

ON ENTROPIC AND ALMOST MULTILINEAR REPRESENTABILITY OF MATROIDS

LUKAS KÜHNE AND GEVA YASHFE

ABSTRACT. This article studies two notions of generalized matroid representations motivated by algorithmic information theory and cryptographic secret sharing. The first (entropic representability) involves discrete random variables, while the second (almost-multilinear representability) deals with approximate subspace arrangements. In both cases, we prove that determining whether an input matroid has such a representation is undecidable. Consequently, the conditional independence implication problem is also undecidable, providing an independent answer to a question posed by Geiger and Pearl, recently resolved by Cheuk Ting Li. These problems are also closely related to characterizing achievable rates in network coding and constructing secret sharing schemes. For example, another corollary of our work is that deciding whether an access structure admits an ideal secret sharing scheme is undecidable. Our approach reduces undecidable problems from group theory to matroid representation problems. Specifically, we reduce the uniform word problem for finite groups to entropic representability and the word problem for sofic groups to almost-multilinear representability. A key part of this reduction involves modifying group presentations into forms where linear or sofic representations are generic in an appropriate sense when restricted to the generating set.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Main results	2
1.2. Conditional independence implications	3
1.3. Related work	4
1.4. Methods and structure of the article	4
Acknowledgments	6
2. Preliminaries	7
2.1. Notation for probability spaces and random variables	7
2.2. Entropy functions of discrete random variables	7
2.3. Matroids	7
2.4. Matroid representations	8
2.5. Hamming and rank distance	9
2.6. The uniform word problem for finite groups	10
2.7. Sofic groups	10
2.8. Approximate representations of groups	11
2.9. Finitely presented categories	13
2.10. Approximate representations of groupoids	14
2.11. Some algebraic lemmas	15

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05B35, 52B40, 14N20, 68P30, 94A17, 20F10, 03D40.

Key words and phrases. matroids, entropic matroids, almost multilinear matroids, undecidability, word problem, von Staudt constructions, conditional independence implication, secret sharing schemes.

L.K. was supported by the Studienstiftung des deutschen Volkes, the ERC StG 716424 - CAsE and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – SFB-TRR 358/1 2023 – 491392403 and SPP 2458 – 539866293. G.Y. was supported by ERC StG 716424 - CAsE, by ERC COG 101045750 HodgeGeoComb and by ISF grant 1050/16.

3. Generalized Dowling groupoids and geometries	16
3.1. Representations of \mathcal{G} and of G	18
3.2. Generalized Dowling geometries	20
4. Probability space representations of matroids	21
4.1. Entropic representations of generalized Dowling geometries	22
5. Multilinear representations of matroids	24
5.1. Notation for vector spaces and linear maps	24
5.2. Vector space representations	24
6. Group scrambling	25
6.1. Sufficiently generic elements	26
6.2. Scrambled groups and their representations	28
6.3. The augmentation construction	30
6.4. The scrambling construction	38
7. Entropic matroid representability is undecidable	46
8. The conditional independence implication problem	47
9. Almost multilinear matroids	49
9.1. Approximate vector space representations	49
9.2. Almost multilinear Dowling geometries	53
9.3. Approximate representations of scrambled groups	60
9.4. Almost-multilinear matroid representability is undecidable	65
Appendix A. Proof of Theorem 4.4	66
References	68

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Main results. A *matroid* is a combinatorial abstraction of linear independence in vector spaces and forests in graphs. Classically, a matroid is said to be representable over a field if there exists a set of vectors in some vector space over that field such that the subsets of linearly independent vectors are exactly the independent subsets of the matroid. This article investigates entropic and multilinear representations.

1.1.1. Entropic matroids.

Problem 1.1. *The entropic matroid representation problem asks the following:*

Instance: *A matroid M on a finite ground set E with rank function r .*

Question: *Does there exist a family of discrete random variables $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ and a positive scalar λ such that for all $A \subseteq E$ the joint entropy $H(X_A)$ of the variables $\{X_a\}_{a \in A}$ equals $\lambda \cdot r(A)$?*

Matroids for which the answer is positive are called *entropic*. The class of entropic matroids contains the ones that are representable over a field (also called linear matroids) and multilinear matroids. Entropic matroids possibly go back to Fujishige [Fuj78] and these representations are equivalent to matroid representations by partitions [Mat99] and almost affine codes [SA98].

The first main result of this article is the following:

Theorem 1.2. *The entropic matroid representation problem is algorithmically undecidable.*

(This is restated and proved as Theorem 7.3) In contrast, representability over some field can be decided using Gröbner bases [Oxl11, Thm. 6.8.9]. Generalized matrix representability over a division ring and multilinear representability are also undecidable [KPY23, KY22].

Entropic matroids are related to ideal secret sharing schemes: In the theory of secret sharing schemes one wants to distribute shares of a secret amongst a number of participants. The goal is that only certain authorized subsets of the participants can recover the secret by combining their shares, while other subsets of the participants can recover no information about the secret. See [Sti92] for a detailed explanation. The family of subsets of the participants that can jointly recover the secret is called the *access structure*.

A secret sharing scheme is *ideal* if the size of the share given to each participant equals the size of the secret. Brickell and Davenport observed that the access structure of an ideal secret sharing scheme determines a matroid, and called matroids arising in such a way *secret sharing matroids* [BD91]. These are the same as the entropic matroids [Mat99]. Martin extended this bijection to connected monotone access structures that potentially don't admit an ideal secret sharing scheme [Mar91], and Seymour proved that the Vámos matroid is not a secret sharing matroid [Sey92].

Martin asked which connected monotone access structures admit an ideal secret sharing scheme [Mar91]. Theorem 1.2 show that this question is undecidable.

1.1.2. *Almost multilinear matroids.* Almost-multilinear matroids are matroids approximately representable by subspace arrangements. See below for a precise definition.

Problem 1.3. *The almost multilinear matroid representation problem asks the following:*

Instance: *A matroid M on a finite ground set E with rank function r and a field \mathbb{F} .*

Question: *Is it true that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a vector space V over \mathbb{F} together with a collection of subspaces $\{W_e\}_{e \in E}$ and a $c \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$\max_{S \subseteq E} \left| r(S) - \frac{1}{c} \dim \left(\sum_{e \in S} W_e \right) \right| < \varepsilon?$$

Matroids for which this problem has a positive answer are called *almost multilinear*. This class generalizes the class of linear and multilinear matroids and is defined analogously to the class of almost entropic matroids studied by Matúš [Mat07, Mat24]. Almost multilinear matroids are elements of the closure of the cone of realizable polymatroids defined by Kinser [Kin11]. Our second main result of the article is the following.

Theorem 1.4. *The almost multilinear matroid representation problem is algorithmically undecidable.*

Multilinear matroids found applications to network coding capacity: In [ESG10], El Rouayheb et al. constructed linear network capacity problems equivalent to multilinear matroid representability. Our previous result in [KY22] implies that the question whether an instance of the network coding problem has a linear vector coding solution is undecidable. Theorem 1.4 implies that it is also undecidable whether an instance of the network coding problem has an approximate linear vector coding solution.

A natural extension of both theorems is the question whether almost entropic representability is also undecidable. This will be shown to be the case in the upcoming paper [Yas24], which crucially relies on our work here for the almost-multilinear case.

1.2. **Conditional independence implications.** Given a finite ground set E , a *conditional independence (CI) statement* is a triple $(A \perp B \mid C)$ of subsets $A, B, C \subseteq E$ which encodes the statement “ A is independent from B given C ”. We say that a family of discrete random variables $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ *realizes* a CI statement $(A \perp B \mid C)$ if X_A and X_B are probabilistically independent given X_C . Here X_A is the random variable given by the tuple $(X_a)_{a \in A}$, so that its distribution is the joint distribution of variables with indices in A .

Problem 1.5. *The conditional independence implication problem (CII) is:*

Instance: A set A of CI statements on a finite ground set E and a CI statement c .

Question: Does

$$\bigwedge_{A \in \mathcal{A}} A \Rightarrow c$$

hold for every family $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ of discrete random variables? In other words, is it true that whenever a family $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ of discrete random variables realizes all CI statements in \mathcal{A} it also realizes the CI statement c .

In the literature, the sets appearing in CI statements are sometimes defined to be pairwise disjoint. In this paper, we do not make this assumption but note that both formulations are equivalent as shown by Cheuk Ting Li [Li21].

In the 1980s, Pearl and Paz conjectured that there exists a finite set of axioms characterizing all valid CI implication statements [PP86]. This conjecture was later refuted by Studený [Stu90]. Subsequently, Geiger and Pearl proved that the CII problem is decidable under certain conditions on the CI statements and asked whether it is undecidable in general [GP93]. Partial results concerning the CII problem were obtained in [NGSVG13, Li21] and it was shown in [KKNS20] that the CII problem is co-recursively enumerable. Recently Cheuk Ting Li showed that the CII problem is undecidable [Li23].

An oracle to decide the CII problem can also decide the EMR problem. Therefore we obtain a second independent solution of the long-standing CII problem.

Corollary 1.6. *The conditional independence implication (CII) problem is algorithmically undecidable.*

1.3. Related work. We attempt to give a concise summary of that part of the literature that is most relevant to this paper, and apologize for any omissions.

Very recently Cheuk Ting Li proved that the conditional independence implication problem is undecidable, as well as that the networking coding problem is undecidable [Li23]. His work became available very late in our writing. The methods used in both papers are related to each other, and also to the methods of [KY22]: all three papers reduce a representability problem to the uniform word problem for finite groups. The similarity in methods seems to end there: the proof in [Li23] uses different (though related) combinatorial configurations of random variables, and is significantly shorter than ours. We do not know whether it can be used to prove that entropic representability of matroids is undecidable (and thus be applied to show that it is undecidable whether an access structure admits an ideal secret scheme). It also does not cover approximate results like almost-multilinear representability.

Multilinear representations of Dowling geometries were studied by Beimel, Ben-Efraim, Padró, and Tyomkin in [BBEPT14]. This work was extended by Ben-Efraim and Matúš to entropic matroids [MBE20] building on Matúš' earlier work on these matroids in [Mat99]. We previously used generalized Dowling geometries to prove that the representability problem of multilinear matroids is undecidable [KY22] and, with Rudi Pendavingh, we used more general von Staudt constructions to compare the multilinear matroid representations with representations over division rings [KPY23]. Almost entropic matroids featured prominently in Matúš' recent article where he proved that algebraic matroids are almost entropic [Mat24].

1.4. Methods and structure of the article. We first sketch the structure of the main argument and then describe the paper section by section. Undefined terms can be found in the preliminaries (Section 2).

The basic idea is that given a finitely presented group $G = \langle S \mid R \rangle$ and one of the generators $s \in S$, we construct a finite family of matroids \mathcal{M} (in an explicit, computable way). These satisfy:

- At least one of the matroids $M \in \mathcal{M}$ is entropic if and only if G has a finite quotient in which s maps to a nontrivial element.
- If G is a sofic group, then at least one of the matroids $M \in \mathcal{M}$ is almost-multilinear if and only if s is nontrivial in G .




Figure 1. The two “if and only if” statements above, put together. The first lines of both boxes describe the first statement, the second lines describe the second.

Hence, the so-called uniform word problem for finite groups can be reduced to the entropic matroid representation problem. In the same way, the word problem for sofic groups can be reduced to the almost-multilinear representation problem. Both of these word problems are known to be undecidable (see Sections 2.6 and 2.7).

The construction of the finite family of matroids \mathcal{M} is the same in both cases. Schematically, the process is described by Figure 2.




Figure 2. Construction of the finite matroid family \mathcal{M} .

In this schematic, the Dowling groupoid is an intermediate object between $G'' = \langle S'' \mid R'' \rangle$ and a matroid called the generalized Dowling geometry of the presentation.

Using the construction of \mathcal{M} , we prove the two “if and only if” statements of Figure 1. Implication (A) of Figure 1 is relatively straightforward, and does not require the scrambling construction. It would be enough to bring the given presentation $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ to our symmetric triangular form (Definition 3.1) and work with $\mathcal{M}_{S,R}$. For entropic matroids and the uniform word problem for finite groups, this is proved in Section 4.1. For almost-multilinear matroids and the word problem for sofic groups, this is proved in Theorem 9.12.

Implication (B) is somewhat more delicate and (together with the construction of augmented scramblings, which was designed for this purpose) takes up much of the paper. See Section 6 and Section 9. In the proof it is useful to have some linear algebraic tools, so even for the statement on entropic matroids we work specifically with multilinear representations (multilinear matroids are entropic, so finding a multilinear representation suffices).

The paper is organized as follows.

- (a) We start by recalling definitions and setting up basic notions and notation in Section 2.
- (b) Given a finite group, one can define an associated matroid, the so-called *Dowling geometry*, whose representations are closely related to the representation theoretic properties of the group [Dow73]. We work with a generalization of this construction to finitely presented groups which we present in Section 3. We call the resulting matroids *generalized Dowling geometries* (GDG). We first used them in [KY22, KPY23]. They are special cases of frame matroids as studied by Zaslavsky in [Zas03]. The idea is to encode group presentations via the von Staudt constructions.
- (c) After defining entropic matroids in Section 4 as well as the essentially equivalent (but more convenient) notion of probability space representations, we prove in Section 4.1 that the existence of an entropic representation of the GDG of a symmetric triangular presentation $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ implies the existence of a group homomorphism from $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ to a finite group such that images of some elements are nontrivial.
- (d) In Section 5 we discuss multilinear matroid representations and introduce an equivalent (but more convenient) notion we call *vector space representations*, as part of our preparation for proving implication (B) of Figure 1.
- (e) In Section 6 we introduce the scrambling and augmentation constructions and prove that the resulting groups have linear representations with desirable properties.
- (f) In Section 7 we put together our tools to show that the entropic representation problem is undecidable.
- (g) In Section 8 we briefly discuss the conditional independence implication problem.
- (h) In Section 9 we discuss almost-multilinear matroids. The discussion parallels the earlier sections: first we introduce approximate vector space representations in Section 9.1. Then we discuss almost-multilinear representations of generalized Dowling geometries in Section 9.2. In Section 9.3 we discuss approximate linear representations of scrambled groups, and in Section 9.4 we prove the almost-multilinear representation problem is undecidable.
- (i) In Appendix A we prove a mild generalization of a theorem of Matus [Mat93], which states that a matroid is entropic if and only if it has a probability space representation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank Tobias Boege, Michael Dobbins, Zlil Sela, and Thomas Zaslavsky for inspiring discussions. We are grateful to Karim Adiprasito for introducing us to the topic of almost multilinear matroids.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Notation for probability spaces and random variables. An indexed collection of random variables on a probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) consists of a set E , a collection of measurable spaces $\{(\Omega_e, \mathcal{F}_e)\}_{e \in E}$, and a collection of measurable functions $\{X_e : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega_e\}_{e \in E}$.

For convenience, we often write “let $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ be a collection of random variables on (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) ,” and use the notation $\{(\Omega_e, \mathcal{F}_e)\}_{e \in E}$ for the codomains of the random variables without explicitly naming them. We also denote by $\{P_e\}_{e \in E}$ the probability measures defined by $P_e = (X_e)_* P$. By definition this implies that each of the transformations

$$X_e : (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P) \rightarrow (\Omega_e, \mathcal{F}_e, P_e)$$

is measure-preserving.

Given a collection of random variables $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ on (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) as above and a tuple $S = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ with elements in E , we define a measurable space $(\Omega_S, \mathcal{F}_S)$ by $\Omega_S = \prod_{i=1}^n \Omega_{s_i}$ and $\mathcal{F}_S = \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}_{s_i}$ the σ -algebra generated by measurable boxes (which are the sets $\prod_{i=1}^n A_i$ with $A_i \in \mathcal{F}_{s_i}$ for each i). We then define a random variable $X_S : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega_S$ by

$$X_S(\omega) = (X_{s_i}(\omega))_{i=1}^n.$$

If the order is inessential, the same notation can be used if S is a set. On $(\Omega_S, \mathcal{F}_S)$ we define the probability measure $P_S = (X_S)_* P$, the pushforward of P .

2.2. Entropy functions of discrete random variables. Let $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ be a collection of discrete random variables on (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) . For each $S \subseteq E$ we denote by $H(X_S)$ the (*Shannon*) entropy of the random variable X_S :

$$H(X_S) := - \sum_{\omega \in \Omega_S} P_S(\omega) \log P_S(\omega).$$

We set $H(X_S) := \infty$ if the sum does not converge. The base of the logarithm is irrelevant for this article; for consistency we work with the natural logarithm throughout.

2.3. Matroids. We frequently use standard terminology from matroid theory, as for instance explained in Oxley’s textbook [Oxl11]. For the reader’s convenience we briefly recall some basic definitions.

Definition 2.1. A *matroid* $M = (E, r)$ is a pair consisting of a finite *ground set* E together with a *rank function* $r : \mathcal{P}(E) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that

- (a) $r(A) \leq |A|$ for all $A \subseteq E$,
- (b) $r(A) \leq r(B)$ for all $A \subseteq B \subseteq E$ (r is monotone), and
- (c) $r(A \cup B) + r(A \cap B) \leq r(A) + r(B)$ for all $A, B \subseteq E$ (r is submodular).

A function $r : \mathcal{P}(E) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ satisfying (b) and (c) is called a *polymatroid*.

Given a matroid $M = (E, r)$ we use the following terms:

Independent and dependent sets: A set $A \subseteq E$ is called *independent* if $r(A) = |A|$ and *dependent* otherwise.

Bases: An independent set of maximal cardinality is called a *basis*. They are all of the same cardinality $r(E)$, and this cardinality is called the rank of the matroid.

Circuits: A *circuit* C is a minimal dependent subset of E . That is, C is dependent and every proper subset of C is independent.

Flats and closure: A subset $F \subseteq E$ is called a *flat* if $r(F) < r(F \cup \{e\})$ for all $e \in E \setminus F$. Every set $A \subseteq E$ is contained in a unique minimal flat

$$\text{cl}(A) := \{e \in E \mid r(A \cup \{e\}) = r(A)\}.$$

The flat $\text{cl}(A)$ is called the *closure* of A .

Loops: An element $e \in E$ is a *loop* if the set $\{e\}$ is dependent.

Simple matroids: A matroid is *simple* if every pair $\{e, e'\} \subseteq E$ is contained in a basis.

This occurs if and only if there are no loops and every subset of cardinality 2 has rank 2.

Connected matroids: A matroid is *connected* if every pair $\{e, e'\} \subseteq E$ is contained in a circuit.

A matroid is uniquely determined by its ground set together with any one of the following families of subsets: the independent subsets, the dependent subsets, the bases, the circuits, and the flats.

2.4. Matroid representations. Matroid theory is the combinatorial study of various notions of dependence and independence, analogous to those in linear algebra. A well-studied subclass of matroids is the class of linearly-representable matroids, in which the rank function is actually given by linear-algebraic rank: A matroid $M = (E, r)$ is *representable* over a field \mathbb{F} if there exists a family of vectors $\{v_e\}_{e \in E}$ in a vector space over \mathbb{F} such that $r(S) = \dim(\text{span}(\{v_e\}_{e \in S}))$ for all $S \subseteq E$. The matroid M is also called *linear* over \mathbb{F} in this case.

When studying any notion of matroid representability, it is desirable to be able to decide whether a given matroid is representable. For example, using Gröbner bases one can decide whether a matroid is linear over an algebraically closed field [Oxl11, Theorem 6.8.9]. The question of whether one can decide representability over \mathbb{Q} is equivalent to the solvability of Diophantine equations in \mathbb{Q} [Stu87]. This is a variant of Hilbert’s tenth problem and still open. In this paper we study generalized notions of matroid representability and the associated decision problems.

In this section we define the notions of representability that we will investigate throughout the article.

Definition 2.2 ([SA98]). A matroid $M = (E, r)$ is *multilinear* over a field \mathbb{F} if there exist an integer c and a vector space V over \mathbb{F} with subspaces $\{W_e\}_{e \in E}$ such that for each $S \subseteq E$

$$r(S) = \frac{1}{c} \dim \left(\sum_{e \in S} W_e \right).$$

In this case the vector space V and the indexed family of subspaces $\{W_e\}_{e \in E}$ are called a *multilinear representation* of M , or a *representation of M as a c -arrangement*. (We learned the term “ c -arrangement” from [GM88].) Observe that if we add the constraint $c = 1$ we recover the definition of linear representability.

Given a collection $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ of discrete random variables, Fujishige observed that the assignment $H : \mathcal{P}(E) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ given for each $S \subseteq E$ by the entropy $H(X_S)$ is a polymatroid [Fuj78]. Polymatroids arising this way are called *entropic*. Subsequently entropic polymatroids were studied by various authors, and entropic matroids were defined, for instance by Matůs, who called them “strongly probabilistically representable matroids” in [Mat99]:

Definition 2.3. A matroid $M = (E, r)$ is *entropic* if there exists a family $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ of random variables on a discrete probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) and a real $\lambda > 0$ such that for all subsets $A \subseteq E$

$$r(A) = \lambda H(X_A).$$

We now introduce approximate notions of multilinear and entropic matroid representations.

Definition 2.4. A polymatroid (E, r) is *linear* over a field \mathbb{F} if there exists a vector space V and a collection of subspaces $\{W_e\}_{e \in E}$ of V satisfying that for all $S \subseteq E$:

$$r(S) = \dim \left(\sum_{e \in S} W_e \right).$$

A matroid $M = (E, r)$ is *almost multilinear* if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a linear polymatroid (\tilde{E}, \tilde{r}) and a $c \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\left\| r - \frac{1}{c} \tilde{r} \right\|_{\infty} = \max_{S \subseteq E} \left| r(S) - \frac{1}{c} \tilde{r}(S) \right| < \varepsilon.$$

Note that we may always assume the ambient vector space V of a linear polymatroid (E, r) is finite dimensional: if the representation is given by the subspaces $\{W_e\}_{e \in E}$ of V , we may replace V by $\sum_{e \in E} W_e$, which has dimension $r(E)$.

Definition 2.5 ([Mat07]). A matroid (E, r) is *almost entropic* if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a collection of discrete random variables $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ on a probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) and a real $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$\max_{S \subseteq E} |r(S) - \lambda H(X_S)| < \varepsilon.$$

2.5. Hamming and rank distance.

Definition 2.6. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The *normalized Hamming distance* d_{hamm} is the metric on the symmetric group S_n defined by

$$d_{\text{hamm}}(\sigma, \tau) := \frac{1}{n} |\{i \in [n] \mid \sigma(i) \neq \tau(i)\}|$$

for all $\sigma, \tau \in S_n$.

The normalized Hamming distance satisfies that if $\sigma, \sigma', \tau \in S_n$ then

$$d_{\text{hamm}}(\sigma, \sigma') = d_{\text{hamm}}(\sigma \circ \tau, \sigma' \circ \tau) = d_{\text{hamm}}(\tau \circ \sigma, \tau \circ \sigma').$$

Definition 2.7. Let $A, B \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$ be matrices. Their *normalized rank distance* is

$$d_{\text{rk}}(A, B) := \frac{1}{n} \text{rk}(A - B).$$

More generally, if $T_1, T_2 : V \rightarrow W$ are linear maps between finite dimensional vector spaces V, W over a field, define

$$d_{\text{rk}}(T_1, T_2) := \frac{1}{\dim(W)} \text{rk}(T_1 - T_2),$$

where the rank of a linear map is the dimension of its image.

By abuse of notation, we denote all these functions $d_{\text{rk}} : \text{Hom}(V, W) \times \text{Hom}(V, W) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (or $M_n(\mathbb{F}) \times M_n(\mathbb{F})$) by the same name. It will always be clear from the arguments which function we mean.

By representing maps with respect to a fixed basis, it is clear that any result on the metric d_{rk} defined on $M_n(\mathbb{F})$ extends to $\text{End}(W) = \text{Hom}(W, W)$ for any finite dimensional vector space W over \mathbb{F} and vice versa.

Proposition 2.8. *The function $d_{\text{rk}} : \text{Hom}(V, W) \times \text{Hom}(V, W) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a metric on $\text{Hom}(V, W)$. In particular, $d_{\text{rk}} : M_n(\mathbb{F}) \times M_n(\mathbb{F}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a metric.*

Proof. Symmetry and positivity are obvious. Let us prove the triangle inequality: for $T_1, T_2, T_3 \in \text{Hom}(V, W)$, we want to show

$$d_{\text{rk}}(T_1, T_3) \leq d_{\text{rk}}(T_1, T_2) + d_{\text{rk}}(T_2, T_3).$$

This is equivalent to

$$\operatorname{rk}(T_1 - T_3) \leq \operatorname{rk}(T_1 - T_2) + \operatorname{rk}(T_2 - T_3).$$

Now, for any vector subspaces W_1, W_2 of V we have $\dim(W_1 + W_2) \leq \dim(W_1) + \dim(W_2)$. Therefore:

$$\dim \operatorname{im}(T_1 - T_2) + \dim \operatorname{im}(T_2 - T_3) \geq \dim(\operatorname{im}(T_1 - T_2) + \operatorname{im}(T_2 - T_3)),$$

and the space $\operatorname{im}(T_1 - T_2) + \operatorname{im}(T_2 - T_3)$ contains $\operatorname{im}(T_1 - T_3)$, since $(T_1 - T_3)v$ equals $(T_1 - T_2)v + (T_2 - T_3)v$ for each $v \in V$. \square

Remark 2.9. Note that d_{rk} is left- and right-invariant under composition with invertible transformations, in the sense that if $T_1, T_2 \in \operatorname{Hom}(V, W)$ and S, Q are invertible linear transformations such that S has domain W and Q has codomain V , then

$$d_{\operatorname{rk}}(T_1, T_2) = d_{\operatorname{rk}}(S \circ T_1 \circ Q, S \circ T_2 \circ Q).$$

If the requirement that S, Q are invertible is dropped and $S : W \rightarrow U$, we obtain instead

$$d_{\operatorname{rk}}(S \circ T_1 \circ Q, S \circ T_2 \circ Q) \leq \frac{\dim W}{\dim U} d_{\operatorname{rk}}(T_1, T_2).$$

To see this, observe that

$$\operatorname{rk}(S \circ T_1 \circ Q - S \circ T_2 \circ Q) = \operatorname{rk}(S \circ (T_1 - T_2) \circ Q) \leq \operatorname{rk}(T_1 - T_2).$$

In particular, if $A, B, C \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$ and $d_{\operatorname{rk}}(A, B) < \varepsilon$ then also $d_{\operatorname{rk}}(CA, CB) < \varepsilon$.

2.6. The uniform word problem for finite groups. The uniform word problem for finite groups (UWPG) is the following decision problem.

Instance: A finite presentation $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ of a group G and an element $w \in S$.

Task: Decide whether there exists a finite group H and a homomorphism $\varphi : G \rightarrow H$ such that $w \notin \ker(\varphi)$.

Our undecidability results in the entropic setting rely on the following consequence of Slobodskoi's work [Slo81].

Theorem 2.10. *The uniform word problem for finite groups is undecidable.*

Slobodskoi's result is stronger: it shows that in fact the word problem for finite groups is undecidable for some specific $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ (in the notation above, it is only the word w that is not fixed).

Note that this problem is semi-decidable: there exists an algorithm which halts and returns the answer whenever it is positive, and otherwise runs forever.

2.7. Sofic groups. For an introduction to sofic groups see the survey by Pestov [Pes08].

The following is one of several equivalent definitions of sofic groups (see for instance [ES06]). To see its equivalence to the characterization in [Pes08, Theorem 3.5], one uses the amplification trick described in the proof of the same theorem.

Definition 2.11. A group G is *sofic* if for every finite $F \subseteq G$ and for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and a mapping $\theta : F \rightarrow S_n$ such that

- (a) If $g, h, gh \in F$ then $d_{\operatorname{hamm}}(\theta(g)\theta(h), \theta(gh)) < \varepsilon$,
- (b) If the neutral element e_G is in F then $d_{\operatorname{hamm}}(\theta(e), \operatorname{id}) < \varepsilon$, and
- (c) If $x, y \in F$ are distinct then $d_{\operatorname{hamm}}(\theta(x), \theta(y)) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$.

Our proof that the existence of almost multilinear matroid representations is undecidable relies on the following theorem.

Theorem 2.12. *There exists a finitely presented sofic group with an undecidable word problem.*

This follows from the standard result that a solvable group is sofic, together with the theorem of Kharlampovich [Kha81] that there exists a finitely presented solvable group with undecidable word problem.

The following simple lemma will be useful.

Lemma 2.13. *Let G be a sofic group, let $F \subseteq G$ be a finite subset, and let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there exists an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and a mapping $\theta : F \rightarrow S_n$ satisfying the conditions in Definition 2.11 with the following additional property: for each $g \in F$, $\theta(g)$ is either the identity permutation or a derangement.*

Proof. If $e_G \notin F$, replace F with $F \cup \{e_G\}$. Let $\tilde{\theta} : F \rightarrow S_n$ be a mapping satisfying the conditions of Definition 2.11 with $\varepsilon' = \min(1/7, \varepsilon/7)$.

Construct $\theta : F \rightarrow S_n$ as follows: set $\theta(e_G) = \text{id}$, and for each $x \in F$ which is not the neutral element of G define $\theta(x)$ to be a derangement satisfying

$$d_{\text{hamm}}(\theta(x), \tilde{\theta}(x)) \leq 2\varepsilon'.$$

There exists such a derangement: we have

$$d_{\text{hamm}}(\tilde{\theta}, \text{id}) \geq d_{\text{hamm}}(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{\theta}(e_G)) - d_{\text{hamm}}(\tilde{\theta}(e_G), \text{id}) \geq 1 - 2\varepsilon',$$

so $\tilde{\theta}(x)$ has at most $2\varepsilon'n < \frac{2}{7}n$ fixed points. We can take $\theta(x)$ to be the composition of $\tilde{\theta}(x)$ with a cycle on these fixed points.

That θ satisfies the conditions of Definition 2.11 with the given ε follows from the triangle inequality. \square

2.8. Approximate representations of groups. In order to study almost-multilinear Dowling geometries we need a ‘‘linear version’’ of soficity. This has been studied by Arzhantseva and Păunescu in [AP17]. Our definitions are specialized to the finitely presented case and avoid metric ultraproducts.

Definition 2.14. Let $G = \langle S \mid R \rangle$ be a finitely presented group and let $\varepsilon > 0$. An ε -approximate representation of the presentation $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ of G over a field \mathbb{F} is a function

$$\rho : S \rightarrow \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{F})$$

satisfying:

- (a) If $r = s_{i_1}^{\varepsilon_1} \cdots s_{i_k}^{\varepsilon_k}$ is a relator in R then $d_{\text{rk}}(I, \rho(s_{i_1})^{\varepsilon_1} \cdots \rho(s_{i_k})^{\varepsilon_k}) < \varepsilon$ (in this case we say that ρ ε -satisfies r).
- (b) If the neutral element e_G is in S then $d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(e), I) < \varepsilon$.

An ε -approximate representation of $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ naturally extends to all words on S : if $w = w(S) = s_{i_1}^{\varepsilon_1} \cdots s_{i_k}^{\varepsilon_k}$ is any word in S , we denote $\rho(w) = \rho(s_{i_1})^{\varepsilon_1} \cdots \rho(s_{i_k})^{\varepsilon_k}$.

Lemma 2.15. *Let $G \simeq \langle S \mid R \rangle$ be a sofic group. Then for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and an ε -approximate representation $\rho : S \rightarrow \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ such that for each $s \in S$:*

- (a) If $s = e_G$ in G then $\rho(s) = I_n$.
- (b) If $s \neq e_G$ in G then $\rho(s)$ is the permutation matrix of a derangement, and

$$d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(s), I_n) \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Proof. Let $\pi : F_S \rightarrow G$ be the projection of the free group on S to G . Let B be a finite subset of F_S such that $S \cup S^{-1} \subset B$ and each prefix of each relator of R is in B (including the relator itself and the empty word).

Take a map $\theta : \pi(B) \rightarrow S_n$ as in Lemma 2.13, applying the lemma with $\varepsilon/2L$ where L is the maximal length of a relator in R , and define ρ to be the composition of $\theta \circ \pi$ with the homomorphism $S_n \rightarrow \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ that takes each permutation to its permutation matrix.

It is clear from Lemma 2.13 that each $s \in S$ such that $\pi(s) \neq e_G$ is mapped to the permutation matrix of a derangement, and if $\pi(s) = e_G$ then $\rho(s) = I_n$. Further, if $r = s_{i_1}^{\epsilon_1} \cdots s_{i_k}^{\epsilon_k}$ is a relator in R then since each prefix of r and each element of $S \cup S^{-1}$ is in B , we have

$$d_{\text{hamm}}((\theta \circ \pi)(s_{i_1}^{\epsilon_1} \cdots s_{i_j}^{\epsilon_j}) \cdot (\theta \circ \pi)(s_{i_{j+1}}^{\epsilon_{j+1}}, s_{i_1}^{\epsilon_1} \cdots s_{i_{j+1}}^{\epsilon_{j+1}}) < \varepsilon/2L.$$

By the triangle inequality it follows that

$$d_{\text{hamm}}((\theta \circ \pi)(s_{i_1}^{\epsilon_1}) \cdots (\theta \circ \pi)(s_{i_k}^{\epsilon_k}), (\theta \circ \pi)(s_{i_1}^{\epsilon_1} \cdots s_{i_k}^{\epsilon_k})) < k\varepsilon/2L \leq \varepsilon/2,$$

where $\pi(s_{i_1}^{\epsilon_1} \cdots s_{i_k}^{\epsilon_k})$ is the identity permutation. Hence

$$d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(s_{i_1}^{\epsilon_1}) \cdots \rho(s_{i_k}^{\epsilon_k}), I_n) < \varepsilon/2.$$

Since $d_{\text{hamm}}((\theta \circ \pi)(s) \cdot (\theta \circ \pi)(s^{-1}), \theta(e_G)) < \varepsilon/2L$,

$$d_{\text{hamm}}((\theta \circ \pi)(s^{-1}), (\theta \circ \pi)(s)^{-1}) < \varepsilon/2L.$$

Using the triangle inequality (together with Remark 2.9) to replace each $\rho(s_{i_j}^{\epsilon_j})$ with $\rho(s_{i_j})^{\epsilon_j}$, we thus obtain

$$d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(s_{i_1})^{\epsilon_1} \cdots \rho(s_{i_k})^{\epsilon_k}, I_n) < \varepsilon.$$

Therefore $\rho \upharpoonright_S$ is an ε -approximate representation of $\langle S \mid R \rangle$.

