MATROID FRAGILITY AND RELAXATIONS OF CIRCUIT HYPERPLANES

JIM GEELEN AND FLORIAN HOERSCH

ABSTRACT. We relate two conjectures that play a central role in the reported proof of Rota's Conjecture. Let \mathbb{F} be a finite field. The first conjecture states that: the branch-width of any \mathbb{F} -representable N-fragile matroid is bounded by a function depending only upon \mathbb{F} and N. The second conjecture states that: if a matroid M_2 is obtained from a matroid M_1 by relaxing a circuit-hyperplane and both M_1 and M_2 are \mathbb{F} -representable, then the branch-width of M_1 is bounded by a function depending only upon \mathbb{F} . Our main result is that the second conjecture implies the first.

1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to relate two concepts, N-fragile matroids and circuit-hyperplane relaxations, which both play a central role in the reported proof of Rota's Conjecture [1].

A matroid M is N-fragile if N is a minor of M, but there is no element $e \in E(M)$ such that N is a minor of both $M \setminus e$ and M/e or, equivalently, there is a unique partition (C, D) of E(M) - E(N) such that $N = M/C \setminus D$. Note that here we want N, itself, as a minor, not just an isomorphic copy of N.

For a finite field \mathbb{F} of order q, we let \mathbb{F}^k denote an extension field of \mathbb{F} of order q^k . We prove the following result.

Theorem 1.1. Let \mathbb{F} be a finite field, let N be a matroid with k elements, let B be a basis of N, and let M be an \mathbb{F} -representable N-fragile matroid. Then there exist \mathbb{F}^{2k^2} -representable matroids M_1 and M_2 on the same ground set and elements $c, d \in E(M_1)$ such that M_2 is obtained from M_1 by relaxing a circuit-hyperplane and $M/B\setminus (E(N)-B)=M_1/c\setminus d$.

Date: September 9, 2019.

¹⁹⁹¹ Mathematics Subject Classification. 05B35.

Key words and phrases. Rota's Conjecture, matroid fragility, circuit-hyperplane relaxation.

This research was partially supported by grants from the Office of Naval Research [N00014-10-1-0851] and NSERC [203110-2011].

The proof of Rota's Conjecture relies on the reported proofs of the following two conjectures by Geelen, Gerards, and Whittle.

Conjecture 1.2. Let \mathbb{F} be a finite field and let N be a matroid. Then the branch-width of any \mathbb{F} -representable N-fragile matroid is bounded by a constant depending only upon $|\mathbb{F}|$ and |N|.

For the definition of branch-width see Oxley [2]. For this paper it suffices to know that branch-width is a parameter associated with a matroid M, which we denote here by bw(M), and that for any minor N of M we have

$$bw(M) - (|E(M)| - |E(N)|) \le bw(N) \le bw(M).$$

Conjecture 1.3. Let H be a circuit-hyperplane in a matroid M_1 and let M_2 be the matroid obtained by relaxing H. If M_1 and M_2 are both representable over a finite field \mathbb{F} , then the branch-width of M_1 is bounded by a constant depending only upon $|\mathbb{F}|$.

Theorem 1.1 shows that Conjecture 1.3 implies Conjecture 1.2.

Our proof of Theorem 1.1 is via a sequence of results on matrices, but those results have interesting consequences for matroids, which we state below.

We call a matroid *isolated* if each of its components has only one element. Thus an isolated matroid consists only of loops and coloops; the set of coloops is the unique basis. The isolated matroid on ground set E with basis B is denoted ISO(B, E). For integers r and n with $0 \le r \le n$ we denote $ISO(\{1, \ldots, r\}, \{1, \ldots, n\})$ by ISO(r, n).

The following result shows that, in order to prove Theorem 1.1, it suffices to consider the case that N is an isolated matroid.

Theorem 1.4. Let \mathbb{F} be a finite field, let B be a basis of a matroid N, and let M be an \mathbb{F} -representable N-fragile matroid. Then there exists an \mathbb{F} -representable ISO(B, E(N))-fragile matroid M' such that E(M') = E(M) and M'/B = M/B.

The following result shows that, in order to prove Theorem 1.1, it suffices to consider the case that N = ISO(1, 2).

