

# Baker-Bowler theory for Lagrangian Grassmannians

Donggyu Kim<sup>\*2,1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Discrete Mathematics Group, Institute for Basic Science (IBS), Daejeon, South Korea

<sup>2</sup>Department of Mathematical Sciences, KAIST, Daejeon, South Korea

Email: donggyu@kaist.ac.kr

March 6, 2024

## Abstract

Baker and Bowler (2019) showed that the Grassmannian can be defined over a tract, a ring-like structure generalizing both partial fields and hyperfields. This notion unifies theories for matroids over partial fields, valuated matroids, and oriented matroids. We extend Baker-Bowler theory for the Lagrangian Grassmannian which is the set of maximal isotropic subspaces of a  $2n$ -dimensional symplectic vector space. By Boege et al. (2019), the Lagrangian Grassmannian is parameterized into the projective space of dimension  $2^{n-2}(4 + \binom{n}{2}) - 1$  and its image is exactly the solutions of quadrics induced by determinantal identities of principal and almost-principal minors of a symmetric matrix. From the idea that the strong basis exchange axiom of matroids captures the combinatorial essence of the Plücker relations, we define matroid-like objects, called antisymmetric matroids, from the quadrics for the Lagrangian Grassmannian. We also provide its cryptomorphic definition in terms of circuits capturing the orthogonality and maximality of vectors in a Lagrangian subspace. We define antisymmetric matroids over tracts in two equivalent ways, which generalize both Baker-Bowler theory and the parameterization of the Lagrangian Grassmannian. It provides a new perspective on the Lagrangian Grassmannian over hyperfields, especially, the tropical Lagrangian Grassmannian. Our proof involves a homotopy theorem for graphs associated with antisymmetric matroids, generalizing Maurer's homotopy theorem for matroids. We also prove that if a point in the projective space satisfies 3-/4-term quadrics for the Lagrangian Grassmannian and its supports form the bases of an antisymmetric matroid, then it satisfies all quadrics, which is motivated by the earlier work of Tutte (1958) for matroids and linear spaces.

## 1 Introduction

For a field  $k$  and integers  $0 \leq r \leq n$ , the Grassmannian  $\text{Gr}_k(r, n)$  is the set of  $r$ -dimensional linear subspaces in the  $n$ -dimensional vector space  $k^n$ , which can be parameterized into the projective space of dimension  $\binom{n}{r} - 1$  by the Grassmann-Plücker embedding  $p$ . The image of  $p$  is exactly cut out by the Grassmann-Plücker relations, which are homogeneous quadrics. Remarkably, for every linear subspace  $V \in \text{Gr}_k(r, n)$ , the supports of a Plücker vector  $p(V)$  form the bases of a matroid  $M$ , and the minimal supports of nonzero vectors in  $V$  forms the circuits of the dual matroid  $M^\perp$ . Therefore, matroids are the combinatorial essence of linear subspaces as the strong basis exchange axiom of matroids extracts combinatorial data of the Grassmann-Plücker relations, and the circuit elimination axiom captures the linearity of vectors in  $V \in \text{Gr}_k(r, n)$ . A similar combinatorial abstraction exists for the orthogonal Grassmannian  $OG(n, 2n)$ , which is the set of maximal isotropic subspaces of  $k^{2n}$  equipped with the standard symmetric bilinear form; see [11, 27, 29, 3, 19]. We explore a combinatorial structure established on the Lagrangian Grassmannian.

Let  $E := [n] \cup [n]^* = \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \sqcup \{1^*, 2^*, \dots, n^*\}$ , and let  $\omega$  be the standard symplectic form on  $k^{2n} = k^E$ , i.e.,  $\omega(X, Y) := \sum_{i=1}^n (X(i)Y(i^*) - X(i^*)Y(i))$ . The Lagrangian Grassmannian  $\text{Lag}_k(n, 2n)$  is the set of maximal isotropic subspaces in  $k^{2n}$ , which are  $n$ -dimensional and are also called Lagrangian

---

<sup>\*</sup>Supported by the Institute for Basic Science (IBS-R029-C1).

subspaces. De Concini [13] showed that  $\text{Lag}_k(n, 2n)$  is parameterized into the projective space of dimension  $\binom{2n}{n} - 1$  and the image is cut out by the Grassmann-Plücker relations together with certain linear relations. Such linear relations capture a property that if  $\Lambda = [A|B]$  is an  $n$ -by- $E$  matrix such that its row-space is Lagrangian, then  $AB^t$  is a symmetric matrix. By Boege, D’Ali, Kahle, and Sturmfels [6], the Lagrangian Grassmannian  $\text{Lag}_k(n, 2n)$  is parameterized into the projective space of dimension  $2^{n-2}(4 + \binom{n}{2})$ , of which image is exactly the solutions of quadrics induced by the Laplace expansions only concerning principal and almost-principal minors of a symmetric matrix. These quadrics are generated by four types of certain quadrics [6], and we show that they can be refined to a single type. We call such refined quadrics the *restricted Grassmann-Plücker relations*. In Section 3, we define *antisymmetric matroids*, in terms of bases, by extracting zero and nonzero patterns of the restricted Grassmann-Plücker relations, and we provide an equivalent definition, in terms of circuits, capturing the orthogonality and maximality of vectors in a Lagrangian subspace. Antisymmetric matroids generalize matroids as the Grassmannian  $\text{Gr}_k(r, n)$  is embedded into the Lagrangian Grassmannian  $\text{Lag}_k(n, 2n)$  by mapping  $V$  to  $V \oplus V^\perp$ , and moreover, we prove that a matroid is representable over a field  $k$  in the usual sense if and only if it is representable over  $k$  as an antisymmetric matroid.

Baker and Bowler [2] defined commutative ring-like structures, called *tracts*, encompassing both partial fields and hyperfields, and they introduced *matroids with coefficients in tracts*. This concept provides a unified framework for partial field representations of matroids [24], valuated matroids [17], oriented matroids [5], and ordinary matroids, and it gives rise to the Grassmannian over hyperfields. In Section 5, we define *antisymmetric matroids with coefficients in tracts* in two equivalent ways: One generalizes points satisfying the restricted Grassmann-Plücker relations and the other generalizes Lagrangian subspaces in the standard symplectic vector space. The equivalence of these two definitions extends

- (1) the parameterizations of the Lagrangian Grassmannian into the projective space of dimension  $2^{n-2}(4 + \binom{n}{2}) - 1$  by Boege et al. [6] and
- (2) matroids with coefficients in tracts by Baker and Bowler [2].

It also provides a new perspective on the Lagrangian Grassmannian over hyperfields, especially,

- (3) the tropical Lagrangian Grassmannian.

Balla and Olarte [4] studied the tropical Lagrangian Grassmannian by bringing De Concini’s parameterization [13] into the tropical geometry. We compare our work with [4] in Section 5.3. The author extended Baker-Bowler theory for the orthogonal Grassmannian in [19], and we describe connections with the Lagrangian Grassmannian over tracts with  $1 = -1$  in the same section.

A proof of the cryptomorphism on antisymmetric matroids with coefficients in tracts involves a homotopy theorem for graphs associated with antisymmetric matroids. Our homotopy theorem is proved in Section 4. Remarkably, it extends Maurer’s homotopy theorem for matroids [20] and Wenzel’s homotopy theorem for even delta-matroids [28].

We finally describe why antisymmetric matroids are a natural notion for understanding combinatorics behind the Lagrangian Grassmannian. Until before, delta-matroids were regarded as a combinatorial abstraction of Lagrangian subspaces; see [11, 14, 9], but they lack several important properties observed in matroids, such as the strong basis exchange property and fundamental circuits. In Section 3, we present that antisymmetric matroids possess such properties and show that every antisymmetric matroid induces a delta-matroid by discarding certain bases standing for almost-principal minors of a symmetric matrix. We further notice that antisymmetric matroids extends one of the fundamental results on the Grassmannian and matroids, that is, a point in the  $\binom{n}{r} - 1$ -dimensional projective space is a solution of all Grassmann-Plücker relations if and only if it satisfies the 3-term Grassmann-Plücker relations and its supports form the bases of a rank- $r$  matroid on  $n$  elements. This was implicitly shown by Tutte [25] in terms of chain-group representations of matroids. We prove an analogous result for the Lagrangian Grassmannian using antisymmetric matroids in Section 7.

**Theorem 1.1.** *A point in the projective space of dimension  $2^{n-2}(4 + \binom{n}{2}) - 1$  satisfies all restricted Grassmann-Plücker relations if and only if it satisfies the 3-/4-term restricted Grassmann-Plücker relations and its supports form the bases of an antisymmetric matroid.*

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides basic notations and recalls fundamental relations between matroids and linear spaces. Moreover, it explicitly describes the parameterization of the Lagrangian Grassmannian [6] and the restricted Grassmann-Plücker relations. In Section 3, we define antisymmetric matroids in two equivalent ways and explore their properties such as fundamental circuits, minors, and representability. We also show how we understand matroids as a special case of antisymmetric matroids. In Section 4, we prove a homotopy theorem for graphs associated with antisymmetric matroids, which is an extension of Maurer’s homotopy theorem for matroids. In Section 5, we define antisymmetric matroids with coefficients in tracts. This notion is defined in two tantamount ways as a generalization of the parameterization of the Lagrangian Grassmannian and the ordinary Baker-Bowler theory for matroids, and the cryptomorphism is proved in Section 6 using the homotopy theorem. In Section 7, we prove Theorem 1.1, an analogue of Tutte’s theorem for the Lagrangian Grassmannian. Section 8 concludes the paper with open problems on antisymmetric matroids motivated by matroid theory.

## 2 Preliminaries

For two sets  $S$  and  $T$ , we often write  $S \cup T$  and  $S \setminus T$  as  $S + T$  and  $S - T$ , respectively. If  $T = \{x\}$ , we abuse the notation and write  $S + x$  and  $S - x$  rather than  $S + \{x\}$  and  $S - \{x\}$ . When the symbols ‘+’ and ‘-’ are used more than once for a single set, we read it from the left, such as  $S - x + y = (S - x) + y$ . We often omit brackets and commas while denoting a set, such as  $abc = \{a, b, c\}$ .

For a set  $E$  and an integer  $r$ , we denote by  $\binom{E}{r}$  the set of all  $r$ -element subsets of  $E$ . Suppose  $E$  is equipped with a linear ordering  $<$ . Then for  $S \subseteq E$  and  $x \in E$ , let  $|S < x|$  be the number of elements  $y \in S$  smaller than  $x$ . We usually denote a field by  $k$ . The *support* of a vector  $X \in k^E$ , denoted by  $\text{supp}(X)$  or  $\underline{X}$ , is the set of  $i \in E$  such that  $X(i) \neq 0$ .

**Matroids** A *matroid* is a pair  $M = (E, \mathcal{B})$  of a finite set  $E$  and a nonempty set  $\mathcal{B}$  of subsets of  $E$  satisfying the (*strong*) *basis exchange axiom*:

- For all  $B, B' \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $e \in B \setminus B'$ , there is  $f \in B' \setminus B$  such that  $B - e + f \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $B' + e - f \in \mathcal{B}$ .

