright$  Calculate  $r_{M \setminus \{e\}}(X)$ .
5:   else if  $e \succ \min X$  then return RANK( $Z(\mathcal{I}), X \setminus \{\min X\}$ )  $\triangleright$   $\min X$  is a loop of  $M$ .
6:   else return RANK( $\text{child}_1(Z(\mathcal{I})), X \setminus \{e\}$ ) + 1  $\triangleright$  Calculate  $r_{M/\{e\}}(X \setminus \{e\}) + 1$ .
```

- (ii) If e_1 is a coloop, then it follows from (i) since $M \setminus \{e_1\} = M / \{e_1\}$. If e_1 is neither a loop nor a coloop, then we have $e_1 \prec^* g_1$. The set $\text{gb}(M, \preceq)$ is the Gale basis of $M \setminus \{e_1\}$ by the same arguments as in (ii) of the proof of Theorem 4.7.

Therefore, the i th width is at most

$$\begin{aligned} r(M \setminus E_{\preceq, i}) - r(M / E_{\preceq, i}) + 1 &= |\{j \in \{1, \dots, r(M)\} : e_{i+1} \preceq g_j\}| - (r(M) - \min\{i, r(M)\}) + 1 \\ &= |\{j \in \{1, \dots, r(M)\} : e_{i+1} \preceq g_j\}| + \min\{i - r(M), 0\} + 1, \end{aligned}$$

which reaches its maximum value $p + 1$ when $i = \min\{r(M), n - 1\}$. \square

Theorems 4.16 and 4.17 establish Theorem 1.5.

4.3 Application: implementation of a rank oracle

Matroids are often represented as oracles in algorithms on matroids (see [17, 25]). This section shows how to implement matroid oracles, such as a rank oracle, for a matroid M by using the property that the 0-child (resp. 1-child) of the ZDD $Z(\mathcal{I}(M))$ which has the root with label $e \in E(M)$ represents the collection of independent sets of $M \setminus \{e\}$ (resp. $M / \{e\}$).

One of the matroid oracles is an independence oracle. The *independence oracle* for M determines whether a given set $I \subseteq E(M)$ is independent in M . Since membership queries to a ZDD can be answered in time proportional to the size of its ground set, the ZDD $Z(\mathcal{I}(M))$ can simulate this oracle in $O(|E(M)|)$ time. This is one of the reasons why we use BDDs/ZDDs as data structures for representing matroids.

Another oracle is a rank oracle. The *rank oracle* for M provides the rank $r_M(X)$ of a given set $X \subseteq E(M)$. Simulating this oracle in a computer usually requires $O(|X|)$ probes of the independence oracle for M (see [25, Proposition 1(3)] and [17, Proposition 2.1]) or an $O(2^{|E(M)|})$ space preprocessing. However, the ZDD $Z(\mathcal{I}(M))$ can simulate the rank oracle in $O(|E(M)|)$ time as shown in Algorithm 4.1. This algorithm is based on the following (see [23, Proposition 3.1.6]):

$$r_M(X) = \begin{cases} r_{M \setminus \{e\}}(X) & \text{if } e \notin X, \\ r_{M/\{e\}}(X \setminus \{e\}) + r_M(\{e\}) & \text{if } e \in X, \end{cases}$$

for all $e \in E(M)$, which allows us to reduce the calculation to a case with a smaller ground set. Other basic oracles for M can be simulated in $O(|E(M)|)$ or $O(|E(M)|^2)$ time by using this rank oracle.

Acknowledgments

The second author was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP22K17854. The third author was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP20H00605, JP20H05964.

References

- [1] F. Ardila. The Catalan matroid. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 104(1):49–62, 2003.
- [2] N. Bansal, R. A. Pendavingh, and J. G. van der Pol. On the number of matroids. *Combinatorica*, 35(3):253–277, 2015.
- [3] L. J. Billera, N. Jia, and V. Reiner. A quasisymmetric function for matroids. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 30(8):1727–1757, 2009.
- [4] J. E. Bonin. A characterization of positroids, with applications to amalgams and excluded minors, 2024.