Theorem 1.5. Let \mathbb{F} be a finite field, let X_1 and X_2 be disjoint finite sets with $|X_1 \cup X_2| = k$, let M be an \mathbb{F} -representable ISO $(X_1, X_1 \cup X_2)$ -fragile matroid, and let c and d be distinct elements not in M. Then there exists an \mathbb{F}^{k^2} -representable ISO $(\{c\}, \{c, d\})$ -fragile matroid M' such that $E(M') = E(M) - (X_1 \cup X_2) \cup \{c, d\}$ and $M'/c \setminus d = M/X_1 \setminus X_2$.

The final result shows that an \mathbb{F} -representable ISO(1,2)-fragile matroid has a circuit-hyperplane whose relaxation results in an \mathbb{F}^2 -representable matroid.

Theorem 1.6. Let $N = \text{ISO}(\{c\}, \{c, d\})$ where $c \neq d$, let M be an N-fragile matroid representable over a finite field \mathbb{F} , and let C and D be disjoint subsets of E(M) such that $N = M/C \setminus D$. Then $C \cup \{d\}$ is a circuit-hyperplane of M and the matroid obtained from M by relaxing $C \cup \{d\}$ is \mathbb{F}^2 -representable.

Observe that Theorem 1.1 is an immediate consequence of Theorems 1.4, 1.5, and 1.6.

We assume that the reader is familiar with elementary matroid theory; we use the terminology and notation of Oxley [2].

2. Fragile matrices

In this section we will give a matrix interpretation for minor-fragility in representable matroids. Towards this end, we develop convenient terminology for viewing a representable matroid with respect to a fixed basis.

For a basis B of a matroid M and a set $X \subseteq E(M)$ we denote the minor $M/(B-X)\setminus (E(M)-(B\cup X))$ of M by M[X,B]. The following result is routine and well-known.

Lemma 2.1. If N is a minor of a matroid M, then there is a basis B of M such that N = M[E(N), B].

If B is a basis of a matroid M and N = M[E(N), B], then we say that B displays N.

When we refer to a matrix $A \in \mathbb{F}^{S_1 \times S_2}$ we are implicitly defining \mathbb{F} to be a field and S_1 and S_2 to be finite sets. Let $A \in \mathbb{F}^{S_1 \times S_2}$ be a matrix where S_1 and S_2 are disjoint. We let [I, A] denote the matrix obtained from A by appending an $S_1 \times S_1$ identity matrix; thus $[I, A] \in \mathbb{F}^{S_1 \times (S_1 \cup S_2)}$. For $X \subseteq S_1 \cup S_2$, we let A[X] denote the submatrix $A[X \cap S_1, X \cap S_2]$.

If B is a basis of an \mathbb{F} -representable matroid M, then there is a matrix $A \in \mathbb{F}^{B \times E(M) - B}$ such that M = M([I, A]); we call A a standard representation with respect to B. Note that, if N is a minor of M displayed by B and A is a standard representation of M with respect to B, then A[E(N)] is a standard representation of N with respect to the basis $B \cap E(N)$.

For a finite set X, a matrix $A \in \mathbb{F}^{S_1 \times S_2}$ is called X-fragile if

• S_1 and S_2 are disjoint,

- $X \subseteq S_1 \cup S_2$,
- A[X] = 0, and
- for each nonempty subset Y of $(S_1 \cup S_2) X$, we have rank $(A[X \cup Y]) > \operatorname{rank}(A[Y])$.

Note that, if $A \in \mathbb{F}^{S_1 \times S_2}$ is an X-fragile matrix, then $M([I, A[X]]) = ISO(X \cap S_1, X)$.

The following result provides us with a matrix interpretation of minor-fragility for representable matroids.

Lemma 2.2. Let N be a matroid, let M be an \mathbb{F} -representable N-fragile matroid, let B be a basis of M that displays N, and let A be a standard representation of M with respect to B. If A' is the matrix obtained from A by replacing each entry in the submatrix A[E(N)] with 0, then A' is E(N)-fragile.

Proof. Let X = E(N). Suppose that A' is not X-fragile. Then there is a non-empty set $Y \subseteq E(M) - X$ such that $\operatorname{rank}(A'[X \cup Y]) = \operatorname{rank}(A'[Y])$. By removing the other elements, we may assume that $E(M) = X \cup Y$. Let $C = B \cap Y$, D = Y - B, and let $B_N = B \cap E(N)$. Observe that $\operatorname{rank}(A') = \operatorname{rank}(A[C, D])$ by the choice of Y. We will obtain a contradiction to the fact that M is N-fragile by showing that $N = M/D \setminus C$.