Each element in  $\mathcal{B}$  is called a *basis* of  $M$ , and the *rank* of  $M$  is the size of a basis.

Matroids are combinatorial abstractions of linear independence of vector spaces, which is revealed clearly from the Grassmann-Plücker relations. For a field  $k$  and integers  $0 \leq r \leq n$ , the *Grassmannian*  $\text{Gr}_k(r, n)$  is the set of  $r$ -dimensional vector spaces in the  $n$ -dimensional vector space  $k^n$ . It is parameterized into the projective space of dimension  $\binom{n}{r} - 1$  by the Grassmann-Plücker embedding and is exactly the solution of the *Grassmann-Plücker relations*:

$$\sum_{x \in S \setminus T} (-1)^{|S < x| + |T < x|} p_{S-x} p_{T+x} = 0 \text{ for all } S \in \binom{[n]}{r+1} \text{ and } T \in \binom{[n]}{r-1}. \quad (\dagger)$$

For a given point  $p$  satisfying all Grassmann-Plücker relations, let  $\mathcal{B}$  be the set of  $B \in \binom{[n]}{r}$  such that  $p_B \neq 0$ . Then for any  $B, B' \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $e \in B \setminus B'$ , we have

$$\sum_{x \in (B'+e) \setminus (B-e)} (-1)^{|(B'+e) < x| + |(B-e) < x|} p_{B'+e-x} p_{B-e+x} = 0.$$

Thus, there is  $f \in B' \setminus B$  such that  $B' + e - f$  and  $B - e + f$  are in  $\mathcal{B}$ , implying that  $\mathcal{B}$  is the set of bases of a rank- $r$  matroid on  $[n]$ . A matroid is *representable over  $k$*  if it is obtainable by the previous construction up to isomorphism.

There are more ways to understand a matroid as an underlying combinatorial structure of a linear space. We first recall two equivalent definitions of a matroid. A *circuit* of a matroid  $M = (E, \mathcal{B})$

is a minimal subset of  $E$  contained in no basis. The *dual* of  $M$  is a matroid  $M^\perp := (E, \mathcal{B}^\perp)$  where  $\mathcal{B}^\perp := \{E \setminus B : B \in \mathcal{B}\}$ . A *cocircuit* of  $M$  is a circuit of the dual  $M^\perp$ . We say a set  $\mathcal{C}$  of subsets of  $E$  is *prepared* if  $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{C}$  and no proper subset of an element in  $\mathcal{C}$  is in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

**Lemma 2.1** (see [22]). *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a set of subsets of  $E$ . Then  $\mathcal{C}$  is the set of circuits of a matroid if and only if  $\mathcal{C}$  is prepared and it satisfies the circuit elimination axiom:*

- For distinct  $C, C' \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $e \in C \cap C'$ , there is  $C'' \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $C'' \subseteq (C \cup C') - e$ .

**Lemma 2.2** (Minty's Painting Axiom [21]). *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  be sets of subsets of  $E$ . Then  $\mathcal{C}$  is the set of circuits of a matroid and  $\mathcal{D}$  is the set of cocircuits of the same matroid if and only if  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  satisfy the following:*

- $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  are prepared.
- $|C \cap D| \neq 1$  for all  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $D \in \mathcal{D}$ .
- For every tripartition  $(P, Q, \{e\})$  of  $E$ , either there is  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $e \in C \subseteq P + e$  or there is  $D \in \mathcal{D}$  such that  $e \in D \subseteq Q + e$ .

We often call Lemma 2.2(ii) the *orthogonality* of matroids.

Let  $V$  be an  $r$ -dimensional linear space in  $k^n = k^{[n]}$ , and let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the minimal supports of nonzero vectors in  $V$ . Then  $\mathcal{C}$  is the set of circuits of a matroid  $M$ , because for any  $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$  with  $X(e) = Y(e) \neq 0$ ,  $\text{supp}(X - Y) \subseteq (\text{supp}(X) + \text{supp}(Y)) - e$ . We notice that the rank of  $M$  is  $n - r$  and  $\mathcal{C}$  satisfies the *strong circuit elimination axiom*: For all  $C, C' \in \mathcal{C}$ ,  $e \in C \cap C'$ , and  $f \in C \setminus C'$ , there is  $C'' \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $f \in C'' \subseteq (C \cup C') - e$ . We further remark that if we let  $N$  be the matroid induced by the supports of  $p(V)$ , where  $p$  is the Grassmann-Plücker embedding, then  $N = M^\perp$ . The linear space  $V$  also induces the sets of circuits and cocircuits of a matroid.

**Lemma 2.3** (forklore). *Let  $V$  be a linear space in  $k^n$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the set of minimal supports of nonzero vectors in  $V$ , and let  $\mathcal{D}$  be the set of minimal supports of nonzero vectors in the orthogonal complement  $V^\perp$ . Then  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  are the sets of circuits and cocircuits, respectively, of a matroid.*

*Proof.* It suffices to show that  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  fulfill (ii) and (iii) in Lemma 2.2. Because  $\sum_{i=1}^n X(i)Y(i) = 0$  for each  $X \in V$  and  $Y \in V^\perp$ , two sets  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  satisfies (ii), the orthogonality.

Let  $(P_0, Q_0, \{e\})$  be a tripartition of  $[n]$ . If there is  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $C \subseteq P$ , then we choose an arbitrary  $f \in C$  and update our tripartition to  $(P_1, Q_1, \{e\})$  where  $P_1 := P_0 - f$  and  $Q_1 := Q_0 + f$ . Then there is no element  $D \in \mathcal{D}$  such that  $f \in D \subseteq Q_1$  by the orthogonality. Furthermore, by the strong circuit elimination axiom, there is an element  $C_0 \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $e \in C_0 \subseteq P_0 + e$  if and only if there is  $C_1 \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $e \in C_1 \subseteq P_1 + e$ . Hence  $(P_0, Q_0, \{e\})$  satisfies (iii) if and only if  $(P_1, Q_1, \{e\})$  satisfies (iii). Dually, we can execute a similar process if there is  $D \in \mathcal{D}$  such that  $D \subseteq Q$ . We repeat these processes until we get a tripartition  $(P, Q, \{e\})$  such that there is no  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  and no  $D \in \mathcal{D}$  such that  $C \subseteq P$  and  $D \subseteq Q$ . Now we suppose that  $(P, Q, \{e\})$  violates (iii). Then there is no  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $C \subseteq P + e$ , and thus  $\dim V \leq |[n] - (P + e)|$ . Similarly,  $\dim V^\perp \leq |[n] - (Q + e)|$ . Hence  $\dim V + \dim V^\perp \leq n - 1$ , a contradiction. Thus, our original tripartition  $(P_0, Q_0, \{e\})$  satisfies (iii).  $\square$

**Lagrangian Grassmannian** Let  $E := [n] \cup [n]^* = \{1, \dots, n\} \cup \{1^*, \dots, n^*\}$  with a linear ordering  $1 < \dots < n < 1^* < \dots < n^*$  and let  $*$  be the natural involution on  $E$  mapping  $i \in [n]$  to  $i^*$ . A *skew pair* is a 2-element subset of  $E$  of the form  $\{i, i^*\}$ . Let  $\chi : E \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a map such that  $\chi(i) = 0$  whenever  $i \in [n]$ . Then the *standard symplectic form*  $\omega$  on  $k^E$  is represented as  $\omega(X, Y) = \sum_{i \in E} (-1)^{\chi(i)} X(i)Y(i^*)$ . Let  $\mathcal{T}_n := \{T \in \binom{E}{n} : |T \cap T^*| = 0\}$  and  $\mathcal{A}_n := \{A \in \binom{E}{n} : |A \cap A^*| = 1\}$ . Then  $|\mathcal{T}_n| = 2^n$  and  $|\mathcal{A}_n| = n(n-1)2^{n-2}$ . We call each element in  $\mathcal{T}_n$  (resp.  $\mathcal{A}_n$ ) a *transversal* (resp. an *almost-transversal*). A *subtransversal* is a subset of a transversal.

The *Lagrangian Grassmannian*  $\text{Lag}_k(n, 2n)$  is the set of all maximal isotropic subspaces of the standard symplectic space  $k^E$ . In 1979, De Concini [13] showed that  $\text{Lag}_k(n, 2n)$  is parameterized into the projective space of dimension  $\binom{2n}{n} - 1$ , which is exactly the solution of the Grassmann-Plücker relations together with certain linear relations. Boege, D'Alì, Kahle, and Sturmfels [6] recently proved

that  $\text{Lag}_k(n, 2n)$  is also parameterized into the projective space of dimension  $2^{n-2}(4 + \binom{n}{2}) - 1$  whose image is cut out by certain quadratic relations deduced by principal and almost-principal minors of a symmetric matrix.

Now we briefly review the latter parameterization of  $\text{Lag}_k(n, 2n)$ . We will regard the coordinates of the projective space of dimension  $2^{n-2}(4 + \binom{n}{2}) - 1$  by elements in  $\mathcal{T}_n$  and  $\mathcal{A}_n$  satisfying the following property: For each point  $x$  and almost-transversal  $A \in \mathcal{A}_n$ , if  $p, q$  are skew pairs such that  $p \subseteq A$  and  $q \cap A = \emptyset$ , then  $x_{A-p+q} = (-1)^m x_A$  where  $m := \sum_{e \in p+q} |(A+q) \cap e|$ . Let  $\Lambda = [\Lambda_1 \mid \Lambda_2]$  be an  $n \times E$  matrix whose row-space is a Lagrangian subspace  $W$  in  $k^E$ , and we define a point  $\Phi(W) := x$  in the projective space such that  $x_B := \det(\Lambda[n, B])$  for each  $B \in \mathcal{T}_n \sqcup \mathcal{A}_n$ . Then it evidently satisfies the following *restricted Grassmann-Plücker relations* (in short, *restricted G-P relations*):

$$\sum_{b \in S_1 \setminus S_2} (-1)^{|S_1 < b| + |S_2 < b|} x_{S_1 - b} x_{S_2 + b} = 0 \quad (\diamond)$$

for all  $S_1 := T_1 + a_1$  and  $S_2 := T_2 - a_2$  such that  $T_1, T_2 \in \mathcal{T}_n$  and  $a_1, a_2 \in T_2 \setminus T_1$  (possibly,  $a_1 = a_2$ ). Conversely, every point satisfying all restricted Grassmannian-Plücker relations can be constructed from a Lagrangian subspace in the above way, which is explained in Section 6.3. Notice that some restricted G-P relations contain a square monomial such as  $x_{12}x_{1^*2^*} + x_{12^*}x_{1^*2} - x_{11^*}^2 = 0$  for  $n = 2$ .

Similar to matroids and the Grassmannian-Plücker relations, we will define a matroid-like structure, named *antisymmetric matroids*, extracting underlying combinatorial properties of the restricted G-P relations in Section 3. We also provide its cryptomorphic definition in terms of circuits, extending Minty's Painting Axiom and capturing the orthogonality and maximality of Lagrangian subspaces.