It follows from [Lup14, Lemma 13] (or [KY22, Lemma 3.7]) that if $A \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$ is the permutation matrix of a derangement then $d_{\text{rk}}(A, I_n) \geq \frac{1}{2}$. \square

Lemma 2.16. *Let $G = \langle S \mid R \rangle$ be a finitely presented group. Denote the normal closure of R by N . Let $w_1, w_2 \in F_S$ be two elements in the free group on S and suppose w_1, w_2 map to the same element of $G \simeq F_S/N$. Then there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and every ε -approximate representation $\rho : S \rightarrow \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ of $G = \langle S \mid R \rangle$:*

$$d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(w_1), \rho(w_2)) < k\varepsilon.$$

Proof. By assumption $w_1 w_2^{-1} \in N$, so it can be written in the form

$$u = g_1 r_1 g_1^{-1} \cdot g_2 r_2 g_2^{-1} \cdots g_k r_k g_k^{-1}$$

with r_i or r_i^{-1} in R and $g_i \in F_S$ for each $1 \leq i \leq k$. We have $d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(g_i r_i g_i^{-1}), I_n) < \varepsilon$ for each $1 \leq i \leq k$, and an induction on k using the inequality $d_{\text{rk}}(AB, B) = d_{\text{rk}}(A, I)$ (for invertible B) together with the triangle inequality shows that $d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(u), I_n) < k\varepsilon$. Therefore also

$$d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(w_1), \rho(w_2)) = d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(uw_2), \rho(w_2)) = d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(u), I_n) < k\varepsilon. \quad \square$$

Corollary 2.17. *Let $G = \langle S \mid R \rangle$ be a finitely presented group, let $w_1, w_2 \in F_S$, and let $c > 0$. If for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an ε -approximate representation $\rho : S \rightarrow \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ of $G = \langle S \mid R \rangle$ such that*

$$d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(w_1), \rho(w_2)) \geq c$$

then w_1, w_2 map to different elements of G .

Proof. By the previous lemma, if w_1 and w_2 map to the same element of G then for all small enough $\varepsilon > 0$ each ε -approximate representation $\rho : S \rightarrow \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ of G satisfies $d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(w_1), \rho(w_2)) < c$. \square

Lemma 2.18. *Let $G = \langle S \mid R \rangle$ be a finitely presented group. Let $\langle T \mid R_T \rangle$ be a presentation of G with $T \supseteq S$ such that the diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S & \longrightarrow & T \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ G & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_G} & G, \end{array}$$

commutes, where the map $S \rightarrow T$ is the inclusion map, and the vertical maps are the natural maps into G .

Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $\rho : S \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F})$ is a δ -approximate representation of $\langle S \mid R \rangle$, then there exists an ε -approximate representation

$$\tilde{\rho} : T \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F})$$

of $\langle T \mid R_T \rangle$ which extends ρ in the sense that $\tilde{\rho}(s) = \rho(s)$ for all $s \in S$.

Proof. For each $t \in T \setminus S$ choose $w_t \in F_S$ that maps to the same element as t in G . Let $r = t_{i_1}^{\varepsilon_1} \cdot \dots \cdot t_{i_m}^{\varepsilon_m} \in F_T$ be a relator in R_T . The word $w_r = w_{t_{i_1}}^{\varepsilon_1} \cdot \dots \cdot w_{t_{i_m}}^{\varepsilon_m} \in F_S$ maps to the identity of G . So by Lemma 2.16 there exists $k_r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d_{\mathrm{rk}}(\rho(w_r), I) < k_r \delta$ for any δ -approximate representation ρ of $\langle S \mid R \rangle$.

Take $k = \max_{r \in R_T} k_r$ and $\delta = \frac{\varepsilon}{k}$. Given a δ -approximate representation $\rho : S \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ of $\langle S \mid R \rangle$, extend ρ to $\tilde{\rho} : T \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ by setting $\tilde{\rho}(t) = \rho(w_t)$ for all $t \in T \setminus S$. If $r \in R_T$ then

$$d_{\mathrm{rk}}(\tilde{\rho}(r), I) = d_{\mathrm{rk}}(\rho(w_r), I_n) < k\delta = \varepsilon$$

as desired. \square

2.9. Finitely presented categories. Finitely presented categories are to finitely presented monoids as groupoids are to groups. We use these in our discussion of almost-multilinear representations.

For the following definitions see also Awodey's book [Awo10]. All our directed graphs may have multiple edges between the same pair of edges.

Definition 2.19 (free categories). The *free category* on a directed graph G is the category $\mathcal{C}(G)$ in which objects are the vertices of G , morphisms are (directed) paths in G , and composition is given by concatenating paths.

Definition 2.20. A *congruence* on a category \mathcal{C} is an equivalence relation \sim on the morphisms of \mathcal{C} such that:

- (a) If $f \sim g$ then f, g have the same domain and the same codomain.
- (b) If $f \sim g$ then $a \circ f \circ b \sim a \circ g \circ b$ for all morphisms a with codomain the domain of f, g and all morphisms b with domain the codomain of f, g .

A congruence on \mathcal{C} is precisely an equivalence relation \sim on morphisms such that there is a quotient category \mathcal{C}/\sim with the same objects as \mathcal{C} and such that $\mathrm{hom}_{\mathcal{C}/\sim}(x, y) = \mathrm{hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(x, y)/\sim$ for all $x, y \in \mathrm{ob}(\mathcal{C})$. The composition in \mathcal{C}/\sim is induced from that of \mathcal{C} , and the identity morphisms are the images through the quotient map of those in \mathcal{C} .

Definition 2.21 (finitely presented categories). Let \mathcal{C} be a category and let $R = \{f_i = g_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a set of formal expressions ("relations") such that for each $i \in I$, $f_i, g_i : x_i \rightarrow y_i$ are two morphisms between the same two objects of \mathcal{C} . Denote by \sim_R the minimal congruence satisfying that $f_i \sim_R g_i$ for each $i \in I$. We call \sim_R the congruence generated by the relations in R .

A *finitely presented category* is a category of the form $\mathcal{C}(G)/\sim_R$, where G is a finite directed graph and R is a finite set of relations between morphisms of $\mathcal{C}(G)$.

In this situation we denote $\langle G \mid R \rangle = \mathcal{C}(G)/\sim_R$. As far as we are aware this notation is nonstandard, but it gives us a convenient way to refer to the finite set R , rather than just to the congruence \sim_R .

Remark 2.22. In the notation above, the congruence \sim_R is precisely the equivalence relation in which h_1, h_2 are equivalent if and only if they may be written in the form

$$h_1 = a_1 \circ f_{i_1} \circ a_2 \circ f_{i_2} \circ \dots \circ a_n \circ f_{i_n} \circ a_{n+1},$$

$$h_2 = a_1 \circ g_{i_1} \circ a_2 \circ g_{i_2} \circ \dots \circ a_n \circ g_{i_n} \circ a_{n+1},$$

where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and “ $f_{i_j} = g_{i_j}$ ” is a relation in R for each $1 \leq j \leq n$.

To verify this, it suffices to note that \sim_R is indeed a congruence and that it contains the relations $f_i \sim_R g_i$ for all $i \in I$.

Remark 2.23. To construct a functor F from a finitely presented category $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(G) / \sim_R$ into a category \mathcal{D} , it suffices to define F on the objects and morphisms of \mathcal{C} corresponding to vertices and edges of G , and to show that if $\varphi_1 = \varphi_2$ is a relation in R then $F(\varphi_1) = F(\varphi_2)$ in \mathcal{D} (see [Awo10]).

Definition 2.24. A groupoid is a category in which every morphism has a two-sided inverse. A finitely-presented groupoid is a finitely-presented category that happens to be a groupoid.

Remark 2.25. For a finitely presented category $\mathcal{C}(G) / \sim_R$ to be a groupoid it suffices that each generating morphism (i.e. corresponding to an edge of G) is invertible.

2.10. Approximate representations of groupoids. In some situations it is more natural to produce approximate representations of Dowling groupoids (see Section 3 below) than of the corresponding groups. It is useful to have some results applicable in this situation.

Definition 2.26. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. An ε -representation ρ of a finitely presented groupoid $\mathcal{C} = \langle G \mid R \rangle$ over a field \mathbb{F} is a functor ρ from $\mathcal{C}(G)$ to the category of finite dimensional \mathbb{F} -vector spaces such that

- (a) If “ $f = g$ ” is a relation in R then $d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(f), \rho(g)) < \varepsilon$.
- (b) If x, y are vertices in the same connected component of G then $\dim \rho(x) = \dim \rho(y)$.

Remark 2.27. Note that by Remark 2.23 it suffices to specify an approximate representation of $\langle G \mid R \rangle$ on the vertices and edges of the graph G .

Condition (b) can be omitted more-or-less harmlessly, in the sense that approximate ε -“representations” that do not satisfy it can be approximated by ones that do (with slightly larger ε , depending on the particular presentation). But it shortens some proofs.

Lemma 2.28. *Let $\mathcal{C} = \langle G \mid R \rangle$ be a finitely presented groupoid. Denote the congruence generated by R by \sim_R . Let h_1, h_2 be two morphisms in the free category $\mathcal{C}(G)$ that map to the same morphism of \mathcal{C} (note that in particular they have the same domain and codomain). Then there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and every ε -approximate representation ρ of $\langle G \mid R \rangle$:*

$$d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(h_1), \rho(h_2)) < k\varepsilon.$$

Proof. By Remark 2.22, we may write

$$h_1 = a_1 \circ f_{i_1} \circ a_2 \circ f_{i_2} \circ \dots \circ a_n \circ f_{i_k} \circ a_{k+1},$$

$$h_2 = a_1 \circ g_{i_1} \circ a_2 \circ g_{i_2} \circ \dots \circ a_k \circ g_{i_k} \circ a_{k+1},$$

where $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and “ $f_{i_j} = g_{i_j}$ ” is a relation in R for each $1 \leq j \leq k$.

Since

$$d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(f_{i_j}), \rho(g_{i_j})) < \varepsilon$$

for each $1 \leq j \leq k$, the result follows by Remark 2.9. □

Corollary 2.29. *Let $\mathcal{C} = \langle G \mid R \rangle$ be a finitely presented groupoid, let h_1, h_2 be morphisms in the free category $\mathcal{C}(G)$ with the same domain and codomain, and let $\alpha > 0$. If for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an ε -approximate representation ρ of $\langle G \mid R \rangle$ such that*

$$d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(h_1), \rho(h_2)) \geq \alpha$$

then h_1, h_2 map to different elements of \mathcal{C} .

Proof. By the previous lemma, if h_1, h_2 map to the same element of \mathcal{C} then for all small enough $\varepsilon > 0$ each ε -approximate representation ρ of $\langle G \mid R \rangle$ satisfies $d_{\text{rk}}(h_1, h_2) < \alpha$. \square

2.11. Some algebraic lemmas. We collect some results about field theory and linear algebra for later use. We use them in order to prove that certain matroids are (almost) multilinear. All of them are either elementary or well known, but we include proofs for most.

Recall that a group G is residually finite if for each $x \in G$ such that $x \neq e_G$ there exists a finite group H and a homomorphism $\varphi : G \rightarrow H$ such that $\varphi(x) \neq e_H$.

Theorem 2.30 (Mal'cev's theorem). *Let \mathbb{F} be a field. A finitely generated subgroup of $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{F})$ is residually finite.*

For a proof see [LS77] for example.

Lemma 2.31. *Let \mathbb{F} be a field, G a finitely generated group, $g \in G$ an element, and let $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{F})$ be a representation such that $\rho(g) \neq I_n$. Then there exists $n' \in \mathbb{N}$ and a representation $\rho' : G \rightarrow \text{GL}_{n'}(\mathbb{F})$ such that for every $x \in G$ the matrix $\rho'(x)$ is either $I_{n'}$ or the permutation matrix of a derangement, and $\rho'(g) \neq I_{n'}$.*

Proof. The image $\rho(G)$ is a finitely generated subgroup of $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{F})$, so it is residually finite by Mal'cev's theorem. Therefore there exists a finite group H and a homomorphism $\varphi : \rho(G) \rightarrow H$ such that $\varphi(\rho(g)) \neq e_H$. The left action of H on itself defines a permutation representation of H , and thus of $\rho(G)$ and of G , on a set of $n' = |H|$ elements, such that any element that acts nontrivially acts by a derangement. Choosing a bijection between H and the set $\{1, \dots, n'\}$ we produce a homomorphism $G \rightarrow S_{n'}$ which maps each $x \in G$ to the identity or to a derangement (and g to a derangement). There is a homomorphism $S_{n'} \rightarrow \text{GL}_{n'}(\mathbb{F})$ which maps each permutation to its permutation matrix. Taking ρ' to be the composition of these homomorphisms $G \rightarrow S_{n'} \rightarrow \text{GL}_{n'}(\mathbb{F})$ yields the result. \square

Lemma 2.32. *Let \mathbb{F} be an algebraically closed field of characteristic either 0 or larger than n and let $A \in \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{F})$ be the permutation matrix of a derangement. Then A is conjugate to a block diagonal matrix in which every $k \times k$ nonzero block is a diagonal matrix of the form*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \omega^0 & & & & \\ & \omega^1 & & & \\ & & \ddots & & \\ & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & \omega^{k-1} \end{bmatrix} \in \text{GL}_k(\mathbb{F})$$

for ω a primitive k -th root of unity.

Proof. Suppose A is the permutation matrix of a derangement $\sigma \in S_n$. Let the cycle decomposition of σ be

$$(i_1 i_2 \dots i_{k_1}) (i_{k_1+1} i_{k_1+2} \dots i_{k_2}) \dots (i_{k_{r-1}+1} i_{k_{r-1}+2} \dots i_n).$$

Then if P is the permutation matrix of the permutation that takes j to i_j for all $1 \leq j \leq n$, it is clear that $P^{-1}AP$ is a block diagonal matrix which blocks of size $k_1, k_2 - k_1, k_3 - k_2, \dots, n - k_{r-1}$, in which each nonzero $k \times k$ block is the permutation matrix of a cyclic permutation, i.e., is of the form

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \ddots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \text{GL}_k(\mathbb{F}).$$

Such a matrix defines a representation of $\mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z}$ (in which the generator $1 \in \mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z}$ maps to B). Its character vanishes on every $x \in \mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z}$ except the identity, on which it achieves the value k . Since this is precisely the sum of the irreducible characters of $\mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z}$ the result follows.

More concretely, if ω is a primitive k -th root of unity in \mathbb{F} then for the Vandermonde matrix $Q = (\omega^{-(i-1)(j-1)})_{1 \leq i, j \leq k}$ we have

$$QBQ^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \omega^0 & & & \\ & \omega^1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \omega^{k-1} \end{bmatrix}. \quad \square$$

We need a basic property of transcendental field extensions. The following is elementary and well known.

Lemma 2.33. *Let $\mathbb{F} \subset \mathbb{L}$ be fields with $z_1, \dots, z_n \in \mathbb{L}$ transcendental over \mathbb{F} . Then $\mathbb{F}(z_1, \dots, z_n)$ (the minimal subfield of \mathbb{L} containing \mathbb{F} and z_1, \dots, z_n) is isomorphic to the field of rational functions in n variables over \mathbb{F} . In particular, if $p \in \mathbb{F}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is nonzero then $p(z_1, \dots, z_n) \neq 0$.*

We apply this lemma in the following form:

Corollary 2.34. *Let \mathbb{F} be a field and let $\mathbb{L} = \mathbb{F}(z_{k,i,j})_{1 \leq k \leq r, 1 \leq i, j \leq n}$. For each $1 \leq k \leq r$ denote by $A_k \in M_n(\mathbb{L})$ the matrix given by*

$$A_k = (z_{k,i,j})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}.$$

Let w an element of the free algebra over \mathbb{F} with generators $b_1, \dots, b_r, b_1^{-1}, \dots, b_r^{-1}$ and $c_1, \dots, c_s, c_1^{-1}, \dots, c_s^{-1}$ (note that formally b_i and b_i^{-1} as well as c_i and c_i^{-1} are unrelated generators, and not inverses in this algebra). For invertible matrices $B_1, \dots, B_r, C_1, \dots, C_s \in M_n(\mathbb{L})$, denote by $w(B_1, \dots, B_r, C_1, \dots, C_s) \in M_n(\mathbb{L})$ the matrix obtained by substituting B_i and B_i^{-1} for b_i and b_i^{-1} and C_i and C_i^{-1} for c_i and c_i^{-1} in the expression w .

If there exist invertible matrices $B_1, \dots, B_r, C_1, \dots, C_s \in M_n(\mathbb{L})$ such that the matrix $w(B_1, \dots, B_r, C_1, \dots, C_s)$ is invertible then $w(A_1, \dots, A_r, C_1, \dots, C_s)$ is invertible too.

Proof. Using Cramer's formula, consider $p = \det(w(A_1, \dots, A_r, C_1, \dots, C_s))$ as a rational function over \mathbb{F} in variables the entries $\{z_{k,i,j}\}_{1 \leq k \leq r, 1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ of A_1, \dots, A_r . Represent it as a reduced fraction of polynomials $\frac{f}{g}$ in the variables. Then

$$\det(w(B_1, \dots, B_r, C_1, \dots, C_s))$$

is the value of this rational function when the entries of B_1, \dots, B_r are substituted for the variables. In particular, f and g are nonzero (because they give nonzero values with this substitution). Thus also $p \neq 0$ by an application of Lemma 2.33 to each of f and g . \square

Corollary 2.35. *Let \mathbb{F} be a field, let $\mathbb{L} = \mathbb{F}(z)$, and let $A, B \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$ be invertible matrices. Then $\det(zA + B) \neq 0$.*

Proof. Consider $\det(xA + B)$ as a polynomial in x : it is nonzero because substituting $x = 0$ yields $\det(B) \neq 0$. By Lemma 2.33 we have $\det(zA + B) \neq 0$ as required. \square

3. GENERALIZED DOWLING GROUPOIDS AND GEOMETRIES

We find it useful to think of generalized Dowling geometries (see the overview in Section 1) as matroidal encodings of certain groupoids, which we call Dowling groupoids. In this section we introduce the Dowling groupoid of a finitely presented group, explain how

representations of these groupoids are related to representations of the associated groups, and define the generalized Dowling geometries.

To define the generalized Dowling groupoids and geometries we use group presentations satisfying certain combinatorial requirements. While algebraically some of them are very artificial, they make the combinatorics that follows more convenient. Note that the relators in our presentations are not necessarily reduced. (To describe group presentations we freely use both relators and relations as convenient.)

Definition 3.1. We call a group presentation $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ *symmetric triangular* if it satisfies the following conditions.

- (a) S and R are finite and the neutral element e is a generator in S .
- (b) The generators S are symmetric. That is, for $e \neq s \in S$ also $s^{-1} \in S$. Further, $ss^{-1}e$ is a relator in R .
- (c) All relators in R are of length three.
- (d) The relators in R are cyclically symmetric. That is, if $abc \in R$ is a relator for $a, b, c \in S$ then also bca and cab are relators in R .
- (e) If $abc \in R$ is a relator then also $c^{-1}b^{-1}a^{-1}$ is a relator in R .
- (f) eee is a relator in R .

Any finitely presented group has a symmetric triangular presentation. To obtain one from a given presentation $\langle S \mid R \rangle$, first add the neutral element e to S if necessary. Then symmetrize the generators (by adding a formal inverse s^{-1} for each $s \in S \setminus \{e\}$ which does not already have one, together with the relation $s^{-1}se = e$). Then “break up” long relators into short ones as follows: given a relator $s_1s_2 \dots s_n$ in R , add generators x_2, x_3, \dots, x_{n-2} , and symmetrize the generating set (to add inverses for the new generators). Then add the relations

$$s_1s_2x_1^{-1} = e, \quad x_1s_3x_2^{-1} = e, \quad \dots, \quad x_{n-2}s_{n-1}s_n = e,$$

and delete $s_1s_2 \dots s_n = e$ from R . Symmetrize R by adding the cyclic shifts of each relator and their inverses. Finally, add the relator eee .

Definition 3.2. Let G be a group given by a symmetric triangular presentation $\langle S \mid R \rangle$. The *Dowling groupoid* associated to $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ is the finitely presented groupoid \mathcal{G} with the following presentation:

- (a) The objects are $\{b_1, b_2, b_3\}$,
- (b) Generators for the morphisms are given by

$$\{g_{s,i,j} : b_i \rightarrow b_j \mid s \in S, \text{ and } i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\} \text{ with } i \neq j\}.$$

- (c) For each $s \in S$ and each pair of distinct indices $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ we impose the relation $g_{s,j,i} \circ g_{s,i,j} = \text{id}_{b_i}$. For each cyclic shift (i, j, k) of $(1, 2, 3)$ and for each relation $s''s's = e$ in R , we impose the relation

$$g_{s'',k,i} \circ g_{s',j,k} \circ g_{s,i,j} = \text{id}_{b_i}.$$

Remark 3.3. It is useful to note that since $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ is symmetric triangular, the following relations hold in \mathcal{G} :

- (a) For each permutation (i, j, k) of $(1, 2, 3)$ and for each $s \in S$, the relation

$$g_{e,j,k} \circ g_{s,i,j} = g_{s,j,k} \circ g_{e,i,j}$$

holds.

- (b) For each permutation (i, j, k) of $(1, 2, 3)$, the relation $g_{e,k,i} \circ g_{e,j,k} \circ g_{e,i,j} = \text{id}_{b_i}$ holds.




Figure 3. Morphisms in a generalized Dowling groupoid that correspond to a generator $s \in S$.

Each relation of type (a) can be deduced from the relation

$$g_{s^{-1},k,i} \circ g_{e,j,k} \circ g_{s,i,j} = \text{id}_{b_i} = g_{s^{-1},k,i} \circ g_{s,j,k} \circ g_{e,i,j}$$

which can itself be deduced from the defining relations of \mathcal{G} and the fact that $s^{-1}es = e$ is a relation of $\langle S \mid R \rangle$, because the presentation is symmetric triangular.

Similarly, the six relations of type (b) follow from the defining relations of \mathcal{G} , together with the fact that $eee = e$ is a relation in R . Note that for (i, j, k) an odd permutation of $(1, 2, 3)$ (which is not a cyclic shift) the relation $g_{e,k,i} \circ g_{e,j,k} \circ g_{e,i,j} = \text{id}_{b_i}$ is the inverse of $g_{e,j,i} \circ g_{e,k,j} \circ g_{e,i,k} = \text{id}_{b_i}$, where (i, k, j) is a cyclic shift of $(1, 2, 3)$.

3.1. Representations of \mathcal{G} and of G . Let G be a group with a symmetric triangular presentation. The Dowling groupoid \mathcal{G} does not interest us in itself; it is a sort of intermediate object between G and the matroids constructed further below. The point is that from a representation of \mathcal{G} into some category C (i.e. a functor $F : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow C$) one can obtain a representation of G in C and vice versa. Here G is considered as a groupoid with one object $*$. This is shown in several lemmas below. The proofs are rather obvious and readers may wish to skip them (the purpose of this section is to verify that the relations defining \mathcal{G} have been chosen correctly).

Lemma 3.4. *For each representation $F : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow C$ of \mathcal{G} in a category C there is an isomorphic representation $F' : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow C$ which satisfies:*

- (a) $F'(b_1) = F'(b_2) = F'(b_3)$,
- (b) $F'(g_{e,i,j}) = \text{id}_{F'(b_i)}$ for all i, j ,
- (c) $F'(g_{s,1,2}) = F'(g_{s,2,3}) = F'(g_{s,3,1})$ for each $s \in S$, and
- (d) $F'(g_{s,2,1}) = F'(g_{s,3,2}) = F'(g_{s,1,3}) = F'(g_{s,1,2})^{-1}$ for each $s \in S$.

That F' is an isomorphic representation of \mathcal{G} means that there is a natural isomorphism $F \rightarrow F'$.

Proof. Define F' on objects by setting $F'(b_i) := F(b_1)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 3$. Further define it on the generating morphisms $f : b_i \rightarrow b_j$ as follows:

$$F'(f) := \begin{cases} F(g_{e,j,1} \circ f \circ g_{e,1,i}) & \text{if } i \neq 1 \text{ and } j \neq 1, \\ F(g_{e,j,1} \circ f) & \text{if } i = 1, \\ F(f \circ g_{e,1,i}) & \text{if } j = 1. \end{cases}$$

For each object b_i of \mathcal{G} we define an isomorphism $\eta_{b_i} : F(b_i) \rightarrow F'(b_i)$ by setting $\eta_{b_1} := \text{id}_{F(b_1)}$ and $\eta_{b_i} = F(g_{e,i,1})$ for $i = 2, 3$. By definition of F' this yields for each generating morphism $f : b_i \rightarrow b_j$ of \mathcal{G} the commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F(b_i) & \xrightarrow{\eta_{b_i}} & F'(b_i) \\ \downarrow F(f) & & \downarrow F'(f) \\ F(b_j) & \xrightarrow{\eta_{b_j}} & F'(b_j). \end{array}$$

For general morphisms of \mathcal{G} the same diagrams commute, because they can be written as compositions of generating morphisms. Thus F' is a functor, i.e. it respects composition: if $f_2 \circ f_1 = f_3$ in \mathcal{G} for some $f_1 : b_i \rightarrow b_j$, $f_2 : b_j \rightarrow b_k$, and $f_3 : b_i \rightarrow b_k$ then the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} F(b_i) & \xrightarrow{F(f_1)} & F(b_j) & \xrightarrow{F(f_2)} & F(b_k) \\ \downarrow \eta_{b_i} & & \downarrow \eta_{b_j} & & \downarrow \eta_{b_k} \\ F'(b_i) & \xrightarrow{F'(f_1)} & F'(b_j) & \xrightarrow{F'(f_2)} & F'(b_k) \end{array}$$

commutes, implying that

$$F'(f_2) \circ F'(f_1) \circ \eta_{b_i} = \eta_{b_k} \circ F(f_2) \circ F(f_1)$$

and thus that $F'(f_2) \circ F'(f_1) = \eta_{b_k} \circ F(f_2 \circ f_1) \circ \eta_{b_i}^{-1} = \eta_{b_k} \circ F(f_3) \circ \eta_{b_i}^{-1}$. But by definition we have $F'(f_3) = \eta_{b_k} \circ F(f_3) \circ \eta_{b_i}^{-1}$, which shows

$$F'(f_3) = F'(f_2 \circ f_1)$$

as desired. By definition the maps $\{\eta_{b_i}\}_{b_i \in \text{ob}(\mathcal{G})}$ define a natural isomorphism $F \rightarrow F'$.

We now prove each of the claimed properties of F' in turn:

Property (a) is satisfied by definition, and property (b) follows from the following computations, in which we use the relations of \mathcal{G} :

$$\begin{aligned} F'(g_{e,1,2}) &= F(g_{e,2,1} \circ g_{e,1,2}) = F(\text{id}_{b_1}) = \text{id}_{F'(b_1)} \\ F'(g_{e,2,3}) &= F(g_{e,3,1} \circ g_{e,2,3} \circ g_{e,1,2}) = F(\text{id}_{b_1}) = \text{id}_{F'(b_1)} \\ F'(g_{e,3,1}) &= F(g_{e,3,1} \circ g_{e,1,3}) = F(\text{id}_{b_1}) = \text{id}_{F'(b_1)}. \end{aligned}$$

We now prove property (c). To this end observe that $F'(g_{s,1,2}) = F(g_{e,2,1} \circ g_{s,1,2})$ and furthermore $F'(g_{s,2,3}) = F(g_{e,3,1} \circ g_{s,2,3} \circ g_{e,1,2})$. The relations of \mathcal{G} imply that

$$\begin{aligned} F'(g_{s,1,2}) &= F(g_{e,2,1} \circ g_{s,1,2}) \stackrel{(1)}{=} F(g_{e,3,1} \circ g_{e,2,3} \circ g_{s,1,2}) \\ &\stackrel{(2)}{=} F(g_{e,1,3} \circ g_{s,2,3} \circ g_{e,1,2}) = F'(g_{s,2,3}). \end{aligned}$$

where (1) is obtained by precomposing the identity $g_{e,2,1} \circ g_{e,1,2} = \text{id}_{b_1} = g_{e,3,1} \circ g_{e,2,3} \circ g_{e,1,2}$ with $g_{e,1,2}^{-1}$ and (2) follows from the relation $g_{e,2,3} \circ g_{s,1,2} = g_{s,2,3} \circ g_{e,1,2}$. The identity

$F'(g_{s,2,3}) = F'(g_{s,3,1})$ follows similarly: we have

$$\begin{aligned} F'(g_{s,3,1}) &= F(g_{s,3,1} \circ g_{e,1,3}) = F(g_{s,3,1} \circ g_{e,2,3} \circ g_{e,1,2}) \\ &= F(g_{e,3,1} \circ g_{s,2,3} \circ g_{e,1,2}) = F'(g_{s,2,3}). \end{aligned}$$

For property (d), using the fact that $g_{s,2,1} = g_{s,1,2}^{-1}$ in \mathcal{G} we see that $F'(g_{s,2,1}) = F'(g_{s,1,2})^{-1}$. Similarly we have $g_{s,3,2} = g_{s,2,3}^{-1}$ and $g_{s,1,3} = g_{s,3,1}^{-1}$. It follows that

$$F'(g_{s,2,1}) = F'(g_{s,3,2}) = F'(g_{s,1,3}). \quad \square$$

Lemma 3.5. *Consider G as a groupoid with one object $*$ and morphisms the elements of the group G . Let $F : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow C$ be a representation satisfying properties (a)-(d) of Lemma 3.4. Then there is a functor*

$$F' : G \rightarrow C$$

defined by $F'(*) = F(b_1)$ and on the generating morphisms by $F'(s) = F(g_{s,1,2})$.

Proof. We only have to verify that $F'(s'') \circ F'(s') \circ F'(s) = \text{id}_{F'(*)}$ for any relation $s''s's = e$ in R . We compute

$$\begin{aligned} F'(s'') \circ F'(s') \circ F'(s) &= F(g_{s'',1,2}) \circ F(g_{s',1,2}) \circ F(g_{s,1,2}) \\ &= F(g_{s'',3,1}) \circ F(g_{s',2,3}) \circ F(g_{s,1,2}) = F(g_{s'',3,1} \circ g_{s',2,3} \circ g_{s,1,2}) = F(\text{id}_{b_1}) \\ &= \text{id}_{F(b_1)} = \text{id}_{F'(*)}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.6. *Consider G as a groupoid with one object $*$. Let $F : G \rightarrow C$ be a representation of G . Then there is a functor*

$$F' : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow C$$

defined on objects by $F'(b_i) = F(*)$ and on the generating morphisms by:

$$\begin{aligned} F'(g_{s,1,2}) &= F'(g_{s,2,3}) = F'(g_{s,3,1}) = F(s) \text{ and} \\ F'(g_{s,2,1}) &= F'(g_{s,3,2}) = F'(g_{s,1,3}) = F(s)^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

for each $s \in S$. This functor satisfies properties (a)-(d) of Lemma 3.4.

Proof. Once we prove F' is a functor, properties (a)-(d) follow directly from the definition. Thus we only need to check that each relation between morphisms in \mathcal{G} is respected by F' .

Observe that if $s \in S$ and $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ are distinct then $F'(g_{s,j,i}) \circ F'(g_{s,i,j})$ equals either $F(s) \circ F(s)^{-1}$ or $F(s)^{-1} \circ F(s)$, depending on whether the pair (i, j) is one of $\{(1, 2), (2, 3), (3, 1)\}$, and in either case the composition maps to the identity. Since $F'(g_{e,i,j}) = F(e) = \text{id}_{F(*)}$, it is clear that

$$F'(g_{e,k,i}) \circ F'(g_{e,j,k}) \circ F'(g_{e,i,j}) = \text{id}_{F(b_i)}$$

whenever i, j, k are distinct indices. Similarly,

$$F'(g_{s,j,k}) \circ F'(g_{e,i,j}) = F'(s)^{\text{sgn}(j,k,i)} = F'(s)^{\text{sgn}(i,j,k)} = F'(g_{e,j,k}) \circ F'(g_{s,i,j}).$$

If $s''s's = e$ is a relation in R and (i, j, k) is a cyclic shift of $(1, 2, 3)$ we then have $F'(g_{s,i,j}) = F(s)$, $F'(g_{s',j,k}) = F(s')$, and $F'(g_{s'',k,i}) = F(s'')$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} F'(g_{s'',k,i}) \circ F'(g_{s',j,k}) \circ F'(g_{s,i,j}) &= F(s'') \circ F(s') \circ F(s) \\ &= F(s''s's) = F(e) = \text{id}_{F(b_i)}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

3.2. Generalized Dowling geometries. We define a class of matroids which generalize the classical Dowling geometries from finite groups to finitely presented groups (we first defined these in [KY22]). The structure closely parallels that of the Dowling groupoids defined above.

Definition 3.7. Let $G = \langle S \mid R \rangle$ be a group together with a symmetric triangular presentation. The *generalized Dowling geometry* associated to the presentation $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ is the rank 3 matroid M on the ground set

$$E := \{b_1, b_2, b_3\} \cup \{s_i \mid s \in S, 1 \leq i \leq 3\}$$

(i.e., three elements b_1, b_2, b_3 and three indexed copies of each element $s \in S$) and with the following flats of rank 2 (which are called lines, in analogy with affine geometry):

- For each $s \in S$, we place the element s_1 on the line spanned by $\{b_1, b_2\}$, and similarly s_2 and s_3 are on the lines spanned by $\{b_2, b_3\}$ and $\{b_3, b_1\}$ respectively. This means that each of the sets

$$\{b_1, b_2\} \cup \{s_1 \mid s \in S\}, \quad \{b_2, b_3\} \cup \{s_2 \mid s \in S\}, \quad \{b_3, b_1\} \cup \{s_3 \mid s \in S\}$$

is a flat.

- For each relation $s''s's = e$ in R and any cyclic shift (i, j, k) of the indices $(1, 2, 3)$, we take $\{s_i, s'_j, s''_k\}$ to be a flat.

Proposition 3.8. *The generalized Dowling geometry associated to a symmetric triangular group presentation is a matroid and $B = \{b_1, b_2, b_3\}$ is one of its bases.*

Proof. Any two of the rank-2 flats defined above intersect in at most one element, and B is not contained in any of these flats. The result thus follows from [Oxl11, Prop. 1.5.6]. \square

Definition 3.9. Let $G = \langle S \mid R \rangle$ be a group with a symmetric triangular presentation. We define a set $\mathcal{M}_{S,R}$ of generalized Dowling geometries, which we call the *set of generalized Dowling geometries subordinate to $\langle S \mid R \rangle$* .

Denote by T the set of all words $s''s's$, where $s, s', s'' \in S$ are three generators (not necessarily distinct). For each $X \subseteq T$ symmetrize the relations of $\langle S \mid R \cup X \rangle$ and denote by M_X the generalized Dowling geometry associated to the resulting group presentation. Then

$$\mathcal{M}_{S,R} := \{M_X \mid X \subseteq T\}.$$

Remark 3.10. Each generalized Dowling geometry in $\mathcal{M}_{S,R}$ is the geometry associated to $\langle S \mid R \cup X \rangle$ for some X , and there is a quotient map $\langle S \mid R \rangle \rightarrow \langle S \mid R \cup X \rangle$ which is the identity on the generators.

The family $\mathcal{M}_{S,R}$ can also be described as a collection of certain weak images of the generalized Dowling geometry associated to $\langle S \mid R \rangle$, but we will not use this.