We start by constructing an isomorphic copy A_0 of A'[B, X - B] by relabelling the columns so that the indices form a set Z disjoint from E(N). Now let $A_1 = [A, A_0]$ and $M_1 = M([I, A_1])$.

We claim that:

- (i) $N = (M_1/Z)|X$, and
- (ii) B_N is independent in $M_1/(D \cup Z)$, and
- (iii) Z is a set of loops in M_1/D .

Note that Z is a set of loops in M_1/C and N is a minor of M_1/C , so M_1/Z contains N as a minor. To show that N is a restriction of M_1/Z it suffices to show that B_N spans E(N) in M_1/Z , or, equivalently, that $B_N \cup Z$ spans E(N) in M_1 , which is clear from the construction. This proves (i).

Note that $r_{M_1}(B_N \cup D \cup Z) = |B_N| + \operatorname{rank}(A_1[C, D \cup Z]) = |B_N| + \operatorname{rank}(A'[C, D \cup X]) = |B_N| + \operatorname{rank}(A[C, D]) = |B_N| + \operatorname{rank}(A[B, D]),$ since $\operatorname{rank}(A') = \operatorname{rank}(A[C, D])$. Therefore B_N is independent in in $M_1/(D \cup Z)$, proving (ii).

Now (iii) follows directly from the fact that rank(A') = rank(A[C, D]).

By (iii), we have $M/D = (M_1/D)\backslash Z = (M_1/D)/Z$. By (i), N is a restriction of M_1/Z . By (ii), the sets B_N and D are skew in M_1/Z

(that is, $r_{M_1/Z}(B_N \cup D) = r_{M_1/Z}(B_N) + r_{M_1/Z}(D)$), and hence N is a restriction of $M_1/(D \cup Z)$. However $M/D = M_1/(D \cup Z)$, contradicting the fact that M is N-fragile.

The converse of Lemma 2.2 is not true in general, but the following result is a weak converse, and it implies Theorem 1.4.

Lemma 2.3. If $A \in \mathbb{F}^{S_1 \times S_2}$ is an X-fragile matrix, where $X \subseteq S_1 \cup S_2$, then M([I, A]) is $ISO(X \cap S_1, X)$ -fragile.

Proof. Let M = M([I, A]). Note that $M[X, S_1] = \mathrm{ISO}(X \cap S_1, X)$. Let C and D be a partition of E(M) - X such that $C \neq S_1 - X$. We will prove that $M/C \setminus D \neq \mathrm{ISO}(X \cap S_1, X)$. By contracting $C \cap S_1$ and deleting $D - S_1$ we may assume that $D = S_1 - X$ and that $C = S_2 - X$. Since A is X-fragile, $\mathrm{rank}(A[D, C]) < \mathrm{rank}(A)$. Now either

- (i) $\operatorname{rank}(A[D,C]) < \operatorname{rank}(A[S_1,C])$, or
- (ii) $\operatorname{rank}(A[S_1, C]) < \operatorname{rank}(A)$.

In case (i), we have $r_{M/C}(S_1 \cap X) = r_M(C \cup (S_1 \cap X)) - r_M(C) = |S_1 \cap X| + \operatorname{rank}(A[D,C]) - \operatorname{rank}(A[S_1,C]) < |S_1 \cap X|$. So $S_1 \cap X$ is dependent in M/C and hence $M/C \setminus D \neq \operatorname{ISO}(X \cap S_1, X)$, as required.

In case (ii), we have $r_{M/C}(X - S_1) = r_M((X - S_1) \cup C) - r_M(C) = \operatorname{rank}(A) - \operatorname{rank}(A[S_1, C]) > 0$, so $M/C \setminus D \neq \operatorname{ISO}(X \cap S_1, X)$, as required.

3. Reduction to ISO(1,2)-fragility

The results in this section prove Theorem 1.5.

Let F be a flat of a matroid M. We say that a matroid M' is obtained by adding an element e freely to F in M if M' is a single-element extension by a new element e in such a way that F spans e and that each flat of $M' \setminus e$ that spans e contains F.

Lemma 3.1. Let M be an $ISO(X_1, X_1 \cup X_2)$ -fragile matroid, where X_1 and X_2 are disjoint finite sets, and let M' be obtained from M by adding a new element d freely into the flat spanned by X_2 . Then $M' \setminus X_2$ is $ISO(X_1, X_1 \cup \{d\})$ -fragile.