We remark that  $\Sigma := \Lambda_1 \Lambda_2^t$  is symmetric because  $\Sigma[i, j] = \sum_{\ell=1}^n X_i(\ell) X_j(\ell^*) = \sum_{\ell=1}^n X_i(\ell^*) X_j(\ell) = \Sigma[j, i]$ , where  $X_i$  is the  $i$ -th row of  $\Lambda$ . Furthermore, if  $\Lambda_1$  is nonsingular, then  $\det(\Sigma(X, Y)) = \det(\Lambda[n, [n] - X + Y^*])$  for each  $X, Y \subseteq [n]$  such that  $|X| = |Y|$  and  $|X \setminus Y| \leq 1$ . Hence the restricted G-P relations can be regarded as Grassmann-Plücker relations only concerning principal and almost-principal minors of a symmetric matrix, as written in [6].

### 3 Antisymmetric matroids

We introduce a combinatorial abstraction, called an *antisymmetric matroid*, of a Lagrangian subspace in the standard symplectic vector space. First, we define this notion in terms of bases, which is reminiscent of the relation between the basis exchange axiom of a matroid and the Grassmann-Plücker relations. In Section 3.1, we provide an equivalent definition in terms of circuits, which extends the Minty's Painting Axiom (Lemma 2.2). We also define the minors of an antisymmetric matroid in Section 3.2, and show how antisymmetric matroids encompass matroids in Section 3.3.

Let  $E := [n] \cup [n]^*$  through this section.

**Definition 3.1** (Antisymmetric Matroids). A pair  $M = ([n] \cup [n]^*, \mathcal{B})$  is an *antisymmetric matroid* if  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_n \cup \mathcal{A}_n$  and the following hold:

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

(B2) For  $T \in \mathcal{T}_n$  and distinct skew pairs  $p$  and  $q$ ,  $T + p - q \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{A}_n$  if and only if  $T - p + q \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{A}_n$ .

(Exch) For  $B, B' \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $e \in B \setminus B'$ , if  $B - e$  has no skew pair and  $B' + e$  has exactly one skew pair, then there is  $f \in B' \setminus B$  such that both  $B - e + f$  and  $B' + e - f$  are in  $\mathcal{B}$ .

We call each element in  $\mathcal{B}(M) := \mathcal{B}$  a *basis* of  $M$ .

One can rewrite (Exch) as follows, which captures the zero and nonzero patterns of a point in the projective space of dimension  $2^{n-2}(4 + \binom{n}{2})$  satisfying all restricted Grassmann-Plücker relations ( $\diamond$ ).

(Exch') For arbitrary transversals  $T, T'$  and  $e, f \in T' \setminus T$  (possibly,  $e = f$ ) there are no or at least two  $g \in (T + e) \setminus (T' - f)$  such that  $\{T + e - g, T' - f + g\} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ .



**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $M = (E, \mathcal{B})$  be an antisymmetric matroid. Let  $T$  be a transversal and  $p, q$  be distinct skew pairs. Then none or at least two of*

$$\{T + p - q, T - p + q\}, \{T, T\Delta(p + q)\}, \text{ and } \{T\Delta p, T\Delta q\}$$

*are contained in  $\mathcal{B}$ . In particular, if  $T + p - q \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{A}_n$ , then  $\{T, T\Delta(p + q)\} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$*

*Proof.* We denote by  $\{x\} = T \cap p$  and  $\{y\} = T \cap q$ . Applying (Exch') to  $T + p - q - x$  and  $T - p + q + x$ , there is no or at least two  $g \in \{x, y, y^*\} = (T - p + q + x) \setminus (T + p - q - x)$  such that  $T + p - q - x + g$  and  $T - p + q + x - g$  are bases of  $M$ . Note that

$$T + p - q - x + g = \begin{cases} T + p - q & \text{if } g = x, \\ T\Delta(p + q) & \text{if } g = y^*, \\ T\Delta p & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad T - p + q + x - g = \begin{cases} T - p + q & \text{if } g = x, \\ T & \text{if } g = y^*, \\ T\Delta q & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By (B2),  $T + p - q \in \mathcal{B}$  if and only if  $T - p + q \in \mathcal{B}$ . Hence the proof is completed.  $\square$

### 3.1 Circuits

A *circuit* of an antisymmetric matroid  $M$  on  $E = [n] \cup [n]^*$  is a minimal subset  $C$  of  $E$  such that  $|C \cap C^*| \leq 1$  and  $C$  is not a subset of any basis of  $M$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{C}(M)$  the set of circuits of  $M$ . Note that every circuit is nonempty by (B1). We show several properties of circuits and present a cryptomorphic definition of antisymmetric matroids in terms of circuits.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $C$  be a circuit of an antisymmetric matroid on  $E$  and let  $x \in E$ . If  $C - x$  has no skew pair, then there is a basis  $B$  such that  $B$  is a transversal and  $C \setminus B = \{x\}$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $C - x$  is not a circuit, there is a basis  $B$  such that  $C - x \subseteq B$  and  $x \notin B$ . We may assume that  $B \in \mathcal{A}_n$  and let  $p$  and  $q$  be skew pairs such that  $p \subseteq B$  and  $q \cap B = \emptyset$ . Then  $p \neq \{x, x^*\}$ . Let  $y \in p \setminus C$ . By Lemma 3.2, for some  $z \in q$ ,  $B' := B - y + z$  is a basis. Then  $B'$  is a transversal and  $C \setminus B' = \{x\}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $M = (E, \mathcal{B})$  be a antisymmetric matroid on  $E$  and let  $S$  be a subset of  $E$  such that  $|S| = n + 1$ ,  $S$  has exactly one skew pair, and  $S - e \in \mathcal{B}$  for some  $e \in S$ . Then there is a unique circuit  $C$  contained in  $S$ . Moreover,  $C = \{e \in S : S - e \in \mathcal{B}\}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $C := \{e \in S : S - e \in \mathcal{B}\}$  and  $\{z, z^*\} \subseteq S$ . By the assumption,  $C \neq \emptyset$ . If there is  $x \in C \setminus \{z, z^*\}$ , then by Lemma 3.2,  $S - z$  or  $S - z^*$  is a basis. Thus, by relabelling we can assume that  $B := S - z \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{T}_n$ .

We first claim that  $C$  is a circuit of  $M$ . For every  $y \in C$ , we have  $C - y \subseteq S - y \in \mathcal{B}$ . So it suffices to show that  $C$  is not a subset of any basis. Suppose to the contrary that there is a basis  $B'$  containing  $C$ . Then  $z \in C \setminus B \subseteq B' \setminus B$ . By Lemma 3.2, we may assume that  $B' - z$  has no skew pair. By (Exch), there is  $y \in B \setminus B'$  such that  $S - y = B + z - y \in \mathcal{B}$ . Then  $y \in C$  contradicting that  $y \in B \setminus B' \subseteq B \setminus C$ . Hence  $C$  is a circuit.

Let  $D$  be a circuit of  $M$  such that  $D \subseteq S$ . If  $e \in S \setminus D$ , then  $S - e \notin \mathcal{B}$  and hence  $e \notin C$ . Then  $C \subseteq D$ . This implies that  $C$  is a unique circuit contained in  $S$ .  $\square$

For an antisymmetric matroid  $M$  on  $E$ ,  $B \in \mathcal{B}(M) \cap \mathcal{T}_n$ , and  $e \in B^*$ , the unique circuit contained in  $B + e$  is called the *fundamental circuit* of  $M$  with respect to  $B$  and  $e$ . The following lemma is a generalization of the orthogonality of matroids, which will be explained in detail in Section 3.3.

**Lemma 3.5.** *If  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are circuits of an antisymmetric matroid, then  $|C_1 \cap C_2^*| \neq 1$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.3, there are transversal basis  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  such that  $|C_i \setminus B_i| = 1$ . For each  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , let  $S_i = B_i \cup C_i$  and let  $q_i$  be a skew pair contained in  $S_i$ . For each  $e \in S_1 \setminus (S_2 - q_2)$ , by Lemma 3.4,  $e \in C_1$  if and only if  $S_1 - e \in \mathcal{B}$ . Similarly, we have that  $e^* \in C_2$  if and only if  $S_2 - e^* \in \mathcal{B}$ , and the latter condition is equivalent that  $S_2 - q_2 + e \in \mathcal{B}$  by (B2). By (Exch') applied to  $S_1$  and  $S_2 - q_2$ , we deduce  $|C_1 \cap C_2^*| \neq 1$ .  $\square$

The next theorem provide a cryptomorphic definition of an antisymmetric matroid.

**Theorem 3.6.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a set of subsets  $C$  of  $E$  such that  $|C \cap C^*| \leq 1$ . Then  $\mathcal{C}$  is the set of circuits of an antisymmetric matroid on  $E$  if and only if it satisfies the following:*

(C1)  $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{C}$ .

(C2) If  $C_1, C_2 \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $C_1 \subseteq C_2$ , then  $C_1 = C_2$ .

(Orth)  $|C_1 \cap C_2^*| \neq 1$  for all  $C_1, C_2 \in \mathcal{C}$ .

(Max) For every transversal  $T \in \mathcal{T}_n$  and element  $e \in T^*$ , there is  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $C \subseteq T \cup \{e\}$ .

**Lemma 3.7.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a set of subsets  $C$  of  $E$  such that  $|C \cap C^*| \leq 1$ . If  $\mathcal{C}$  satisfies (Orth) and (Max), then it satisfies the following:*

(Add) For distinct  $C_1, C_2 \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $e \in C_1 \cap C_2$ , if  $(C_1 \cup C_2) - e$  contains at most one skew pair, then there is  $C_3 \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $C_3 \subseteq (C_1 \cup C_2) - e$ .

*Proof.* We say a subtransversal  $I \subseteq E$  is  $\mathcal{C}$ -independent if  $I$  contains no element in  $\mathcal{C}$ . If a subtransversal  $I$  is  $\mathcal{C}$ -independent and a skew pair  $\{e, e^*\}$  does not intersect with  $I$ , then  $I + e$  or  $I + e^*$  is  $\mathcal{C}$ -independent by (Orth).

Let  $C_1, C_2$  be distinct elements in  $\mathcal{C}$  and let  $e \in C_1 \cap C_2$  such that  $J := (C_1 \cup C_2) \setminus \{e\}$  contains at most one skew pair. Suppose to contrary that  $J$  does not contain any element in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

We first assume that  $J$  is a subtransversal. Then  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are also subtransversals by (Orth). By the assumption,  $J$  is  $\mathcal{C}$ -independent and thus there is a  $\mathcal{C}$ -independent transversal  $J'$  containing  $J$ . Then  $e^* \in J'$ . As  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are distinct, there is  $f \in C_2 \setminus C_1$ . By (Max), there is  $D \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $f^* \in D \subseteq J' + f^*$ . By (Orth) applied to  $D$  and  $C_2$ , we have  $e^* \in D$ . Then  $D \cap C_1^* = \{e^*\}$  contradicting (Orth).