4. PROBABILITY SPACE REPRESENTATIONS OF MATROIDS

An entropic representation of a matroid is given by a collection of random variables on a discrete probability space. We introduce some new language to handle these more conveniently: rather than working with the entropy function, we prefer to work with the independence and determination properties of the variables. In terms of the matroids involved, this corresponds to working with independent sets and circuits. We package everything we need into the definition of a “probability space representation” and the accompanying notation. The discussion is essentially equivalent to the probabilistic representations introduced by Matúš in [Mat93].

Definition 4.1. Let (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) be a probability space and let $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ be a finite collection of random variables on (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) . (See Section 2.1 for the notation.)

- (a) The variables $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ are *independent* if for any $(A_e)_{e \in E} \in \prod_{e \in E} \mathcal{F}_e$:

$$P \left(\bigcap_{e \in E} X_e^{-1}(A_e) \right) = \prod_{e \in E} P(X_e^{-1}(A_e)).$$

(This is the usual notion of independence of random variables.)

- (b) Fix $c \in C \subseteq E$. The function X_c is *determined* by $\{X_e\}_{e \in C \setminus \{c\}}$ if there exists a measurable function

$$f : \prod_{e \in C \setminus \{c\}} \Omega_e \rightarrow \Omega_c$$

such that $f \circ (X_e)_{e \in C \setminus \{c\}} = X_c$. Such a function f is called a *determination function* for X_c given $\{X_e\}_{e \in C \setminus \{c\}}$, or just a determination function for short.

Definition 4.2. Let M be a matroid on a finite set E . A probability space representation of M consists of a discrete probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) and an indexed collection of random variables $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ on Ω such that the following conditions hold:

- (a) (Independence.) If $A \subseteq E$ is independent, the variables $\{X_e\}_{e \in A}$ are independent.
- (b) (Determination.) If $C \subseteq E$ is a circuit and $c \in C$, then X_c is determined by $\{X_e\}_{e \in C \setminus \{c\}}$.
- (c) (Non-triviality.) If $e \in E$ is not a loop, there are disjoint measurable $S, T \subsetneq \Omega_e$ such that $X_e^{-1}(S)$ and $X_e^{-1}(T)$ have nonzero probability.

Remark 4.3. The non-triviality condition implies, for instance, that Ω_e is not a singleton. Together with the independence condition, it also ensures that if $e \in A \subseteq E$ where A is independent then X_e is *not* determined by $\{X_f\}_{f \in A \setminus \{e\}}$.

Note that since the probability space is discrete, it is harmless to assume that all singletons have positive probability. With this additional assumption we have that X_A is surjective for each independent $A \subseteq E$.

As in Section 2.1, whenever we work with just one matroid on a ground set E and one probability space representation in (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) , we will denote the measurable spaces and functions associated to each element $e \in E$ by $(\Omega_e, \mathcal{F}_e)$ and $X_e : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega_e$ respectively, without further explicit mention of the notation.

Theorem 4.4. *Let M be a connected matroid of rank at least two. Then M is entropic if and only if it has a probability space representation in a discrete probability space in which each singleton has nonzero probability. In this case, each of the random variables $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ is uniformly distributed and the underlying probability space has a finite subset of probability 1.*

The first part of the theorem relies on standard facts concerning entropy functions and the second part of the theorem is a trivial generalization of a result by Matúš in [Mat93, p.190-191]. We defer the proof to Appendix A.

4.1. Entropic representations of generalized Dowling geometries. In this section we extract group-theoretic information from entropic representations of generalized Dowling geometries.

Theorem 4.5. *Let G be a group with a symmetric triangular presentation $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ and let M be the associated generalized Dowling geometry. If M is entropic then there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that there exists a group homomorphism $\rho : G \rightarrow S_n$ with $\rho(s) \neq \rho(s')$ for distinct $s, s' \in S$.*

This follows from the following more technical result using Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5.

Theorem 4.6. *Let $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ be a group with a symmetric triangular presentation. Let $M = (E, \mathcal{C})$ be the associated generalized Dowling geometry, and let \mathcal{G} be the corresponding groupoid. Suppose M has a probability space representation in a discrete probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) , with each $e \in E$ assigned the measurable space $(\Omega_e, \mathcal{F}_e)$ and the measurable function $X_e : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega_e$. For $s \in S$ and each circuit $C \in \mathcal{C}$ of the form $\{b_i, b_j, s_i\}$ (with i, j*

distinct) let

$$\begin{aligned} f_{s,i,j} &: \Omega_{b_i} \times \Omega_s \rightarrow \Omega_{b_j} \text{ and} \\ f_{s,j,i} &: \Omega_{b_j} \times \Omega_s \rightarrow \Omega_{b_i} \end{aligned}$$

be the two corresponding determination functions of the circuit.

Further define

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{s,i,j} &: \Omega_{b_i} \times \Omega \rightarrow \Omega_{b_j} \times \Omega \\ \varphi_{s,i,j}(\omega_i, \omega) &= (f_{s,i,j}(\omega_i, X_{s_i}(\omega)), \omega) \end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{s,j,i} &: \Omega_{b_j} \times \Omega \rightarrow \Omega_{b_i} \times \Omega \\ \varphi_{s,j,i}(\omega_j, \omega) &= (f_{s,j,i}(\omega_j, X_{s_i}(\omega)), \omega). \end{aligned}$$

Then there is a functor $F : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \text{FinSet}$ defined on objects by $F(b_i) = \Omega_{b_i} \times \Omega$ and on the generators of the morphisms by $F(g_{s,i,j}) = \varphi_{s,i,j}$. This functor is faithful (that is, it maps distinct generating morphisms to distinct morphisms.) More explicitly:

- (a) The functions $\varphi_{s,i,j}$ and $\varphi_{s,j,i}$ are mutually inverse.
- (b) If (i, j, k) is an even permutation of $(1, 2, 3)$ and $s''s's = e$ is a relation in R then

$$\varphi_{s'',k,i} \circ \varphi_{s',j,k} \circ \varphi_{s,i,j} = \text{id}_{\Omega_{b_i} \times \Omega}.$$

- (c) If $s, s' \in S$ are distinct elements and $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ are distinct then $\varphi_{s,i,j} \neq \varphi_{s',i,j}$.

Proof. We assume, as we may by Theorem 4.4, that Ω (together with all probability spaces Ω_e for $e \in E$) is finite. Thus if F defines a functor its values are in FinSet (rather than just Set .) To show F is a functor it suffices to prove the three statements above.

- (a) Let $(\omega_i, \omega) \in \Omega_{b_i} \times \Omega$, and assume without loss of generality that i precedes j in the cyclic ordering of the indices. Denote $\omega_s = X_{s_i}(\omega)$. Then there exists $\omega' \in \Omega$ such that $X_{b_i}(\omega') = \omega_i$ and $X_{s_i}(\omega') = \omega_s$, since $X_{\{b_i, s_i\}}$ is surjective. Denote $\omega_j = X_{b_j}(\omega')$. Then

$$f_{s,i,j}(\omega_i, \omega_s) = f_{s,i,j} \circ X_{\{b_i, s_i\}}(\omega') = X_{b_j}(\omega') = \omega_j,$$

and similarly $f_{s,j,i}(\omega_j, \omega_s) = f_{s,j,i} \circ X_{\{b_j, s_i\}}(\omega') = X_{b_i}(\omega') = \omega_i$. It follows that

$$\varphi_{s,i,j}(\omega_i, \omega) = (\omega_j, \omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_{s,j,i}(\omega_j, \omega) = (\omega_i, \omega).$$

- (b) Let $(\omega_i, \omega) \in \Omega_{b_i} \times \Omega$, and denote $\omega_s = X_{s_i}(\omega)$, $\omega_{s'} = X_{s'_j}(\omega)$. Since $\{b_i, s_i, s'_j\}$ is an independent set, there exists $\omega' \in \Omega$ such that

$$X_{b_i}(\omega') = \omega_i, \quad X_{s_i}(\omega') = \omega_s, \quad \text{and} \quad X_{s'_j}(\omega') = \omega_{s'}.$$

Since $\{s_i, s'_j, s''_k\} \in \mathcal{C}$, the variable $X_{s''_k}$ is determined by the values of X_{s_i} and $X_{s'_j}$, and we have

$$X_{s''_k}(\omega') = X_{s''_k}(\omega)$$

because the same equalities hold for X_{s_i} and $X_{s'_j}$. Using this, we compute:

$$\varphi_{s,i,j}(\omega_i, \omega) = (f_{s,i,j}(\omega_i, \omega_s), \omega) = (X_{b_j}(\omega'), \omega)$$

where the last equality holds because $X_{b_i}(\omega') = \omega_i$ and $X_{s_i}(\omega') = \omega_s$. In precisely the same way,

$$\varphi_{s',j,k}(X_{b_j}(\omega'), \omega) = (f_{s',j,k}(X_{b_j}(\omega'), \omega_{s'}), \omega) = (X_{b_k}(\omega'), \omega) \quad \text{and}$$

$$\varphi_{s'',k,i}(X_{b_k}(\omega'), \omega) = (f_{s'',k,i}(X_{b_k}(\omega'), X_{s''_k}(\omega')), \omega) = (\omega_i, \omega)$$

so that $\varphi_{s'',k,i} \circ \varphi_{s',j,k} \circ \varphi_{s,i,j}(\omega_i, \omega) = (\omega_i, \omega)$ where $(\omega_i, \omega) \in \Omega_{b_i} \times \Omega$ is an arbitrary element.

- (c) Assume without loss of generality that i precedes j in the cyclic ordering, and consider the circuits $C_1 = \{b_i, b_j, s_i\}$ and $C_2 = \{b_i, b_j, s'_i\}$ in M . Since $\{s_i, s'_i\}$ is an independent subset, there exist elements $\omega, \omega' \in \Omega$ such that $X_{s'_i}(\omega) = X_{s'_i}(\omega')$ but $X_{s_i}(\omega) \neq X_{s_i}(\omega')$ (here we used the non-triviality condition of probability space representations of matroids).

Fix $\omega_i \in \Omega_{b_i}$. Then by definition

$$\varphi_{s',i,j}(\omega_i, \omega) = f_{s',i,j}(\omega_i, X_{s'_i}(\omega)) = f_{s',i,j}(\omega_i, X_{s'_i}(\omega')) = \varphi_{s',i,j}(\omega_i, \omega').$$

Suppose for a contradiction that $\omega_j := \varphi_{s,i,j}(\omega_i, \omega) = \varphi_{s,i,j}(\omega_i, \omega')$ also. Since $\{b_i, s_i\}$ are independent we can find $\tilde{\omega}, \tilde{\omega}' \in \Omega$ such that $(X_{b_i}, X_{s_i})(\tilde{\omega}) = (\omega_i, X_{s_i}(\omega))$ and $(X_{b_i}, X_{s_i})(\tilde{\omega}') = (\omega_i, X_{s_i}(\omega'))$. Using the fact that X_{b_j} is determined by X_{b_i} and X_{s_i} we obtain the equalities

$$\begin{aligned} (X_{b_i}, X_{s_i}, X_{b_j})(\tilde{\omega}) &= (\omega_i, X_{s_i}(\omega), \omega_j) \quad \text{and} \\ (X_{b_i}, X_{s_i}, X_{b_j})(\tilde{\omega}') &= (\omega_i, X_{s_i}(\omega'), \omega_j). \end{aligned}$$

In particular $(X_{b_i}, X_{b_j})(\tilde{\omega}) = (\omega_i, \omega_j) = (X_{b_i}, X_{b_j})(\tilde{\omega}')$. But X_{s_i} is determined by X_{b_i} and X_{b_j} , so

$$X_{s_i}(\omega) = X_{s_i}(\tilde{\omega}) = X_{s_i}(\tilde{\omega}') = X_{s_i}(\omega').$$

This is a contradiction. □

5. MULTILINEAR REPRESENTATIONS OF MATROIDS

Multilinear matroids are entropic [Mat99], so the results of Section 4.1 are valid for them as well: a multilinear representation of a generalized Dowling geometry gives rise, by the correspondences described above, to a representation of the associated groupoid. We prove a partial converse to this result, which states that under certain conditions a matrix representation of a group $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ implies that the corresponding generalized Dowling geometry is multilinear. But first we digress and discuss multilinear matroid representations on their own terms: We introduce an equivalent definition of multilinear representability which is directly analogous to probability space representations. We feel this definition helps clarify what is going on: groupoid representations are constructed using determination functions in a manner similar to the entropic case.

5.1. Notation for vector spaces and linear maps. We introduce some notation which closely parallels the notation for probability spaces and random variables introduced in Section 2.1.

Let \mathbb{F} be a field. An indexed collection of linear maps on a vector space V over \mathbb{F} consists of an index set E , a collection of vector spaces $\{W_e\}_{e \in E}$, and a collection of linear maps $\{T_e : V \rightarrow W_e\}_{e \in E}$. As in Section 2.1, we sometimes write “let $\{T_e\}_{e \in E}$ be a collection of linear maps on V , and refer to the codomain of each T_e by W_e (without naming W_e explicitly).

Given a tuple $S = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ of elements of E , we denote $W_S = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n W_{s_i}$ and define a linear map $T_S : V \rightarrow W_S$ by

$$T_S(v) = (T_{s_i}(v))_{i=1}^n.$$

If the order is inessential, the same notation can be used if S is a set.

5.2. Vector space representations. The following terminology is nonstandard, but useful because of the close analogy with random variables, probability spaces, and probability space representations of matroids. All vector spaces in this section are over a fixed field \mathbb{F} and assumed to be finite dimensional.

Definition 5.1. Let V be a vector space, let E be a finite set, and let $\{T_e\}_{e \in E}$ be a collection of linear maps on V .

- (a) The maps $\{T_e\}_{e \in E}$ are *independent* if $\text{rk}(T_E) = \sum_{e \in E} \dim W_e$.
- (b) Fix $x \in E$. The map T_x is *determined* by $\{T_e\}_{e \in E \setminus \{x\}}$ if there exists a linear map $S : W_{E \setminus \{x\}} \rightarrow W_x$ such that

$$T_x = S \circ T_{E \setminus \{x\}}.$$

Definition 5.2. Let M be a matroid on E . A *vector space representation* of M consists of $c \in \mathbb{N}$, a vector space V , a collection of vector spaces $\{W_e\}_{e \in E}$ with $\dim W_e = c$ for all $e \in E$, and a collection of linear maps $\{T_e : V \rightarrow W_e\}_{e \in E}$. These are required to satisfy:

- (a) If $A \subseteq E$ is independent in M then the maps $\{T_e\}_{e \in A}$ are independent.
- (b) If $c \in C \subseteq E$ is a circuit in M then T_c is determined by $\{T_e\}_{e \in C \setminus \{c\}}$.

We hope the proliferation of similar names (linear and multilinear representations of matroids, vector space representations) does not cause confusion. Vector space representability for matroids is equivalent to multilinear representability.

Theorem 5.3. *A simple matroid has a vector space representation if and only if it is multilinear.*

This is a special case of the more general Theorem 9.5.

Given a representation of a finitely presented group we can construct a vector space representation of the associated generalized Dowling geometry under certain conditions.

Theorem 5.4. *Let G be a group with a symmetric triangular presentation $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ and let $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(W)$ be a linear representation of G in a vector space W . Suppose that*

- (a) *If $s, s' \in S$ are distinct then $\rho(s) - \rho(s')$ is invertible,*
- (b) *Whenever $s, s', s'' \in S$ (not necessarily distinct) satisfy $\rho(ss's'') \neq \text{id}_W$ the linear transformation $\rho(ss's'') - \text{id}_W$ is invertible, and*
- (c) *For $s, s', s'' \in S$ satisfying $\rho(ss's'') = \text{id}_W$, the equation $ss's'' = e$ is a relation in R .*

Then the generalized Dowling geometry corresponding to the presentation $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ has a vector space representation.

Moreover, if the representation ρ just satisfies the assumptions (a) and (b) then some matroid of the generalized Dowling geometries $\mathcal{M}_{S,R}$ subordinate to $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ has a vector space representation.

Proof. This is the special case $\varepsilon = 0$ of the more general Theorem 9.11 proved below. \square

6. GROUP SCRAMBLING

We introduce a two-step construction to modify finitely presented groups. Its goal is to facilitate the encoding of word problems into representation problems for generalized Dowling geometries. The main difficulty is that a linear representation of a group need not satisfy conditions (a,b) of Theorem 5.4.

The first step, which we call *scrambling*, takes as input a symmetric triangular presentation $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ of a group G , and outputs a presentation $\langle S' \mid R' \rangle$ of $(G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$ where F_R is the free group on the generating set R , $*$ is the free product of groups, and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ is some natural number. Any matrix representation of G extends to a representation of $\langle S' \mid R' \rangle$ which satisfies conditions (a,b) of Theorem 5.4.

The second step, which we call *augmentation*, takes as input the result of the first step together with the original presentation $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ and a generator $s \in S$. It outputs a presentation of $(G * F_R * F_4) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$ (where $F_4 = \langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle$ is the free group on four generators). The resulting presentation has z_1 and sz_1s as two of its generators; it has a matrix representation

satisfying the conditions of Theorem 5.4 if and only if there is a matrix representation ρ of G such that $\rho(s) \neq \rho(e)$. The “only if” direction follows from that fact that $z_1 \neq sz_1s$ only if $s \neq e$. The “if” follows from a direct construction of a representation, which is rather lengthy and forms a significant part of what follows.

Throughout this section we work over \mathbb{C} in order to ensure the existence of roots of unity. Our main aim is to show that certain matroids are entropic, and for this it suffices to show that they are multilinear over some field by [Mat99]. Therefore, working over \mathbb{C} results in no loss of generality.

6.1. Sufficiently generic elements. In the rest of this section we face the following sort of problem several times: given some finitely presented group $G = \langle S \mid R \rangle$, a free group F on some finite set of generators, an element $g \in G * F$, and a linear representation $\rho : G * F \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$, show that $\rho(g) - I_n$ is invertible or zero.

We have some control over ρ . In particular, we are able to ensure that for each $g \in G$ the matrix $\rho(g)$ is either I_n or the permutation matrix of a derangement. This motivates the next definition.

Definition 6.1. Let F_S be a free group with basis S and F_T a free group on the set of generators T . An element of $x \in F_S * F_T$ is a *sufficiently generic word* if the following holds: Suppose $\rho : F_S * F_T \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ is a linear representation satisfying

- (a) For each $s \in S$, $\rho(s)$ is either I_n or the permutation matrix of a derangement.
- (b) The indexed collection of entries of the matrices $\{\rho(t)\}_{t \in T}$ is algebraically independent over \mathbb{Q} .

Then $\rho(x) - I_n$ is either invertible or 0.

Definition 6.2. Let G be a group and let S be a finite set together with a map $\varphi : S \rightarrow G$. Let F_T a free group on the set of generators T . Denote by $\varphi : F_S \rightarrow G$ the group homomorphism mapping each $s \in S \subset F_S$ to the corresponding element $\varphi(s)$ of G . An element $x \in G * F_T$ is *sufficiently generic relative to φ* if there exists a sufficiently generic word $\tilde{x} \in F_S * F_T$ such that x is conjugate to the image of \tilde{x} under the map $\varphi * \mathrm{id}_{F_T} : F_S * F_T \rightarrow G * F_T$.

Remark 6.3. Often, S is either a subset of G or a set of generators in a group presentation $\langle S \mid R \rangle \simeq G$, in which case φ is the obvious map $S \rightarrow G$. In general, whenever the map φ is clear from the context, we omit it and discuss sufficiently generic elements relative to S .

We prove that various elements of $G * F_T$ are sufficiently generic.

Lemma 6.4. Let $g, g' \in G$ and let $t \in T$. The following elements of $G * F_T$ are sufficiently generic relative to $\{g, g'\}$:

- (i) The element $gtgt^{-1}$,
- (ii) the commutator $[t, g]$, and
- (iii) the commutator $[g, tg']$.

In particular, in parts (i), (ii), the elements are sufficiently generic relative to $\{g\}$. Moreover, if $\rho : F_{\{g, g'\}} * F_T \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ is a representation such that $\rho(g)$ is the permutation matrix of a derangement and $\rho(t)$ has entries which are algebraically independent over \mathbb{Q} then the element w of each of (i), (ii), (iii) satisfies that $\rho(w) - I_n$ is invertible.

Proof. It suffices to prove the claim with G replaced by the free group $F = \langle g, g' \rangle$. For the rest of the proof G denotes this free group.

Let $\rho : G * F_T \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ be a representation satisfying the assumptions (a) and (b) of Definition 6.1. So in particular $\rho(g)$ is either I_n or the permutation matrix of a derangement and $\rho(t)$ is a matrix with algebraically independent entries. If $\rho(g) = I_n$ then $\rho(x) - I_n$

is 0 for each of the considered words x and we are done. We therefore assume that $\rho(g)$ is the permutation matrix of a derangement.

By Lemma 2.32 each of the matrices $\rho(g)$ and $\rho(g^{-1})$ is conjugate to a block diagonal matrix in which each nonzero $m \times m$ block is a diagonal matrix of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} \omega^0 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \omega^{m-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

for ω a primitive m -th root of unity, and $m \geq 2$ for all blocks. Thus by changing basis we may assume that $\rho(g)$ has this form.

- (i) To show $\rho(gtgt^{-1}) - I_n$ is invertible it suffices to show $\rho(t) - \rho(gtg)$ is invertible. In a basis in which $\rho(g)$ has the form above, substitute a block diagonal matrix for $\rho(t)$ in which each diagonal block is of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

In this basis, each diagonal block of $\rho(t) - \rho(gtg)$ is of the form

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \omega^0 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \omega^{m-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \omega^0 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \omega^{m-1} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \omega^{m-1} \\ 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ \omega^{m-1} & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = (1 - \omega^{m-1}) \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

which has rank m , so each block is invertible. Thus by Corollary 2.34 the matrix $\rho(gtgt^{-1}) - I_n$ is also invertible.

- (ii) Using Corollary 2.34 again it suffices to show that $[A, \rho(g)] - I_n$ is invertible for some invertible matrix A . Again, working in a basis in which $\rho(g)$ has the block diagonal form described above and taking an A with the same block structure, it suffices to show this on each diagonal block separately. Note that for invertible matrices A, B , the matrix $[A, B] - I_n$ is invertible if and only if $AB - BA$ is invertible. To see this, note that

$$(AB - BA)(BA)^{-1} = ABA^{-1}B^{-1} - I_n.$$

Thus for each integer $m \geq 2$ and each primitive m -th root of unity ω we need to find an $m \times m$ matrix A such that

$$A \begin{bmatrix} \omega^0 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \omega^{m-1} \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \omega^0 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \omega^{m-1} \end{bmatrix} A$$

is invertible. Take the matrix A that acts on the standard basis e_1, \dots, e_n of the column space \mathbb{C}^n by $Ae_i = e_{i+1}$ for $i < n$, and $Ae_n = e_1$. Thus

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & \\ & \ddots & \ddots \\ & & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

where the unfilled entries are zero. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & A \begin{bmatrix} \omega^0 & & & \\ & \ddots & & \\ & & \omega^{m-1} & \\ & & & \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \omega^0 & & & \\ & \ddots & & \\ & & \omega^{m-1} & \\ & & & \end{bmatrix} A \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & \omega^{m-1} \\ \omega^0 & 0 & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & \omega^{m-2} & 0 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & \omega^0 \\ \omega^1 & 0 & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & \omega^{m-1} & 0 \end{bmatrix} = (1 - \omega) A \begin{bmatrix} \omega^0 & & & \\ & \ddots & & \\ & & \omega^{m-1} & \\ & & & \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

which is invertible, as a product of an invertible scalar and two invertible matrices.

- (iii) As $\rho(g')$ is a permutation matrix by assumption, $\rho(tg')$ is a matrix with algebraically independent entries. Thus this case follows from the previous one. \square

6.2. Scrambled groups and their representations. We encode the properties that our scrambling construction satisfies into a definition, and work with it axiomatically to defer the discussion of the implementation. The actual construction is postponed to Section 6.4.

Definition 6.5. Let G be a group given by a symmetric triangular presentation $\langle S \mid R \rangle$. We call a finitely presented group $G' = \langle S' \mid R' \rangle$ a *scrambling* of $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ if it satisfies the following properties:

(PS1) $\langle S' \mid R' \rangle$ is a symmetric triangular presentation.

(PS2) There is an isomorphism $\mu : G' \rightarrow (G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$ for some $N \geq 0$ where F_R is the free group on the letters f_r for $r \in R$. We denote the projections onto the factors by

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_G &: (G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^N \rightarrow G, \\ \pi_{\mathbb{Z}} &: (G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^N, \\ \pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}} &: (G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{|R|} \times \mathbb{Z}^N, \end{aligned}$$

where $\pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}$ is the composition of the projection to $F_R \times \mathbb{Z}^N$ with the abelianization homomorphism of F_R . Slightly abusing notation we identify G' with $(G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$ via μ .

(PS3) If $s, s' \in S'$ are distinct then $\pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(s) \neq \pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(s')$.

(PS4) For any $s, s', s'' \in S'$ (not necessarily distinct) either

- (i) $\pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(s''s's) \neq 0$,
- (ii) $s''s's = e$ in G' , or
- (iii) $s''s's$ is a sufficiently generic element in $G * F_R$ relative to the map $S \rightarrow G$ given by the presentation $G = \langle S \mid R \rangle$. (Note that $s''s's$ is in $G * F_R \simeq (G * F_R) \times \{0\}$ if (i) does not hold.)

(PS5) There is a function $i : S \hookrightarrow S'$ such that $\pi_G \circ i = \text{id}_G \upharpoonright_S$.

(PS6) There is a basis $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_N\}$ of \mathbb{Z}^N and a function $j : B \rightarrow S'$ such that $\mu \circ j(b_i) = (e_{G * F_R}, b_i)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq N$.

(The functions i and j are to be given explicitly.)

(PS7) For each $s \in S$ we have $\mu(i(s)) \in (G * \{e_F\}) \times \mathbb{Z}^N \leq (G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$. Further, there is a $1 \leq k \leq N$ such that $\pi_{\mathbb{Z}}(i(s)) = \sum_{m=1}^N c_m b_m$ with $c_k \geq 5$, and such that for each $s' \in S'$, the absolute value of the b_k -coefficient of $\pi_{\mathbb{Z}}(s')$ is at most $c_k + 1$.

We will frequently use the following immediate consequence of the definition of a group scrambling.

Proposition 6.6. *In the notation of Definition 6.5 consider the equation*

$$\pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x''x'x) = 0$$

where $x, x', x'' \in G'$. If we fix $x = g$ and $x'' = g''$ for some generators $g, g'' \in S'$ then there is at most one $x' \in S'$ that satisfies this equation.

Proof. Since the group $\mathbb{Z}^{|R|} \times \mathbb{Z}^N$ is abelian the equation $\pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x'' x' x) = 0$ is equivalent to $\pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x') = -\pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(g g'')$ assuming $x = g$ and $x'' = g''$. Therefore by property (PS3) if there exists a generator g' such that $x' = g'$ fulfills the equation this generator must be unique. \square

Let $G = \langle S \mid R \rangle$ be a group with a given symmetric triangular presentation. We prove that certain matrix representations of G extend to nice representations of scramblings of G .

Proposition 6.7. *Let $\langle S' \mid R' \rangle$ be a scrambling of $G = \langle S \mid R \rangle$, so that $\langle S' \mid R' \rangle \simeq (G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$. Let $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ be a representation satisfying that for each $g \in G$ the matrix $\rho(g)$ is either the permutation matrix of a derangement or the identity matrix. Then there exists a representation*

$$\tilde{\rho} : (G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^N \rightarrow \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$$

which satisfies:

- (a) If $s, s' \in S'$ are distinct then $\tilde{\rho}(s) - \tilde{\rho}(s')$ is invertible.
- (b) For $s, s', s'' \in S'$ (not necessarily distinct) the matrix $\tilde{\rho}(s'' s' s) - I_n$ is either invertible or zero.
- (c) For each $g \in G$ we have $\tilde{\rho}(g) = \rho(g)$.

Proof. Choose algebraically independent elements $\{y_{r,i,j}\}_{r \in R, 1 \leq i, j \leq n} \cup \{z_1, \dots, z_N\} \subset \mathbb{C}$ over \mathbb{Q} .

The free group F_R has generators f_r for $r \in R$. For each such generator f_r we define

$$\tilde{\rho}(f_r) = (y_{r,i,j})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}.$$

For $g \in G$ define $\tilde{\rho}(g) = \rho(g)$. This extends to a representation $\tilde{\rho} : G * F_R \rightarrow \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ because $G * F_R$ is a free product, and F_R is free. Thus $\langle S \cup \{f_r\}_{r \in R} \mid R \rangle$ is a presentation of $G * F_R$, and it is clear that $\tilde{\rho}$ maps all words that represent relators to the identity matrix.

This representation extends further to a representation of $(G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$ as follows. For $v = (v_1, \dots, v_N) \in \mathbb{Z}^N$ define

$$\tilde{\rho}(v) = \left(\prod_{i=1}^N z_i^{v_i} \right) \cdot I_n.$$

If $g \in G * F_R$ and $v \in \mathbb{Z}^N$, define $\tilde{\rho}(gv) = \tilde{\rho}(g) \tilde{\rho}(v)$. Any element of $(G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$ can be written in exactly one way in the form gv , so $\tilde{\rho}$ is well defined. It is a homomorphism essentially because if $v \in \mathbb{Z}^N$ then $\tilde{\rho}(v)$ is a scalar matrix, and hence commutes with all matrices in the image of $\tilde{\rho}$. More explicitly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}(g_1 v_1 \cdot g_2 v_2) &= \tilde{\rho}((g_1 g_2) (v_1 v_2)) = (\tilde{\rho}(g_1) \tilde{\rho}(g_2)) (\tilde{\rho}(v_1) \tilde{\rho}(v_2)) \\ &= \tilde{\rho}(g_1) \tilde{\rho}(v_1) \tilde{\rho}(g_2) \tilde{\rho}(v_2) = \tilde{\rho}(g_1 v_1) \tilde{\rho}(g_2 v_2), \end{aligned}$$

for $g_1, g_2 \in G * F_R$ and $v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^N$. Observe that if $v \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ is nonzero then $\tilde{\rho}(v)$ is of the form λI_n where λ is transcendental over \mathbb{Q} .

We now prove the three claimed properties. It is convenient to define an auxiliary representation $\tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}} : (G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$ which is defined in the same way as $\tilde{\rho}$ by extending ρ except that $\tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}(f_r) = y_{r,1,1} I_n$ for all $r \in R$.

- (a) Let $s, s' \in S'$ be distinct elements. Denote $v = \pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(s)$ and $v' = \pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(s')$, as well as $z = \tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}(v)$ and $z' = \tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}(v')$. By property (PS3) of scramblings $v \neq v'$, so $z^{-1} z'$ is transcendental over \mathbb{Q} . Denote $g = \pi_G(s)$ and $g' = \pi_G(s')$. It suffices to prove that the matrix $\rho(g) z - \rho(g') z'$ is invertible by Lemma 2.33: this matrix is obtained from $\tilde{\rho}(s) - \tilde{\rho}(s')$ by substituting different values instead of the transcendental matrix

entries $\{y_{r,i,j}\}_{r,i,j}$. More explicitly, each matrix $\tilde{\rho}(f_r) = (y_{r,i,j})_{i,j}$ is replaced by $y_{r,1,1}I_n$. Thus, instead of each off-diagonal entry $y_{r,i,j}$ ($i \neq j$) we substitute 0, and instead of each diagonal entry $y_{r,i,i}$ we substitute $y_{r,1,1}$.

Since $z^{-1}z'$ is transcendental over \mathbb{Q} , Corollary 2.35 implies that

$$\det(\rho(g) - z^{-1}z'\rho(g')) \neq 0.$$

Hence also $\det(\rho(g)z - \rho(g')z') \neq 0$.

(b) Let $s, s', s'' \in S'$ be not necessarily distinct generators. Then by property (PS4) of scramblings exactly one of the following three cases holds:

Case 1: Suppose $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(s''s's) \neq 0$. Denote $z = \tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}(\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(s''s's))$ as well as $g = \pi_G(s''s's)$. By construction $z \cdot \tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}(g) = \tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}(s''s's)$. Since z is transcendental over \mathbb{Q} , Corollary 2.35 shows $\det(\tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}(s''s's) - I_n) \neq 0$. By Corollary 2.34 also $\tilde{\rho}(s''s's) - I_n$ is invertible.

Case 2: If $s''s's = e$ then $\tilde{\rho}(s''s's) - I_n = 0$.

Case 3: Suppose $s''s's$ is sufficiently generic relative to S . By construction, for each $g \in G$ the matrix $\tilde{\rho}(g)$ is either the identity matrix or a permutation matrix of a derangement, and the entries of the matrices representing the free generators of F_R are mutually transcendental elements over the prime field. So by definition of sufficiently generic elements the matrix $\tilde{\rho}(s''s's) - I_n$ is invertible.

(c) This is immediate from the construction of $\tilde{\rho}$. \square

6.3. The augmentation construction. We construct and prove the necessary properties of augmentations of

a presentation of the group $(G * F_R * \langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$ with certain properties. These properties are encoded by Propositions 6.10 and 6.12.

Construction 6.8. Let $\langle S' \mid R' \rangle$ be a scrambling of the group $G = \langle S \mid R \rangle$ given by a symmetric triangular presentation, and let $s \in S$ be a given generator. We use the same notation as in Definition 6.5: $G' = \langle S' \mid R' \rangle$ is isomorphic to $(G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$ for some given $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_N\}$ is a basis of \mathbb{Z}^N , and $\mu, \pi_{\mathbb{Z}}, \pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}, \pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}, i$, and j are the same maps as in that definition.

In what follows we construct a new finitely presented group $G'' = \langle S'' \mid R'' \rangle$ by iteratively adding generators and relations to S' and R' .

(C1) Add four generators z_1, \dots, z_4 to S' . For each $1 \leq i \leq N$ and each $1 \leq k \leq 4$ we add the following generators and relations in order to ensure that $j(b_i)$ commutes with z_k in G'' :

(a) Add a generator $u_{z_k,i}$ and its inverse $u_{z_k,i}^{-1}$.

(b) Add the relations $u_{z_k,i}u_{z_k,i}^{-1}e = e$, $j(b_i)z_ku_{z_k,i}^{-1} = e$, and $u_{z_k,i}j(b_i)^{-1}z_k^{-1} = e$.

Remark 6.9. Note that the first of these relations ensures that $u_{z_k,i}$ and $u_{z_k,i}^{-1}$ are actually inverses in G'' ; the second is equivalent to $u_{z_k,i} = j(b_i)z_k$; and substituting the second relation into the third, we obtain $j(b_i)z_kj(b_i)^{-1}z_k^{-1} = e$. We “break up” relations in this way in the rest of this construction and in Construction 6.16 to ensure that indeed all relations in the constructed presentation have length three.