Proof. Let (C, D) be a partition of $E(M) - (X_1 \cup X_2)$. It suffices to show that $M/C \setminus D = \mathrm{ISO}(X_1, X_1 \cup X_2)$ if and only if $(M' \setminus X_2)/C \setminus D = \mathrm{ISO}(X_1, X_1 \cup \{d\})$. Note that $M'/C \setminus D$ is obtained from $M/C \setminus D$ by adding d freely to the flat spanned by X_2 . If $M/C \setminus D = \mathrm{ISO}(X_1, X_1 \cup X_2)$, then $M'/C \setminus D = \mathrm{ISO}(X_1, X_1 \cup X_2 \cup \{d\})$ and hence $(M' \setminus X_2)/C \setminus D = \mathrm{ISO}(X_1, X_1 \cup \{d\})$. Conversely, if $(M' \setminus X_2)/C \setminus D = \mathrm{ISO}(X_1, X_1 \cup \{d\})$, then $M'/C \setminus D = \mathrm{ISO}(X_1, X_1 \cup X_2 \cup \{d\})$ and hence $(M' \setminus \{d\})/C \setminus D = \mathrm{ISO}(X_1, X_1 \cup X_2)$, as required. \square

Note that, by Lemma 3.1, we can reduce an $ISO(X_1, X_1 \cup X_2)$ -fragile matroid to an $ISO(X_1, X_1 \cup \{d\})$ -fragile matroid. Repeating this in the dual we can further reduce to an $ISO(\{c\}, \{c, d\})$ -fragile matroid.

We can add an element freely into a flat in a represented matroid by going to a sufficiently large extension field; this is both routine and well-known.

Lemma 3.2. Let $A \in \mathbb{F}^{S_1 \times S_2}$, let M = M(A), let X be a k-element subset of S_2 , and let M' be the matroid obtained from M by adding a new element e freely into the flat spanned by X. Then there is a vector $b \in (\mathbb{F}^k)^{S_1}$ such that [A, b] is a representation of M' over \mathbb{F}^k .

Proof. Let A_v denote the column of A that is indexed by v. The elements of the field \mathbb{F}^k form a vectorspace of dimension k over \mathbb{F} ; let $(\alpha_v : v \in X)$ be a basis of this vectorspace. Now let $b = \sum_{v \in X} \alpha_v A_v$ and let M' = M([A, b]). By construction, the new element e of M' is spanned by X. It remains to show that each flat of $M' \setminus e$ that spans e also spans X. Consider an independent set $I \subseteq E(M)$ that does not span X in M. We may apply elementary row-operations over \mathbb{F} so that each column of I contains exactly one non-zero entry. Let $R \subseteq S_1$ denote the set of rows containing non-zero entries in $A[S_1, I]$. Since I does not span X, there exists $i \in S_1 - R$ such that $A[\{i\}, X]$ is not identically zero. However the entries of $A[\{i\}, X]$ are all in \mathbb{F} and the values $(\alpha_v : v \in X)$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{F} , so $b_i = \sum_{v \in X} \alpha_v A_{i,v} \neq 0$. Hence I does not span e in M', as required.

4. Relaxing a circuit-hyperplane

The following result implies Theorem 1.6.

Lemma 4.1. Let \mathbb{F} be a field and \mathbb{F}' be a field extension. Now let $A_1 \in \mathbb{F}^{S_1 \times S_2}$ be a $\{c, d\}$ -fragile matrix where $c \in S_1$ and $d \in S_2$ and let A_2 be obtained from A_1 by replacing the (c, d)-entry with an element in $\mathbb{F}' - \mathbb{F}$. Then $(S_1 - \{c\}) \cup \{d\}$ is a circuit-hyperplane in $M([I, A_1])$ and $M([I, A_2])$ is the matroid obtained from $M([I, A_1])$ by relaxing $(S_1 - \{c\}) \cup \{d\}$.