Now we may assume that  $J$  has a skew pair, say  $\{f, f^*\}$ . By (Orth),  $\{e, e^*\}$  is in  $C_1 \cup C_2$ . By symmetry, we can assume that  $\{e^*, f\} \subseteq C_1$ . Then by (Orth),  $\{f, f^*\} \subseteq C_2$ . In short,  $\{e, e^*, f\} \subseteq C_1$  and  $\{e, f, f^*\} \subseteq C_2$ . Let  $K := J - f^*$ . Then  $K$  is a  $\mathcal{C}$ -independent subtransversal and thus there is a  $\mathcal{C}$ -independent transversal  $K'$  containing  $K$ . By (Max), we have an element  $D \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $f^* \in D \subseteq K' + f^*$ . By the assumption that  $J$  contains no element in  $\mathcal{C}$ , there is  $g \in D \setminus J$ . By (Max),  $\mathcal{C}$  has an element  $D'$  such that  $g^* \in D' \subseteq K' + g^*$ . As  $g \in D \cap (D')^* \subseteq \{g, f^*\}$ , we deduce that  $f^* \in (D')^*$  by (Orth). Then  $f^* \in C_2 \cap (D')^* \subseteq \{f^*, e\}$  and by (Orth),  $e \in (D')^*$ . Then  $C_1 \cap (D')^* = \{e\}$  that contradicts (Orth).  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.6.* The forward direction is done by Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5.

Now to show the converse we assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  satisfies the four clauses (C1), (C2), (Orth), and (Max). By Lemma 3.7,  $\mathcal{C}$  also satisfies (Add). Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be the set of transversals and almost-transversals that do not contain any  $C \in \mathcal{C}$ . It is enough to prove that  $\mathcal{B}$  satisfies (B1), (B2), and (Exch').

We first show (B1), i.e.,  $\mathcal{B} \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $C \in \mathcal{C}$ . By (C1),  $C \neq \emptyset$ . We choose an element  $e \in C$ , and we additionally assume that  $\{e, e^*\} \subseteq C$  if  $C$  contains a skew pair. Let  $I_0 = C - e + e^*$ . Then by (Orth), there is no  $D \in \mathcal{C}$  contained in  $I_0$ . By (Orth), if  $I$  is a subtransversal containing no set in  $\mathcal{C}$ , then for each  $\{f, f^*\} \subseteq E - I$ , at least one of two sets  $I + f$  and  $I + f^*$  contains no set in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Hence we can obtain  $B \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{T}_n$  such that  $B \supseteq I_0$ .

Second we claim (B2). Let  $T$  be a transversal and  $p, q$  be distinct skew pairs such that  $T + p - q \in \mathcal{B}$ . Suppose to the contrary that there is  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $C \subseteq T - p + q$ . Then  $C \cap q \neq \emptyset$  and let  $x \in C \cap q$ . Replacing  $T$  with  $T \Delta q$  if necessary, we can assume that  $x \in T$ . There is  $D \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $D \subseteq (T \Delta q) + p$  by (Max). Then  $x^* \in D$  because otherwise  $D \subseteq T + p - q$ . Then  $C \cap D^* = \{x\}$ , contradicting (Orth).

Finally, we show (Exch'). Let  $S := T + e$ ,  $S' := T' - f$ , and  $q := \{f, f^*\}$ . We may assume that  $S'$  does not contain any set in  $\mathcal{C}$ , since otherwise  $S' + x \notin \mathcal{B}$  for any  $x \in E$ . Then by (Add) and (Orth),  $\mathcal{C}$  has a unique element  $D$  such that  $D \subseteq S' + q$ . By (Max), there is  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $C \subseteq S$ . If there is another  $C_2 \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $C_2 \subseteq S$ , then by (Add), we deduce that  $S - x \notin \mathcal{B}$  for every  $x \in S$ . Hence we may assume that  $C$  is the unique element in  $\mathcal{C}$  such that  $C \subseteq S$ . Then

$$C = \{x \in S : S - x \in \mathcal{B}\} \quad \text{and} \quad D = \{x \in S' : S' + q - x \in \mathcal{B}\}.$$

For each  $x \in S - S'$ , we have that  $S' + q - x^* \in \mathcal{B}$  if and only if  $S' + x \in \mathcal{B}$  by (B2). Then by (Orth),  $\mathcal{B}$  satisfies (Exch').  $\square$

Recall that for an  $r$ -dimensional linear space  $V$  of  $k^n$ , the set of minimal supports of  $V \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$  is the set of cocircuits of a rank- $r$  matroid  $M$  on  $E$ . In addition, the set of bases of  $M$  equals to the set of  $r$ -element subsets  $B$  of  $[n]$  such that  $p(V)_B \neq 0$ , where  $p$  is the Grassmann-Plücker embedding. We show an analogous result for Lagrangian subspaces and antisymmetric matroids. Recall that the parameterization  $\Phi$  of the  $\text{Lag}_k(n, 2n)$  into the projective space of dimension  $2^{n-2}(4 + \binom{n}{2}) - 1$  was defined in Section 2.

**Proposition 3.8.** *Let  $W$  be a Lagrangian subspace in  $k^E$ . Let  $\mathcal{B} := \{B \in \mathcal{T}_n \sqcup \mathcal{A}_n : \Phi(W)_B \neq 0\}$  and let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the set of minimal supports  $C$  of vectors in  $W \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$  such that  $|C \cap C^*| \leq 1$ . Then  $\mathcal{B}$  is the set of bases of an antisymmetric matroid, and  $\mathcal{C}$  is the set of circuits of an antisymmetric matroid  $(E, \mathcal{B}^*)$ , where  $\mathcal{B}^* := \{B^* : B \in \mathcal{B}\}$ .*

*Proof.* The set  $\mathcal{B}$  satisfies (B1) and (B2) trivially, and (Exch') is deduce from the restricted Grassmann-Plücker relations ( $\diamond$ ). Thus,  $M_1 = (E, \mathcal{B})$  is an antisymmetric matroid.

We now prove that  $\mathcal{C}$  is the set of circuits of an antisymmetric matroid. By definition, (C1) and (C2) hold. As  $W$  is isotropic,  $\mathcal{C}$  satisfies (Orth). Let  $T \in \mathcal{T}_n$  and  $e \in T^*$ . Suppose that there is no  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $C \subseteq T + e$ . Then  $\dim W \leq |E - (T + e)| = n - 1$ , a contradiction. Thus, (Max) holds. Let  $M_2$  be the antisymmetric matroid on  $E$  such that  $\mathcal{C}(M_2) = \mathcal{C}$ .

Finally, we show that  $M_2 = (E, \mathcal{B}^*)$ . Let  $\Lambda$  be an  $n \times E$  matrix such that its row-space is  $W$ . Then  $\Phi(W)_B = \det(\Lambda[n, B])$  for each  $B \in \mathcal{T}_n \cup \mathcal{A}_n$  by definition.

**Claim 3.8.1.** *For each  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ , there is no  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $C \subseteq B^*$ .*

*Proof.* We denote by  $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$  and  $E - B = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ . Since  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ ,  $\Phi(W)_B = \det(\Lambda[n, B])$  is nonzero. Hence  $\Lambda$  is row-equivalent to a matrix  $\Lambda'$  such that  $\Lambda'[n, B]$  is an identity matrix. So  $W$  has  $n$  independent vectors  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  such that  $\text{supp}(X_i) \cap B = \{b_i\}$ .

Suppose that  $B$  is a transversal. As  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  span  $W$ , every element  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  intersects with  $B$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{C}$  has no element contained in  $B^* = E - B$ .

Hence we can assume that  $B$  is an almost-transversal. By relabelling, we may assume that  $b_2 = b_1^*$  and  $a_2 = a_1^*$ . Then  $B \cap \{a_1, a_1^*\} = \emptyset = (E - B) \cap \{b_1, b_1^*\}$ . Hence  $0 = \omega(X_1, X_2) = \sum_{e \in \{b_1, a_1, a_2\}} (-1)^{\chi(e)} X_1(e) X_2(e^*)$ , implying that  $(X_1(a_1), X_1(a_2))$  and  $(X_2(a_1), X_2(a_2))$  are not a scalar multiple of each other. Then the support of each nonzero linear combination of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  intersects with  $E - B^* = \{a_1, a_2\} \cup \{b_3, \dots, b_n\}$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{C}$  has no element contained in  $B^*$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Claim 3.8.2.** *For each pair  $(C, e)$  such that  $e \in C \in \mathcal{C}$ , there is  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $C - e \subseteq B^*$ .*

*Proof.* First, suppose that  $C - e$  has no skew pair. Then  $M_2$  has a transversal basis  $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$  such that  $C - e \subseteq B$  by Lemma 3.3. Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  be vectors in  $W$  such that  $\text{supp}(X_i)$  is the fundamental circuit of  $M_2$  with respect to  $B$  and  $b_i^*$ . Because  $b_i^* \in \text{supp}(X_i) \subseteq B + b_i^*$ ,  $n$  vectors  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are independent. Hence  $\Lambda$  is row-equivalent to a matrix  $\Lambda'$  consisting of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  and a submatrix  $\Lambda'[n, B^*]$  only has nonzero entries for  $(i, b_i^*)$  with  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Thus,  $\Lambda[n, B^*]$  is nonsingular and  $B^* \in \mathcal{B}$ .

Now we assume that  $C - e$  has a skew pair, say  $\{x, x^*\}$ . Then  $M_2$  has a transversal basis  $B$  such that  $C - x \subseteq B$  by Lemma 3.3. Then  $B_2 := B + x - e$  is also a basis of  $M_2$  by Lemma 3.4. Note that  $B_2 \supseteq C - e$ . We denote by  $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$  such that  $b_1 = x^*$  and  $b_2 = e$ . Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  be vectors in  $W$  such that each  $\text{supp}(X_i)$  is the fundamental circuit of  $M_2$  with respect to  $B$  and  $b_i^*$ . Then  $\text{supp}(X_1) = C \ni b_2$ . Then by the orthogonality,  $b_1 \in \text{supp}(X_2)$ . Let  $Y_2 := X_2$  and for  $i \in [n] \setminus \{2\}$ , let  $Y_i := X_i - \frac{X_i(b_1)}{X_2(b_1)}$ . Then an  $n \times E$  matrix  $\Lambda'$  consisting of  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$  is row-equivalent to  $\Lambda$  and its square submatrix  $\Lambda'[n, \{b_1^*, b_1\} \cup \{b_3^*, \dots, b_n^*\}] = \Lambda'[n, B_2^*]$  is a nonsingular diagonal matrix. Thus,  $\Phi(B_2^*) = \det(\Lambda[n, B_2^*]) \neq 0$  and  $B_2^* \in \mathcal{B}$ .  $\blacksquare$

By the above two claims,  $\mathcal{C}$  is the set of circuits of  $(E, \mathcal{B}^*)$ .  $\square$



**Example 3.9.** Let  $\Lambda = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$  be a  $2 \times ([2] \cup [2]^*)$  matrix over a field  $k$ . Then its row-space is in  $\text{Lag}_k(2, 4)$ . The minimal supports  $C$  of nonzero vectors in the row-space such that  $|C \cap C^*| \leq 1$  are  $12$ ,  $11^*2^*$ , and  $21^*2^*$ . Also,  $\mathcal{B} := \{B \in \mathcal{T}_2 \cup \mathcal{A}_2 : \det(\Lambda[2, B]) \neq 0\} = \{12, 11^*, 12^*, 21^*, 22^*\}$  and the set of circuits of  $(E, \mathcal{B})$  is  $\{1^*2^*, 121^*, 122^*\}$ .