(C2) Add a new generator t to S' . The following ensures that $t = sz_1s$ in G'' : Denote $s' = i(s)$, and express $-2 \cdot \pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(s') \in \mathbb{Z}^N$ as a minimal-length sum

$$\varepsilon_1 b_{k_1} + \varepsilon_2 b_{k_2} + \dots + \varepsilon_r b_{k_r}$$

of elements of B , where $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_r \in \{-1, 1\}$. Recall that $\pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(s')$ is generated by elements in B by property (PS7). We add generators and relations to “break up” the relation

$$t = z_4^{-1} \left(z_4 \left((z_3^{-1} ((z_3 s') z_1 s')) z_2 b_{k_1}^{\varepsilon_1} z_2 b_{k_2}^{\varepsilon_2} z_2 \dots b_{k_{r-1}}^{\varepsilon_{r-1}} z_2 b_{k_r}^{\varepsilon_r} \right) \underbrace{z_2^{-1} \dots z_2^{-1}}_{r \text{ times}} \right).$$

Explicitly:

(a) Add generators v_1, \dots, v_4 , one for each of the words

$$z_3 s', \quad (z_3 s') z_1, \quad (z_3 s') z_1 s', \quad (z_3^{-1} ((z_3 s') z_1 s')) = s' z_1 s'.$$

Then add their inverses, together with relations

$$v_1 v_1^{-1} e = e, \dots, v_4 v_4^{-1} e = e$$

and the relations

$$z_3 s' v_1^{-1} = e, \quad v_1 z_1 v_2^{-1} = e, \quad v_2 s' v_3^{-1} = e, \quad z_3^{-1} v_3 v_4^{-1} = e.$$

These relations ensure that $v_1 = z_3 s'$, $v_2 = (z_3 s') z_1$, $v_3 = (z_3 s') z_1 s'$, and $v_4 = s' z_1 s'$ in the resulting group.

(b) Add further generators $v_5 = v_{4+1}$ up to v_{4+2r} , one for each of the words

$$(z_3^{-1} ((z_3 s') z_1 s')) z_2, \dots, (z_3^{-1} ((z_3 s') z_1 s')) z_2 b_{k_1}^{\varepsilon_1} z_2 b_{k_2}^{\varepsilon_2} z_2 \dots b_{k_{r-1}}^{\varepsilon_{r-1}} z_2 b_{k_r}^{\varepsilon_r}.$$

Add the inverses of these generators, together with the appropriate relations (analogously to the above).

(c) Add generators v_{5+2r} up to v_{5+3r} for each of the words

$$z_4 v_{4+2r}, z_4 v_{4+2r} z_2^{-1}, \dots, z_4 v_{4+2r} \underbrace{z_2^{-1} \dots z_2^{-1}}_{r \text{ times}}.$$

Add inverses for these generators, and add the appropriate relations (exactly as above).

(d) Add a generator t , together with its inverse and the relation $tt^{-1}e = e$. Then add the relation $z_4^{-1} v_{5+3r} t^{-1} = e$ to ensure $t = s z_1 s$ in G'' .

(C3) Symmetrize the set of relations.

We abuse notation slightly and denote by b_i (for $1 \leq i \leq N$) the element $j(b_i)$ in G'' . As for general elements of G'' , we use multiplicative notation for b_i in this context. Thus for $\varepsilon \in \{-1, 1\}$, b_i^ε denotes an element of G'' , but εb_i denotes an element of \mathbb{Z}^N .

Proposition 6.10. *In the notation of the construction, $G'' = \langle S'' \mid R'' \rangle$ is isomorphic to $(G * F_R * \langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$ by an isomorphism which maps each element of $S' \subset S''$ to the corresponding element of $(G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^N \leq (G * F_R * \langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$, and which maps z_1, \dots, z_4 to the elements of the same name in $(G * F_R * \langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$.*

*This isomorphism maps $t \in S''$ to $(s z_1 s, 0) \in (G * F_R * \langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$.*

Proof. The proposition defines a map $G'' \rightarrow (G * F_R * \langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$, and this is clearly surjective. It is injective: first note that step (C1) of the construction ensures that every element of G'' commutes with each $j(b_k)$. Consider a relation added during step (C2), skipping over all relations of the form $yy^{-1}e = e$ for y a new generator. Each such relation is of the form $x_1 \dots x_n y^{-1} = e$, for y one of the new generators which does not appear in any of the previous relations (except $yy^{-1}e = e$). Thus, traversing this list in reverse, we may apply Tietze transformations to remove each relation along with the generator y . The same procedure can be applied to the relations $u_{z_k, i} u_{z_k, i}^{-1} e = e$ and $j(b_i) z_k u_{z_k, i}^{-1} = e$ and the generators $u_{z_k, i}$ (for all $1 \leq k \leq 4$ and $1 \leq i \leq N$), thus eliminating all new generators in S'' except for z_1, \dots, z_4 and their inverses. At the end of this process is finished we end up

with the group presentation

$$\left\langle S' \cup \{z_1, \dots, z_4\} \mid R' \cup \{j(b_i) z_k j(b_i)^{-1} z_k^{-1}\}_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq N \\ 1 \leq k \leq 4}} \right\rangle,$$

which is isomorphic to $(G * F_R * \langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$ in the desired manner.

Observe that $t = s' z_1 s' z_2 b_{k_1}^{\varepsilon_1} z_2 b_{k_2}^{\varepsilon_2} z_2 \dots b_{k_{r-1}}^{\varepsilon_{r-1}} z_2 b_{k_r}^{\varepsilon_r} z_2^{-r}$ in G'' , where $s' \in S'$ maps to $(s, \pi_{\mathbb{Z}}(s')) \in (G * \langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$ (this is its image in $G * F_R \times \mathbb{Z}^N$ under μ). \square

This proposition allows us to identify G'' with $(G * F_R * \langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$.

Notation 6.11. Consider the quotient map $G'' \rightarrow \langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle$. Composing the abelianization homomorphism $\langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^4$ on this map we obtain a homomorphism

$$\deg_z : G'' \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^4.$$

Define homomorphisms $\deg_{z_i} : G'' \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ for each $1 \leq i \leq 4$, so that $\deg_{z_i}(x)$ is the total degree of z_i in x , and $\deg_z(x) = (\deg_{z_1}(x), \dots, \deg_{z_4}(x))$.

Proposition 6.12. Let $G = \langle S \mid R \rangle$ be a group given by a symmetric triangular presentation and let $G' = \langle S' \mid R' \rangle$ be a scrambling. Let $s \in S$ and let $G'' = \langle S'' \mid R'' \rangle \simeq (G * F_R * \langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$ be the associated augmentation. Then the following two conditions are equivalent:

- (i) There exists a representation $\rho : G \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\rho(s) \neq \rho(e)$.
- (ii) There exists a representation $\tilde{\rho} : G'' \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ which satisfies:
 - (a) If $x, x' \in S''$ are distinct then $\tilde{\rho}(x) - \tilde{\rho}(x')$ is invertible,
 - (b) For $x, x', x'' \in S''$ a not necessarily distinct triple of generators, $\tilde{\rho}(x''x'x) - I_n$ is invertible or 0.

Proof. Assume (ii) holds. The isomorphism from G'' to $(G * F_R * \langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$ stemming from Proposition 6.10 maps the generator $t \in S''$ (see Construction 6.8) to $s z_1 s$. Further observe that $z_1 \in S''$. Since z_1, t are distinct generators, $\tilde{\rho}(z_1) - \tilde{\rho}(t)$ is invertible, and in particular $\tilde{\rho}(t) = \tilde{\rho}(s z_1 s) \neq \tilde{\rho}(z_1)$. Thus $\tilde{\rho}(s) \neq \tilde{\rho}(e)$. Restricting $\tilde{\rho}$ to $G \leq (G * F_R * \langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$ we obtain (i).

Assuming (i) holds, let $\rho : G \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ be a representation such that $\rho(s) \neq \rho(e)$. By applying Lemma 2.31, changing n as necessary, we obtain a new representation ρ of G with the property that every $\rho(x)$ for $x \in S$ is the permutation matrix of a derangement or the identity matrix and $\rho(s) \neq I_n$. By Proposition 6.7, ρ extends to a representation ρ' of $G' \simeq G * F_R \times \mathbb{Z}^N$ over \mathbb{C} satisfying conditions analogous to (a) and (b). Let $\{\xi_{k,i,j}\}_{1 \leq k \leq 4, 1 \leq i,j \leq n}$ be a collection of complex numbers which are algebraically independent over \mathbb{Q} and algebraically independent over all entries in the matrices of the image of ρ' . Now extend ρ' to $\tilde{\rho} : G'' \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ by defining (on generators) $\tilde{\rho}(z_k) = (\xi_{k,i,j})_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ for each $1 \leq k \leq 4$. This defines a representation $\tilde{\rho} : (G * F_R * \langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle) \times \mathbb{Z}^N \simeq G'' \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ because elements of the \mathbb{Z}^N -factor map to scalar matrices, which commute with all matrices in $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$, and because any representation of $G * F_R$ extends to a representation of $G * F_R * \langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle$ once the images of z_1, \dots, z_4 are chosen (there is no constraint on these images because there are no nontrivial relations involving any of z_1, \dots, z_4).

We verify that conditions (a) and (b) hold for this representation by considering the various pairs and triples of generators in S'' .

As a first step, we verify that if $\deg_z(x''x'x) \neq 0$ then $\tilde{\rho}(x''x'x) - I_n$ is invertible. So assume for $x, x', x'' \in S''$ that $\deg_{z_i}(x''x'x) \neq 0$ for some i . Considering

$$\det(\tilde{\rho}(x''x'x) - I_n)$$

as a polynomial in the entries of $\tilde{\rho}(z_i)$ we see that the determinant doesn't vanish, because it doesn't vanish if we substitute a transcendental multiple of the identity matrix by Corollary 2.35. We also get invertibility if $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x''x'x) \neq 0$, by the same argument.

Therefore to verify the conditions (a) and (b) it suffices to check ordered pairs x, x' of generators which have equal values under \deg_z and $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}$ and ordered triples x, x', x'' with $\deg_z(x''x'x) = \pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x''x'x) = 0$. By the next proposition (Proposition 6.13), the only such pairs are $x = t, x' = z_1$, the inverse pair $x = t^{-1}, z_1^{-1}$, and their re-orderings. To see that $\tilde{\rho}(xx') - I_n$ is invertible in this case, we note that $t = sz_1s$ in G'' by Proposition 6.10, and $\rho(s) \neq e$ is the permutation matrix of a derangement. From Lemma 6.4, it follows that $\rho(tz_1^{-1}) - I_n$ is invertible and hence so are $\rho(t) - \rho(z_1)$ and $\rho(z_1^{-1}) - \rho(t^{-1})$ as desired.

Similarly, for each ordered triple x, x', x'' which satisfies $\deg_z(x''x'x) = \pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x''x'x) = 0$, we need to check that $\tilde{\rho}(x''x'x) - I_n$ is invertible or 0. It suffices that $x''x'x$ is either the identity element or sufficiently generic in $G * (\langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle * F_R)$ relative to S (notice that $x''x'x \in G * (\langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle * F_R)$ because its projection to \mathbb{Z}^N is trivial by assumption. Since $(\langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle * F_R)$ is a free group, we can discuss its sufficient genericity). That this holds is precisely the statement of the next proposition. \square

Proposition 6.13. *Let $G = \langle S \mid R \rangle$ be a group given by a symmetric triangular presentation and let $G' = \langle S' \mid R' \rangle$ be a scrambling. Let $s \in S$ and let $G'' = \langle S'' \mid R'' \rangle \simeq (G * F_R * \langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$ be the associated augmentation. Then for any $x, x', x'' \in S''$ such that*

$$\deg_z(x''x'x) = e \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x''x'x) = e,$$

each of the six products

$$x''x'x, x''xx', x'x''x, x'xx'', xx''x', xx'x''$$

over a permutation of x'', x', x is either trivial or sufficiently generic relative to S .

Further, the only pairs of elements $x, x' \in S''$ satisfying both $\deg_z(x) = \deg_z(x')$ and $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x) = \pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x')$ are t, z_1 and the inverse pair t^{-1}, z_1^{-1} .

Remark 6.14. By assumption, the element $x''x'x$ in the statement satisfies $x''x'x \in (G * F_R * \{z_1, \dots, z_4\}) \times \{0\} \simeq G * (\langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle * F_R)$, so it makes sense to discuss sufficient genericity in $G * (\langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle * F_R)$ relative to the generating set S of the presentation $G = \langle S \mid R \rangle$.

Proof. Table 1 contains, out of each pair of mutually inverse generators $\{x, x^{-1}\}$ of S'' , an element with nonnegative degrees in z_1, \dots, z_4 and shows their degrees under the map \deg_z .

Considering the rows R_1, \dots, R_{15} of the table as vectors in \mathbb{Z}^4 , we are thus looking for dependencies of the form $\pm R_i \pm R_j \pm R_k = 0$.

Considering the values of $\deg_z(x)$ of the rows in Table 1 as vectors in \mathbb{Z}^4 , we are thus looking for dependencies of the form $\pm R_1 \pm R_2 \pm R_3 = 0$ where R_1, R_2, R_3 are three of these vectors. Such dependencies correspond exactly to those triples $x, x', x'' \in S''$ such that

$$\deg_z(x''x'x) = e \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x''x'x) = e.$$

Since all rows in the table have nonnegative degrees (and no row is 0 except the last, which corresponds to generators in S'), at least one of the coefficients in such a dependence must be negative and at least one must be positive. Thus we may assume (by permuting the indices if necessary) that the equation has the form $R_1 + R_2 = R_3$.

Given a dependence $R_1 + R_2 = R_3$, let x, x' , and x''^{-1} be the generators corresponding to R_1, R_2 , and R_3 , respectively. For the rest of this proof, “sufficiently generic” is short for “sufficiently generic in $G * (F_R * \langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle)$ relative to S ”. It suffices to check that $x''x'x$

Generator x	$\deg_z(x)$
z_4	$(0, 0, 0, 1)$
$u_{z_4, i} = j(b_i) z_4$	$(0, 0, 0, 1)$
z_3	$(0, 0, 1, 0)$
$u_{z_3, i} = j(b_i) z_3$	$(0, 0, 1, 0)$
z_2	$(0, 1, 0, 0)$
$u_{z_2, i} = j(b_i) z_2$	$(0, 1, 0, 0)$
z_1	$(1, 0, 0, 0)$
$u_{z_1, i} = j(b_i) z_1$	$(1, 0, 0, 0)$
$z_3 s'$	$(0, 0, 1, 0)$
$z_3 s' z_1$	$(1, 0, 1, 0)$
$z_3 s' z_1 s'$	$(1, 0, 1, 0)$
$s' z_1 s'$	$(1, 0, 0, 0)$
$s' z_1 s' z_2 \cdots b_{k_{i-1}}^{\varepsilon_{i-1}} \cdot z_2$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$	$(1, i, 0, 0)$
$s' z_1 s' z_2 b_{k_1}^{\varepsilon_1} \cdots z_2 b_{k_i}^{\varepsilon_i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$	$(1, i, 0, 0)$
$z_4 s' z_1 s' z_2 b_{k_1}^{\varepsilon_1} \cdots z_1 b_{k_r}^{\varepsilon_r} z_2^{-i}$ for $0 \leq i \leq r$	$(1, r - i, 0, 1)$
$s z_1 s$	$(1, 0, 0, 0)$
any $x \in S'$	$(0, 0, 0, 0)$

Table 1. The generators of S'' together with their degrees \deg_z .

and $x'x''x$ are either trivial or sufficiently generic, since each of the four other products $xx'x''$, $xx''x'$, $x''xx'$, $x'xx''$ is a cyclic shift of one of these, and cyclic shifts are conjugate to each other.

We now enumerate all cases by going over the possible vectors of $R_3 \in \mathbb{Z}^4$.

Case 1: Suppose $R_3 = (0, 0, 1, 0)$. Then without loss of generality $R_1 = (0, 0, 1, 0)$ and $R_2 = (0, 0, 0, 0)$. In this case x''^{-1} and x are among z_3 , $j(b_i)z_3$ (for some $1 \leq i \leq N$), and $z_3 s'$, while $x' \in S'$. It follows that

$$\pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x''x) \in \{0, \pm b_i, \pm \pi_{\mathbb{Z}}(s'), \pm b_i \pm \pi_{\mathbb{Z}}(s')\}.$$

Case 1.1: If $\pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x''x) = 0$ it follows that $x'' = x^{-1}$. The relation $\pi_{\mathbb{Z}}(x''x'x) = 0$ then yields $x' = e$ by Proposition 6.6. Thus the elements $x''x'x$ and $x'x''x$ are both e .

Case 1.2: If $\pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x''x) = \pm b_i$ we may assume $x''^{-1} = z_3$ and $x = j(b_i)z_3$. Proposition 6.6 yields $x' = j(b_i)^{-1}$. Since $j(b_i)$ commutes with z_3 , the elements $x''x'x$ and $x'x''x$ are both e .

Case 1.3: If $\pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x''x) = \pm \pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(s')$ we may assume $x''^{-1} = z_3$ and $x = z_3 s'$. Thus $\pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x') = -\pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(s')$, and by Proposition 6.6 we must have $x' = s'^{-1}$. In this case we obtain

$$x''x'x = z_3^{-1} s'^{-1} z_3 s = [z_3, s'^{-1}] \quad \text{and} \quad x'x''x = s'^{-1} z_3^{-1} z_3 s' = e.$$

We show in Lemma 6.15 that $[z_3, s'^{-1}]$ is sufficiently generic.

Case 1.4: If $\pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x''x) = \pm b_i \pm \pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(s')$, we may assume $x''^{-1} = j(b_i)z_3$ and $x = z_3 s'$. Thus $\pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x') = b_i - \pi_{\mathbb{Z}}(s')$, and by Proposition 6.6 we must have $x' = j(b_i) s'^{-1}$. In this case the elements x'' , x' , x differ from the elements of the previous case by $j(b_i)^{\pm 1}$.

Since $j(b_i)$ commutes with all other generators and thus cancels in the elements $x''x'x$ and $x'x''x$, the computation is the same as in the previous case.

Case 2: Suppose $R_3 = (0, 1, 0, 0)$ or $R_3 = (0, 0, 0, 1)$. Then without loss of generality $R_1 = R_1$ and $R_2 = (0, 0, 0, 0)$. Each possibility in this case was checked in the $R_3 = (0, 0, 1, 0)$ -case with z_3 in place of z_2 or z_4 .

Case 3: Suppose $R_3 = (1, 0, 0, 0)$. Then without loss of generality $R_1 = (1, 0, 0, 0)$ and $R_2 = (0, 0, 0, 0)$. In this case x''^{-1} and x are among $z_1, j(b_i)z_1$ (for some $1 \leq i \leq N$), $s'z_1s'$, and sz_1s , while $x' \in S'$. It follows that

$$\pi_{F,Z}^{\text{ab}}(x''x) \in \{0, \pm b_i, \pm 2\pi_Z(s'), \pm (2\pi_Z(s') - b_i)\}.$$

There is no $x' \in S'$ with $\pi_{F,Z}^{\text{ab}}(x') \in \{\pm 2\pi_Z(s'), \pm (2\pi_Z(s') - b_i)\}$ by property (PS7) of scramblings, so either $x'' = x^{-1}$ (in which case $x' = e$ and the two elements $x''x'x$ and $x'x''x$ are e) or one of the following cases occurs:

Case 3.1: $\{x''^{-1}, x\} = \{z_1, j(b_i)z_1\}$: this case was considered in the $R_3 = (0, 0, 1, 0)$ -case, with z_3 in place of z_1 .

Case 3.2: $\{x''^{-1}, x\} = \{z_1, sz_1s\}$. In this case $x' = e$ and the two elements $x''x'x$ and $x'x''x$ are both conjugate to $sz_1sz_1^{-1}$ of which we show in Lemma 6.15 that it is sufficiently generic.

Case 3.3: $\{x''^{-1}, x\} = \{j(b_i)z_1, sz_1s\}$. In this case $x' = j(b_i)^{\pm 1}$, and since $j(b_i)$ commutes with all other generators the resulting elements are just those of the previous case.

Case 4: Suppose $R_3 = (1, 0, 1, 0)$. Then x''^{-1} is either $z_3s'z_1$ or $z_3s'z_1s'$. There are two cases to consider:

Case 4.1: $R_1 = (1, 0, 0, 0)$ and $R_2 = (0, 0, 1, 0)$.

In this case x' is either z_3 or $j(b_i)z_3$ for some $1 \leq i \leq N$, and x is one of $z_1, j(b_k)z_1$ (for some $1 \leq k \leq N$), $s'z_1s'$, and sz_1s . We consider the possibilities for x''^{-1} :

Case 4.1.1: $x''^{-1} = z_3s'z_1$: Since $\pi_{F,Z}^{\text{ab}}(s')$ is not of the form $\pm b_i \pm b_i \pm b_i$, or $\pm 2\pi_Z(s') \pm b_i$ by property (PS7) of scramblings, it is impossible to obtain $\pi_{F,Z}^{\text{ab}}(x''x'x) = 0$ in this case.

Case 4.1.2: $x''^{-1} = z_3s'z_1s'$: As in the previous case, to obtain $\pi_{F,Z}^{\text{ab}}(x''x'x) = 0$ we must have $x' = z_3$ and $x = s'z_1s'$. In this case we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} x''x'x &= (z_3s'z_1s')^{-1} z_3 (s'z_1s') = e \text{ and} \\ x'x''x &= z_3 (z_3s'z_1s')^{-1} (s'z_1s') = \left[z_3, (s'z_1s')^{-1} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We prove that $\left[z_3, (s'z_1s')^{-1} \right]$ is sufficiently generic in Lemma 6.15.

Case 4.2: Suppose $R_1 = (1, 0, 1, 0)$ and $R_2 = (0, 0, 0, 0)$. In this case x is either $z_3s'z_1$ or $z_3s'z_1s'$ and $x' \in S'$. We consider the possibilities for x''^{-1} :

Case 4.2.1: $x''^{-1} = z_3s'z_1$: If $x = z_3s'z_1$ then $\pi_{F,Z}^{\text{ab}}(x''x) = 0$, and by Proposition 6.6 we must have $x' = e$. In this case the elements $x''x'x$ and $x'x''x$ are both e . If $x = z_3s'z_1s'$ then $\pi_{F,Z}^{\text{ab}}(x''x) = \pi_{F,Z}^{\text{ab}}(s')$, and again by Proposition 6.6 we must have $x' = s'^{-1}$. Thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} x''x'x &= (z_3s'z_1)^{-1} s'^{-1} (z_3s'z_1s') = \left[(z_3s'z_1)^{-1}, s'^{-1} \right] \text{ and} \\ x'x''x &= s'^{-1} (z_3s'z_1)^{-1} (z_3s'z_1s') = e. \end{aligned}$$

We prove that $\left[(z_3s'z_1)^{-1}, s'^{-1} \right]$ is sufficiently generic in Lemma 6.15.

Case 4.2.2: $x''^{-1} = z_3s'z_1s'$. If $x = z_3s'z_1$ then by exchanging the roles of x and x'' (and inverting all three generators) we reduce to the previous case. If $x = z_3s'z_1s'$ then $\pi_{F,Z}^{\text{ab}}(x''x) = 0$, and by Proposition 6.6 we must have $x' = e$. In this case the elements $x''x'x$ and $x'x''x$ are both e .

Case 5: Suppose $R_3 = (1, i, 0, 0)$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$. There are two cases to consider in this case:

Case 5.1: $R_1 = (1, i - 1, 0, 0)$ and $R_2 = (0, 1, 0, 0)$.

In this case x''^{-1} is either $s'z_1s'z_2 \dots b_{k_{i-1}}^{\varepsilon_{i-1}}z_2$ or $s'z_1s'z_2 \dots z_2b_{k_i}^{\varepsilon_i}$. If $i > 1$, x is either $s'z_1s'z_2 \dots z_2b_{k_{i-1}}^{\varepsilon_{i-1}}$ or $s'z_1s'z_2 \dots z_2$, and thus $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x''x)$ is either 0, $-\varepsilon_i b_{k_i}$, $-\varepsilon_{i-1} b_{k_{i-1}}$, or $-\varepsilon_{i-1} b_{k_{i-1}} - \varepsilon_i b_{k_i}$. The generator x' must be either z_2 or $j(b_k)z_2$ for some $1 \leq k \leq N$, so in the case $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x''x) = -\varepsilon_{i-1} b_{k_{i-1}} - \varepsilon_i b_{k_i}$ there is nothing to check (because it implies $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x''x'x) \neq 0$). In each of the other cases, all elements $b_j^{\varepsilon_j}$ and $j(b_k)$ vanish from the product (because they commute with all other generators, and cancel out). Thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} x''x'x &= (s'z_1s'z_2^i)^{-1} z_2 (s'z_1s'z_2^{i-i}) = \left[(s'z_1s'z_2^i)^{-1}, z_2 \right] \text{ and} \\ x'x''x &= z_2 (s'z_1s'z_2^i)^{-1} (s'z_1s'z_2^{i-i}) = e. \end{aligned}$$

We prove that $\left[(s'z_1s'z_2^i)^{-1}, z_2 \right]$ is sufficiently generic in Lemma 6.15.

If $i = 1$ we have that $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x'')$ equals either $-2\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(s)$ or $2\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(s) - \varepsilon_{k_1} b_{k_1}$, and x may also equal one of z_1 , $j(b_k)z_1$ (for some $1 \leq k \leq N$), $s'z_1s'$, and sz_1s (the other possible values for x have been dealt with in the case $i > 1$). Thus $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x)$ is one of 0, b_k (for some $1 \leq k \leq N$), and $2\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(s')$. By property (PS7) of scramblings, if $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x) \neq 2\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(s')$ then $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x''x'x) \neq 0$ (note that x' is either z_2 or its product with some $j(b_{k'})$, and thus $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x')$ is either 0 or some basis element). Therefore we need only consider the case where $x = s'z_1s'$. Since all basis elements of \mathbb{Z}^N cancel in the product, it suffices to compute the elements $x''x'x$ and $x'x''x$ for $x''^{-1} = s'z_1s'z_2$, $x = s'z_1s'$, and $x' = z_2$. This yields

$$\begin{aligned} x''x'x &= (s'z_1s'z_2)^{-1} z_2 (s'z_1s') = [z_2^{-1}, s'z_1s'] \text{ and} \\ x'x''x &= z_2 (s'z_1s'z_2)^{-1} (s'z_1s') = e. \end{aligned}$$

We prove that $[z_2^{-1}, s'z_1s']$ is sufficiently generic in Lemma 6.15.

Case 5.2: $R_1 = (1, i, 0, 0)$ and $R_2 = (0, 0, 0, 0)$.

In this case, $x' \in S'$ while x and x''^{-1} are each equal to one of $s'z_1s'z_2 \dots b_{k_{i-1}}^{\varepsilon_{i-1}}z_2$ and $s'z_1s'z_2 \dots z_2b_{k_i}^{\varepsilon_i}$. It follows that $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x''x) \in \{\pm\varepsilon_i b_{k_i}, 0\}$ and therefore by Proposition 6.6 $x' = e$ or $x' = b_{k_i}^{\pm 1}$. In all cases, the elements $x''x'x$ and $x'x''x$ are both e .

Case 6: Suppose $R_3 = (1, i, 0, 1)$ for $0 \leq i \leq r$. There are three cases to consider in this case.

In all of them we must have $x''^{-1} = z_4s'z_1s'z_2b_{k_1}^{\varepsilon_1} \dots z_2b_{k_r}^{\varepsilon_r}z_2^{r-i} = z_4sz_1sz_2^i$.

Case 6.1: $R_1 = (1, i - 1, 0, 1)$ and $R_2 = (0, 1, 0, 0)$ (if $i \neq 0$).

In this case $x = z_4s'z_1s'z_2b_{k_1}^{\varepsilon_1} \dots z_2b_{k_r}^{\varepsilon_r}z_2^{r-i+1} = z_4sz_1sz_2^{i-1}$. Since $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x''x) = 0$ we must also have $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x') = 0$. Thus $x' = z_2$. This yields

$$\begin{aligned} x''x'x &= (z_4sz_1sz_2^i)^{-1} z_2 (z_4sz_1sz_2^{i-1}) = \left[(z_4sz_1sz_2^i)^{-1}, z_2 \right] \text{ and} \\ x'x''x &= z_2 (z_4sz_1sz_2^i)^{-1} (z_4sz_1sz_2^{i-1}) = e. \end{aligned}$$

We prove that $\left[(z_4sz_1sz_2^i)^{-1}, z_2 \right]$ is sufficiently generic in Lemma 6.15.

Case 6.2: $R_1 = (1, i, 0, 0)$ and $R_2 = (0, 0, 0, 1)$.

Suppose first $i \neq 0$. Then x is one of $s'z_1s'z_2 \dots b_{k_{i-1}}^{\varepsilon_{i-1}}z_2$ and $s'z_1s'z_2 \dots b_{k_{i-1}}^{\varepsilon_{i-1}}z_2b_{k_i}^{\varepsilon_i}$, while x' is either z_4 or $j(b_k)z_4$ for some $1 \leq k \leq N$. Supposing $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x''x'x) = 0$, we may ignore any basis element of \mathbb{Z}^N in $x''x'x$ and $x'x''x$ as these basis elements commute with all other generators and cancel each other. Modulo the \mathbb{Z}^N factor, x is equivalent to

sz_1s and x' is equivalent to z_4 . This yields

$$\begin{aligned} x''x'x &= (z_4sz_1s)^{-1}z_4(sz_1s) = e \text{ and} \\ x'x''x &= z_4(z_4sz_1s)^{-1}(sz_1z) = [z_4, (sz_1s)^{-1}]. \end{aligned}$$

We prove that $[z_4, (sz_1s)^{-1}]$ is sufficiently generic in Lemma 6.15.

If $i = 0$ there are more possibilities for x : it may additionally be one of z_1 , $j(b_{k'})z_1$ (for some $1 \leq k' \leq N$), $s'z_1s'$, and sz_1s . The possibilities for x' remain the same. Again, assuming $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x''x'x) = 0$, we may work modulo the \mathbb{Z}^N factor; thus the last two possibilities for x are both equivalent to sz_1s , which has already been considered. The first two possibilities for x are equivalent to z_1 . Thus the elements $x''x'x$ and $x'x''x$ are equivalent to one of e , $[z_4, (sz_1s)^{-1}]$,

$$\begin{aligned} (z_4sz_1s)^{-1}z_4z_1 &= s^{-1}z_1^{-1}s^{-1}z_1 \text{ and} \\ z_4(z_4sz_1s)^{-1}z_1 &= z_4(s^{-1}z_1^{-1}s^{-1})z_4^{-1}z_1. \end{aligned}$$

We prove that these are sufficiently generic in Lemma 6.15.

Case 6.3: $R_1 = (1, i, 0, 1)$ and $R_2 = (0, 0, 0, 0)$.

In this case $x' = e$ and $x''^{-1} = x$. Thus the elements $x''x'x$ and $x'x''x$ are both e .

Case 7: Suppose $R_3 = (0, 0, 0, 0)$. Then also $R_1 = R_2 = (0, 0, 0, 0)$. Since all three generators are then in S' , there is nothing to check: condition (b) holds by property (PS4) of scramblings. \square

We now verify the second part of the statement, on pairs $x, x' \in S''$ satisfying both $\deg_z(x) = \deg_z(x')$ and $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x) = \pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x')$. For each possible value of $\deg_z(x)$ we consider the corresponding set of rows:

Case 1: $\deg_z(x) = (0, 0, 0, 1)$: the corresponding generators are z_4 and those generators of the form $j(b_i)z_4$. Any two of these have distinct values under $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}$ (because $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(z_4) = 0$ and $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(j(b_i))$ takes different values for different indices i , all of which are nonzero).

Case 2: $\deg_z(x) = (0, 0, 1, 0)$: the corresponding generators are z_3 and those of the form $j(b_i)z_3$, and the verification is the same as that for $(0, 0, 0, 1)$.

Case 3: $\deg_z(x) = (0, 1, 0, 0)$ is identical to the previous case, with z_2 replacing z_3 .

Case 4: $\deg_z(x) = (1, 0, 1, 0)$: the possible generators are $z_3s'z_1$ and $z_3s'z_1s'$. These have different values under $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}$.

Case 5: $\deg_z(x) = (1, i, 0, 0)$ for some $1 \leq i \leq r$: the possible generators are $s'z_1s'z_2 \cdot \dots \cdot b_{k_{i-1}}^{\varepsilon_{i-1}} \cdot z_2$ and $s'z_1s'z_2b_{k_1}^{\varepsilon_1} \cdot \dots \cdot z_2b_{k_i}^{\varepsilon_i}$. These have different values under $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}$ (differing by $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(b_{k_i}^{\varepsilon_i}) \neq 0$).

Case 6: $\deg_z(x) = (1, 0, 0, 0)$: the corresponding generators are z_1 , generators of the form $j(b_i)z_1$, $s'z_1s'$, and sz_1s . Except for the pair $\{z_1, t = sz_1s\}$, any two of these have distinct values under $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}$ (this follows directly from (PS7)).

Case 7: $\deg_z(x) = (1, r - i, 0, 1)$ for some $0 \leq i \leq r$: there is only one generator with this degree.

Case 8: $\deg_z(x) = (0, 0, 0, 0)$: these cases follow from property (PS3) in the definition of group scrambling.

Lemma 6.15. *In the notation of Proposition 6.13, the following elements are sufficiently generic relative to S :*

- (1) $sz_1sz_1^{-1}$, $s^{-1}z_1^{-1}s^{-1}z_1$, and $z_1(s^{-1}z_1^{-1}s^{-1})$,
- (2) $[z_3, s'^{-1}]$ and $[(z_3s'z_1)^{-1}, s'^{-1}]$, and
- (3) $[z_3, (sz_1s)^{-1}]$, $[(sz_1sz_2^i)^{-1}, z_2]$, $[z_2^{-1}, sz_1s]$, $[(z_4sz_1sz_2^i)^{-1}, z_2]$, and $[z_4, (sz_1s)^{-1}]$,
- (4) $z_4(s^{-1}z_1^{-1}s^{-1})z_4^{-1}z_1$.

Proof. For the following, let $\rho : F_S * \langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ be any homomorphism mapping each $s \in S$ to the permutation matrix of a derangement or to I_n and mapping z_1, \dots, z_4 to matrices with algebraically independent entries over \mathbb{Q} .

Observe that the value of each of the elements in the lemma's statement under $\pi_{\mathbb{Z}}$ is 0. Therefore, all occurrences of s' can be replaced with s without changing the words' value in the group G'' . We then obtain elements in G'' which are words in s and z_1, \dots, z_4 , and it suffices to show that $\rho(w) - I_n$ is invertible or 0 for w each of these words.