- [5] J. E. Bonin and A. de Mier. Lattice path matroids: structural properties. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 27(5):701–738, 2006.
- [6] J. E. Bonin and A. de Mier. The lattice of cyclic flats of a matroid. *Annals of Combinatorics*, 12(2):155–170, 2008.
- [7] J. E. Bonin, A. de Mier, and M. Noy. Lattice path matroids: enumerative aspects and Tutte polynomials. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 104(1):63–94, 2003.
- [8] R. E. Bryant. Graph-based algorithms for boolean function manipulation. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, 35(8):677–691, 1986.
- [9] H. Crapo and W. Schmitt. A free subalgebra of the algebra of matroids. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 26(7):1066–1085, 2005.
- [10] H. H. Crapo. Single-element extensions of matroids. *Journal of Research of the National Bureau of Standards, Section B: Mathematics and Mathematical Physics*, 69B(1–2):55–65, 1965.
- [11] J. Edmonds and D. R. Fulkerson. Transversals and matroid partition. *Journal of Research of the National Bureau of Standards, Section B: Mathematics and Mathematical Physics*, 69B(3):147–153, 1965.
- [12] T. Fife and J. Oxley. Laminar matroids. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 62:206–216, 2017.
- [13] D. Funk, D. Mayhew, and M. Newman. Tree automata and pigeonhole classes of matroids: I. *Algorithmica*, 84(7):1795–1834, 2022.
- [14] D. Funk, D. Mayhew, and M. Newman. Tree automata and pigeonhole classes of matroids: II. *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 30(3), 2023.
- [15] D. Gale. Optimal assignments in an ordered set: an application of matroid theory. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory*, 4(2):176–180, 1968.

- [16] J. Geelen, B. Gerards, and G. Whittle. On Rota’s conjecture and excluded minors containing large projective geometries. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 96(3):405–425, 2006.
- [17] D. Hausmann and B. Korte. Algorithmic versus axiomatic definitions of matroids. In *Mathematical Programming at Oberwolfach*, pages 98–111. Springer, 1981.
- [18] D. Král’. Decomposition width of matroids. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 160(6):913–923, 2012.
- [19] S. Minato. Zero-suppressed BDDs for set manipulation in combinatorial problems. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Design Automation Conference (DAC ’93)*, pages 272–277, 1993.
- [20] T. Nakasawa. Zur Axiomatik der linearen Abhängigkeit. I. *Science Reports of the Tokyo Bunrika Daigaku, Section A*, 2(43):235–255, 1935.
- [21] T. Nakasawa. Zur Axiomatik der linearen Abhängigkeit, III (Schluss). *Science Reports of the Tokyo Bunrika Daigaku, Section A*, 3(55):123–136, 1936.
- [22] T. Nakasawa. Zur Axiomatik der linearen Abhängigkeit. II. *Science Reports of the Tokyo Bunrika Daigaku, Section A*, 3(50–51):45–69, 1936.
- [23] J. Oxley. *Matroid Theory*. Oxford University Press, 2nd edition, 2011.
- [24] J. Oxley, K. Prendergast, and D. Row. Matroids whose ground sets are domains of functions. *Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society. Series A. Pure Mathematics and Statistics*, 32(3):380–387, 1982.
- [25] G. C. Robinson and J. A. D. Welsh. The computational complexity of matroid properties. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 87(1):29–45, 1980.
- [26] K. Sekine, H. Imai, and S. Tani. Computing the Tutte polynomial of a graph of moderate size. In *Algorithms and Computations*, pages 224–233, 1995.
- [27] P. D. Seymour. On the connectivity function of a matroid. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 45(1):25–30, 1988.
- [28] M. Sohoni. Rapid mixing of some linear matroids and other combinatorial objects. *Graphs and Combinatorics*, 15(1):93–107, 1999.
- [29] R. Thomas. Tree-decompositions of graphs (lecture notes). School of Mathematics, Georgia Institute of Technology, 1996. <https://thomas.math.gatech.edu/PAP/treenotes.pdf>.
- [30] W. T. Tutte. Connectivity in matroids. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 18:1301–1324, 1966.
- [31] H. Whitney. On the abstract properties of linear dependence. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 57(3):509–533, 1935.