**Definition 3.10.** An antisymmetric matroid  $M$  on  $E = [n] \cup [n]^*$  is *representable* over a field  $k$  if there is an  $n \times E$  matrix  $\Lambda$  over  $k$  such that its row-space is Lagrangian in  $k^E$  and  $\mathcal{B}(M) = \{B \in \mathcal{T}_n \sqcup \mathcal{A}_n : \det(\Lambda[n, B]) \neq 0\}$ .

For a Lagrangian subspace  $W$  in  $k^E$ , let  $M(W)$  be an antisymmetric matroid on  $E$  such that  $\mathcal{C}(M(W))$  is the set of minimal supports  $C$  of vectors in  $W \setminus \{0\}$  such that  $|C \cap C^*| \leq 1$ . Then an antisymmetric  $M$  is representable over  $k$  if and only if  $M = M(W)$  for some Lagrangian subspace  $W$ .

### 3.2 Minors

We define minors of an antisymmetric matroid and show their compatibility with orthogonal projections of a Lagrangian subspace.

**Proposition 3.11.** *Let  $W$  be in  $\text{Lag}(n, 2n)$  and  $v$  be a nonzero vector in  $k^{[n] \cup [n]^*}$  such that  $\text{supp}(v) \subseteq \{n, n^*\}$ . Then the natural projection of  $W \cap v^\perp$  into  $k^{[n-1] \cup [n-1]^*}$  is in  $\text{Lag}(n-1, 2n-2)$ .*

*Proof.* We can assume that  $v \notin W$ . Then the dimension of  $W \cap v^\perp$  is  $n-1$ . Since  $\text{supp}(v) \subseteq \{n, n^*\}$ , every vector in  $W \cap v^\perp$  has support in  $[n-1] \cup [n-1]^*$ . Thus, the natural projection of  $W \cap v^\perp$  into  $k^{[n-1] \cup [n-1]^*}$  is maximal isotropic.  $\square$

The next lemma is easily seen by definition. For a set  $\mathcal{S}$  of subsets of  $E$ , let  $\text{Min}(\mathcal{S})$  be the set of inclusion-minimal elements of  $\mathcal{S}$ .

**Lemma 3.12.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the set of circuits of an antisymmetric matroid  $M$  on  $E$  and let  $i \in E$ . Then  $\mathcal{C}|i := \text{Min}\{C \setminus \{i\} : i^* \notin C \in \mathcal{C} \text{ and } C \neq \{i\}\}$  is the set of circuits of an antisymmetric matroid on  $E \setminus \{i, i^*\}$ .*  $\square$

We denote the resulting antisymmetric matroid by  $M|i$  and call it an *elementary minor* of  $M$ . An antisymmetric matroid  $N$  is a *minor* of another antisymmetric matroid  $M$  if  $N = M|i_1|i_2 \cdots |i_k$  for some  $i_1, \dots, i_k$ . The class of antisymmetric matroids representable over a given field is closed under taking minors by the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.13.** *Let  $W \in \text{Lag}(n, 2n)$  and let  $\pi : k^{[n] \cup [n]^*} \rightarrow k^{[n] \cup [n]^* \setminus \{i, i^*\}}$  be the natural projection. Then  $M(\pi(W \cap e_i^\perp)) = M(W)|i$ .*  $\square$

### 3.3 Link to matroids

For a field  $k$ , the Grassmannians  $\bigsqcup_{0 \leq r \leq n} \text{Gr}_k(r, n)$  can be embedded into the Lagrangian Grassmannian  $\text{Lag}_k(n, 2n)$  by mapping a linear space  $V$  to  $V \oplus V^\perp$ . So one may ask whether there is a natural injection from the set of matroids on  $[n]$  to the set of antisymmetric matroids on  $[n] \cup [n]^*$ . We give an affirmative answer to this question.

Recall that a matroid is a pair of a finite set  $E$  and a nonempty set  $\mathcal{B}$  of subsets of  $E$  satisfying the basis exchange axiom:

- For every  $B, B' \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $e \in B \setminus B'$ , there is  $f \in B' \setminus B$  such that  $B - e + f \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $B' + e - f \in \mathcal{B}$ .

We first review one notion generalizing matroids, defined by independent researchers [10, 12, 14] under various names.

**Definition 3.14.** A *symmetric matroid* is a pair  $M = ([n] \cup [n]^*, \mathcal{B})$  such that  $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_n$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  satisfies the *symmetric exchange axiom*:

(SEA) For all  $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $x \in B_1 - B_2$ , there is  $y \in B_1 - B_2$  (possibly,  $x = y$ ) such that  $B_1 \Delta \{x, x^*, y, y^*\} \in \mathcal{B}$ .

We call each member of  $\mathcal{B}$  a *basis*. A subset  $C \subseteq E$  is a *circuit* of  $M$  if  $|C \cap C^*| = 0$  and it is not contained in any bases of  $M$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{B}(M)$  the set of bases and denote by  $\mathcal{C}(M)$  the set of circuits. The symmetric matroid  $M$  is *even* if all intersections  $B \cap [n]$  with  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $[n]$  have the same parity.

We note that the symmetric exchange axiom cannot be strengthened by the following condition: For all  $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $x \in B_1 - B_2$ , there is  $y \in B_1 - B_2$  such that  $B_1 \Delta \{x, x^*, y, y^*\} \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $B_2 \Delta \{x, x^*, y, y^*\} \in \mathcal{B}$ . For instance, a pair  $([3] \cup [3]^*, \{123, 123^*, 12^*3, 1^*23, 1^*2^*3^*\})$  is a symmetric matroid that does not satisfy the above condition applied to  $B_1 = 123$  and  $B_2 = 1^*2^*3^*$ .

*Remark 3.15.* A *delta-matroid*, mentioned in Section 1, is a pair  $M = ([n], \mathcal{B})$  such that  $\mathcal{B}$  is a nonempty set of subsets of  $[n]$  and for all  $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $x \in B_1 \Delta B_2$ , there is  $y \in B_1 \Delta B_2$  such that  $B_1 \Delta \{x, y\} \in \mathcal{B}$ . By converting each  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  to  $B \cup ([n] \setminus B)^*$ , we result in a symmetric matroid. Conversely, we can obtain a delta-matroid from a symmetric matroid by removing the starred elements from each basis.

For a given matroid  $M$  on  $[n]$ , let  $\text{lift}(M)$  be a pair  $([n] \cup [n]^*, \mathcal{B})$  such that  $\mathcal{B} = \{B \cup ([n] \setminus B)^* : B \text{ is a basis of } M\}$ . We call it the *lift* of  $M$ . The following are easily deduced.

- $\text{lift}(M)$  is an even symmetric matroid.
- $\mathcal{C}(\text{lift}(M))$  equals to the union of  $\{C : C \text{ is a circuit of } M\}$  and  $\{D^* : D \text{ is a cocircuit of } M\}$ .
- $\mathcal{C}(\text{lift}(M))$  satisfies (Add) and (Orth) by the circuit elimination axiom and the orthogonality of matroids. It also satisfies (Max) because of fundamental circuits and cocircuits of  $M$ .
- A symmetric matroid  $N$  is the lift of a matroid if and only if all  $B \cap [n]$  with bases  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  have the same cardinality.

By [11], given  $[n] \times [n]$  symmetric matrix  $A$ , a pair  $M(A) := ([n] \cup [n]^*, \mathcal{B}_A)$  is a symmetric matroid, where  $\mathcal{B}_A$  is the set of  $X \cup ([n] \setminus X)^*$  such that  $X \subseteq [n]$  and  $\det(A[X]) \neq 0$ . Hence, it is natural to ask for a relation between symmetric matroids and antisymmetric matroids.

**Proposition 3.16.** *Let  $M = ([n] \cup [n]^*, \mathcal{B})$  is an antisymmetric matroid. Then  $([n] \cup [n]^*, \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{T}_n)$  is a symmetric matroid.*

*Proof.* By (B1) and Lemma 3.2,  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{T}_n \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{T}_n$  and let  $x \in B_1 - B_2$ . Then  $x^* \in B_2 - B_1$ . We may assume that  $B - x + x^* \notin \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{T}_n$ . Then by (Exch), there is  $y \in (B_1 - B_2) - x$  such that  $B + x^* - y \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{A}_n$ . By Lemma 3.2,  $(B + x^* - y) - x + y^* = B \Delta \{x, x^*, y, y^*\} \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{T}_n$ .  $\square$

The converse of Proposition 3.16 holds for even symmetric matroids, which is unknown in general.

**Theorem 3.17.** *Let  $M = ([n] \cup [n]^*, \mathcal{B})$  be an even symmetric matroid. There is unique  $\mathcal{B}' \subseteq \mathcal{A}_n$  such that  $M' = ([n] \cup [n]^*, \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{B}')$  is an antisymmetric matroid.*

We remark that two distinct antisymmetric matroids can induce the same non-even symmetric matroid. For instance, two antisymmetric matroids  $M_1 = ([2] \cup [2]^*, \mathcal{T}_2)$  and  $M_2 = ([2] \cup [2]^*, \mathcal{T}_2 \cup \mathcal{A}_2)$  induce the same symmetric matroid  $M_1$ . Note that the antisymmetric matroid  $M_1$  is representable over the binary field, but  $M_2$  is not. If  $A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$  and  $A_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$  are ternary matrices, then  $M_i$  is represented by  $[I | A_i]$  and thus both  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  are representable over the ternary field.

Theorem 3.17 is easily deduced from the circuit definition of even symmetric matroids by Booth, Moreira, and Pinto [8].

**Theorem 3.18** ([8, Theorem 12]). *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a set of subsets of  $E = [n] \cup [n]^*$  such that  $|C \cap C^*| = 0$ . Then  $\mathcal{C}$  is the set of circuits of an even symmetric matroid if and only if it satisfies (C1), (C2), (Orth), and (Max).*

Remark that the original statement in [8] includes one additional condition weaker than (Add), but it can be omitted because of Lemma 3.7.

*Proof of Theorem 3.17.* Let  $\mathcal{B}'$  be the set of almost-transversals  $A \in \mathcal{A}_n$  such that for some  $x, y \in E$  with  $\{x, x^*\} \subseteq A$  and  $\{y, y^*\} \cap A = \emptyset$ , both  $A - x + y$  and  $A - x^* + y^*$  are in  $\mathcal{B}$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the set of circuits of the even symmetric matroid  $M$ . It is easy to check that  $\mathcal{C}$  is equal to the set of minimal subsets  $C$  of  $E$  such that  $|C \cap C^*| \leq 1$  and  $C$  is not contained any set  $B \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{B}'$ . Therefore, by Theorems 3.18 and 3.6,  $M' = (E, \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{B}')$  is an antisymmetric matroid such that  $\mathcal{C}(M') = \mathcal{C}$ .