- (1) The inverse of $z_1 (s^{-1} z_1^{-1} s^{-1})$ is $sz_1sz_1^{-1}$ and the inverse of $s^{-1} z_1^{-1} s^{-1} z_1$ is conjugate to $sz_1sz_1^{-1}$. So only one of these words needs to be checked by Definition 6.2. The element $sz_1sz_1^{-1}$ is sufficiently generic by Lemma 6.4 (i).

Note that if $\rho(s)$ is the permutation matrix of a derangement then, for each of these words w , by applying Lemma 6.4 as above we find that $\rho(w) - I_n$ is invertible (and not zero).

- (2) Following the above remark it is enough to consider the elements

$$[z_3, s^{-1}] \text{ and } [(z_3sz_1)^{-1}, s^{-1}].$$

The first is sufficiently generic by Lemma 6.4 (ii). For $w = [(z_3sz_1)^{-1}, s^{-1}]$, observe that if $\rho(s) = I_n$ then $\rho(w) - I_n = 0$. Otherwise, $\rho(s)$ is the permutation matrix of a derangement. By Corollary 2.34, if there exist matrices B_1, B_2 such that $[(B_1\rho(s)B_2)^{-1}, \rho(s)^{-1}] - I_n$ is invertible then so is $\rho(w) - I_n$. Taking $B_2 = \rho(s)^{-1}$ and $B_1 = \rho(z_3)^{-1}$, we obtain

$$[(B_1\rho(s)B_2)^{-1}, \rho(s)^{-1}] - I_n = [\rho(z_3), \rho(s)^{-1}],$$

which (since $\rho(s)^{-1}$ is the permutation matrix of a derangement) is again invertible by Lemma 6.4 (ii).

- (3) Let w be any of these commutators and consider $\rho(w)$ as a matrix with entries which are polynomials in the entries of the matrices $\{\rho(z_i)\}_{i=1}^4$. It is clear that for any pair of invertible matrices A, B we can arrange for $\rho(w)$ to equal $[A, B]$ by choosing the entries of $\{\rho(z_i)\}_{i=1}^4$ appropriately. For example, for $[(z_4sz_1sz_2^i)^{-1}, z_2]$ we can set $\rho(z_2) = B$, $\rho(z_1) = I$, and take $\rho(z_4)$ to be the unique matrix such that $\rho((z_4sz_1sz_2^i)^{-1}) = A$. Similarly, for $[z_4, (sz_1s)^{-1}]$ we can set $\rho(z_4) = A$ and take $\rho(z_1)$ to be the unique matrix such that $\rho((sz_1s)^{-1}) = B$. If we take matrices A, B that have algebraically independent entries then $[A, B] - I_n$ is invertible (for instance by Lemma 6.4 (ii)), and hence so is $\rho(w) - I_n$.
- (4) Denote $w = z_4 (s^{-1} z_1^{-1} s^{-1}) z_4^{-1} z_1$. If $\rho(s) = I_n$ then $\rho(w) - I_n = \rho([z_4, z_1^{-1}]) - I_n$ is invertible. Otherwise, $\rho(s)$ is the permutation matrix of a derangement. Considering $\rho(w) - I_n$ as a matrix with entries which are polynomials in the entries of $\rho(z_4)$, we can substitute I_n for $\rho(z_4)$ to obtain $\rho(s^{-1} z_1^{-1} s^{-1} z_1) - I_n$, which is invertible by case (1). \square

6.4. The scrambling construction. We describe a construction fulfilling the axioms for group scramblings (see Definition 6.5).

Construction 6.16. Let $G = \langle S \mid R \rangle$ be a group given by a symmetric triangular presentation. We construct a finitely presented group $G' = \langle S' \mid R' \rangle$ together with an isomorphism $\varphi : G' \rightarrow G \times \mathbb{Z}^{S \sqcup R}$ in a sequence of steps. In each step (except the first preprocessing step) a group $G_i = \langle S_i \mid R_i \rangle$ and a homomorphism $\varphi_i : G_i \rightarrow G \times \mathbb{Z}^{S \sqcup R}$ is constructed. It is always the case that $S_i \subset S_{i+1}$, $R_i \subset R_{i+1}$, and $\varphi_{i+1} \upharpoonright_{S_i} = \varphi_i \upharpoonright_{S_i}$. We take G' and φ to be the group presentation and homomorphism of the last step.

In what follows we denote by $B = \{b_s\}_{s \in S} \cup \{b_r\}_{r \in R}$ a basis for $\mathbb{Z}^{S \sqcup R}$.

(CS1) (A preprocessing step.) We modify $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ to arrange that no relation $abc = e$ in R contains the same generator twice (though it may contain a generator and its inverse) as follows. If some $s \in S$ appears twice or three times in some relation in R , add new elements s' and s'' to S , and add the relations $ss'^{-1}e = e$ and $ss''^{-1}e = e$ to R . Then, in any relation in which s appears more than once, replace the second (and if present, the third) occurrence by s' (or s''). Repeat this process until each relation is a product of three distinct generators (a generator and its inverse are considered distinct for this purpose). Then symmetrize the set of relations. It is clear how the resulting finitely presented group is isomorphic to the original one.

(CS2) For each $s \in S \setminus \{e\}$ define symbols x_s, x_s^{-1} . We call x_s^{-1} the formal inverse of x_s . We consider mutually inverse generators s, s^{-1} in S as distinct for this purpose. In particular, for any such pair there are four symbols: $x_s, x_{s^{-1}}, x_s^{-1}$, and $x_{s^{-1}}^{-1}$. Furthermore, define symbols w_r, w_r^{-1} for each $r \in R$. Set

$$\begin{aligned} S_0 &= \{x_s, x_s^{-1}\}_{s \in S} \cup \{w_r, w_r^{-1}\}_{r \in R} \cup \{e\}, \\ R_0 &= \{x_s x_s^{-1} e = e\}_{s \in S} \cup \{w_r w_r^{-1} e = e\}_{r \in R}, \end{aligned}$$

and $G_0 = \langle S_0 \mid R_0 \rangle$, so that G_0 is a free group on $|S| + |R|$ generators (note: x_s and $x_{s^{-1}}$ are not inverses in G_0 for any pair $s, s^{-1} \in S$). Then define

$$\varphi_0 : G_0 \rightarrow (G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^{S \sqcup R}$$

where F_R is the free group with generators f_r for $r \in R$ by setting

$$\varphi_0(x_s) = (s, 5b_s) \quad \varphi_0(w_r) = (f_r, 0)$$

for each generator x_s and w_r , and extending to G_0 .

(CS3) In this step we add generators for the the $\mathbb{Z}^{S \sqcup R}$ part together with the appropriate commutators as relations to ensure they commute with all other generators.

(a) For each $s \in S$ define symbols t_s and t_s^{-1} , and for each $r \in R$ define symbols t_r and t_r^{-1} (again, mutually inverse generators s, s^{-1} in S are distinct for this purpose). Define $T^+ = \{t_s\}_{s \in S} \cup \{t_r\}_{r \in R}$, let $T^- = \{t_s^{-1}\}_{s \in S} \cup \{t_r^{-1}\}_{r \in R}$ be the formal inverses of those symbols in T^+ , and define $T = T^+ \cup T^-$.

Choose a linear ordering \prec on T^+ .

(b) For each $s \in S$ and $t \in T^+$ define new symbols $u_{s,t}$ and $u_{s,t}^{-1}$. Similarly for each $r \in R$ and $t \in T^+$ define new symbols $u_{r,t}$ and $u_{r,t}^{-1}$. Lastly for distinct $t_1, t_2 \in T^+$ with $t_1 \prec t_2$ define the new symbols u_{t_1, t_2} and u_{t_1, t_2}^{-1} . Denote the set of all these symbols by U , and define

$$S_1 = S_0 \cup T \cup U.$$

If $t_1 \succ t_2$ are elements of T^+ , define the additional notation u_{t_1, t_2} for u_{t_2, t_1} (it is not a distinct symbol). Similarly let u_{t_1, t_2}^{-1} denote u_{t_2, t_1}^{-1} .

(c) Write the following relations: for each pair of mutually inverse symbols y, y^{-1} in $T \cup U$, write the relation $yy^{-1}e = e$. For each $s \in S$ and $t \in T^+$, write the relations $x_s t u_{s,t}^{-1} = e$ and $u_{s,t} x_s^{-1} t^{-1} = e$ (here $t^{-1} \in T^-$ is the formal inverse of $t \in T^+$). Similarly for each $r \in R$ and $t \in T^+$, write the relations $w_r t u_{r,t}^{-1} = e$ and $u_{r,t} w_r^{-1} t^{-1} = e$. Denote the set of all these relations by R_T . Define

$$R_1 = R_0 \cup R_T.$$

Define $G_1 = \langle S_1 \mid R_1 \rangle$, and define

$$\varphi_1 : G_1 \rightarrow (G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^{S \sqcup R}$$

by setting $\varphi_1(t_s) = b_s$ for each $s \in S$, $\varphi_1(t_r) = b_r$ for each $r \in R$, $\varphi_1(x_s) = \varphi_0(x_s)$, and extending to all other generators and elements as the relations dictate (for example, if $t \in T^+$ and $s \in S$ then $\varphi_1(u_{s,t}) = \varphi_1(x_s) \cdot \varphi_1(t)$).

Note that φ_1 is surjective: (e, b_r) and (e, b_s) are in the image for each $r \in R$ and each $s \in S$. Similarly $(s, 5b_s)$ is in the image for each $s \in S$.

(CS4) Order R arbitrarily, and denote the relations by r_1, \dots, r_n . For each relation $r = r_j$, in order, for $j = 1, \dots, n$:

(a) Write r as $abc = e$ for $a, b, c \in S$ (by step (1) these are distinct).

(b) Define generators and relations to “break up” the relation

$$w_r^{-1}(w_r x_a t_r^5 x_b t_r^5 x_c (t_a^{-1} t_r^{-1} t_b^{-1} t_r^{-1} t_c^{-1})^5) = e$$

from left to right. Explicitly, write out the word on the left hand side of the relation without the w_r^{-1} :

$$(\spadesuit) \quad w_r x_a \underbrace{t_r \dots t_r}_{\times 5} x_b \underbrace{t_r \dots t_r}_{\times 5} x_c \underbrace{t_a^{-1} t_r^{-1} t_b^{-1} t_r^{-1} t_c^{-1} \dots t_a^{-1} t_r^{-1} t_b^{-1} t_r^{-1} t_c^{-1}}_{\times 5}.$$

Then define symbols $y_{r,1}, \dots, y_{r,36}$ (together with formal inverses $y_{r,1}^{-1}, \dots, y_{r,36}^{-1}$), one for each prefix of this word, omitting the empty prefix, the first prefix w_r and the final three prefixes (the entire word, and the entire word with the last or the two last letters omitted). Denote the set of all these symbols by Y_r . Write the following relations:

$$w_r x_a y_{r,1}^{-1} = e, \quad y_{r,1} t_r y_{r,2}^{-1} = e, \quad \dots \quad y_{r,35} t_b^{-1} y_{r,36} = e.$$

(Multiplying by the symbols $y_{r,i}$ from the right and substituting the previous relation into each relation in turn, these read $y_{r,1} = w_r x_a$, $y_{r,2} = w_r x_a t_r$, and so on up to $y_{r,36} = w_r x_a t_r \dots t_b^{-1}$, which equals the entire word without the final two letters $t_r^{-1} t_c^{-1}$). Finally, write the relation

$$w_r^{-1} y_{r,36} u_{t_c, t_r}^{-1} = e.$$

Also, for each $y_{r,i}$ write the relation $y_{r,i} y_{r,i}^{-1} e = e$.

Denote the set of all these relations by R_r . Then define $S_{j+1} = S_j \cup Y_r$ and $R_{j+1} = R_j \cup R_r$, $G_{j+1} = \langle S_{j+1} \mid R_{j+1} \rangle$, and extend $\varphi_j : G_j \rightarrow (G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^{S \sqcup R}$ to

$$\varphi_{j+1} : G_{j+1} \rightarrow (G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^{S \sqcup R}$$

in the manner dictated by the relations (this is possible because every generator $y \in S_{j+1} \setminus S_j$ satisfies a relation which defines it in terms of previous generators.)

Observe that φ_{j+1} is a homomorphism: it maps every relator of R_{j+1} to the identity. For “trivial” relators of the form $yy^{-1}e = e$ this is obvious, and similarly for the 36 relators

$$w_r x_a y_{r,1}^{-1}, \quad y_{r,1} t_r y_{r,2}^{-1}, \quad \dots, \quad y_{r,35} t_b^{-1} y_{r,36},$$

since they define $y_{r,1}, \dots, y_{r,36}$ in terms of the previous generators. For the relator $w_r^{-1} y_{r,36} u_{t_c, t_r}^{-1}$, note that $u_{t_c, t_r} = t_c t_r$, and when we substitute previous relations into it we obtain

$$w_r^{-1} w_r x_a t_r^5 x_b t_r^5 x_c (t_a^{-1} t_r^{-1} t_b^{-1} t_r^{-1} t_c^{-1})^5 = e.$$

When the left hand side is evaluated under φ_j we obtain precisely abc , but this product is the identity in G , as desired.

(CS5) (Postprocessing.) Let $G_{n+1} = \langle S_{n+1} \mid R_{n+1} \rangle$ be the presentation of the last step and $\varphi_{n+1} : G_{n+1} \rightarrow (G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^{S \sqcup R}$ the corresponding homomorphism. Symmetrize the set of relations. For any relation $abc = e$ in R_{n+1} in which $a = e$ or $a \in T$, add the relations $bac = e$ and $bca = e$. Then symmetrize the set of relations again. This does not change the group: each generator in T commutes with all other generators.

Remark 6.17. It is obvious from the construction that it is computable. The presentation $\langle S' \mid R' \rangle$ can be computed from $\langle S \mid R \rangle$, and the homomorphism φ can be computed in the sense that we can explicitly write the image of each generator in S' (as a tuple consisting of a word in the generators S and an explicitly-given element of $\mathbb{Z}^{S \sqcup R}$).

Theorem 6.18. *Let $G = \langle S \mid R \rangle$ be a group given by symmetric triangular presentation. Let $G' = \langle S' \mid R' \rangle$ and $\varphi : G' \rightarrow G \times \mathbb{Z}^{S \sqcup R}$ be the output of Construction 6.16 applied to $\langle S \mid R \rangle$. Then $\langle S' \mid R' \rangle$ is a group scrambling of $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ in the sense of Definition 6.5.*

Proof of Theorem 6.18. Properties (PS3) and (PS4) require some case enumeration and are therefore split up into the Lemmas 6.19 and 6.20.

(PS1): The generating set S' is symmetric by construction, and similarly all relators in R' have length three. The relators are cyclically symmetric as we symmetrized the relations in the last step of the construction.

(PS2): Denote $N = |S \sqcup R|$. We prove that $\mu = \varphi : G' \rightarrow (G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^{S \sqcup R} \simeq (G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$ is an isomorphism:

- (1) It is a homomorphism, as explained in the construction.
- (2) It is surjective because $\varphi_1 : G_1 = \langle S_1 \mid R_1 \rangle \rightarrow (G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^{S \sqcup R}$ is surjective, where $S_1 \subset S'$ and $\varphi(s) = \varphi_1(s)$ for each $s \in S_1$.
- (3) It is injective: just like in the proof of Proposition 6.10, all generators except for $\{x_s\}_{s \in S} \cup \{t_s\}_{s \in S} \cup \{t_r\}_{r \in R}$ can be eliminated using Tietze transformations. The relations then simplify to:
 - (a) The commutators $[t_s, x] = e$ for each generator $x \neq t_s$,
 - (b) The commutators $[t_r, x] = e$ for each generator $x \neq t_r$,
 - (c) For each mutually inverse pair $s, s^{-1} \in S'$, the relation $x_{s^{-1}}x_s = e$.
 - (d) For each relation $abc = e$ in $\langle S \mid R \rangle$, the relation

$$w_r^{-1} w_r x_a t_r^5 x_b t_r^5 x_c (t_a^{-1} t_r^{-1} t_b^{-1} t_r^{-1} t_c^{-1})^5 = e.$$

Since $\{t_s\}_{s \in S} \cup \{t_r\}_{r \in R}$ commute with all generators, the relation of the form

$$w_r^{-1} w_r x_a t_r^5 x_b t_r^5 x_c (t_a^{-1} t_r^{-1} t_b^{-1} t_r^{-1} t_c^{-1})^5 = e$$

can be replaced by $x_a t_a^{-5} x_b t_b^{-5} x_c t_c^{-5} = e$. Using further Tietze transformations, introduce for each $s \in S$ a new generator \tilde{x}_s and the relation $\tilde{x}_s = x_s t_s^{-5}$. Since each generator x_s can be expressed as $\tilde{x}_s t_s^5$, the generators $\{x_s\}_{s \in S}$ can be eliminated (again by Tietze transformations). This yields a presentation with generators $\{\tilde{x}_s\}_{s \in S} \cup \{t_s\}_{s \in S} \cup \{w_r\}_{r \in R} \cup \{t_r\}_{r \in R}$, with relations similar to the above: the relations of type (a) and (b) are the same, relations of type (c) are replaced by $\tilde{x}_s \tilde{x}_{s^{-1}} = e$, and each relation of type (d) is replaced by $\tilde{x}_a \tilde{x}_b \tilde{x}_c = e$ for each relation $abc = e$ in R . It is clear that the resulting group is isomorphic to $(G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^{S \sqcup R}$ with μ mapping each \tilde{x}_s to the corresponding $s \in S$, each w_r to the free generator f_r , and each element of $\{t_s\}_{s \in S} \cup \{t_r\}_{r \in R}$ to the corresponding basis element of $\mathbb{Z}^{S \sqcup R}$.

(PS5): Define $i : S \rightarrow S'$ by $i(s) = x_s$. Then $\pi_G(i(s)) = s$.

(PS6): Denote $B = \{b_s\}_{s \in S} \cup \{b_r\}_{r \in R}$. This is a basis of $\mathbb{Z}^{S \sqcup R} \simeq \mathbb{Z}^N$. Define $j : B \rightarrow S'$ by $j(b_z) = t_z$ (for all $z \in S \sqcup R$). Then $\mu(j(b_z)) = (e, b_z)$.

(PS7): Let $s \in S$. Then $\pi_{\mathbb{Z}}(i(s)) = \pi_{\mathbb{Z}}(x_s) = 5b_s$, so (expressed in the basis $B = \{b_s\}_{s \in S} \cup \{b_r\}_{r \in R}$) the b_s -coefficient of $\pi_{\mathbb{Z}}(i(s))$ is at least 5. We verify that the b_s -coefficient of $\pi_{\mathbb{Z}}(s')$ (expressed in B) is at most 6 for each $s' \in S'$:

- (1) If x is one of the generators added in step (CS2) then $\pi_{\mathbb{Z}}(x) = \pm 5b$ for some $b \in B$, and its b_s -coefficient is clearly at most 6 in absolute value.
- (2) If x is one of the generators w_r and w_r^{-1} it is zero under the projection $\pi_{\mathbb{Z}}$.

- (3) Similarly, any of the generators t_s or t_r added in step (CS3) have b_s -coefficient at most 1 in absolute value.
- (4) The generators $u_{s,t}$ added in step (CS3) have b_s -coefficient at most 6 in absolute value; the generators u_{t_1,t_2} have b_s -coefficient at most 1 in absolute value.
- (5) If x is one of the generators added in step (CS4), there is a relation $abc = e$ in R such that x is a proper prefix of

$$w_r x_a \underbrace{t_r \dots t_r}_{\times 5} x_b \underbrace{t_r \dots t_r}_{\times 5} x_c \underbrace{t_a^{-1} t_r^{-1} t_b^{-1} t_r^{-1} t_c^{-1} \dots t_a^{-1} t_r^{-1} t_b^{-1} t_r^{-1} t_c^{-1}}_{\times 5}.$$

If $s \notin \{a, b, c\}$ then $\pi_{\mathbb{Z}}(x)$ has b_s -coefficient 0. If $s \in \{a, b, c\}$, then since a, b, c are distinct it is easy to see that $\pi_{\mathbb{Z}}(x)$ has b_s -coefficient nonnegative and at most 5. \square

Lemma 6.19. *Properties (PS3) and (PS4) hold for the generators added in the steps (CS1)-(CS3) of Construction 6.16.*

Proof. Table 2 contains the generators defined in steps (CS1)-(CS3) of the construction (one representative from each mutually inverse pair) together with their values under $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}$. (We slightly abuse notation: if $t \in T^+ = \{t_s\}_{s \in S} \cup \{t_r\}_{r \in R}$ then b_t refers to b_s or b_r according to the value of t . Further, we denote by f_r both the generators of the free group F_R and its abelianization $\mathbb{Z}^{|R|}$.)

Generator x	$\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x)$
e	0
x_s for each $s \in S$	$5b_s$
w_r for each $r \in R$	f_r
t_s for each $s \in S$	b_s
t_r for each $r \in R$	b_r
$u_{s,t}$ for $s \in S, t \in T^+$	$5b_s + b_t$
$u_{r,t}$ for $r \in R, t \in T^+$	$f_r + b_t$
u_{t_1,t_2} for distinct $t_1, t_2 \in T^+$	$b_{t_1} + b_{t_2}$

Table 2. The generators added in the steps (CS1)-(CS3) of the scrambling construction.

For Property (PS3) it suffices to verify that the values of any two of the generators in the table under $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}$ are distinct, and that the value of any generator under $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}$ is different than the value of the inverse of another generator. This is clear by inspection of the rows of the table.

We now verify Property (PS4) by checking that if generators x, x', x'' from Table 2 satisfy $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x''x'x) = 0$ then the word $x''x'x$ is trivial in G' or sufficiently generic relative to the map from S to $G * F_R$. So assume these generators satisfy $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x''x'x) = 0$. This means we have $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x) + \pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x') + \pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x'') = 0$. But the $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}$ -values in Table 2 are positive linear combinations of the elements of the basis of $\mathbb{Z}^{|R|} \times \mathbb{Z}^N$, so at least one of the generators x, x', x'' is the inverse of a generator listed in this table. By negating the equation if necessary, we may assume without loss of generality that exactly one is the inverse of a generator listed in Table 2, and after replacing x'' by x''^{-1} and renaming the generators if

necessary we obtain the equation

$$(\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}) \quad \pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x) + \pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x') = \pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x'').$$

Subsequently we need to show that for generators x, x', x'' that satisfy this equation the elements $xx'x''^{-1}, x'x''^{-1}x, x''^{-1}xx', x'xx''^{-1}, xx''^{-1}x', x''^{-1}x'x$ are all trivial or sufficiently generic relative to the map from S to $G * F_R$. Note that the cyclic shifts of these words arise by conjugating with x^{-1} or x'^{-1} . As conjugation preserves the set of sufficiently generic words by Definition 6.2 it suffices to consider the elements $xx'x''^{-1}$ and $x'xx''^{-1}$ in the following.

So we now look for all generators x, x', x'' in Table 2 satisfying Equation $(\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}})$ and check if the elements $xx'x''^{-1}$ and $x'xx''^{-1}$ are trivial in G' or sufficiently generic relative to the map from S to $G * F_R$. We split the argument into cases based on the value of x'' . We can exclude the cases $x = e$ or $x' = e$ as this would imply $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x'x''^{-1}) = e_F$ or $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(xx''^{-1}) = e_F$ respectively, and there exist no nontrivial solution to these equations by property (PS3) which we already verified above. If g_1, g_2, g_3 are generators in Table 2 we don't distinguish between the solutions $x = g_1, x' = g_2, x'' = g_3$ and $x = g_2, x' = g_1, x'' = g_3$ as we analyze the words $xx'x''^{-1}$ and $x'xx''^{-1}$ for each such solution in both cases.

Case 1: Suppose $x'' = e$. Then $x = w_r, x' = w_r^{-1}$ for some $r \in R$. Both words $xx'x''^{-1}$ and $x'xx''^{-1}$ are trivial in G' in this case.

Case 2: Suppose $x'' = x_s$ for some $s \in S$. There is no solution in this case.

Case 3: Suppose $x'' = w_r$ for some $r \in R$. There is no solution in this case.

Case 4: Suppose $x'' = t_s$ for some $s \in S$. There is no solution in this case.

Case 5: Suppose $x'' = t_r$ for some $r \in R$, Then $x = w_r^{-1}, x' = u_{r,t_r}$ and both associated words are trivial in G' .

Case 6: Suppose $x'' = u_{s,t}$ for $s \in S$ and $t \in T^+$. The unique solution is $x = x_s$ and $x' = t$. In this case $x''^{-1}x'x = u_{s,t}^{-1}x_s t = e$ is a relator in R' , as is $u_{s,t}^{-1}t x_s = e$.

Case 7: Suppose $x'' = u_{r,t}$ for $r \in R$ and $t \in T^+$. The unique solution is $x = w_r$ and $x' = t$. The resulting words are again trivial in G' .

Case 8: Suppose $x'' = u_{t_1,t_2}$ for $t_1, t_2 \in T^+$. The unique solution is $x = t_1$ and $x' = t_2$. In this case $x''^{-1}x'x = u_{t_1,t_2}^{-1}t_1 t_2 = e$ is a relation in R' . \square

Lemma 6.20. *Properties (PS3) and (PS4) hold for all generators added in the scrambling construction.*

Proof. We inductively verify that these properties still hold when further generators are added for each relator in R in step (CS4) of Construction 6.16. Denote the relators in R by r_1, \dots, r_n according to the arbitrary order chosen in Construction 6.16. By induction on $1 \leq j \leq n$ we show that:

- (i) For each $j = 1, \dots, n$, the generators $\left\{ y_{r_j,i}^{\pm 1} \right\}_{i=1}^{36}$ all satisfy that their value under $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}$ involves b_{r_j} or f_{r_j} and no other element of $\{b_r, f_r\}_{r \in R}$.
- (ii) The generators added in steps (CS1)-(CS3) of the construction, together with the generators $\bigcup_{k \leq j} \left\{ y_{r_k,i}^{\pm 1} \right\}_{i=1}^{36}$ satisfy conditions (PS3) and (PS4).

Let the j -th relation r_j be $abc = e$. Table 3 lists one generator from each mutually inverse pair $\left\{ y_{r_j,i}, y_{r_j,i}^{-1} \right\}$ added in step (CS4) for this relation.

Part (i) is clear: the new generators all satisfy that their value under $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}$ involves b_{r_j} or f_{r_j} and no other element of $\{b_r, f_r\}_{r \in R}$. We need to verify (ii), i.e. conditions (PS3) and (PS4).

For condition (PS3) it suffices to check that any two of the new generators have distinct values under $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}$, and that their values under $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}$ are distinct from those of the generators

Generator x	$\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x)$
$y_{r_j,i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq 6$	$f_{r_j} + 5b_a + (i-1)b_{r_j}$
$y_{r_j,i}$ for $7 \leq i \leq 12$	$f_{r_j} + 5b_a + 5b_b + (i-2)b_{r_j}$
$y_{r_j,13}$	$f_{r_j} + 5b_a + 5b_b + 5b_c + 10b_{r_j}$
$y_{r_j,13+5k}$ for $1 \leq k \leq 4$	$f_{r_j} + (5-k)b_a + (5-k)b_b + (5-k)b_c + (10-2k)b_{r_j}$
$y_{r_j,14+5k}$ for $0 \leq k \leq 4$	$f_{r_j} + (4-k)b_a + (5-k)b_b + (5-k)b_c + (10-2k)b_{r_j}$
$y_{r_j,15+5k}$ for $0 \leq k \leq 4$	$f_{r_j} + (4-k)b_a + (5-k)b_b + (5-k)b_c + (9-2k)b_{r_j}$
$y_{r_j,16+5k}$ for $0 \leq k \leq 4$	$f_{r_j} + (4-k)b_a + (4-k)b_b + (5-k)b_c + (9-2k)b_{r_j}$
$y_{r_j,17+5k}$ for $0 \leq k \leq 3$	$f_{r_j} + (4-k)b_a + (4-k)b_b + (5-k)b_c + (8-2k)b_{r_j}$

Table 3. The generators corresponding to the relator r_j added in the step (CS4) of the scrambling construction.

added in steps (CS1)-(CS3) of the construction. Note that the values of $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}$ in Table 3 are all distinct, so it suffices to compare these generators with the ones added in steps (CS1)-(CS3). These all have a b_{r_j} -coefficient at most one. We list all generators which after applying $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}$ have b_{r_j} -coefficient one or involve the generator f_{r_j} in Table 4. Apparently, any two of

Generator x	$\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x)$
$y_{r_j,1}$	$f_{r_j} + 5b_a$
$y_{r_j,36}$	$f_{r_j} + b_c + b_{r_j}$
t_{r_j}	b_{r_j}
$u_{s,t_{r_j}}$ for $s \in S$	$5b_s + b_{r_j}$
$u_{r_j,t}$ for $t \in T^+$	$f_{r_j} + b_t$
$u_{t_{r_j},t}$ for $t \in T^+ \setminus \{t_{r_j}\}$	$b_{r_j} + b_t$
w_{r_j}	f_{r_j}

Table 4. The generators of S' which have b_{r_j} -coefficient one or involve the generator f_{r_j} after applying $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}$.

these have different values under $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}$. and it is not possible that $\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x) = \pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x'^{-1}) = -\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x')$.

For the rest of this proof, “sufficiently generic” is short for “sufficiently generic in $G * (F_R * \langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle)$ relative to S ”

For condition (PS4) we proceed similarly as in Lemma 6.19, namely we consider generators x, x', x'' in the Tables 2 and 3 that satisfy Equation $(\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}})$. We verify that for these generators the words $xx'x''^{-1}$ and $x'x''x^{-1}$ are trivial in G' or sufficiently generic.

By the above discussion we may exclude the cases in which $x = e$ or $x' = e$. As in the proof of Lemma 6.19, we don't distinguish between the solutions $x = g_1, x' = g_2, x'' = g_3$ and $x = g_2, x' = g_1, x'' = g_3$ for generators g_1, g_2, g_3 as we analyze the words $xx'x''^{-1}$ and $x'x''x^{-1}$ for each such solution in both cases. We may also restrict to cases in which at least one of the generators involves a generator $y_{r_j,k}$ for $1 \leq k \leq 36$ as otherwise the

condition was already checked in Lemma 6.19. We begin by assuming that $x'' = y_{r_j, k}$ for some $1 \leq k \leq 36$. This yields the following cases.

Case 1: Suppose $x'' = y_{r_j, 1}$. In this case the only solution is $x = x_a$, $x' = w_{r_j}$ which yields the words $x_a w_{r_j} x_a^{-1} w_{r_j}^{-1}$ and $w_{r_j} x_a x_a^{-1} w_{r_j}^{-1}$. The former is sufficiently generic by Lemma 6.4 (ii) and the latter is clearly trivial in G' .

Case 2: Suppose $x'' = y_{r_j, k}$ with $2 \leq k \leq 6$. In this case there are the following solutions:

- (1) If $k = 2$ there is $x = u_{a, t_{r_j}}$, $x' = w_r$ which yields the words $x_a t_{r_j} w_r t_{r_j}^{-1} x_a^{-1} w_r^{-1}$ and $w_r x_a t_{r_j} t_{r_j}^{-1} x_a^{-1} w_r^{-1}$. Since t_{r_j} commutes with all other involved letters this case reduces to the previous one.
- (2) If $k = 2$ there is $x = x_a$, $x' = u_{r_j, t_{r_j}}$ which yields the words $x_a w_{r_j} t_{r_j} t_{r_j}^{-1} x_a^{-1} w_{r_j}^{-1}$ and $w_{r_j} t_{r_j} x_a t_{r_j}^{-1} x_a^{-1} w_{r_j}^{-1}$. These words again reduce to the $k = 1$ case.
- (3) If $k = 3$ there is $x = u_{a, t_{r_j}}$, $x' = u_{r_j, t_{r_j}}$ which yields the words $x_a t_{r_j} w_{r_j} t_{r_j} t_{r_j}^{-2} x_a^{-1} w_{r_j}^{-1}$ and $w_{r_j} t_{r_j} x_a t_{r_j} t_{r_j}^{-2} x_a^{-1} w_{r_j}^{-1}$ which also reduces to the $k = 1$ case.
- (4) For all $k = 2, \dots, 6$ there is $x = y_{r_j, k-1}$, $x' = t_{r_j}$ which yields trivial words in G' in both orders.

Case 3: Suppose $x'' = y_{r_j, k}$ with $7 \leq k \leq 12$. In this case we have the solution $x = y_{r_j, k-1}$, $x' = t_{r_j}$ which yields either the trivial element in G' or (after canceling t_{r_j}) the word

$$x_b w_{r_j} x_a x_b^{-1} x_a^{-1} w_{r_j}^{-1} = [x_b, w_{r_j} x_a].$$

This word is sufficiently generic by Lemma 6.4 (iii). For $k = 7$ there is the additional solution $x = y_{r_j, 5}$, $x' = u_{b, t_{r_j}}$ which yields the same words as the previous solution.

Case 4: Suppose $x'' = y_{r_j, 13}$. There is $x = y_{r_j, 12}$, $x' = x_c$ and $x = y_{r_j, 11}$, $x' = u_{c, t_{r_j}}$ which yields a trivial word in G' and the word

$$x_c w_{r_j} x_a x_b x_c^{-1} x_b^{-1} x_a^{-1} w_{r_j}^{-1} = [x_c, w_{r_j} x_a x_b].$$

This word is sufficiently generic by Lemma 6.4 (iii). Furthermore there are solutions $x = y_{r_j, 14}$, $x' = t_a$ and $x = y_{r_j, 15}$, $x' = u_{a, t_{r_j}}$. Both solutions yield in both orders trivial words in G' as all t 's commute with all other letters.

Case 5: Suppose $x'' = y_{r_j, k}$ with $14 \leq k \leq 34$. The prefixes $y_{r_j, k}$ all involve f_{r_j} and at least three different bases elements of B with b_{r_j} -coefficient at least two. Thus the only solutions involve the two previous or the two following prefixes and the appropriate letters that got added between these prefixes. Denoting by l_k the k -th letter of the word (\spadesuit) we have the following solutions:

- (1) $x = y_{r_j, k-2}$, $x' = u_{l_k^{-1}, l_{k+1}^{-1}}$ where $u_{l_k^{-1}, l_{k+1}^{-1}}$ is the commutator symbol of the letters l_k^{-1} and l_{k+1}^{-1} ,
- (2) $x = y_{r_j, k-1}$, $x' = l_{k+1}^{-1}$,
- (3) $x = y_{r_j, k+1}$, $x' = l_{k-1}^{-1}$,
- (4) $x = y_{r_j, k+2}$, $x' = u_{l_{k-1}^{-1}, l_{k-2}^{-1}}$ where $u_{l_{k-1}^{-1}, l_{k-2}^{-1}}$ is the commutator symbol of the letters l_{k-1}^{-1} and l_{k-2}^{-1} .

The case $k = 14$ and $x = y_{r_j, 12}$, $x' = u_{c, t_{r_j}}$ reduces to the sufficiently generic word given in Case 4. All other resulting words are trivial in G' as they involve the ‘‘noncommutative block’’ $w_{r_j} x_a x_b x_c$ in the right order on both sides and the t 's cancel.