Proof. Let $M_1 = M([I, A_1])$, $M_2 = M([I, A_2])$, and $H = (S_1 - \{c\}) \cup \{d\}$. We claim that H is a circuit of M_1 ; suppose otherwise. Note that S_1 is a basis, so $S_1 \cup \{d\}$ contains a unique circuit C. Since A_1 is $\{c, d\}$ -fragile, we have $A[\{c\}, \{d\}] = 0$, and hence $c \notin C$. Since H is not a circuit, there exists $e \in S_1 - \{c\}$ such that e is a coloop of $M_1|(S_1 \cup \{d\})$. Then $(M_1|(S_1 \cup \{d\})) \setminus e = (M_1|(S_1 \cup \{d\}))/e$. But then M_1 is not $ISO(\{c\}, \{c, d\})$ -fragile, contrary to Lemma 2.3. Thus H is a circuit as claimed.

Note that $M_1^* = M([A_1^T, I])$ and that A_1^T is $\{c, d\}$ -fragile. Then, by duality, $E(M_1) - H$ is a cocircuit and, hence, H is a circuit-hyperplane.

To prove that M_2 is obtained from M_1 by relaxing H it suffices to show, for each set $Z \subseteq S_1 \cup S_2$, that rank $A_1[Z] \neq \operatorname{rank} A_2[Z]$ if and only if $Z = \{c, d\}$. Note that rank $A_1[\{c, d\}] \neq \operatorname{rank} A_2[\{c, d\}]$. Consider a set $Z \subseteq S_1 \cup S_2$ such that rank $A_1[Z] \neq \operatorname{rank} A_2[Z]$.

Claim: We have rank $A_1[Z] < \operatorname{rank} A_2[Z]$.

Proof of claim. Suppose for a contradiction that $\operatorname{rank} A_1[Z] > \operatorname{rank} A_2[Z]$ and consider a minimal subset $X \subseteq Z$ such that $\operatorname{rank} A_1[X] > \operatorname{rank} A_2[X]$. Thus $A_1[X]$ is square and non-singular, $A_2[X]$ is singular, and $c, d \in X$. Let B(x) denote the matrix obtained from $A_1[X]$ by replacing the (c,d)-entry with a variable x and let $p(x) = \det(B(x))$. Note that $p(x) = \alpha x + \beta$ where $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F}$. Since $A_1[X]$ is non-singular, we have $p(0) \neq 0$. Therefore p(x) has at most one root and, since $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F}$, if p(x) has a root, that root is in \mathbb{F} . However, this contradicts the fact that $A_2[X]$ is singular. \square

By construction, $c, d \in \mathbb{Z}$ and we may assume that $\mathbb{Z} \neq \{c, d\}$. Then, since A_1 is $\{c, d\}$ -fragile,

$$\operatorname{rank} A_{1}[Z - \{c, d\}] \leq \operatorname{rank} A_{1}[Z] - 1$$

 $\leq \operatorname{rank} A_{2}[Z] - 2$
 $\leq \operatorname{rank} A_{2}[Z - \{c, d\}]$
 $= \operatorname{rank} A_{1}[Z - \{c, d\}].$

Hence $\operatorname{rank} A_1[Z] = \operatorname{rank} A_1[Z - \{c,d\}] + 1$ and $\operatorname{rank} A_2[Z] = \operatorname{rank} A_2[Z - \{c,d\}] + 2$. This second equation implies that $\operatorname{rank} A_2[Z - \{c\}] = \operatorname{rank} A_2[Z - \{c,d\}] + 1$. Therefore $\operatorname{rank} A_1[Z - \{c\}] = \operatorname{rank} A_1[Z - \{c,d\}] + 1$ and hence $\operatorname{rank} A_1[Z - \{c\}] = \operatorname{rank} A_1[Z]$. Thus the row c of $A_1[Z]$ is a linear combination of the other rows. But then the row c of $A_1[Z - \{d\}]$ is a linear combination of the other rows. So $\operatorname{rank} A_1[Z - \{d\}] = \operatorname{rank} A_1[Z - \{c,d\}]$ and, hence, $\operatorname{rank} A_2[Z - \{d\}] = \operatorname{rank} A_2[Z - \{c,d\}]$. However, this contradicts the fact that $\operatorname{rank} A_2[Z] = \operatorname{rank} A_2[Z - \{c,d\}] + 2$.

References

- [1] J. Geelen, B. Gerards, G. Whittle, Solving Rota's Conjecture, Notices of the AMS 61 (2014), 736-743.
- [2] J. Oxley, *Matroid Theory, second edition*, Oxford University Press, New York, (2011).

DEPARTMENT OF COMBINATORICS AND OPTIMIZATION, UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO, WATERLOO, CANADA