Let  $M''$  be an antisymmetric matroid on  $E$  such that  $\mathcal{B}(M'') \cap \mathcal{T}_n = \mathcal{B}$ . Then  $\mathcal{B}(M'') \cap \mathcal{A}_n = \mathcal{B}'$  by Lemma 3.2, so  $M'' = M'$ .  $\square$

By Theorem 3.17, the class of matroids can be regarded as a subclass of the class of antisymmetric matroids. We prove the following stronger result.

**Theorem 3.19.** *There is a natural injection  $\iota$  from the set of matroids on  $[n]$  to the set of anti-symmetric matroids on  $[n] \cup [n]^*$  such that  $M$  is representable over a field  $k$  if and only if  $\iota(M)$  is representable over  $k$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $M$  be a matroid on  $[n]$ , and let  $\iota(M)$  be the unique antisymmetric matroid on  $[n] \cup [n]^*$  associated with  $\text{lift}(M)$ .

Suppose that  $M$  is representable over  $k$ , and let  $V$  be a linear space in  $k^n$  representing  $M$ . Then  $\iota(M)$  is represented by  $V \oplus V^\perp \in \text{Lag}(n, 2n)$  and so  $\iota(M)$  is representable over  $k$ .

Suppose that  $\iota(M)$  is representable over  $k$ . Let  $W$  be a Lagrangian space in  $k^{[n] \cup [n]^*}$  representing  $\iota(M)$ . Since the set of circuits of  $\iota(M)$  is the union of  $\{C : C \text{ is a circuit of } M\}$  and  $\{D^* : D \text{ is a cocircuit of } M\}$ , the projection of  $W$  into  $k^{[n]}$  is a linear subspace representing  $M$ .  $\square$

Matroids on  $[n]$  in Theorem 3.19 can be generalized to even symmetric matroids on  $[n] \cup [n]^*$  if  $k$  has characteristic two. Let  $M$  be an even symmetric matroid and  $M'$  be the antisymmetric matroid associated with  $M$  by Theorem 3.17. Geelen [18, Page 27] showed that if the even symmetric matroid  $M$  is represented by a symmetric matrix over a field  $k$  in the sense of [11] and  $M$  is not isomorphic to the lift of a matroid, then  $k$  has characteristic two. Now we assume that  $\text{char}(k) = 2$ , and let  $\Sigma = (\sigma_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$  be a symmetric matrix over  $k$  with zero diagonals. Then all 2-by-2 principal minors  $\Sigma[\{i, j\}, \{i, j\}] = \sigma_{ij}^2$  are enough to recover the original matrix  $\Sigma$ . Thus,  $M$  is represented over  $k$  if and only if  $M'$  is represented over  $k$ . However, we cannot replace matroids on  $[n]$  in Theorem 3.19 with symmetric matroids on  $[n] \cup [n]^*$  because of an example mentioned below Theorem 3.17.

*Remark 3.20.* Even symmetric matroids capture the combinatorial essence of skew-symmetric matrices [11, 27, 29, 3, 19]. Note that  $n$ -by- $n$  skew-symmetric matrices can be identified with maximal isotropic subspaces in the  $2n$ -dimensional vector space equipped with the standard symmetric bilinear form. They are embedded into the projective space of dimension  $2^n - 1$  and the image is cut out by certain quadratic relations, called *Wick relations*, introduced by Pfaffian identities. Even symmetric matroids satisfy several basic properties of matroids, such as the strong basis exchange property [26] and fundamental circuits [8]. The representability of matroids is well extended to the representability of even symmetric matroids by [11]. Furthermore, an analogue of Tutte's theorem holds [3] and Baker-Bowler theory is generalized [19].

## 4 Homotopy theorem

We show that the first homology group of a graph associated with an antisymmetric matroid is generated by short cycles, which will be used to prove the equivalence of two notions of antisymmetric matroids over tracts in Sections 5–6. Our result implies the homotopy theorem for basis graphs of matroids by Maurer [20].

A *transversal basis graph*  $\mathcal{G}_M$  of an antisymmetric matroid  $M$  is a graph such that

- its vertex set is  $\mathcal{B}(M) \cap \mathcal{T}_n$ , and

- two vertices  $B$  and  $B'$  is adjacent if and only if (i)  $|B \setminus B'| = 1$  or (ii)  $|B \setminus B'| = 2$  and there is  $A \in \mathcal{B}(M) \cap \mathcal{A}_n$  such that  $|B \setminus A| = |B' \setminus A| = 1$ .

The *weight* of an edge  $BB'$  is  $\eta(BB') := |B \setminus B'|$ .

For two transversal bases  $B, B'$  of  $M$ , let  $\text{dist}_M(B, B')$  be the smallest sum  $\eta(P) = \sum_{e \in E(P)} \eta(e)$  among all paths  $P$  from  $B$  to  $B'$  in  $\mathcal{G}_M$ .

**Lemma 4.1.** *The following hold.*

(i)  $\text{dist}_M(B, B') = |B \setminus B'|$ .

(ii) *For every cycle  $C$  in  $\mathcal{G}_M$ , the weight  $\eta(C) = \sum_{e \in E(C)} \eta(e)$  is even.* □

**Definition 4.2** (Graph Homology). For a graph  $G = (V, E)$  and a linear ordering  $\prec$  on  $V$ , let  $\partial_1 : \mathbb{Z}^E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^V$  and  $\partial_0 : \mathbb{Z}^V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  be group homomorphisms such that  $\partial_1(vw) = v - w$  if  $v \prec w$ , and  $\partial_0(v) = 1$ . The (first) homology group of  $G$  is  $H(G) := \ker(\partial_0)/\text{im}(\partial_1)$ .

For a fixed graph  $G$ , its homology group  $H(G)$  is unique up to isomorphism for different choices of linear orderings on the vertex set. We will often identify a cycle  $v_1v_2 \dots v_kv_1$  in  $G$  with an element  $\sum_{i=1}^k \epsilon_i v_i v_{i+1} \in H(G)$  where  $\epsilon_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } v_i \prec v_{i+1} \\ -1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$  and  $v_{k+1} := v_1$ . Note that the cycles of  $G$  generate  $H(G)$ .

We denote the homology group of  $\mathcal{G}_M$  by  $H_M$ . We call a cycle  $C$  in  $\mathcal{G}_M$  is *reducible* if, in  $H_M$ , it can be generated by the cycles of weight smaller than  $\eta(C)$ . Otherwise, we say  $C$  is *irreducible*. Now we are ready to state the Homotopy Theorem for transversal basis graphs.

**Theorem 4.3** (Homotopy Theorem). *The homology group  $H_M$  is generated by cycles  $C$  of  $\eta(C) \leq 8$ .*

Our result implies Maurer's homotopy theorem for basis graphs of matroids [20]. We account for this implication in a bit general setting concerning even symmetric matroids. The *basis graph* of an even symmetric matroid  $N$  is a graph on  $\mathcal{B}(N)$  such that two vertices  $B$  and  $B'$  are adjacent if and only if  $|B \setminus B'| = 2$ . By Theorem 3.17, there is an antisymmetric matroid  $M$  such that  $\mathcal{B}(M) \cap \mathcal{T}_n = \mathcal{B}(N)$ . Clearly, the basis graph of  $N$  is identical to the transversal basis graph of  $M$ . Hence, Wenzel's homotopy theorem [28] for even symmetric matroid is deduced immediately.

**Corollary 4.4** ([28]). *The homology group of the basis graph of an even symmetric matroid is generated by cycles of length at most four.* □

The *basis graph* of a matroid is a graph on the set of bases such that two vertices  $B, B'$  are adjacent if and only if  $|B \setminus B'| = 1$ .

**Corollary 4.5** ([20]). *The homology group of the basis graph of a matroid is generated by cycles of length at most four.* □

In order to prove Theorem 4.3, we first observe several properties of irreducible cycles in  $\mathcal{G}_M$ .

**Lemma 4.6.** *Let  $C$  be an irreducible cycle in  $\mathcal{G}_M$ . Then for every pair of vertices  $B, B'$  in  $C$  and a path  $P$  from  $B$  to  $B'$  in  $C$  such that  $\eta(P) \leq \eta(C)/2$ , we have  $\eta(P) = \text{dist}_M(B, B')$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose not. We take a pair of distinct vertices  $B, B'$  in  $C$  and a path  $P$  from  $B$  to  $B'$  in  $C$  such that

(i)  $\eta(P) \leq \eta(C)/2$ ,

(ii)  $\eta(P) > \text{dist}_M(B, B')$ , and

(iii) subject to (i) and (ii),  $\text{dist}_M(B, B')$  is minimized.

Let  $P'$  be the path from  $B$  to  $B'$  in  $C$  other than  $P$ , and let  $Q$  be a path from  $B$  to  $B'$  in  $\mathcal{G}_M$  such that  $\eta(Q) = \text{dist}_M(B, B')$ . By (iii), no internal vertex of  $Q$  is in  $C$ . Then the cycle induced by paths  $P$  and  $Q$  have weight  $\eta(P) + \eta(Q) < 2\eta(P) \leq \eta(C)$ , and the cycle induced by paths  $P'$  and  $Q$  have weight  $\eta(P') + \eta(Q) < \eta(P') + \eta(P) = \eta(C)$ . It contradicts that  $C$  is irreducible. □

**Lemma 4.7.** *Let  $C$  be a cycle of weight  $2\ell$  in  $\mathcal{G}_M$  and let  $B_0 \in V(C)$ . If  $C$  is irreducible, then either*

- *there is  $B \in V(C)$  such that  $\text{dist}_M(B_0, B) = \ell$  or*
- *there is  $BB' \in E(C)$  such that  $\text{dist}_M(B_0, B) = \text{dist}_M(B_0, B') = \ell - 1$  and  $\eta(BB') = 2$ .  $\square$*

*Proof of Theorem 4.3.* Suppose to the contrary that  $\mathcal{G}_M$  has irreducible cycles of weight larger than 8. Among such cycles, we choose  $C$  such that

- (i) its weight  $\eta(C)$  is minimized, and
- (ii) subject to (i), the number  $|E(C) \cap \eta^{-1}(1)|$  of weight 1 edges in  $C$  is minimized.

We denote by  $\eta(C) = 2\ell > 8$ . Then all cycles of weight less than  $2\ell$  are reducible. We select an arbitrary vertex  $B_0 \in V(C)$ . There are two cases by Lemma 4.7.

**Case I.** There is a vertex  $B$  in  $C$  such that  $\text{dist}_M(B_0, B) = \ell$ . Let  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  be two distinct neighbors of  $B$  in  $C$ , and let  $P$  be a path in  $C$  from  $B_1$  to  $B_2$  containing  $B_0$ .