Case 6: Suppose $x'' = y_{r_j, 35}$. There are also solutions of the same shape as in the previous case, namely $x = y_{r_j, 33}$, $x' = u_{t_b, t_{r_j}}$, $x = y_{r_j, 34}$, $x' = t_{b_b}$, and $x = y_{r_j, 36}$, $x' = b_{r_j}$ which all yield trivial words in G' . Furthermore, there is also the solution $x = u_{r_j, t_{r_j}}$, $x' = u_{t_c, t_{r_j}}$ which after reordering some t 's yields the word

$$(1) \quad w_{r_j} t_{r_j}^2 t_c y_{r_j, 35}^{-1} = w_{r_j} y_{r_j, 36}^{-1} u_{t_c, t_{r_j}}.$$

This word is trivial in G' as there is the relation $w_r^{-1}y_{r_j,36}u_{t_c,t_r}^{-1} = e$ in this group.

Case 7: Suppose $x'' = y_{r_j,36}$. There are the solutions $x = y_{r_j,34}$, $x' = u_{t_b,t_{r_j}}$ and $x = y_{r_j,35}$, $x' = t_{r_j}$ which also yield trivial words as above. Furthermore, there are the solution $x = w_{r_j}$, $x' = u_{t_c,t_{r_j}}$, $x = u_{r_j,t_c}$, $x' = t_{r_j}$, and $x = u_{r_j,t_{r_j}}$, $x' = t_c$ which yield the same trivial word as in Equation (1) after reordering the t 's.

The only remaining cases left to check are the ones where $x = y_{r_j,k}$ for some $1 \leq k \leq 36$ and x'' is a generator of Table 2. As the b_{r_j} -coefficient of the generator x can be at most one and the generators x, x', x'' satisfy Equation $(\pi_{F,\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}})$ there are only the following cases to consider.

Case 8: Suppose $x = y_{r_j,1}$. The only solution is $x' = w_{r_j}^{-1}$ and $x'' = x_a$. This yields a trivial word and the word $w_{r_j}x_ax_a^{-1}$. The latter is sufficiently generic by Lemma 6.4.

Case 9: Suppose $x = y_{r_j,2}$. The only solution is $x' = w_{r_j}^{-1}$ and $x'' = u_{a,t_{r_j}}$. As the t 's commute and cancel we obtain the same words as in the previous case.

Case 10: Suppose $x = y_{r_j,36}$. The only solution is $x' = w_{r_j}^{-1}$ and $x'' = u_{t_c,t_{r_j}}$. Both words are trivial due to the relation $w_r^{-1}y_{r_j,36}u_{t_c,t_r}^{-1} = e$ in the group G' .

Thus, condition (PS4) holds for all generators $x, x', x'' \in S'$ which completes the proof. \square

7. ENTROPIC MATROID REPRESENTABILITY IS UNDECIDABLE

We have now all necessary tools at our disposal to complete the proof that there is no algorithm that checks whether a matroid is entropic. We prove this result by connecting the uniform word problem for finite groups with the entropic representations of the associated generalized Dowling geometries. The first part of this relation is described in the following theorem.

Theorem 7.1. *Let $\langle S \mid R \rangle, s \in S$ be an instance of the uniform word problem for finite groups. Furthermore let $\langle S'' \mid R'' \rangle$ be the augmented presentation from Construction 6.8 and \mathcal{M} the set of generalized Dowling geometries subordinate to this presentation. If there exists a finite quotient of $G_{S,R}$ in which s is nontrivial then some matroid in \mathcal{M} is entropic.*

Proof. Assume there is a group homomorphism $\varphi : G_{S,R} \rightarrow G$ for some finite group G with $\varphi(s) \neq e$. Set $n := |G|$ and identify the elements of G with $\{1, \dots, n\}$. Let $\rho : G_{S,R} \rightarrow \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ the representation where each $\rho(g)$ is the permutation matrix corresponding to the action of $\varphi(g)$ by left-multiplication on G .

By assumption we have $\rho(s) \neq \rho(e)$. Therefore we can apply Proposition 6.12 and obtain a representation $\tilde{\rho} : G_{S'',R''} \rightarrow \text{GL}_{\tilde{n}}(\mathbb{C})$ for some $\tilde{n} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

- (a) $\tilde{\rho}(s) - \tilde{\rho}(s')$ is invertible for any distinct $s, s' \in S''$ and
- (b) whenever $s, s', s'' \in S''$ (not necessarily distinct) satisfy $\tilde{\rho}(s''s's) \neq I_n$ then the matrix $\tilde{\rho}(s''s's) - I_n$ is invertible.

Hence by Theorem 5.4 some of the generalized Dowling geometries \mathcal{M} subordinate to $\langle S'' \mid R'' \rangle$ is multilinear over \mathbb{F} . Thus by [Mat99] this matroid in \mathcal{M} is also entropic. \square

The next theorem describes the converse implication

Theorem 7.2. *Let $\langle S \mid R \rangle, s \in S$ be an instance of the uniform word problem for finite groups and M be the generalized Dowling geometry of the presentation $\langle S'' \mid R'' \rangle$ obtained from Construction 6.8. Assume that some matroid of the generalized Dowling geometries \mathcal{M} subordinate to $\langle S'' \mid R'' \rangle$ is entropic. Then there exists a group homomorphism $\varphi : G_{S,R} \rightarrow G$ to a finite group G with $\varphi(s) \neq e$.*

Proof. Suppose the matroid $M \in \mathcal{M}$ is entropic. This is the generalized Dowling geometry of a quotient of $G_{S'',R''}$. Composing the quotient map with the group homomorphism stemming from Theorem 4.5 applied to the entropic matroid M we obtain an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and a group homomorphism $\rho : G_{S'',R''} \rightarrow S_n$ with $\rho(x) \neq \rho(x')$ for distinct $x, x' \in S''$. Recall from Construction 6.8 that there is an isomorphism

$$\nu : (G_{S,R} * F_R * \langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle) \times \mathbb{Z}^N \rightarrow G_{S'',R''}$$

such that $\nu(z_1) = s_z$ for some generator $s_z \in S''$ and $\nu(sz_1s) = t$ with $t \in S''$.

As ν is an isomorphism the generators s_z and t must be distinct. Hence we obtain $\rho(t) \neq \rho(s_z)$. Composing these maps therefore yields $\rho \circ \nu(sz_1s) \neq \rho \circ \nu(z_1)$. Thus $\rho \circ \nu(s) \neq \rho \circ \nu(e)$. Restricting $\rho \circ \nu$ to $G_{S,R} \leq (G_{S,R} * F_R * \langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$ therefore yields the desired map from $G_{S,R}$ to the finite group S_n with $\rho \circ \nu(s) \neq \rho \circ \nu(e)$. \square

Combining the last two theorems with Slobodskoi's undecidability of the uniform word problem for finite groups immediately yields a proof of Theorem 1.2, which we restate here:

Theorem 7.3. *The entropic matroid representation problem is algorithmically undecidable. In other words, there is no algorithm that takes a matroid as input, always halts, and returns "true" if and only if the matroid is entropic.*

Proof. Theorems 7.1 and 7.2 imply that solving an instance of the uniform word for finite groups is equivalent to checking whether at least one member in finite set of matroids is entropic. The conclusion therefore follows from Slobodskoi's theorem that the uniform word problem for finite groups is undecidable (Theorem 2.10). \square

8. THE CONDITIONAL INDEPENDENCE IMPLICATION PROBLEM

We fix some finite ground set E for the entire section.

Lemma 8.1. *A family of discrete random variables $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ realizes the CI statement $(i \perp i \mid J)$ with $i \in E$ and $J \subseteq E \setminus \{i\}$ if and only if X_i is determined by $\{X_j\}_{j \in J}$.*

Proof. The random variables $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ realize a CI statement $(A \perp B \mid C)$ for $A, B, C \subseteq E$ if and only if

$$H(X_A \mid X_C) + H(X_B \mid X_C) - H(X_{A \cup B} \mid X_C) = 0,$$

where $H(X_S \mid X_T)$ is the entropy of X_S conditioned on X_T for subsets $S, T \subseteq E$. Applying this to the CI statement $(i \perp i \mid J)$ implies that $H(X_i \mid X_J) = 0$ which is the case if and only if X_i is determined by $\{X_j\}_{j \in J}$. \square

We relate probability space representations of matroids to the following variant of the conditional independence implication (CII) problem.

Problem 8.2. *The conditional independence realization (CIR) problem asks:*

Instance: *A set \mathcal{C} of CI statements on a finite ground set E .*

Question: *Does there exist a nontrivial family of discrete random variables $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ realizing all CI statements in \mathcal{C} ? By nontrivial we mean that there is at least one random variable that is not constant (i.e., at least one random variable does not take a single value with probability 1).*

Theorem 8.3. *Let M be a connected matroid on the ground set E . There exists a set of CI statements \mathcal{C}_M on the ground set E such that M has a discrete probability space representation if and only if \mathcal{C}_M can be realized by a nontrivial family of discrete random variables.*

Proof. Given a connected matroid M we construct a set of CI statements \mathcal{C}_M :

- (a) For every independent set $A \subseteq E$ in M we add the CI statements $(i \perp A \setminus \{i\} \mid \emptyset)$ for all $i \in A$ to \mathcal{C}_M
- (b) For every circuit $C \subseteq E$ in M we add the CI statements $(i \perp i \mid C \setminus \{i\})$ for all $i \in C$ to \mathcal{C}_M .

Let $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ be a set of discrete random variables. Suppose $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_k\} \subseteq E$ is an independent subset of M . The random variables $\{X_e\}_{e \in A}$ are independent if and only if they realize the CI statements $(a_{i+1} \perp \{a_1, \dots, a_i\} \mid \emptyset)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k-1$. By construction, \mathcal{C}_M contains all these CI statements, because a subset of an independent set of M is independent. Therefore if $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ satisfy \mathcal{C}_M then $\{X_a\}_{a \in A}$ are independent for every independent set A of M .

Conversely, it is clear that if the variables $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ give a probability space representation of M , they satisfy every CI statement in \mathcal{C}_M constructed in (a).

Let $C \subseteq E$ be a circuit of M . Lemma 8.1 yields that the random variables $\{X_e\}_{e \in C \setminus \{i\}}$ determine X_i for all $i \in C$ if and only if the random variables realize the CI statements corresponding to this circuit. Thus, for the family $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ it is equivalent to realize all CI statements corresponding to circuits of the matroid and to fulfill all determination properties dictated by the matroid in Definition 4.2.

Finally, the probability space representation being nontrivial implies that the random variable corresponding to an element that is not a loop is not constant with probability 1. Hence, if $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ are random variables corresponding to a probability space representation of M then they are a nontrivial realization of \mathcal{C}_M .

Conversely, assume that $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ is a nontrivial family of random variables realizing \mathcal{C}_M , so that there exists $e \in E$ such that X_e is a nontrivial random variable. We show that this implies the nontriviality condition of a probability space representation in Definition 4.2: Let $f \in E$ be any element that is not a loop in the matroid M . Since the matroid is connected, there exists a circuit C of M with $\{e, f\} \subseteq C$. By the above arguments we know that the family $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ satisfies the independence and determination assumptions. In particular, the subfamily $\{X_g\}_{g \in C \setminus \{e\}}$ is independent and determines X_e . Thus, the subfamily $\{X_g\}_{g \in C \setminus \{e, f\}}$ does not determine X_e which implies that X_f must be nontrivial too. \square

Corollary 8.4. *The conditional independence realization (CIR) problem is algorithmically undecidable.*

Proof. This follows directly from the Theorems 7.3 and 8.3 since the generalized Dowling geometries are connected matroids. \square

Now we are finally ready to prove that the conditional independence implication problem is undecidable,

Theorem 8.5. *The conditional independence implication (CII) problem is algorithmically undecidable.*

Proof. Assume there is an oracle to decide the CII problem. We will show that using this oracle one can also decide the CIR problem. By Corollary 8.4 this then shows that the CII problem is algorithmically undecidable.

Let \mathcal{C} be an CIR problem instance and denote by \mathcal{A}_E the set of all CI statements on the ground set E . We claim that \mathcal{C} has a nontrivial realization, that is the associated CIR problem has a positive solution, if and only if at least one of the following finite set of CII problem instances has a negative answer:

$$(2) \quad \left\{ \bigwedge_{A \in \mathcal{C}} A \Rightarrow c \mid c \in \mathcal{A}_E \setminus \mathcal{C} \right\}.$$

Suppose the family $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ is nontrivial and realizes \mathcal{C} . Since the family is nontrivial there is some $c_0 \in \mathcal{A}_E$ that is not realized by this family: $(e \perp e | \emptyset)$ is not realized whenever X_e is not constant. Hence, the CII problem instance $\bigwedge_{A \in \mathcal{C}} A \Rightarrow c_0$ that appears in (2) has a negative answer.

Conversely, assume that $\bigwedge_{A \in \mathcal{C}} A \Rightarrow c_0$ for some $c_0 \in \mathcal{A}_E \setminus \mathcal{C}$ has a negative answer. Hence, there exists a family $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ of discrete random variables that realizes \mathcal{C} but not c_0 . Thus, they also realize \mathcal{C} . Since $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ does not realize c the family is nontrivial and therefore the CIR problem has a positive answer. \square

9. ALMOST MULTILINEAR MATROIDS

This section presents our results in the almost multilinear setting. Section 9.1 and Section 9.2 generalize Section 5.2 and Section 4.1. Section 9.3 parallels Section 6. Finally, Section 9.4 puts everything together to prove undecidability results parallel to Section 7, but for almost multilinear rather than entropic matroids.

9.1. Approximate vector space representations. Here we generalize Definitions 5.1 and 5.2 to the approximate setting. We use the notation for collection of linear maps introduced in Section 5.1

Definition 9.1. Let V be a vector space, $c \in \mathbb{N}$ and E be a finite set. Further, let $\{W_e\}_{e \in E}$ be a collection of vector spaces with $\dim W_e = c$ and let $\{T_e : V \rightarrow W_e\}_{e \in E}$ be a collection of surjective linear maps. Fix some $\varepsilon > 0$.

- (a) The maps $\{T_e\}_{e \in E}$ are *independent with error ε* if $\text{rk}(T_E) \geq c(|E| - \varepsilon)$.
- (b) Fix $x \in E$. The map T_x is *determined with error ε* by $\{T_e\}_{e \in E \setminus \{x\}}$ if there exists a linear map $S : W_{E \setminus \{x\}} \rightarrow W_x$ such that

$$\text{rk}(T_x - S \circ T_{E \setminus \{x\}}) \leq c\varepsilon.$$

That is, the normalized rank distance of T_x and $S \circ T_{E \setminus \{x\}}$ is at most ε . In this case, S is called an ε -*determination map*.

For the sake of brevity we sometimes write that a set of maps is ε -independent, or that some map is ε -determined by a given collection of maps.

Lemma 9.2. *Let $A \in M_c(\mathbb{F})$ be a matrix over a field \mathbb{F} and let $\delta \geq 0$ be a real number. Then $\text{rk}(A) \geq c(1 - \delta)$ if and only if there exists an invertible matrix $D \in M_c(\mathbb{F})$ such that $\text{rk}(I_c - DA) \leq c\delta$.*

Proof. Suppose $\text{rk}(A) \geq c(1 - \delta)$. Then there exists an invertible matrix A' such that $A' - A$ has at most $c\delta$ nonzero rows: To construct such an A' from the given matrix A , iteratively find a row of the matrix which is in the span of the others, and replace it by a row which is not in the row span. After $c - \text{rk}(A)$ row replacements we obtain an invertible matrix and the process ends.

For $D = A'^{-1}$, we have

$$\text{rk}(I_c - DA) = \text{rk}(DA' - DA) = \text{rk}(A' - A) \leq c\delta.$$

Conversely, suppose there exists a matrix D with $\text{rk}(I_c - DA) \leq c\delta$. By the triangle inequality $\text{rk}(I_c) \leq \text{rk}(I_c - DA) + \text{rk}(DA)$, and hence $\text{rk}(DA) \geq c(1 - \delta)$, which implies the claim. \square

The following corollary is obvious from the lemma.

Corollary 9.3. *Let $T : V \rightarrow W$ be a linear transformation between vector spaces of the same (finite) dimension c and let $\delta \geq 0$. Then $\text{rk}(T) \geq c(1 - \delta)$ if and only if there exists an invertible transformation $S : W \rightarrow V$ such that $\text{rk}(\text{id}_V - S \circ T) \leq c\delta$.*

Definition 9.4. Let M be a matroid on E . An ε -approximate vector space representation of M consists of $c \in \mathbb{N}$, a vector space V and a collection of surjective linear maps $\{T_e : V \rightarrow W_e\}_{e \in E}$ with $\dim W_e = c$ such that

- (a) If $A \subseteq E$ is independent, the maps $\{T_e\}_{e \in A}$ are independent with error ε .
- (b) If $C \subseteq E$ is a circuit and $e \in C$, then T_e is determined with error ε by $\{T_f\}_{f \in C \setminus \{e\}}$.

Theorem 9.5. A simple matroid M is multilinear if and only if it has a vector space representation. It is almost-multilinear if and only if it has an ε -approximate vector space representation for every $\varepsilon > 0$.

The proof consists of simple but slightly lengthy calculations.

Notation 9.6. For $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we write $a \approx_\varepsilon b$ as shorthand for $|a - b| \leq \varepsilon$.

Lemma 9.7. Let $M = (E, r)$ be a simple matroid. A vector space V and a collection of linear maps $\{T_e : V \rightarrow W_e\}_{e \in E}$ define a vector space representation of M if and only if there exists $c \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $S \subseteq E$

$$r(S) = \frac{1}{c} \operatorname{rk}(T_S).$$

Proof. Suppose V and the maps $\{T_e\}_{e \in E}$ define a vector space representation of M . Then $c := \dim W_e = \operatorname{rk}(T_e)$ is independent of $e \in E$. Each $S \subseteq E$ contains a maximal independent subset $S' \subseteq S$ with $r(S) = r(S') = |S'|$, which then satisfies

$$\operatorname{rk}(T_{S'}) = \sum_{e \in S'} \operatorname{rk}(T_e) = c |S'|.$$

If $e \in S \setminus S'$ then e is in the closure of S' , so T_e is determined by $\{T_f\}_{f \in S'}$. It follows that $\operatorname{rk}(T_S) = \operatorname{rk}(T_{S'}) = c |S'| = cr(S)$.

Conversely, suppose a vector space V and linear maps $\{T_e : V \rightarrow W_e\}_{e \in E}$ are given such that $\operatorname{rk}(T_S) = cr(S)$ for all $S \subseteq E$. If $S \subseteq E$ is independent then $r(S) = |S|$, so that $\operatorname{rk}(T_S) = c |S| = \sum_{e \in S} \operatorname{rk}(T_e)$, and the maps $\{T_e\}_{e \in S}$ are independent. If $C = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ is a circuit of M then $r(C) = |C| - 1$ and $C \setminus \{e_1\}$ is independent, so

$$\operatorname{rk}(T_{C \setminus \{e_1\}}) = c(|C| - 1) = \operatorname{rk}(T_C).$$

The map $\pi : \bigoplus_{e \in C} W_e \rightarrow \bigoplus_{e \in C \setminus \{e_1\}} W_e$ which drops the W_{e_1} coordinate satisfies $T_{C \setminus \{e_1\}} = \pi \circ T_C$, so it induces an isomorphism $\operatorname{im}(T_C) \rightarrow \operatorname{im}(T_{C \setminus \{e_1\}})$ (π must be a surjection onto $\operatorname{im}(T_{C \setminus \{e_1\}})$ because $T_{C \setminus \{e_1\}}$ is a surjection; the dimensions of the two spaces are equal, so it is injective as well). Let $\psi : \operatorname{im}(T_{C \setminus \{e_1\}}) \rightarrow \operatorname{im}(T_C)$ be its inverse and let $\pi_{e_1} : \bigoplus_{e \in C} W_e \rightarrow W_{e_1}$ be the projection to the W_{e_1} summand. Then

$$(\pi_{e_1} \circ \psi) \circ T_{C \setminus \{e_1\}} = \pi_{e_1} \circ T_C = T_{e_1},$$

and T_{e_1} is determined by $\{T_e\}_{e \in C \setminus \{e_1\}}$ as required. \square

The proof of the analogous statement for almost-multilinear matroids is very similar. The following simple claim is useful:

Lemma 9.8. Let $T : W_1 \rightarrow W_2$ be a surjection. Then there exists a map $S : W_2 \rightarrow W_1$ such that $\operatorname{rk}(S \circ T - \operatorname{id}_{W_1}) \leq \dim W_1 - \dim W_2$.

Proof. Pick a basis v_1, \dots, v_n of W_2 and choose $w_1 \in T^{-1}(v_1), \dots, w_n \in T^{-1}(v_n)$. Then w_1, \dots, w_n are independent since they have an independent image, and they can be completed to a basis $w_1, \dots, w_n, w_{n+1}, \dots, w_{n+r}$ of W_1 . Define $S : W_2 \rightarrow W_1$ on v_1, \dots, v_n by $S(v_i) = w_i$ and extend linearly. Then the map $S \circ T - \operatorname{id}_{W_1}$ vanishes on $\operatorname{span}(w_1, \dots, w_n)$, so its image is equal to the image of its restriction to $\operatorname{span}(w_{n+1}, \dots, w_{n+r})$, and therefore has dimension at most $r = \dim W_1 - \dim W_2$. \square

Lemma 9.9. *Let $M = (E, r)$ be a simple matroid, let V be a vector space and let $\{T_e : V \rightarrow W_e\}_{e \in E}$ be a collection of linear maps. If $\{T_e\}_{e \in E}$ defines an ε -approximate vector space representation of M then there exists $c \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$\mathrm{rk}(T_S) \approx_{c|E|\varepsilon} c \cdot r(S) \quad \text{for all } S \subseteq E.$$

Conversely, if there exists $c \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathrm{rk}(T_e) = c$ for all $e \in E$ and

$$\mathrm{rk}(T_S) \approx_{c\varepsilon} c \cdot r(S) \quad \text{for all } S \subseteq E$$

then the maps $\{T_e\}_{e \in E}$ define a 2ε -approximate vector space representation of M .

Proof. Suppose V and the maps $\{T_e\}_{e \in E}$ define an ε -approximate vector space representation of M . Then $c := \dim W_e = \mathrm{rk}(T_e)$ is independent of $e \in E$. Each nonempty $S \subseteq E$ contains a maximal independent subset $S' \subseteq S$ with $r(S) = r(S') = |S'|$, which then satisfies

$$\mathrm{rk}(T_{S'}) \approx_{c\varepsilon} \sum_{e \in S'} \mathrm{rk}(T_e) = c|S'|.$$

If $e \in S \setminus S'$ then e is in the closure of S' , so T_e is determined by $\{T_f\}_{f \in S'}$ with error ε . It follows that

$$\mathrm{rk}(T_S) \approx_{c(|S|-|S'|)\varepsilon} \mathrm{rk}(T_{S'}) \approx_{c\varepsilon} |S'|c = c \cdot r(S),$$

so

$$\mathrm{rk}(T_S) \approx_{c(|S|-|S'|+1)\varepsilon} c \cdot r(S),$$

where $|S| - |S'| + 1 \leq |E|$ because $S' \neq \emptyset$ (or S consists of loops, and M is not simple).

Conversely, suppose a vector space V and linear maps $\{T_e : V \rightarrow W_e\}_{e \in E}$ are given such that $\mathrm{rk}(T_S) \approx_{c\varepsilon} c \cdot r(S)$ for all $S \subseteq E$. If $S \subseteq E$ is independent then $r(S) = |S|$, so that $\mathrm{rk}(T_S) \approx_{c\varepsilon} c|S| = \sum_{e \in S} \mathrm{rk}(T_e)$, and the maps $\{T_e\}_{e \in S}$ are independent with error ε . If $C = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ is a circuit of M then $r(C) = |C| - 1$ and $C \setminus \{e_1\}$ is independent, so

$$\mathrm{rk}(T_{C \setminus \{e_1\}}) \approx_{c\varepsilon} c(|C| - 1) \approx_{c\varepsilon} \mathrm{rk}(T_C),$$

and $\mathrm{rk}(T_C) - \mathrm{rk}(T_{C \setminus \{e_1\}}) \leq 2c\varepsilon$. The map $\pi : \bigoplus_{e \in C} W_e \rightarrow \bigoplus_{e \in C \setminus \{e_1\}} W_e$ which drops the W_{e_1} -coordinate satisfies $T_{C \setminus \{e_1\}} = \pi \circ T_C$, so it induces a surjection $\mathrm{im}(T_C) \rightarrow \mathrm{im}(T_{C \setminus \{e_1\}})$ (π is a surjection onto $\mathrm{im}(T_{C \setminus \{e_1\}})$ because $T_{C \setminus \{e_1\}}$ is a surjection). Lemma 9.8 implies that there exists $\psi : \mathrm{im}(T_{C \setminus \{e_1\}}) \rightarrow \mathrm{im}(T_C)$ such that

$$\mathrm{rk}(\psi \circ \pi - \mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{im}(T_C)}) \leq 2c\varepsilon.$$

Denote the projection to the e_1 -summand $\bigoplus_{e \in C} W_e \rightarrow W_{e_1}$ by π_{e_1} . Then $\pi_{e_1} \circ T_C = T_{e_1}$ by definition, and

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{e_1} \circ (\psi \circ \pi - \mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{im}(T_C)}) \circ T_C &= \pi_{e_1} \circ \psi \circ (\pi \circ T_C) - \pi_{e_1} \circ T_C \\ &= (\pi_{e_1} \circ \psi) \circ T_{C \setminus \{e_1\}} - T_{e_1} \end{aligned}$$

has rank at most $2c\varepsilon$ (since $(\psi \circ \pi - \mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{im}(T_C)})$ has rank at most $2c\varepsilon$). This shows that T_{e_1} is determined by $\{T_e\}_{e \in C \setminus \{e_1\}}$ with error at most 2ε . \square

Lemma 9.10. *A matroid $M = (E, r)$ is almost multilinear if and only if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a linear polymatroid (\tilde{E}, \tilde{r}) and a $c \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$\left\| r - \frac{1}{c} \tilde{r} \right\|_\infty < \varepsilon$$

and in addition $\tilde{r}(e) = c$ for all $e \in E$.

Proof. One direction is trivial: if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a polymatroid as in the statement then M is almost multilinear.

Conversely, suppose M is almost multilinear and let $\varepsilon > 0$. Denote $\varepsilon' = \frac{1}{|E|+1}\varepsilon$. Take a linear polymatroid (\tilde{E}, \tilde{r}) and a $c \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| r - \frac{1}{c} \tilde{r} \right\|_{\infty} < \varepsilon'.$$

Let V be a vector space and let $\{W_e\}_{e \in E}$ be subspaces representing (\tilde{E}, \tilde{r}) . Assume $\dim V \geq c$ (by enlarging V if necessary). For each $e \in E$ denote $d_e = \dim W_e$, and take a basis $b_1^e, \dots, b_{d_e}^e$ for W_e . If $c > d_e$ add vectors to the basis such that $b_1^e, \dots, b_{d_e}^e, \dots, b_c^e$ are linearly independent; if $c < d_e$ remove the last vectors from the list. Then define

$$W'_e = \text{span} \{b_1^e, \dots, b_c^e\}.$$

Consider the subspaces $\{W'_e\}_{e \in E}$. For any $S \subseteq E$ we have

$$\left| \dim \left(\sum_{e \in S} W'_e \right) - \dim \left(\sum_{e \in S} W_e \right) \right| \leq \sum_{e \in S} |c - d_e| \leq \sum_{e \in E} |c - d_e|$$

where $|c - d_e| = c \left| 1 - \frac{1}{c} \tilde{r}(e) \right| \leq c \left\| r - \frac{1}{c} \tilde{r} \right\|_{\infty}$.

In particular, if r' is the rank function of the polymatroid represented by $\{W'_e\}_{e \in E}$ then

$$\|r' - \tilde{r}\|_{\infty} \leq |E| c \left\| r - \frac{1}{c} \tilde{r} \right\|_{\infty},$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| r - \frac{1}{c} r' \right\|_{\infty} &\leq \left\| r - \frac{1}{c} \tilde{r} \right\|_{\infty} + \left\| \frac{1}{c} r' - \frac{1}{c} \tilde{r} \right\|_{\infty} = \left\| r - \frac{1}{c} \tilde{r} \right\|_{\infty} + \frac{1}{c} \|r' - \tilde{r}\|_{\infty} \\ &\leq \left\| r - \frac{1}{c} \tilde{r} \right\|_{\infty} (|E| + 1) < \varepsilon. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Proof of Theorem 9.5. Let V be a finite dimensional vector space and let $\{W_e\}_{e \in E}$ be a finite indexed collection of subspaces. For each $W \leq V$ denote by $W^0 \leq V^*$ the annihilator of W in the dual space, and recall $\dim W^0 = \dim V - \dim W$. Define $T_e : V^* \rightarrow V^*/W_e^0$ to be the quotient map. The indexed collection of maps $\{T_e : V^* \rightarrow V^*/W_e^0\}_{e \in E}$ satisfies

$$\ker T_S = \bigcap_{e \in S} W_e^0 = \left(\sum_{e \in S} W_e \right)^0$$

for any $S \subseteq E$, where T_S is the map

$$T_S : V^* \rightarrow \bigoplus_{e \in S} V^*/W_e^0.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rk}(T_S) &= \dim V^* - \dim \ker T_S = \dim V^* - \left(\dim V - \dim \left(\sum_{e \in S} W_e \right) \right) \\ &= \dim \left(\sum_{e \in S} W_e \right), \end{aligned}$$

and $\dim V^*/W_e^0 = \dim W_e$ for all $e \in E$.

It follows that the subspaces $\{W_e\}_{e \in E}$ define a multilinear representation of a matroid (E, r) if and only if the maps $\{T_e\}_{e \in E}$ define a vector space representation. Similarly, by

Lemma 9.10 and Lemma 9.9 the matroid $M = (E, r)$ is almost multilinear if and only if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ it has an ε -approximate vector space representation. \square

9.2. Almost multilinear Dowling geometries. The next two theorems provide sufficient conditions for a generalized Dowling geometry to be almost multilinear. Moreover, we discuss a group-theoretic consequence of a Dowling geometry being almost-multilinear.

Theorem 9.11. *Let $G = \langle S \mid R \rangle$ be a group with a given symmetric triangular presentation and fix $\varepsilon \geq 0$. Let $\rho : S \rightarrow \text{GL}(W)$ be an $\varepsilon/18$ -approximate representation of $\langle S \mid R \rangle$, where W is a finite dimensional vector space over a field \mathbb{F} . Suppose that*

- (a) $d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(s), \rho(s')) \geq 1 - \varepsilon/18$ for all distinct $s, s' \in S$,
- (b) For all triples $s, s', s'' \in S$ (not necessarily distinct) either $d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(s'')\rho(s')\rho(s), \text{id}_W) \leq \varepsilon/18$ or $d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(s'')\rho(s')\rho(s), \text{id}_W) \geq 1 - \varepsilon/18$.
- (c) If $s, s', s'' \in S$ (not necessarily distinct) satisfy $d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(s'')\rho(s')\rho(s), \text{id}_W) \leq \varepsilon/18$ then $s''s's = e$ is a relation in R .

Then the generalized Dowling geometry of the presentation $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ has an ε -approximate vector space representation.

Moreover, if the approximate representation ρ just satisfies the assumptions (a) and (b) then some matroid among the generalized Dowling geometries $\mathcal{M}_{S,R}$ subordinate to $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ has an ε -approximate vector space representation.

Proof. The second statement (“Moreover, ...”) follows from the first after adding the relations $s''s's = e$ to R whenever $\rho(s''s's) = e$ holds. Note that by the definition of the subordinate generalized Dowling geometries, the matroid of this new presentation is a member of $\mathcal{M}_{S,R}$.

As in Definition 3.7, we denote the generalized Dowling geometry of $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ by M , the ground set by E , and the special basis by $B = \{b_1, b_2, b_3\}$. We construct an ε -approximate vector space representation of M .

Set $c = \dim W$ and for each $e \in E$ set $W_e = W$. Let $V = W_{b_1} \oplus W_{b_2} \oplus W_{b_3}$, and let $T_{b_i} : V \rightarrow W_{b_i}$ be given by the projection. Let $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ be two distinct indices, and suppose j is the element following i in the cyclic ordering. Let $s \in S$ be any element. Define

$$\begin{aligned} T_{s_i} : V = W_{b_1} \oplus W_{b_2} \oplus W_{b_3} &\rightarrow W_{s_i} \\ T_{s_i}(v_1, v_2, v_3) &= v_j - \rho(s)(v_i), \end{aligned}$$

or in other words $T_{s_i} = T_{b_j} - \rho(s)T_{b_i}$.

(One can come up with this guess for the maps by starting with the following determination map for v_j given $v_{s_i} = T_{s_i}(v_1, v_2, v_3)$ and v_i : $S(v_i, v_{s_i}) = \rho(s_i)v_i + v_{s_i}$. Such determination maps “compose correctly” in the sense of Theorem 4.6, condition (b). Another way is to inspect the matrix representations of Dowling geometries.) In order to prove the required ε -independence and ε -determination conditions we first establish the following claims.

Claim 1: $d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(s)^{-1}, \rho(s^{-1})) \leq \varepsilon/9$.

Claim 2: Fix $\varepsilon' \geq 0$. Let $S \subseteq E$ with $|S| = 3$. If T_{b_i} is determined by $\{T_e\}_{e \in S}$ with error $\varepsilon'/3$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 3$ then $\{T_e\}_{e \in S}$ is independent with error ε' .

Claim 3: Let $S \subseteq E$ with $|S| = 3$. If $\{T_e\}_{e \in S}$ is independent with error $\varepsilon'/3$ then T_{b_i} is determined by $\{T_e\}_{e \in S}$ with error ε' for all $1 \leq i \leq 3$.

Proof of Claim 1. Applying assumption (b) to the relation $s^{-1}se = e$, we obtain

$$d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(s^{-1})\rho(s)\rho(e), \text{id}_W) \leq \varepsilon/18.$$

Since $d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(e), \text{id}_W) \leq \varepsilon/18$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(s^{-1})\rho(s), \text{id}_W) \\ & \leq d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(s^{-1})\rho(s) \circ \text{id}_W, \rho(s^{-1})\rho(s)\rho(e)) + d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(s^{-1})\rho(s)\rho(e), \text{id}_W) \leq \varepsilon/9. \end{aligned}$$

by Remark 2.9 and the triangle inequality. \square

Proof of Claims 2 and 3. Given a basis $S \subseteq E$ of M (so that in particular $|S| = 3$) consider the map

$$T_S : V = W_{b_1} \oplus W_{b_2} \oplus W_{b_3} \rightarrow W_S = \bigoplus_{e \in S} W_e.$$

Suppose each T_{b_i} is $(\varepsilon'/3)$ -determined by $\{T_e\}_{e \in S}$. Then there exist maps \tilde{T}_1, \tilde{T}_2 , and \tilde{T}_3 such that

$$\text{rk}(T_{b_i} - \tilde{T}_i \circ T_S) \leq c\varepsilon'/3$$

for each $1 \leq i \leq 3$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{T} : W_S & \rightarrow V = W_{b_1} \oplus W_{b_2} \oplus W_{b_3} \\ w & = (w_e)_{e \in S} \mapsto (\tilde{T}_1(w), \tilde{T}_2(w), \tilde{T}_3(w)) \end{aligned}$$

and observe that T_B differs from $\tilde{T} \circ T_S$ on a subspace of dimension at most $3 \cdot c\varepsilon'/3 = c\varepsilon'$. In particular T_S has rank at least $\text{rk}(T_B) - c\varepsilon'$, and thus $\{T_e\}_{e \in S}$ are ε' -independent.