**Subcase I.1.**  $\eta(BB_1) = \eta(BB_2) = 1$ . Then there are distinct elements  $e, f \in B$  such that  $B_1 = B\Delta\{f, f^*\}$  and  $B_2 = B\Delta\{e, e^*\}$ . By (ii),  $B_1B_2$  is not an edge in  $\mathcal{G}_M$  and  $B + e^* - f$  is not a basis of  $M$ . Thus, by the basis exchange (Exch) applied to  $B_1$  and  $B_2$ ,  $B' := B\Delta\{e, e^*, f, f^*\}$  is a basis; see Figure 1(top left). Then  $B' \notin V(C)$  and  $\text{dist}_M(B_0, B') = \ell - 2$ . Let  $C'$  be a cycle concatenating two paths  $P$  and  $B_1B'B_2$ . By Lemma 4.6,  $C'$  is reducible. Let  $C'' := BB_1B'B_2B$  be a cycle of weight 4. As  $C = aC' + bC''$  in  $H_M$  for some  $a, b \in \{1, -1\}$ , it contradicts that  $C$  is irreducible.

**Subcase I.2.**  $\eta(BB_1) = 2$  and  $\eta(BB_2) = 1$ . Then there are distinct elements  $e, f, g \in B$  such that  $B_1 = B\Delta\{f, f^*, g, g^*\}$  and  $B_2 = B\Delta\{e, e^*\}$ . By (Exch) applied to  $B_1$  and  $B_2$ , there is  $h \in \{e, f^*, g^*\} = B_1 \setminus B_2$  such that  $B_1 + e^* - h$  is a basis of  $M$ .

Suppose that  $B' := B_1 + e^* - e$  is a basis; see Figure 1(top middle). Then  $B' \notin V(C)$  and  $\text{dist}_M(B_0, B') = \ell - 3$ . Let  $Q$  be a path from  $B_2$  to  $B'$  of weight  $\text{dist}_M(B_2, B') = 2$ . Then by Lemma 4.6, a cycle induced by  $P$ ,  $Q$ , and  $B'B_1$  is reducible. Since a cycle induced by two paths  $Q$  and  $B'B_1BB_2$  has weight 6, we deduce that  $C$  is reducible, a contradiction. Therefore,  $B_1 + e^* - e$  is not a basis. Then  $h \neq e$ .

By symmetry, we can assume that  $h = f^*$ . By Lemma 3.2, one of two transversals  $(B_1 + e^* - f^*) - e + f$  and  $(B_1 + e^* - f^*) - e + f^*$  is a basis. Hence  $B'' := (B_1 + e^* - f^*) - e + f = B\Delta\{e, e^*, g, g^*\}$  is a basis; see Figure 1(top right). Note that  $B'' \notin V(C)$  and  $\text{dist}_M(B_0, B'') = \ell - 2$ . Let  $Q$  be a path from  $B_2$  to  $B''$  of weight  $\text{dist}_M(B_2, B'') = 2$ . Then by Lemma 4.6, a cycle induced by  $P$ ,  $Q$ , and  $B''B_1$  is reducible. A cycle consisting of two paths  $Q$  and  $B''B_1BB_2$  has weight 6. This contradicts that  $C$  is irreducible.

**Subcase I.3.**  $\eta(BB_1) = \eta(BB_2) = 2$ . Then there are four distinct elements  $e, f, g, h \in B$  such that  $B_1 = B\Delta\{g, g^*, h, h^*\}$  and  $B_2 = B\Delta\{e, e^*, f, f^*\}$ ; see Figure 1(bottom). By the basis exchange (Exch), there is  $i \in \{e, f, g^*, h^*\} = B_1 \setminus B_2$  such that  $B_1 + e^* - i$  is a basis.

Suppose that  $B' := B_1 + e^* - e$  is a basis. Let  $Q$  be a path from  $B'$  to  $B_2$  of weight  $\text{dist}_M(B', B_2) = 3$ . By Lemma 4.6 applied to  $C$ ,  $B_2$  is the only vertex in both paths  $P$  and  $Q$ . A cycle consisting of two paths  $Q$  and  $B'B_1BB_2$  has weight 8. A cycle consisting of  $P$ ,  $Q$ , and  $B'B_1$  is reducible by Lemma 4.6. It contradicts that  $C$  is irreducible. Therefore,  $B_1 + e^* - e$  is not a basis and  $i \neq e$ .

Suppose that  $i = f$ . By Lemma 3.2,  $(B_1 + e^* - f) - e + f$  or  $(B_1 + e^* - f) - e + f^*$  is a basis. Hence  $B'' := (B_1 + e^* - f) - e + f^*$  is a basis. Then  $B'' \notin V(C)$  and  $\text{dist}_M(B_0, B'') = \ell - 4$ . Let  $Q$  be a path from  $B''$  to  $B_2$  of weight  $\text{dist}_M(B_2, B'') = 2$ . Then  $V(P) \cap V(Q) = \{B_2\}$  by Lemma 4.6. Then the union of  $C$ ,  $Q$ , and  $B''B_1$  has two cycles other than  $C$ . One has weight 8 and the other is reducible by Lemma 4.6, a contradiction. Thus,  $i \in \{g^*, h^*\}$ .

By symmetry, we can assume that  $i = g^*$ . By Lemma 3.2,  $(B_1 + e^* - g^*) - e + g$  or  $(B_1 + e^* - g^*) - e + g^*$  is a basis. Hence  $B''' := (B_1 + e^* - g^*) - e + g = B\Delta\{e, e^*, h, h^*\}$  is a basis. Then  $B''' \notin V(C)$  and  $\text{dist}_M(B_0, B''') = \ell - 2$ . Similarly, Lemma 4.6 yields a contradiction, and we skip details.

**Case II.** There is an edge  $BB'$  in  $C$  such that  $\text{dist}_M(B_0, B) = \text{dist}_M(B_0, B') = \ell - 1$  and  $\eta(BB') = 2$ . Then  $B' = B\Delta\{e, e^*, f, f^*\}$  for some  $e, f^* \in B$ . Let  $B_1$  be the neighbor of  $B$  in  $C$  which is not  $B'$ .






Figure 1: Descriptions of Case I in the proof of Theorem 4.3. Solid lines represent edges of weight 1, double lines represent edges of weight 2, and dashed lines represent paths in  $\mathcal{G}_M$ .

**Subcase II.1.**  $\eta(BB_1) = 2$ . Then  $B_1 = B \Delta \{g, g^*, h, h^*\}$  for some  $g, h \in B \setminus \{e, f^*\}$ ; see Figure 2(top). Let  $P$  be a path in  $C$  from  $B_1$  to  $B'$  containing  $B_0$ . By the basis exchange (Exch), there is  $i \in B_1 \setminus B' = \{e, f^*, g^*, h^*\}$  such that  $B_1 + e^* - i$  is a basis of  $M$ .

Suppose that  $D := B_1 + e^* - e$  is a basis. Then  $D \notin V(C)$  and  $\text{dist}_M(B_0, D) = \ell - 4$ . Let  $Q$  be a path from  $B'$  to  $D$  of weight  $\text{dist}_M(B', D) = 3$ . Note that  $V(P) \cap V(Q) = \{B'\}$  by Lemma 4.6 applied to  $C$ . Then a cycle induced by  $P$ ,  $Q$ , and  $DB_1$  is reducible by Lemma 4.6, and a cycle concatenating two paths  $Q$  and  $DB_1BB'$  has length 8. It contradicts that  $C$  is irreducible. Therefore,  $B_1 + e^* - e$  is not a basis and  $i \neq e$ .

Suppose that  $i = f^*$ . By Lemma 3.2,  $(B_1 + e^* - f^*) - e + f$  or  $(B_1 + e^* - f^*) - e + f^*$  is a basis. Hence  $D' := (B_1 + e^* - f^*) - e + f = B' \Delta \{g, g^*, h, h^*\}$  is a basis. Then  $D' \notin V(C)$  and  $\text{dist}_M(B_0, D') = \ell - 3$ . Using Lemma 4.6, we can similarly conclude that  $C$  is reducible, a contradiction. Thus,  $i \neq f^*$  and so  $i$  is either  $g^*$  or  $h^*$ .

By symmetry, we may assume that  $i = g^*$ . By Lemma 3.2,  $D'' := (B_1 + e^* - g^*) - e + g = B' \Delta \{f, f^*, h, h^*\}$  is a basis. Then  $D'' \notin V(C)$  and  $\text{dist}_M(B_0, D'') = \ell - 2$ . Using Lemma 4.6, similarly one can deduce a contradiction.

**Subcase II.2.**  $\eta(BB_1) = 1$ . Let  $B_2$  be the neighbor of  $B'$  in  $V(C)$  other than  $B$ . By Subcase II.1, we may assume that  $\eta(BB_2) = 1$ . Then for some  $g, h \in B \cap B'$ , we have  $B_1 = B \Delta \{h, h^*\}$  and  $B_2 = B' \Delta \{g, g^*\}$ ; see Figure 2(bottom). Let  $P$  be a path in  $C$  from  $B_1$  to  $B_2$  containing  $B_0$ . By the basis exchange (Exch), there is  $i \in B_1 \setminus B_2 = \{e, f^*, g, h^*\}$  such that  $B_1 + e^* - i$  is a basis of  $M$ .

Suppose that  $D := B_1 + e^* - e$  is a basis. Then  $D \notin V(C)$  and  $\text{dist}_M(B_0, D) = \ell - 3$ . Let  $Q$  be a path from  $B_2$  to  $D$  of weight  $\text{dist}_M(B_2, D) = 3$ . By Lemma 4.6,  $P$  and  $Q$  only meet at a vertex  $B_2$ . A cycle consisting of two paths  $DB_1BB'B_2$  and  $Q$  has length 8, and a cycle consisting of  $P$ ,  $Q$ , and  $DB_1$  is reducible by Lemma 4.6. It contradicts that  $C$  is irreducible. Therefore,  $B_1 + e^* - e$  is not a basis and  $i \neq e$ .

Suppose that  $i = f^*$ . By Lemma 3.2,  $D' := (B_1 + e^* - f^*) - e + f = B_2 \Delta \{g, g^*, h, h^*\}$  is a basis. Then  $D' \notin V(C)$  and  $\text{dist}_M(B_0, D') = \ell - 2$ . Similarly, we can deduce a contradiction using




Figure 2: Descriptions of Case II in the proof of Theorem 4.3.

Lemma 4.6. Thus, we can assume that  $i \neq f^*$ .

Suppose that  $i = h^*$ . By Lemma 3.2,  $D'' := (B_1 + e^* - h^*) - e + h = B_2 \Delta \{f, f^*, g, g^*\}$  is a basis. Then  $D'' \notin V(C)$  and  $\text{dist}_M(B_0, D'') = \ell - 2$ . So, we can deduce a contradiction similarly as before.

Thus, we may assume that  $i = g$ . By Lemma 3.2,  $D''' := (B_1 + e^* - g) - e + g^*$  is a basis. Then  $D''' \notin V(C)$  and  $\text{dist}_M(B_0, D''') = \ell - 4$ . One can deduce a contradiction similarly as before.  $\square$

## 5 Antisymmetric matroids over tracts

A *tract* is a commutative ring-like structure defined by Baker and Bowler [2]. It encompasses fields, partial fields, and hyperfields, and thus matroids with coefficients in a tract generalize partial field representations of matroids [24], oriented matroids [5], valuated matroids [17], and ordinary matroids.