Suppose $\{T_e\}_{e \in S}$ are independent with error $\varepsilon'/3$. Then by definition T_S has rank at least $c(1 - \varepsilon'/3)$. Thus by Corollary 9.3 there exists a map $\tilde{T} : W_S \rightarrow V$ such that

$$\text{rk}(\text{id}_V - \tilde{T} \circ T_S) \leq 3c(\varepsilon'/3) = c\varepsilon'.$$

Composing with T_{b_i} for $1 \leq i \leq 3$, we find

$$\text{rk}(T_{b_i} - (T_{b_i} \circ \tilde{T}) \circ T_S) \leq c\varepsilon',$$

so that each T_{b_i} is determined by $\{T_e\}_{e \in S}$ with error ε' . \square

We now verify that the correct independence and determination conditions hold with error at most ε for the maps $\{T_e : V \rightarrow W_e\}_{e \in E}$.

For the independence conditions there are several cases. It suffices to check the condition for bases of M (recall these are all of size $3 = \text{rk}(M)$). In each case we will show that $\{T_e\}_{e \in S}$ $\varepsilon/3$ -determines T_{b_i} for all $1 \leq i \leq 3$, which suffices by Claim 2.

- (a) For $\{b_1, b_2, b_3\}$ the statement is clear: T_{b_i} ($i = 1, 2, 3$) are distinct projections onto summands of $V = W_{b_1} \oplus W_{b_2} \oplus W_{b_3}$.
- (b) For subsets of the form $\{b_1, b_2, s_2\}$, we have

$$T_{s_2} + \rho(s)T_{b_2} = T_{b_3},$$

so that T_{b_3} is determined (with error 0) by $\{T_{b_1}, T_{b_2}, T_{s_2}\}$, and we reduce to the previous case. The same holds for subsets of the form $\{b_1, b_2, s_3\}$, or similar subsets with cyclic shifts of the indices.

- (c) Subsets of the form $\{s_1, s'_2, b_1\}$ (up to shifts of the indices, with $s = s'$ allowed) are similar: we first observe that T_{b_2} is determined (with error 0) by $\{T_{b_1}, T_{s_1}\}$ and then reduce to (b). The same idea works for subsets of the form $\{s_1, s'_2, b_2\}$.
- (d) For subsets of the form $\{s_1, s'_1\}$ we note that

$$\rho(s)T_{b_1} + T_{s_1} = \rho(s')T_{b_1} + T_{s'_1} = T_{b_2}$$

and therefore $(\rho(s) - \rho(s'))T_{b_1} = T_{s'_1} - T_{s_1}$. By assumption we know that $\text{rk}(\rho(s) - \rho(s')) \geq c(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{18})$. Thus by Corollary 9.3, there is a $\tilde{T} \in \text{GL}(W)$ such that

$$\text{rk}(\text{id}_W - \tilde{T} \circ (\rho(s) - \rho(s'))) \leq c\varepsilon/18.$$

Precomposing with T_{b_1} and using the identity $(\rho(s) - \rho(s'))T_{b_1} = T_{s'_1} - T_{s_1}$, we find

$$\text{rk}(T_{b_1} - \tilde{T} \circ (T_{s'_1} - T_{s_1})) \leq c\varepsilon/18.$$

Thus T_{b_1} is determined by $\{T_{s'_1}, T_{s_1}\}$ with error $\varepsilon/18$.

Using $\rho(s)T_{b_1} + T_{s_1} = T_{b_2}$ and composing the maps in the previous rank inequality with $\rho(s)$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{rk}(T_{b_2} - [\rho(s)\tilde{T} \circ (T_{s'_1} - T_{s_1}) - T_{s_1}]) \\ &= \text{rk}([\rho(s)T_{b_1} + T_{s_1}] - [\rho(s)\tilde{T} \circ (T_{s'_1} - T_{s_1}) - T_{s_1}]) \\ &= \text{rk}(\rho(s) \circ T_{b_1} - \rho(s)\tilde{T} \circ (T_{s'_1} - T_{s_1})) \leq c\varepsilon/18. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $\rho(s)\tilde{T} \circ (T_{s'_1} - T_{s_1}) - T_{s_1}$ is the composition of a map

$$W_{s'_1} \oplus W_{s_1} \rightarrow W = W_{b_2}$$

on $T_{\{s'_1, s_1\}}$. Therefore T_{b_2} is determined with error $\varepsilon/18$ by $T_{\{s'_1, s_1\}}$.

By Claims 2 and 3, this computation yields the independence condition for subsets of the form $S = \{s_1, s'_1, b_3\}$: by our computation, the maps $\{T_e\}_{e \in S}$ determine T_{b_1} and T_{b_2} with error $\varepsilon/18$ each, so that T_B is determined with error at most $\varepsilon/9$ and the maps are $\varepsilon/3$ -independent.

It also yields the independence condition for subsets of the form $S = \{s_1, s'_1, s''_1\}$ which are independent in M (up to shifts of the indices, with s, s', s'' not necessarily distinct): the maps $\{T_e\}_{e \in S}$ determine each T_{b_i} with error $\varepsilon/18$.

(e) Finally, for subsets of the form $\{s_1, s'_2, s''_3\}$ with $s''s's \neq e$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & T_{s''_3} + \rho(s'')T_{s'_2} + \rho(s'')\rho(s')T_{s_1} \\ &= [T_{b_1} - \rho(s'')T_{b_3}] + \rho(s'') [T_{b_3} - \rho(s')T_{b_2}] + \rho(s'')\rho(s') [T_{b_2} - \rho(s)T_{b_1}] \\ &= T_{b_1} - \rho(s'')\rho(s')\rho(s)T_{b_1} = [\text{id}_W - \rho(s'')\rho(s')\rho(s)]T_{b_1}. \end{aligned}$$

By assumption $\text{rk}(\text{id}_W - \rho(s'')\rho(s')\rho(s)) \geq c(1 - \varepsilon/18)$. By Corollary 9.3 there exists a $\tilde{T} \in \text{GL}(W)$ such that

$$\text{rk}(\text{id}(W) - \tilde{T} \circ \rho(s'')\rho(s')\rho(s)) \leq c\varepsilon/18.$$

As in case (d), this implies that T_{b_1} is determined by $\{T_e\}_{e \in S}$ with error $\varepsilon/18$ for each $1 \leq i \leq 3$. By permuting the indices $(1, 2, 3)$ and generators (s, s', s'') cyclically, we find similar expressions for T_{b_2} and T_{b_3} . This shows each T_{b_i} is determined by $(T_{s_1}, T_{s'_2}, T_{s''_3})$ with error $\varepsilon/18$, which by Claim 2 implies the claimed independence.

We now consider the circuits and show that the determination conditions are satisfied.

(a) If C is a circuit of size 4, let $x \in C$. The subset $C \setminus \{x\}$ is a basis of M (since this subset is independent and M has rank 3), so $\{T_e\}_{e \in C \setminus \{x\}}$ determine T_{b_1}, T_{b_2} and T_{b_3} with error $\varepsilon/3$ by the above arguments.

By construction we can express T_x by $T_x = \sum_{i=1}^3 A_i T_{b_i}$ for some maps $A_i \in \text{GL}(W)$. The above argument also implies that $\{T_e\}_{e \in C \setminus \{x\}}$ determines $A_i T_{b_i}$ with error $\varepsilon/3$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 3$. Therefore $\{T_e\}_{e \in C \setminus \{x\}}$ determines T_x with error ε .

(b) If C consists of 3 elements of the flat spanned by $\{b_1, b_2\}$ then any subset consisting of two elements is of the form $S = \{b_1, b_2\}$, $S = \{b_i, s_1\}$ ($i \in \{1, 2\}$), or $S = \{s_1, s'_1\}$ (where $s \neq s'$ in S). In the first case it is clear that $\{T_e\}_{e \in S}$ determines T_x (with error 0) for x the unique element of $C \setminus S$.

For the latter two cases, note that in the cases (b) and (d) of the independence conditions it is shown that $\{T_e\}_{e \in S}$ determines T_{b_1} and T_{b_2} in either case with error $\varepsilon/18$. Therefore, $\{T_e\}_{e \in S}$ determines $T_{e'}$ with error $\varepsilon/18$ for any e' in the flat spanned

by $\{b_1, b_2\}$ by an analogous argument as in the previous case, and in particular for x the unique element of $C \setminus S$.

- (c) Suppose $C = \{s_1, s'_2, s''_3\}$ where $s''s's = e$, or equivalently $s'' = (s's)^{-1} = s^{-1}s'^{-1}$. We show that $T_{s''_3}$ is determined by $\{T_{s_1}, T_{s'_2}\}$ with error ε . To this end, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} & -\rho(s)^{-1}T_{s_1} - \rho(s)^{-1}\rho(s')^{-1}T_{s'_2} \\ &= -\rho(s)^{-1}[T_{b_2} - \rho(s)T_{b_1}] - \rho(s)^{-1}\rho(s')^{-1}[T_{b_3} - \rho(s')T_{b_2}] \\ &= T_{b_1} - \rho(s)^{-1}\rho(s')^{-1}T_{b_3} \end{aligned}$$

By assumption we have $\text{rk}(\rho(s'')\rho(s')\rho(s) - \text{id}_W) \leq \varepsilon/18$. Composing the transformation with $\rho(s)^{-1}\rho(s')^{-1}$ from the right, we obtain

$$\text{rk}(\rho(s'') - \rho(s)^{-1}\rho(s')^{-1}) \leq \varepsilon/18.$$

Therefore

$$\text{rk}(T_{s''_3} - [T_{b_1} - \rho(s)^{-1}\rho(s')^{-1}T_{b_3}]) \leq \varepsilon/18,$$

which implies

$$\text{rk}([-\rho(s)^{-1}T_{s_1} - \rho(s)^{-1}\rho(s')^{-1}T_{s'_2}] - T_{s''_3}) \leq \varepsilon/18,$$

so the map $T_{s''_3}$ is determined by $\{T_{s_1}, T_{s'_2}\}$ as required. \square

Theorem 9.12. *Suppose the generalized Dowling geometry $M = (E, r)$ associated to a finitely presented group $G = \langle S \mid R \rangle$ is almost multilinear. Then $s \neq s'$ in G for all distinct $s, s' \in S$.*

The next lemma is helpful in part of the computation.

Lemma 9.13. *Let $M = (E, r)$ be a matroid and let $E' = \{e_1, e_2, e_3\} \subseteq E$ be a subset such that $r(\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}) = 2$ and $r(\{e_i, e_j\}) = 2$ for all distinct $1 \leq i, j \leq 3$. Let an ε -approximate multilinear representation of M be given by the vector space V and the maps $\{T_e : V \rightarrow W_e\}_{e \in E'}$, and denote by c the dimension of each of the vector spaces $\{W_e\}_{e \in E'}$ (recall this dimension is constant by assumption). Then there are 6ε -determination functions $f : W_{e_1} \oplus W_{e_2} \rightarrow W_{e_3}$ and $g : W_{e_1} \oplus W_{e_3} \rightarrow W_{e_2}$ such that the following holds. Pick bases for W_{e_i} ($1 \leq i \leq 3$) and identify the spaces with \mathbb{F}^c . Then there are matrices $A_1, A_2 \in M_c(\mathbb{F})$ such that A_2 is invertible, and f, g satisfy*

$$f(v_1, v_2) = A_1v_1 + A_2v_2, \quad g(v_1, v_3) = -A_2^{-1}A_1v_1 + A_2^{-1}v_3.$$

Proof. Take an ε -determination map $\tilde{f} : W_{e_1} \oplus W_{e_2} \rightarrow W_{e_3}$. Since \tilde{f} is linear, it is of the form $\tilde{f}(v_1, v_2) = A_1v_1 + \tilde{A}_2v_2$ for some $A_1, \tilde{A}_2 \in M_c(\mathbb{F})$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{T}_{e_3} &: V \rightarrow W_{e_3} \\ \tilde{T}_{e_3}(v) &= \tilde{f}(T_{e_1}(v), T_{e_2}(v)). \end{aligned}$$

Further define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{T}_{(e_1, e_3)} &: V \rightarrow W_{e_1} \oplus W_{e_3} \\ \tilde{T}_{(e_1, e_3)}(v) &= (T_{e_1}(v), \tilde{T}_{e_3}(v)) \end{aligned}$$

by analogy with $T_{(e_1, e_3)}$.

By definition $d_{\text{rk}}(T_{e_3}, \tilde{T}_{e_3}) \leq \varepsilon$, and hence also $d_{\text{rk}}(T_{(e_1, e_3)}, \tilde{T}_{(e_1, e_3)}) \leq \varepsilon$. In particular, $\text{rk}(\tilde{T}_{(e_1, e_3)}) \geq \text{rk}(T_{(e_1, e_3)}) - c\varepsilon \geq 2c - 2c\varepsilon$. Observe that

$$\tilde{T}_{(e_1, e_3)}(v) = (T_{e_1}(v), \tilde{T}_{e_3}(v)) = (T_{e_1}(v), \tilde{f}(T_{e_1}(v), T_{e_2}(v))).$$

Hence, for

$$F : W_{e_1} \oplus W_{e_2} \rightarrow W_{e_1} \oplus W_{e_3}$$

$$F(v_1, v_2) = (v_1, f(v_1, v_2)) = \left(v_1, A_1 v_1 + \tilde{A}_2 v_2 \right),$$

we have $\tilde{T}_{(e_1, e_3)} = F \circ T_{(e_1, e_2)}$. In particular, F has rank at least $2c - 2c\varepsilon$. Identifying $W_{e_1} \oplus W_{e_2}$ and $W_{e_1} \oplus W_{e_3}$ with \mathbb{F}^{2c} via the chosen bases, we represent F by the block matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ A_1 & \tilde{A}_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

(note that indeed $\begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ A_1 & \tilde{A}_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} v_1 \\ A_1 v_1 + \tilde{A}_2 v_2 \end{bmatrix}$). Since such a block matrix has rank $c + \text{rk}(\tilde{A}_2)$, we obtain $\text{rk}(\tilde{A}_2) \geq c - 2c\varepsilon$. By Lemma 9.2 there is an invertible matrix A_2 such that $d_{\text{rk}}(A_2, \tilde{A}_2) \leq 2\varepsilon$. Define

$$f : W_{e_1} \oplus W_{e_2} \rightarrow W_{e_3}$$

$$f(v_1, v_2) = A_1 v_1 + A_2 v_2$$

as well as

$$g : W_{e_1} \oplus W_{e_3} \rightarrow W_{e_2}$$

$$g(v_1, v_3) = -A_2^{-1} A_1 v_1 + A_2^{-1} v_3.$$

It remains to show that these are 6ε -determination functions. First observe that $(\tilde{f} - f)(v_1, v_2) = (A_2 - \tilde{A}_2)v_2$, and therefore

$$d_{\text{rk}}(\tilde{f}, f) = d_{\text{rk}}(\tilde{A}_2, A_2) = \frac{1}{c} \text{rk}(\tilde{A}_2 - A_2) \leq 2\varepsilon.$$

Hence also

$$d_{\text{rk}}(f \circ T_{(e_1, e_2)}, T_{e_3}) \leq d_{\text{rk}}(f \circ T_{(e_1, e_2)}, \tilde{f} \circ T_{(e_1, e_2)}) + d_{\text{rk}}(\tilde{f} \circ T_{(e_1, e_2)}, T_{e_3}) \leq 3\varepsilon,$$

so f is a 3ε -determination function. For g , observe that for all $v \in V$, denoting $v_1 = T_{e_1}(v)$ and $v_2 = T_{e_2}(v)$ we have $g(v_1, f(v_1, v_2)) = v_2$ by construction. So it suffices to bound

$$d_{\text{rk}}(g \circ T_{(e_1, e_3)}, [v \mapsto g(T_{e_1}(v), f(T_{e_1}(v), T_{e_2}(v)))]),$$

since the map on the right equals T_{e_2} . By Remark 2.9 (using the fact that both maps are constructed by composing a map with g) this is at most

$$2d_{\text{rk}}(T_{(e_1, e_3)}, [v \mapsto (T_{e_1}(v), f \circ T_{(e_1, e_2)}(v))])$$

$$\leq 2d_{\text{rk}}(T_{e_3}, f \circ T_{(e_1, e_2)}) \leq 6\varepsilon. \quad \square$$

Proof of Theorem 9.12. We start by constructing approximate representations of the Dowling groupoid \mathcal{G} associated to G . Recall that this is a finitely presented category with objects $\{b_1, b_2, b_3\}$ and with generating morphisms

$$\{g_{s,i,j} : b_i \rightarrow b_j \mid s \in S, \text{ and } i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\} \text{ with } i \neq j\}.$$

These objects and generating morphisms define a directed graph H . Using the notation of Sections 2.9 and 2.10, we denote by $\mathcal{C}(H)$ the free category on H , so that $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{C}(H)/\sim$, with \sim the congruence generated by the relations described in Definition 3.2.

Let an ε -approximate vector space representation of M be given by the vector space V and the linear maps $\{T_e : V \rightarrow W_e\}_{e \in E}$. Suppose the spaces $\{W_e\}_{e \in E}$ all have dimension c , and define \mathcal{D} to be the category of vector spaces over the underlying field of V .

We define a graph homomorphism $f : H \rightarrow \text{Graph}(\mathcal{D})$ as follows. On objects define f by $f(b_i) = W_{b_i}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 3$. To define f on the morphisms, suppose $1 \leq i, j \leq 3$ and i precedes j in the cyclic ordering. Given $s \in S$, choose 6ε -approximate determination maps

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{s,i,j} : W_{b_i} \oplus W_{s_i} &\rightarrow W_{b_j} \text{ and} \\ \varphi_{s,j,i} : W_{b_j} \oplus W_{s_i} &\rightarrow W_{b_i} \end{aligned}$$

for T_{b_j} given $\{T_{b_i}, T_{s_i}\}$ and for T_{b_i} given $\{T_{b_j}, T_{s_i}\}$, respectively. (We take 6ε instead of ε because we later apply this construction with determination maps produced by Lemma 9.13 and obtain additional consequences. For the first part of the proof this choice doesn't matter.)

Then define $f(g_{s,i,j}) : W_{b_i} \rightarrow W_{b_j}$ by

$$(f(g_{s,i,j}))(w) = \varphi_{s,i,j}(w, 0)$$

and similarly define

$$(f(g_{s,j,i}))(w) = \varphi_{s,j,i}(w, 0).$$

We now show that for any relation $\varphi_1 = \varphi_2$ in the presentation of \mathcal{G} we have

$$d_{\text{rk}}(f(\varphi_1), f(\varphi_2)) \leq 20\varepsilon.$$

Case 1: For i, j , and s as above consider the relation $g_{s,j,i} \circ g_{s,i,j} = \text{id}_{b_i}$. Since $T_{(b_i, s_i)}$ is ε -independent, its image intersects the subspace $W_{b_i} \oplus \{0\} \subset W_{b_i} \oplus W_{s_i}$ in a subspace of dimension at least $c(1 - \varepsilon)$. In the same way, the image of $T_{(b_j, s_i)}$ intersects $W_{b_j} \oplus \{0\}$ in a subspace of dimension at least $c(1 - \varepsilon)$. Define

$$V' = T_{s_i}^{-1}(0).$$

The previous considerations imply precisely that $T_{(b_i, s_i)}(V') \simeq T_{b_i}(V')$ and $T_{(b_j, s_i)}(V') \simeq T_{b_j}(V')$ have dimension at least $c(1 - \varepsilon)$. It is clear that

$$\text{rk}(T_{b_j} \upharpoonright_{V'} - \varphi_{s,i,j} \circ T_{(b_i, s_i)} \upharpoonright_{V'}) \leq \text{rk}(T_{b_j} - \varphi_{s,i,j} \circ T_{(b_i, s_i)}) \leq 6c\varepsilon$$

(the inequality on the right is from the definition of $\varphi_{s,i,j}$ as a determination map). In the same way,

$$\text{rk}(T_{b_i} \upharpoonright_{V'} - \varphi_{s,j,i} \circ T_{(b_j, s_i)} \upharpoonright_{V'}) \leq 6c\varepsilon.$$

Therefore

$$V'' = [\ker(T_{b_i} \upharpoonright_{V'} - \varphi_{s,j,i} \circ T_{(b_j, s_i)} \upharpoonright_{V'}) \cap \ker(T_{b_j} \upharpoonright_{V'} - \varphi_{s,i,j} \circ T_{(b_i, s_i)} \upharpoonright_{V'})]$$

is a subspace of V' of dimension at least $\dim V' - 12c\varepsilon$. Its image under T_{b_i} therefore has codimension at most $12c\varepsilon$ within the image of V' , and similarly for T_{b_j} . That is,

$$\dim T_{b_i}(V'') \geq c(1 - 13\varepsilon) \quad \text{and} \quad \dim T_{b_j}(V'') \geq c(1 - 13\varepsilon).$$

By definition, if $w \in T_{b_i}(V'')$ then $w = T_{b_i}(v)$ for some $v \in V''$ and

$$(f_n(g_{s,i,j}))(w) = \varphi_{s,i,j}(w, 0) = \varphi_{s,i,j}(T_{(b_i, s_i)}(v)) = T_{b_j}(v)$$

where the rightmost equality is because $v \in V''$ is contained in the kernel of $T_{b_j} - \varphi_{s,i,j} \circ T_{(b_i, s_i)}$. In the same way, if $w \in T_{b_j}(V'')$ then $w = T_{b_j}(v)$ for some $v \in V''$ and

$$(f_n(g_{s,j,i}))(w) = T_{b_i}(v).$$

It follows that

$$f_n(g_{s,j,i}) \circ f_n(g_{s,i,j}) \upharpoonright_{T_{b_i}(V'')} = \text{id}_{T_{b_i}(V'')},$$

and the normalized rank distance between $f_n(g_{s,j,i}) \circ f_n(g_{s,i,j})$ and $\text{id}_{W_{b_i}}$ is at most

$$\frac{1}{c} (\dim W_{b_i} - \dim T_{b_i}(V'')) \leq 13\varepsilon.$$

Case 2: Suppose (i, j, k) is an even permutation of $(1, 2, 3)$ (so that $i < j < k < i$ in the cyclic ordering) and let $s, s', s'' \in S$ such that $s''s's = e$ is a relation in R . We verify that

$$f_n(g_{s'',k,i}) \circ f_n(g_{s',j,k}) \circ f_n(g_{s,i,j})$$

has small normalized rank distance from $\text{id}_{W_{b_i}}$. Define

$$V' = T_{s_i}^{-1}(0) \cap T_{s'_j}^{-1}(0) \cap T_{s''_k}^{-1}(0) = T_{(s_i, s'_j, s''_k)}^{-1}(0).$$

By ε -determination of $T_{s''_k}$ by $\{T_{s_i}, T_{s'_j}\}$, the map $T_{(s_i, s'_j, s''_k)}$ has rank at most $c(2 + \varepsilon)$. Therefore V' is a subspace of V with dimension at least

$$\dim V - \text{rk}\left(T_{(s_i, s'_j, s''_k)}\right) \geq \dim V - c(2 + \varepsilon).$$

Since $\varphi_{s,i,j}$ is a 6ε determination map we have

$$\text{rk}\left(T_{b_j} \upharpoonright_{V'} - \varphi_{s,i,j} \circ T_{(b_i, s_i)} \upharpoonright_{V'}\right) \leq \text{rk}\left(T_{b_j} - \varphi_{s,i,j} \circ T_{(b_i, s_i)}\right) \leq 6c\varepsilon,$$

and in the same way also

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rk}\left(T_{b_k} \upharpoonright_{V'} - \varphi_{s',j,k} \circ T_{(b_j, s'_j)} \upharpoonright_{V'}\right) &\leq 6c\varepsilon \text{ and} \\ \text{rk}\left(T_{b_i} \upharpoonright_{V'} - \varphi_{s'',k,i} \circ T_{(b_k, s''_k)} \upharpoonright_{V'}\right) &\leq 6c\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} V'' &= \ker\left(T_{b_j} \upharpoonright_{V'} - \varphi_{s,i,j} \circ T_{(b_i, s_i)} \upharpoonright_{V'}\right) \cap \\ &\quad \ker\left(T_{b_k} \upharpoonright_{V'} - \varphi_{s',j,k} \circ T_{(b_j, s'_j)} \upharpoonright_{V'}\right) \cap \\ &\quad \ker\left(T_{b_i} \upharpoonright_{V'} - \varphi_{s'',k,i} \circ T_{(b_k, s''_k)} \upharpoonright_{V'}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Then V'' has codimension at most $18c\varepsilon$ within V' .

We now compute $\dim T_{b_i}(V'')$: observe that $V'' \subseteq V' \subseteq T_{s_i}^{-1}(0) \cap T_{s'_j}^{-1}(0)$. Since $\{T_{s_i}, T_{s'_j}\}$ determine $T_{s''_k}$ with error at most ε , the codimension of V' within $T_{s_i}^{-1}(0) \cap T_{s'_j}^{-1}(0)$ is at most $c\varepsilon$. Thus the codimension of V'' within $T_{s_i}^{-1}(0) \cap T_{s'_j}^{-1}(0)$ is at most $c(1 + 18)\varepsilon = 19c\varepsilon$. Since $\{T_{b_i}, T_{s_i}, T_{s'_j}\}$ are ε -independent, the image of $T_{(b_i, s_i, s'_j)}$ intersects

$$W_{b_i} \oplus \{0\} \oplus \{0\} \subseteq W_{b_i} \oplus W_{s_i} \oplus W_{s'_j}$$

in a subspace of codimension at most $c\varepsilon$. This intersection is isomorphic to

$$T_{b_i}\left(T_{s_i}^{-1}(0) \cap T_{s'_j}^{-1}(0)\right),$$

which thus has codimension at most $c\varepsilon$ in W_{b_i} . It follows that $T_{b_i}(V'')$ has codimension at most $19c\varepsilon + c\varepsilon = 20c\varepsilon$ within W_{b_i} .

Fix $v \in V''$. Then $v \in \ker\left(T_{b_j} - \varphi_{s,i,j} \circ T_{(b_i, s_i)}\right)$, and

$$(f_n(g_{s,i,j}))(T_{b_i}(v)) = \varphi_{s,i,j}(T_{b_i}(v), 0) = \varphi_{s,i,j}(T_{(b_i, s_i)}(v)) = T_{b_j}(v).$$

In the same way we have

$$(f_n(g_{s',j,k}))(T_{b_j}(v)) = T_{b_k}(v) \quad \text{and} \quad (f_n(g_{s'',k,i}))(T_{b_k}(v)) = T_{b_i}(v).$$

It follows that

$$f_n(g_{s'',k,i}) \circ f_n(g_{s',j,k}) \circ f_n(g_{s,i,j}) \upharpoonright_{T_{b_i}(V'')} = \text{id}_{T_{b_i}(V'')},$$

so the normalized rank distance between $f_n(g_{s'',k,i}) \circ f_n(g_{s',j,k}) \circ f_n(g_{s,i,j})$ and $\text{id}_{W_{b_i}}$ is at most

$$\frac{1}{c} [c - \dim T_{b_i}(V'')] \leq 20\varepsilon.$$

This shows that f is a 20ε -approximate representation of \mathcal{G} .

Let $s, s' \in S$ be distinct generators. By Corollary 2.29, it suffices to find a positive constant lower bound on $d_{\text{rk}}(f(\varphi_{s,1,2}), f(\varphi_{s',1,2}))$ that holds for all small enough ε : this implies that $\varphi_{s,1,2} \neq \varphi_{s',1,2}$ in \mathcal{G} and hence by the results of Section 3.1 that s, s' map to distinct elements of G as required.

We apply Lemma 9.13 to $W_{b_1}, W_{b_2}, W_{s_1}$ and obtain 6ε -determination maps $\psi : W_{b_1} \oplus W_{b_2} \rightarrow W_{s_1}$ and $\varphi_{s,1,2} : W_{b_1} \oplus W_{s_1} \rightarrow W_{b_2}$ such that with respect to bases for the three vector spaces, $\psi(v_1, v_2) = A_1 v_1 + A_2 v_2$, the matrix A_2 is invertible, and $\varphi_{s,1,2}(v_1, v_3) = -A_2^{-1} A_1 v_1 + A_2^{-1} v_3$. Applying the lemma to $W_{b_1}, W_{b_2}, W_{s'_1}$ we obtain similar maps $\psi' : W_{b_1} \oplus W_{b_2} \rightarrow W_{s'_1}$ and $\varphi_{s',1,2} : W_{b_1} \oplus W_{s'_1} \rightarrow W_{b_2}$ with matrices A'_1, A'_2 . We may assume that the chosen bases for W_{b_1} and W_{b_2} are the same in both applications of the lemma. Note that with respect to our chosen bases,

$$f(\varphi_{s,1,2}) = -A_2^{-1} A_1 \quad \text{and} \quad f(\varphi_{s',1,2}) = -A'_2{}^{-1} A'_1,$$

and it suffices to find a constant positive lower bound for the normalized rank distance between these two matrices that holds for all small enough ε .

Observe that $\{T_{s_1}, T_{s'_1}\}$ are ε -independent, so $\text{rk}(T_{(s_1, s'_1)}) \geq c(2 - \varepsilon)$. Define

$$F : V \rightarrow W_{s_1} \oplus W_{s'_1}$$

$$F(v) = (\psi \circ T_{(b_1, b_2)}(v), \psi' \circ T_{(b_1, b_2)}(v))$$

and observe that

$$\text{rk}(F - T_{(s_1, s'_1)}) \leq \text{rk}(\psi \circ T_{(b_1, b_2)} - T_{s_1}) + \text{rk}(\psi' \circ T_{(b_1, b_2)} - T_{s'_1}) \leq 12c\varepsilon.$$

Therefore $\text{rk}(F) \geq \text{rk}(T_{(s_1, s'_1)}) - 12c\varepsilon \geq c(2 - 13\varepsilon)$. Representing F with respect to the bases chosen in our applications of Lemma 9.13, we obtain the block matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_1 & A_2 \\ A'_1 & A'_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

By applying block row operations (multiplying the first row by A_2^{-1} , the second by $A'_2{}^{-1}$, and then subtracting the second row from the first) we find it has rank equal to the rank of

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_2^{-1} A_1 - A'_2{}^{-1} A'_1 & 0 \\ A'_2{}^{-1} A'_1 & I \end{bmatrix},$$

which has rank $c + \text{rk}(A_2^{-1} A_1 - A'_2{}^{-1} A'_1)$. It follows that $c + \text{rk}(A_2^{-1} A_1 - A'_2{}^{-1} A'_1) \geq c(2 - 13\varepsilon)$, or in other words that

$$d_{\text{rk}}(-A_2^{-1} A_1, -A'_2{}^{-1} A'_1) \geq 1 - 13\varepsilon,$$

and if $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{26}$ this is at least $\frac{1}{2}$ as required. \square

9.3. Approximate representations of scrambled groups. We prove analogues of Proposition 6.7 and Proposition 6.12 for approximate representations of sofic groups. The statements and proofs are similar, and the approximate statements are strictly more general so that in principle they could replace Proposition 6.7 and Proposition 6.12 entirely. Since the approximate versions are more technical we decided to keep them separate.

Lemma 9.14. *Let G be a group with generating set S and let F_T be a free group with basis T . Suppose $G * F_T$ has a presentation $\langle \tilde{S} | R \rangle$ with $S \cup T \subseteq \tilde{S}$, let $x \in G * F_T$ be*

sufficiently generic relative to S and let $\tilde{x} \in F_{\tilde{S}}$ be a word representing x in the generators. Then there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds.

For every ε -approximate representation $\rho : \tilde{S} \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ of $\langle \tilde{S} | R \rangle$ which satisfies:

- (a) for each $s \in S$ the matrix $\rho(s)$ is the permutation matrix of a derangement or the identity, and
- (b) the entries of the matrices $\{\rho(t) \mid t \in T\}$ are algebraically independent over \mathbb{Q} ,

it holds that

$$d_{\mathrm{rk}}(\rho(\tilde{x}), I_n) \leq k\varepsilon \quad \text{or} \quad d_{\mathrm{rk}}(\rho(\tilde{x}), I_n) \geq 1 - k\varepsilon.$$

Moreover, if $\tilde{x}(g, g', t)$ is one of the words covered by Lemma 6.4 (where $g, g' \in S$ and $t \in T$) and $\rho(g) \neq I_n$ then the second case occurs, i.e., $d_{\mathrm{rk}}(\rho(\tilde{x}), I_n) \geq 1 - k\varepsilon$.

Proof. Suppose $x \in G * F_T$ is sufficiently generic relative to S . Construct a representation $\psi : F_S * F_T \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ by extending the function given by $s \mapsto \rho(s)$ and $t \mapsto \rho(t)$ on $S \cup T$ to a homomorphism from the free group on these generators. Let $w \in F_S * F_T$ be a sufficiently generic word mapping onto a conjugate axa^{-1} of $x \in G * F_T$.

Such a w exists since x is sufficiently generic. Observe that unlike \tilde{x} , it is a word in the generators $S \cup T$ only; this set may be strictly contained in \tilde{S} .

By sufficient genericity, $\psi(w) - I_n$ is invertible or 0. Since w is a word in elements of $S \cup T \subseteq \tilde{S}$ and their inverses, $\rho(w)$ is defined (as a product over values of ρ on the letters of the word) and equal to $\psi(w)$ by construction of ψ . By definition,

$$\psi(w) - I_n = \rho(w) - I_n$$

is invertible or 0. If u is a word in the generators \tilde{S} representing a , then

$$d_{\mathrm{rk}}(\rho(\tilde{x}), \rho(u)^{-1}\rho(w)\rho(u)) < k\varepsilon$$

for some k depending only on $\langle \tilde{S} \mid R \rangle$. Hence

$$d_{\mathrm{rk}}(\rho(u)^{-1}\rho(w)\rho(u), I_n) = d_{\mathrm{rk}}(\rho(u)^{-1}[\rho(w) - I_n]\rho(u), 0) = d_{\mathrm{rk}}(\rho(w) - I_n, 0)$$

is either 1 or 0, and since we have

$$d_{\mathrm{rk}}(\rho(\tilde{x}), \rho(u)^{-1}\rho(w)\rho(u)) < k\varepsilon,$$

by the (reverse) triangle inequality also

$$d_{\mathrm{rk}}(\rho(\tilde{x}), I_n)$$

is either at least $1 - k\varepsilon$ or at most $k\varepsilon$.

Finally, observe that if $\tilde{x}(g, g', t)$ is one of the words covered by Lemma 6.4, where $g, g' \in S$ and $t \in T$, and $\rho(g) \neq I_n$, then $w = \tilde{x}$ and hence $\rho(\tilde{x}) - I_n = \psi(w) - I_n$ is invertible by Lemma 6.4 and the above. \square

The next proposition and proof are analogous to Proposition 6.7 and its proof.

Proposition 9.15. *Let $G' = \langle S' \mid R' \rangle$ be a scrambling of a finitely presented group $G = \langle S \mid R \rangle$, so that $\langle S' \mid R' \rangle \simeq (G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$. Let $\langle T \mid R_T \rangle$ be a presentation of $G' = \langle S' \mid R' \rangle$ such that T contains both S' and S . Explicitly, this means that if G is identified with the subgroup $(G * \{e\}) \times \{0\}$ of G' , the two diagrams:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S & \longrightarrow & T \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ G & \longrightarrow & G' \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} S' & \longrightarrow & T \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ G' & \longrightarrow & G' \end{array}$$

commute, where the vertical maps send generators of a presentation into the appropriate group, and horizontal maps are inclusions (or the identity map $G' \rightarrow G'$).

Then for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that the following holds: If $\rho : S \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ is a δ -approximate representation of $G = \langle S \mid R \rangle$ such that $\rho(s)$ is the permutation matrix of a derangement for each $s \in S$, then there exists an ε -approximate representation of $G' = \langle T \mid R_T \rangle$

$$\tilde{\rho} : T \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$$

which satisfies:

- (a) If $s, s' \in S'$ are distinct then $d_{\mathrm{rk}}(\tilde{\rho}(s), \tilde{\rho}(s')) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$ (our construction actually satisfies $d_{\mathrm{rk}}(\tilde{\rho}(s), \tilde{\rho}(s')) = 1$).
- (b) For $s, s', s'' \in S'$ (not necessarily distinct) the matrix $A = \tilde{\rho}(s'') \tilde{\rho}(s') \tilde{\rho}(s)$ satisfies either $d_{\mathrm{rk}}(A, I_n) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$ or $d_{\mathrm{rk}}(A, I_n) \leq \varepsilon$.
- (c) $\tilde{\rho}(s) = \rho(s)$ for each $s \in S \subseteq T$.

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\rho : S \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ a δ -approximate representation of $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ satisfying the above assumptions where $\delta > 0$ will be determined later.

Choose algebraically independent $\{y_{r,i,j}\}_{\substack{r \in R, \\ 1 \leq i,j \leq n}} \cup \{z_1, \dots, z_N\} \subset \mathbb{C} \{y_{r,i,j}\}_{r \in R, 1 \leq i,j \leq n} \cup \{z_1, \dots, z_N\} \subset \mathbb{C}$.

We denote the generators of the free group F_R by $\{f_r\}_{r \in R}$. For each such f_r we define

$$\tilde{\rho}(f_r) = (y_{r,i,j})_{1 \leq i,j \leq n}.$$

For $s \in S$ define $\tilde{\rho}(s) = \rho(s)$. So in total we have a map $\tilde{\rho} : S \cup \{f_r\}_{r \in R} \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$, which is a δ -approximate representation of $\langle S \cup \{f_r\}_{r \in R} \mid R \rangle \simeq G * F_R$ because $\tilde{\rho}|_S = \rho$ is a δ -approximate representation of $\langle S \mid R \rangle$.

We extend $\tilde{\rho}$ to a map defined on $(S \cup \{f_r\}_{r \in R}) \times \mathbb{Z}^N \subset (G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$ as follows. For $v = (v_1, \dots, v_N) \in \mathbb{Z}^N$ define

$$\tilde{\rho}(v) = \left(\prod_{i=1}^N z_i^{v_i} \right) \cdot I_n.$$

If $x \in S \cup \{f_r\}_{r \in R}$ and $v \in \mathbb{Z}^N$, define $\tilde{\rho}(xv) = \tilde{\rho}(x) \tilde{\rho}(v)$.

Let e_1, \dots, e_N be the standard basis of \mathbb{Z}^N , so that $S \cup \{f_r\}_{r \in R} \cup \{e_1, \dots, e_N\}$ is a generating set for $(G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$. We obtain a presentation with these generators and the relations given by R , together with all commutators $[x, y]$ for x, y any two of the generators such that $y \in \{e_1, \dots, e_N\}$. Since $\tilde{\rho}(e_i)$ is by construction a scalar matrix for all $1 \leq i \leq N$ the map $\tilde{\rho}$ satisfies all these commutation relations on the nose. Hence, $\tilde{\rho}$ also restricts to a δ -approximate representation of $(G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$ for the generating set $S \cup \{f_r\}_{r \in R} \cup \{e_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ with respect to the relations R and the commutators involving the e_i 's.

Extend $\langle T \mid R_T \rangle$ (to a presentation of the same group $G' = (G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^N = \langle S' \mid R' \rangle$) such that R_T contains R' and T contains:

- S' as well as $S \cup \{f_r\}_{r \in R} \cup \{e_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq N}$,
- For every $s, s', s'' \in S'$ a generator mapping onto ss' and a generator mapping onto $ss's''$,
- For every x among the generators above, a generator mapping onto $\pi_G(x)$.

Lemma 2.18 now yields that after sufficiently shrinking δ , we can extend $\tilde{\rho}$ to a δ' -approximate representation of $G' = \langle T \mid R_T \rangle$, where the desired value of $0 < \delta'$ will be determined later.

We now prove the three claimed properties. It is convenient to define an auxiliary map $\tilde{\rho}^{\mathrm{ab}} : T \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ which is constructed from ρ just like $\tilde{\rho}$, except that $\tilde{\rho}^{\mathrm{ab}}(f_r) = y_{r,1,1} I_n$ for all $r \in R$. We can describe $\tilde{\rho}^{\mathrm{ab}}$ explicitly: if w is any word in the generators, $\tilde{\rho}(w)^{\mathrm{ab}}$ is obtained from $\tilde{\rho}(w)$ by substituting different values for the transcendentals $\{y_{r,i,j}\}_{r,i,j}$: each $y_{r,i,i}$ is replaced by $y_{r,1,1}$ and each $y_{r,i,j}$ for $i \neq j$ is replaced by 0. Thus if w, w', \dots are some words in the generators and some expression in the matrices $\tilde{\rho}^{\mathrm{ab}}(w), \tilde{\rho}^{\mathrm{ab}}(w'), \dots$ has

rank d , then Lemma 2.33 implies that the same expression in the matrices $\tilde{\rho}(w), \tilde{\rho}(w'), \dots$ has rank at least d as well.

It is straightforward to verify that $\tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}$ is a δ' -approximate representation of $\langle T \mid R_T \rangle$.

Observe that $\tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}$ extends to an honest representation of the subgroup $F_R \times \mathbb{Z}^N$ of $(G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$: each element of this subgroup can be mapped to any of its expressions in $\{f_r\}_{r \in R} \cup \{e_1, \dots, e_N\}$ (these elements clearly generate $F_R \times \mathbb{Z}^N$), since the only relations between these generators are commutators that $\tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}$ satisfies exactly. In fact, this representation factors through $\mathbb{Z}^{|R|} \times \mathbb{Z}^N$, since each $\tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}(f_r)$ is a scalar matrix $y_{r,1,1} I_n$. Abusing notation slightly, we use this to define expressions of the form $\tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}(v)$ for $v \in \mathbb{Z}^{|R|} \times \mathbb{Z}^N$.

- (a) Let $s, s' \in S'$ be distinct elements. Denote $v = \pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(s)$ and $v' = \pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(s')$, as well as $z = \tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}(v)$ and $z' = \tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}(v')$. By property (PS3) of scramblings $v \neq v'$, so $z^{-1}z'$ is transcendental. Denote $g = \pi_G(s)$ and $g' = \pi_G(s')$.

By construction, T contains generators mapping to g and to g' . We abuse notation slightly and also denote these generators by g, g' .

Observe that the matrix $\tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}(g)z - \tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}(g')z'$ is invertible: Since $z^{-1}z'$ is transcendental, Corollary 2.35 implies that

$$\det(\tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}(g)z - z^{-1}z'\tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}(g')) \neq 0.$$

Hence also $\det(\tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}(g)z - \tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}(g')z') \neq 0$.

By definition of z, z' and the fact that $\tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}$ is a δ' -approximate representation that sends elements of F_R to scalar matrices, Lemma 2.16 shows that there exists some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ (independent of the specific choice of $\tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}$ and δ, δ' but depending only on the presentation $\langle T \mid R_T \rangle$) such that

$$d_{\text{rk}}(\tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}(g)z, \tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}(s)) < k\delta'$$

and similarly

$$d_{\text{rk}}(\tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}(g')z', \tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}(s')) < k\delta'.$$

For this k we have that

$$d_{\text{rk}}(\tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}(s') - \tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}(s), 0) \geq 1 - k\delta',$$

or in other words

$$d_{\text{rk}}(\tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}(s'), \tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}(s)) \geq 1 - k\delta'.$$

By the remark on the comparison of $\tilde{\rho}$ with $\tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}$ above, the last inequality holds with $\tilde{\rho}$ in place of $\tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}$.

- (b) Let $s, s', s'' \in S'$ be not necessarily distinct generators. Then by property (PS4) of scramblings exactly one of the following three cases holds:

Case 1: Suppose $\pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(s''s's) \neq 0$. Denote $z'' = \tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}(\pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(s''))$, $z' = \tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}(\pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(s'))$, and $z = \tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}(\pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(s))$, as well as $g'' = \pi_G(s'')$, $g' = \pi_G(s')$, and $g = \pi_G(s)$. Then as above, T contains generators mapping onto g, g', g'' , which by abuse of notation we denote by g, g', g'' as well. Now

$$z''\rho(g'') - (z'z)^{-1}(\rho(g')\rho(g))^{-1} = (z'') \cdot \left(\rho(g'') - (z''z'z)^{-1}(\rho(g')\rho(g))^{-1} \right).$$

By Corollary 2.35, $\det(\rho(g'') - (z''z'z)^{-1}(\rho(g')\rho(g))^{-1})$ is nonzero as $z''z'z = \tilde{\rho}^{\text{ab}}(\pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(s''s's))$ is transcendental, because $\pi_{F, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(s''s's) \neq 0$. Therefore, just as in (a), there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ depending only on the presentation $\langle T \mid R_T \rangle$ such that $d_{\text{rk}}(\tilde{\rho}(s''), (\tilde{\rho}(s')\tilde{\rho}(s))^{-1}) \geq 1 - k\delta'$. Multiplying both sides on the right by the invertible matrix $(\tilde{\rho}(s')\tilde{\rho}(s))$, we obtain $d_{\text{rk}}(\tilde{\rho}(s'')\tilde{\rho}(s')\tilde{\rho}(s), I_n) \geq 1 - k\delta'$.

Case 2: If $s''s's = e$ then $d_{\text{rk}}(\tilde{\rho}(s'')\tilde{\rho}(s')\tilde{\rho}(s), I_n) < k\delta'$ for k depending only on $\langle T \mid R_T \rangle$ (and not on $\tilde{\rho}$ or δ').

Case 3: Suppose $s''s's \in G * F_R \subset (G * F_R) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$ is sufficiently generic relative to S .

By construction of $\tilde{\rho}$ the representation matrices of elements of S are either the identity matrix or permutation matrices of derangements and the entries of the representation matrices of the free generators of F_R are algebraically independent over \mathbb{Q} . Therefore by Lemma 9.14 there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ depending only on $\langle T \mid R_T \rangle$ and on $s''s's$ such that $d_{\text{rk}}(\tilde{\rho}(s'')\tilde{\rho}(s')\tilde{\rho}(s), I_n)$ is either at least $1 - k\delta'$ or at most $k\delta'$.

(c) This is immediate from the construction of $\tilde{\rho}$.

Given a $\delta > 0$, we found $\delta' > 0$ such that for each δ -approximate representation ρ of $\langle S \mid R \rangle$, there is a δ' -approximate representation $\tilde{\rho}$ of $\langle T \mid R_T \rangle$ such that $\tilde{\rho}$ extends ρ , and such that each of the proposition's claimed inequalities holds with $\varepsilon = k\delta'$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ (which does not depend on δ , ρ , or $\tilde{\rho}$). Taking k to be the maximum of these integers that appears in all these finitely many inequalities, we choose δ small enough that $\delta'/k < \varepsilon$. \square

The next proposition is a translation of Proposition 6.12 to the approximate setting.

Proposition 9.16. *Let $G = \langle S \mid R \rangle$ be a sofic group given by a symmetric triangular presentation and let $G' = \langle S' \mid R' \rangle$ be a scrambling. Let $s \in S$ and let $G'' = \langle S'' \mid R'' \rangle \simeq (G * F_R * \langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$ be the associated augmentation. Then the following two conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) *For all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and an ε -approximate representation $\rho : S \rightarrow \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ of $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ such that $d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(s), \rho(e)) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ and $\rho(x)$ is the identity matrix or the permutation matrix of a derangement for all $x \in S$.*
- (ii) *For all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and an ε -approximate representation*

$$\tilde{\rho} : S'' \rightarrow \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$$

of $\langle S'' \mid R'' \rangle$ which satisfies:

- (a) *If $x, x' \in S''$ are distinct then $d_{\text{rk}}(\tilde{\rho}(x), \tilde{\rho}(x')) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$,*
- (b) *For $x, x', x'' \in S''$ a not necessarily distinct triple of generators, the matrix $A = \tilde{\rho}(x'')\tilde{\rho}(x')\tilde{\rho}(x)$ satisfies either $d_{\text{rk}}(A, I_n) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$ or $d_{\text{rk}}(A, I_n) \leq \varepsilon$.*

Proof. First assume (ii) holds and let $\varepsilon > 0$. So suppose $\tilde{\rho} : S'' \rightarrow \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ is a δ -approximate representation of $\langle S'' \mid R'' \rangle$ satisfying conditions (a) and (b) for some $\delta > 0$. The isomorphism from G'' to $(G * F_R * \langle z_1, \dots, z_4 \rangle) \times \mathbb{Z}^N$ stemming from Proposition 6.10 maps the generator $t \in S''$ (see Construction 6.8) to sz_1s . Using Lemma 2.18, we extend $\tilde{\rho}$ to a δ' -approximate representation of the presentation $\langle S'' \cup \{s\} \mid R'' \cup \{s = w\} \rangle$, where w is a word expressing s in the generators S'' , and $\delta' > 0$ can be made arbitrarily small by taking δ small enough.

Since by the above discussion t and sz_1s define the same word in this group, by Lemma 2.16 there exists a constant $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(3) \quad d_{\text{rk}}(\tilde{\rho}(t), \tilde{\rho}(sz_1s)) < k\delta'.$$

Since $t, z_1 \in S''$ are distinct generators we have $d_{\text{rk}}(\tilde{\rho}(t), \tilde{\rho}(z_1)) \geq 1 - \delta'$ by assumption (a). Together with (3) we obtain

$$d_{\text{rk}}(\tilde{\rho}(sz_1s), \tilde{\rho}(z_1)) > 1 - (k + 1)\delta'.$$

Using the triangle inequality and Remark 2.9 this yields:

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - (k + 1)\delta' &< d_{\text{rk}}(\tilde{\rho}(sz_1s), \tilde{\rho}(z_1)) \\ &\leq d_{\text{rk}}(\tilde{\rho}(sz_1s), \tilde{\rho}(z_1s)) + d_{\text{rk}}(\tilde{\rho}(z_1s), \tilde{\rho}(z_1)) \\ &= d_{\text{rk}}(\tilde{\rho}(s), \tilde{\rho}(e)) + d_{\text{rk}}(\tilde{\rho}(s), \tilde{\rho}(e)) = 2d_{\text{rk}}(\tilde{\rho}(s), \tilde{\rho}(e)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have

$$d_{\text{rk}}(\tilde{\rho}(s), \tilde{\rho}(e)) > \frac{1}{2} - \frac{(k+1)}{2} \delta',$$

and we obtain $d_{\text{rk}}(\tilde{\rho}(s), \tilde{\rho}(e)) > \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon$ if we choose $\delta > 0$ small enough.

By the above calculation and Corollary 2.17 we see that $s \neq e$ in G'' . Thus (i) follows from Lemma 2.15.

Assume (i) holds and let $\varepsilon > 0$. By assumption, for each $\delta > 0$ there exists a δ -approximate representation $\rho : S \rightarrow \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ with $d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(s), \rho(e)) \geq \frac{1}{2}$, and such that $\rho(x)$ is the identity matrix or the permutation matrix of a derangement for all $x \in S$. We take such a ρ , with δ to be determined later, and note that $\rho(s) \neq I_n$ is a derangement matrix.

Let $\varepsilon' > 0$ and fix a presentation $\langle T \mid R_T \rangle$ of G' with $S, S' \subset T$ as in Proposition 9.15. If $\delta > 0$ is chosen small enough, Proposition 9.15 yields an extension of ρ to a ε' -approximate representation $\rho' : T \rightarrow \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ satisfying conditions analogous to (a) and (b) in (ii) for all generators in S' .

Let $\{\xi_{k,i,j}\}_{1 \leq k \leq 4, 1 \leq i,j \leq n} \subset \mathbb{C}$ be algebraically independent over the subfield of \mathbb{C} generated by the entries of all matrices in the image of ρ' . Now extend ρ' to $\tilde{\rho} : T \cup \{z_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq 4} \rightarrow \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ by defining $\tilde{\rho}(z_k) = (\xi_{k,i,j})_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \in \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ for each $1 \leq k \leq 4$. This is again an ε' -approximate representation of $G'' = \langle T \cup \{z_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq 4} \mid R_T \rangle$ as there are no non-trivial relations involving any of z_1, \dots, z_4 . By shrinking $\varepsilon' > 0$ further if necessary, we use Lemma 2.18 to extend $\tilde{\rho}$ to an ε -approximate representation of a presentation of G'' containing as generators all elements of $S'' \cup T$ and all relations $R'' \cup R_T$.

We verify that conditions (a) and (b) hold for this representation by considering the various pairs and triples of generators in S'' . The argument from this point on is almost identical with that in Proposition 6.12.

As a first step, we verify that if $\deg_z(x''x'x) \neq 0$ then $\tilde{\rho}(x'')\tilde{\rho}(x')\tilde{\rho}(x) - I_n$ is invertible. So assume for $x, x', x'' \in S''$ that $\deg_{z_i}(x''x'x) \neq 0$ for some i . Considering

$$\det(\tilde{\rho}(x'')\tilde{\rho}(x')\tilde{\rho}(x) - I_n)$$

as a polynomial in the entries of $\tilde{\rho}(z_i)$ we see that the determinant doesn't vanish, because it doesn't vanish if we substitute a transcendental multiple of the identity matrix by Corollary 2.35 (observe that $\tilde{\rho}(x''), \tilde{\rho}(x'), \tilde{\rho}(x)$ are all invertible since they come from an extension of ρ). We also get invertibility if $\pi_{\mathbb{F}, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{ab}}(x''x'x) \neq 0$, by the same argument.

Using Lemma 9.14 (and perhaps shrinking ε by the constant factor required to use this lemma), the remaining cases follow as in Proposition 6.12. \square

9.4. Almost-multilinear matroid representability is undecidable. We put together our tools and show that it is undecidable whether a matroid is almost multilinear: this section is roughly parallel to Section 7.

Theorem 9.17. *Let $G = \langle S \mid R \rangle$, $s \in S$ be an instance of the word problem and assume $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ is sofic. Let $\langle S'' \mid R'' \rangle$ be the augmented presentation from Construction 6.8, and let \mathcal{M} be the set of generalized Dowling geometries subordinate to this presentation. If s is nontrivial in $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ then some matroid in \mathcal{M} is almost multilinear.*

Proof. Assume s is nontrivial in $\langle S \mid R \rangle$.

By Lemma 2.15 for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and an ε -approximate representation $\rho : S \rightarrow \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ of G such that $\rho(x)$ is either I_n or the permutation matrix of a derangement for each $x \in S$, and $\rho(s)$ satisfies $d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(s), I_n) \geq \frac{1}{2}$.

Applying Proposition 9.16 we see that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and an ε -approximate representation $\rho : S'' \rightarrow \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ of $\langle S'' \mid R'' \rangle$ such that $d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(x), \rho(x')) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$ for all distinct generators $x, x' \in S''$ and such that if $x, x', x'' \in S''$ is any triple of

generators (not necessarily distinct) then $d_{\text{rk}}(\rho(x'')^{-1}, \rho(x'x))$ is either at most ε or at least $1 - \varepsilon$.

Hence by Theorem 9.11 at least one of the generalized Dowling geometries \mathcal{M} subordinate to $\langle S'' \mid R'' \rangle$ is almost multilinear over \mathbb{C} . \square

Theorem 9.18. *Let $G = \langle S \mid R \rangle$, $s \in S$ be an instance of the word problem and M be the generalized Dowling geometry of the presentation $\langle S'' \mid R'' \rangle$ obtained from Construction 6.8. Assume that some matroid of the generalized Dowling geometries \mathcal{M} subordinate to $\langle S'' \mid R'' \rangle$ is almost multilinear. Then $s \neq e$ in G .*

Proof. Say the matroid $M \in \mathcal{M}$ is almost multilinear. This is the generalized Dowling geometry of a quotient of $\langle S'' \mid R'' \rangle$. By Theorem 9.12, we have $t \neq z_1$ in $\langle S'' \mid R'' \rangle$, where $t = sz_1s$. It follows that $s \neq e$ in G as desired. \square

Corollary 9.19. *Almost-multilinearity of matroids is undecidable.*

Proof. The preceding two theorems reduce the word problem in a finitely presented sofic group to a finite (computable) sequence of almost-multilinearity problems for matroids. But the former problem is undecidable by Theorem 2.12. \square

Remark 9.20. One can formulate a problem parallel to conditional independence implication (as in Section 8) in the almost-multilinear setting. We leave the details to the interested reader. Undecidability of conditional rank inequalities in a linear setting already follows from [KY22]; the approximate version would correspond to considering “stable” implications, which continue to hold in an approximate sense even when the assumptions hold only in an approximate sense.

APPENDIX A. PROOF OF THEOREM 4.4

The proof relies on these two properties of entropy functions found for instance in [Yeu08].

Lemma A.1. *Suppose $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ is finite collection of random variables on a discrete probability space (Ω, P) and assume $H(X_A) < \infty$ for all $A \subseteq E$.*

(a) *Then it holds that*

$$H(X_E) \leq \sum_{e \in E} H(X_e)$$

and equality holds if and only if the family $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ is independent.

(b) *Furthermore, it holds that*

$$H(X_{E \setminus \{c\}}) \leq H(X_E)$$

and equality holds if and only if the family $\{X_e\}_{e \in E \setminus \{c\}}$ determines X_c .

We now proceed with proving one part of the first statement in Theorem 4.4.

Lemma A.2. *An entropic matroid $M = (E, r)$ has a discrete probability space representation.*

Proof. By assumption there exists a collection $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ of random variables on a discrete probability space (Ω, P) and a scalar $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $r(A) = \lambda H(X_A)$ for all $A \subseteq E$.

Let $e \in E$ be a non-loop. Then $1 = r(e) = \lambda H(X_e)$, that is, $H(X_e) = \frac{1}{\lambda}$ for all non-loops. Hence X_e is not a trivial random variable.

Let $A \subseteq E$ be an independent subset. Thus $|A| = r(A) = \lambda H(X_A)$. Also, Lemma A.1 (a) yields

$$|A| = \lambda H(X_A) \leq \lambda \sum_{e \in A} H(X_e) = \lambda \sum_{e \in A} \frac{1}{\lambda} = |A|.$$

Hence, the second part of Lemma A.1 (a) yields that $\{X_e\}_{e \in A}$ is independent.

Now let $C \subseteq E$ be a circuit and $c \in C$ an element of the circuit. Thus,

$$\lambda H(X_{C \setminus \{c\}}) = r(C \setminus \{c\}) = r(C) = \lambda H(X_C).$$

There $\{X_e\}_{e \in C \setminus \{c\}}$ determines X_c by Lemma A.1 (b) which verifies the determination property of collections of random variables associated to circuits. \square

The second part of Theorem 4.4 follows from the next lemma which is a trivial generalization of a result proved by Matůs in [Mat93, p.190-191].

Lemma A.3. *Let $M = (E, r)$ be a connected matroid of rank at least two and suppose $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ is a probability space representation of M . Then every X_e is a uniformly distributed random variables and its underlying probability space can be chosen to be finite.*

Proof. Let $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ be a collection of random variables on a discrete probability space (Ω, P) forming a probability space representation of M . Consider a pair $\{e, e'\} \subseteq E$ of distinct elements of M . If $r(\{e, e'\}) = 1$, that is e and e' are parallel elements, then X_e and $X_{e'}$ determine each other which means that the probability distributions of these two random variables agree up to a bijection between Ω_e and $\Omega_{e'}$.

If $r(\{e, e'\}) = 2$ then by assumption there exists a circuit C with $\{e, e'\} \subseteq C$. Set $L = C \setminus \{e, e'\}$. Let $\omega_e \in \Omega_e$ and $\omega_{e'} \in \Omega_{e'}$ be two elements with $P_e(\omega_e) > 0$ and $P_{e'}(\omega_{e'}) > 0$. Since $\{e, e'\}$ is independent this implies

$$P_{\{e, e'\}}(\omega_e, \omega_{e'}) = P_e(\omega_e)P_{e'}(\omega_{e'}) > 0.$$

Thus, there exists a $\omega_L \in \Omega_L$ with $P_C(\omega_L, \omega_e, \omega_{e'}) > 0$ and $P_L(\omega_L) > 0$. Using the determination condition we then obtain

$$P_L(\omega_L)P_{e'}(\omega_{e'}) = P_C(\omega_L, \omega_e, \omega_{e'}) = P_L(\omega_L)P_e(\omega_e).$$

Hence, $P_e(\omega_e) = P_{e'}(\omega_{e'})$ for all nontrivial events ω_e and $\omega_{e'}$. Therefore, all random variables associated to non-loops of the matroid are uniformly distributed. Thus they all have finite support which must be of equal size. Removing all events in Ω_e that occur with probability zero yields the second claim. \square

This allows us to prove the last missing piece of Theorem 4.4.

Lemma A.4. *Let $M = (E, r)$ be a connected matroid that has a discrete probability space representation. Then M is also entropic.*

Proof. By assumption there exists a collection $\{X_e\}_{e \in E}$ of random variables on a discrete probability space (Ω, P) satisfying the assumptions of Definition 4.2. Using Lemma A.3 we can assume that the probability spaces Ω_e for $e \in E$ are finite and therefore $H(X_A) < \infty$ for all $A \subseteq E$. For every non-loop $e \in E$, the random variable X_e is non-trivial which implies $H(X_e) > 0$.

Let $\{e, e'\} \subseteq E$ be a pair of non-loops elements. Since M is connected there exists a circuit C with $\{e, e'\} \subseteq C$. Then Lemma A.1 implies

$$H(X_e) + H(X_{C \setminus \{e, e'\}}) = H(X_{C \setminus \{e'\}}) = H(X_{C \setminus \{e\}}) = H(X_{e'}) + H(X_{C \setminus \{e, e'\}}).$$

Thus, $H(X_e) = H(X_{e'})$ for all non-loops e, e' and we set $\lambda := \frac{1}{H(X_e)}$ for some non-loop e which is well-defined as $H(X_e) > 0$ by assumption on X_e being non-trivial.

Lemma A.1 (a) then implies $r(A) = \lambda H(X_A)$ for all independent subsets $A \subseteq E$. Lemma A.1 (b) and entropy functions being submodular yields this equality for all subsets of E which completes the proof. \square

REFERENCES

- [AP17] Goulnara Arzhantseva and Liviu Păunescu, *Linear sofic groups and algebras*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **369** (2017), no. 4, 2285–2310. [11](#)
- [Awo10] Steve Awodey, *Category theory*, second ed., Oxford Logic Guides, vol. 52, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2010. [13](#), [14](#)
- [BBEPT14] Amos Beimel, Aner Ben-Efraim, Carles Padró, and Ilya Tyomkin, *Multi-linear secret-sharing schemes*, Theory of cryptography, Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., vol. 8349, Springer, Heidelberg, 2014, pp. 394–418. [4](#)
- [BD91] Ernest F. Brickell and Daniel M. Davenport, *On the classification of ideal secret sharing schemes*, Journal of Cryptology **4** (1991), no. 2, 123–134. [3](#)
- [Dow73] Thomas A. Dowling, *A class of geometric lattices based on finite groups*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B **14** (1973), no. 1, 61 – 86. [6](#)
- [ES06] Gábor Elek and Endre Szabó, *On sofic groups*, J. Group Theory **9** (2006), no. 2, 161–171. [10](#)
- [ESG10] Salim El Rouayheb, Alex Sprintson, and Costas Georghiades, *On the index coding problem and its relation to network coding and matroid theory*, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **56** (2010), no. 7, 3187–3195. [3](#)
- [Fuj78] Satoru Fujishige, *Polymatroidal dependence structure of a set of random variables*, Information and Control **39** (1978), 55–72. [2](#), [8](#)
- [GM88] Mark Goresky and Robert MacPherson, *Stratified Morse theory*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3), vol. 14, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1988. [8](#)
- [GP93] Dan Geiger and Judea Pearl, *Logical and algorithmic properties of conditional independence and graphical models*, Ann. Statist. **21** (1993), no. 4, 2001–2021. [4](#)
- [Kha81] Olga Kharlampovich, *A finitely presented solvable group with unsolvable word problem*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. **45** (1981), no. 4, 852–873, 928. [11](#)
- [Kin11] Ryan Kinser, *New inequalities for subspace arrangements*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A **118** (2011), no. 1, 152 – 161. [3](#)
- [KKNS20] Mahmoud Abo Khamis, Phokion G. Kolaitis, Hung Q. Ngo, and Dan Suciu, *Decision Problems in Information Theory*, 47th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2020) (Dagstuhl, Germany), vol. 168, 2020, pp. 106:1–106:20. [4](#)
- [KPY23] Lukas Kühne, Rudi Pendavingh, and Geva Yashfe, *Von Staudt constructions for skew-linear and multilinear matroids*, Comb. Theory **3** (2023), no. 1, Paper No. 16, 27. [2](#), [4](#), [6](#)
- [KY22] Lukas Kühne and Geva Yashfe, *Representability of matroids by c -arrangements is undecidable*, Israel J. Math. **252** (2022), no. 1, 95–147. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [6](#), [12](#), [20](#), [66](#)
- [Li21] Cheuk Ting Li, *The undecidability of conditional affine information inequalities and conditional independence implication with a binary constraint*, 2021 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW), 2021, pp. 1–6. [4](#)
- [Li23] ———, *Undecidability of network coding, conditional information inequalities, and conditional independence implication*, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theor. **69** (2023), no. 6, 3493–3510. [4](#)
- [LS77] Roger C. Lyndon and Paul E. Schupp, *Combinatorial group theory*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1977, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, Band 89. [15](#)
- [Lup14] Martino Lupini, *Logic for metric structures and the number of universal sofic and hyperlinear groups*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society **142** (2014), no. 10, 3635–3648. [12](#)
- [Mar91] Keith Murray Martin, *Discrete structures in the theory of secret sharing*, 1991. [3](#)
- [Mat93] František Matúš, *Probabilistic conditional independence structures and matroid theory: Background*, International Journal of General Systems **22** (1993), no. 2, 185–196. [6](#), [21](#), [22](#), [67](#)
- [Mat99] ———, *Matroid representations by partitions*, Discrete Math. **203** (1999), no. 1-3, 169–194. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [8](#), [24](#), [26](#), [46](#)
- [Mat07] ———, *Two constructions on limits of entropy functions*, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **53** (2007), no. 1, 320–330. [3](#), [9](#)
- [Mat24] ———, *Algebraic matroids are almost entropic*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **152** (2024), no. 1, 1–6. [3](#), [4](#)
- [MBE20] František Matúš and Aner Ben-Efraim, *A note on representing Dowling geometries by partitions*, Kybernetika (Prague) **56** (2020), no. 5, 934–947. [4](#)
- [NGSVG13] Mathias Niepert, Marc Gyssens, Bassem Sayrafi, and Dirk Van Gucht, *On the conditional independence implication problem: a lattice-theoretic approach*, Artificial Intelligence **202** (2013), 29–51. [4](#)
- [Oxl11] James Oxley, *Matroid theory*, second ed., Oxford Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 21, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2011. [2](#), [7](#), [8](#), [21](#)

- [Pes08] Vladimir G. Pestov, *Hyperlinear and sofic groups: a brief guide*, Bull. Symbolic Logic **14** (2008), no. 4, 449–480. [10](#)
- [PP86] Judea Pearl and Azaria Paz, *Graphoids: Graph-based logic for reasoning about relevance relations or when would x tell you more about y if you already know z ?*, Proceedings of the 7th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence - Volume 2, ECAI'86, North-Holland, 1986, p. 357–363. [4](#)
- [SA98] Juriaan Simonis and Alexei Ashikhmin, *Almost affine codes*, Designs, Codes and Cryptography **14** (1998), no. 2, 179–197. [2](#), [8](#)
- [Sey92] Paul D. Seymour, *On secret-sharing matroids*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B **56** (1992), no. 1, 69–73. [3](#)
- [Slo81] A. M. Slobodskoi, *Unsolvability of the universal theory of finite groups*, Algebra and Logic **20** (1981), no. 2, 139–156. [10](#)
- [Sti92] Doug Stinson, *An explication of secret sharing schemes*, Des. Codes Cryptogr. **2** (1992), no. 4, 357–390. [3](#)
- [Stu87] Bernd Sturmfels, *On the decidability of Diophantine problems in combinatorial geometry*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **17** (1987), no. 1, 121–124. [8](#)
- [Stu90] Milan Studený, *Conditional independence relations have no finite complete characterization*, 1990. [4](#)
- [Yas24] Geva Yashfe, *The recognition problem for integer points in the almost-entropic cone*, in preparation., 2024+. [3](#)
- [Yeu08] R.W. Yeung, *Information theory and network coding*, Information Technology: Transmission, Processing and Storage, Springer US, 2008. [66](#)
- [Zas03] Thomas Zaslavsky, *Biased graphs. IV. Geometrical realizations*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B **89** (2003), no. 2, 231–297. [6](#)

FAKULTÄT FÜR MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT BIELEFELD, BIELEFELD, GERMANY

Email address: lukas.kuehne@math.uni-bielefeld.de

EINSTEIN INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM, GIV'AT RAM, JERUSALEM, 91904, ISRAEL

Email address: geva.yashfe@mail.huji.ac.il