We define antisymmetric matroids with coefficients in tracts. As a byproduct, it provides a concept for Lagrangian Grassmannians over hyperfields. We establish them in two ways which generalize a point in the projective space satisfying the restricted G–P relations in Section 5.1 and a maximal isotropic subspace in a symplectic vector space in Section 5.2. We will show these two notions are equivalent in Section 6. In Section 5.3, we give examples of antisymmetric matroids over tracts, including matroids over tracts introduced in [2].

We first review the definition of tracts and some basic properties.

**Definition 5.1** (Tracts). A *tract* is a pair  $F = (G, N_F)$  of an abelian group  $G$ , written multiplicatively, and a subset  $N_F$  of the group semiring  $\mathbb{N}[G]$  satisfying the following axioms:

- (T1) The zero element  $0$  of  $\mathbb{N}[G]$  is in  $N_F$ .
- (T2) The identity  $1$  of  $G$  is not in  $N_F$ .
- (T3) There is a unique  $\epsilon \in G$  such that  $1 + \epsilon \in N_F$ .
- (T4) If  $g \in G$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^n h_i \in N_F$ , then  $\sum_{i=1}^n gh_i \in N_F$ .

Abusing a notation, we write  $F$  for the set  $G \cup \{0\}$ . We denote by  $F^\times := G$ . We call  $N_F$  the *null set*, which can be regarded as the set of linear combinations of  $G$  that sum to zero.

**Lemma 5.2** ([2]). *Let  $F$  be a tract. The following holds.*

- (i)  $\epsilon^2 = 1$ .
- (ii) For  $x, y \in F^\times$ , if  $x + y \in N_F$ , then  $y = \epsilon x$ .
- (iii)  $F^\times \cap N_F = \emptyset$ .

Because of the previous lemma, we often write  $-1$  instead of  $\epsilon$ . A *morphism*  $f$  from a tract  $F_1$  to another tract  $F_2$  is a map such that  $f(0) = 0$  and the restriction  $f : F_1^\times \rightarrow F_2^\times$  is a group homomorphism inducing  $\varphi(N_{F_1}) \subseteq N_{F_2}$ .

**Example 5.3.** We give tracts associated with fields, partial fields, and some hyperfields without precise definitions of partial fields and hyperfields; for more details, see [2].

1. For a field  $k$ , let  $N_k$  be the set of linear combinations of nonzero elements that sum to zero in  $k$ . Then  $(k^\times, N_k)$  is a tract.
2. Let  $R$  be a commutative ring with unity and  $G$  be its unit subgroup, i.e.,  $G \leq R^\times$ . A *partial field*  $P$  associated with  $G$  and  $R$  is a tract such that  $P^\times = G$  and its null set is the set of linear combinations of elements of  $G$  summing to zero in  $R$ . The *regular partial field*  $\mathbb{U}_0$  is a partial field associated with  $G = \{1, -1\}$  and  $R = \mathbb{Z}$ . For every field  $k$ , there is a unique tract morphism  $\mathbb{U}_0 \rightarrow k$ .
3. The *initial tract* is  $\mathbb{I} := (\{\pm 1\}, \{1 + (-1)\})$ .
4. The *Krasner hyperfield*  $\mathbb{K}$  is a tract such that  $\mathbb{K}^\times = \{1\}$  and its null set is  $\mathbb{N}[\mathbb{K}^\times] \setminus \{1\}$ . Note that  $\epsilon = 1$  in  $\mathbb{K}$ , and  $\mathbb{K}$  is the terminal object of the category of tracts.
5. The *sign hyperfield*  $\mathbb{S}$  is a tract such that  $\mathbb{S}^\times = \{\pm 1\}$  and its null set is the set of zero or sums appearing both  $+1$  and  $-1$  at least once. For every ordered field  $k$ , a map  $k \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$  sending zero to zero, all positive elements in  $k$  to  $1 \in \mathbb{S}$ , and all negative elements in  $k$  to  $-1 \in \mathbb{S}$  is a tract morphism.
6. The *tropical hyperfield*  $\mathbb{T}$  is a tract such that  $\mathbb{T}^\times = \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  and its null set is the set of zero or sums in which the maximum element appears at least twice.

## 5.1 Antisymmetric $F$ -matroids

We define an antisymmetric matroid with coefficients in a tract by defining a restricted Grassmann-Plücker relation over tracts.

**Definition 5.4.** A *restricted  $G$ - $P$  function* on  $E = [n] \cup [n]^*$  with coefficients in a tract  $F$  is a nontrivial function  $\varphi : \mathcal{J}_n \sqcup \mathcal{A}_n \rightarrow F$  that satisfies the following.

(Sym) If  $A \in \mathcal{A}_n$  and skew pairs  $p, q$  such that  $p \subseteq A$  and  $q \cap A = \emptyset$ , then

$$\varphi(A) = (-1)^m \varphi(A - p + q)$$

where  $m = 1 + \sum_{z \in p \cup q} |(A + q) < z|$ .

(rGP) For  $S \in \binom{E}{n+1}$  and  $T \in \binom{E}{n-1}$  such that  $S$  contains exactly one skew pair and  $T$  has no skew pair,

$$\sum_{x \in S \setminus T} (-1)^{|S < x| + |T < x|} \varphi(S - x) \varphi(T + x) \in N_F. \quad (\diamond')$$

Then  $\mathcal{B} = \{B \in \mathcal{T}_n \cup \mathcal{A}_n : \varphi(B) \neq 0\}$  satisfies (B1), (B2), and (Exch), and we call a pair  $(E, \mathcal{B})$  the underlying antisymmetric matroid of  $\varphi$ . Two restricted G–P functions  $\varphi$  and  $\varphi'$  are *equivalent* if  $\varphi' = c \cdot \varphi$  for some  $c \in F^\times$ . An *antisymmetric  $F$ -matroids* (or an *antisymmetric matroid over  $F$* ) is an equivalence class of restricted G–P functions with coefficients in  $F$ . The  *$F$ -Lagrangian Grassmannian*  $\text{Lag}_F(n, 2n)$  is the set of antisymmetric  $F$ -matroids on  $[n] \cup [n]^*$ . The antisymmetric  $\mathbb{K}$ -matroids can be regarded as the antisymmetric matroids. We call antisymmetric  $\mathbb{S}$ -matroids *oriented antisymmetric matroids* and call antisymmetric  $\mathbb{T}$ -matroids *valuated antisymmetric matroids*. In Section 5.3, we show that those encompass oriented matroids and valuated matroids, respectively.

For a restricted G–P function  $\varphi$  with coefficient in a tract  $F$  and a tract morphism  $f : F \rightarrow F'$ , the composition  $f \circ \varphi$  is a restricted G–P function with coefficients in  $F'$ . Therefore, there is a pushforward operation  $f_*$  such that for each antisymmetric  $F$ -matroid  $M$ ,  $f_*M$  is an antisymmetric  $F'$ -matroid. In particular, if  $F' = \mathbb{K}$ , then  $f_*M$  is identified with the underlying antisymmetric matroid of  $M$ .

## 5.2 Antisymmetric $F$ -circuit sets

We can identify a set  $E = [n] \cup [n]^*$  with  $\mathbb{K}^E$ . Then an antisymmetric matroid  $M$  on  $E$  is an antisymmetric  $\mathbb{K}$ -matroid, and the circuits  $C \subseteq E$  of  $M$  are vectors in  $\mathbb{K}^E$ . Furthermore, (Orth) and (Max) in Theorem 3.6 are rephrased as follows.

$$\text{(Orth)} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n (X(i)Y(i^*) + X(i^*)Y(i)) \in N_{\mathbb{K}} \text{ for all } X, Y \in \mathcal{C}(M) \subseteq \mathbb{K}^E.$$

(Max) For every  $S \subseteq E$  such that  $|S| = n + 1$  and  $S$  contains exactly one skew pair, there is  $X \in \mathcal{C}(M)$  such that  $\text{supp}(X) \subseteq S$ .

Replacing the Krasner hyperfield  $\mathbb{K}$  with an arbitrary tract  $F$  in (Orth), we define an antisymmetric  $F$ -circuit set which is equivalent to an antisymmetric  $F$ -matroid.

**Definition 5.5.** A set  $\mathcal{C}$  of vectors in  $F^E$  is *prepared* if the following conditions hold.

- (i)  $\mathbf{0} \notin \mathcal{C}$ .
- (ii) The support of each vector in  $\mathcal{C}$  contains at most one skew pair.
- (iii) If  $X \in \mathcal{C}$ , then  $cX \in \mathcal{C}$  for all  $c \in F^\times$ .
- (iv) For  $X, Y \in F^E$ , if  $\text{supp}(X) \subseteq \text{supp}(Y)$  and  $Y \in \mathcal{C}$ , then  $X = cY$  for some  $c \in F^\times$ ,

**Definition 5.6.** An *antisymmetric  $F$ -circuit set* is a prepared set  $\mathcal{C}$  of vectors in  $F^E$  satisfying the next two properties:

$$\text{(Orth')} \quad \omega(X, Y) := \sum_{i=1}^n (X(i)Y(i^*) + \epsilon X(i^*)Y(i)) \in N_F \text{ for all } X, Y \in \mathcal{C}.$$

(Max') If  $S \subseteq E$  is a subset such that  $|S| = n + 1$  and  $S$  contains exactly one skew pair, then there is  $X \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $\text{supp}(X) \subseteq S$ .

**Lemma 5.7.** *If  $\mathcal{C}$  is an antisymmetric  $F$ -circuit set, then  $\underline{\mathcal{C}} := \{\underline{X} : X \in \mathcal{C}\}$  is the set of circuits of an antisymmetric matroid.  $\square$*

The set of circuits of an antisymmetric matroid is identified with an antisymmetric  $\mathbb{K}$ -circuit set. For a field  $k$  and a Lagrangian subspace  $W$  of  $k^E$ , let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the set of nonzero vectors  $X$  in  $W$  such that  $|\underline{X} \cap \underline{X}^*| \leq 1$  and  $\underline{X}$  is minimal. Then  $\mathcal{C}$  is an antisymmetric  $k$ -circuit set. Conversely, if  $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq k^E$  is an antisymmetric  $k$ -circuit set, then the span of  $\mathcal{C}'$  is isotropic by (Orth') and has dimension  $n$  by (Max').

### 5.3 Examples

We first recall basic examples when  $F = \mathbb{K}$  or  $F$  is a field.

**Example 5.8.** An antisymmetric  $\mathbb{K}$ -matroid is identified with the set of bases of an antisymmetric matroid. An antisymmetric  $\mathbb{K}$ -circuit set is identified with the set of circuits of an antisymmetric matroid.

**Example 5.9.** Let  $k$  be a field. Then an antisymmetric  $k$ -matroid is equal to a point in the projective space of dimension  $2^{n-2}(4 + \binom{n}{2})$  satisfying the restricted G–P relations ( $\diamond$ ). For a Lagrangian subspace  $W$  in  $k^{[n] \cup [n]^*}$ , if  $\mathcal{C}$  is the set of vectors  $X$  in  $W \setminus \{0\}$  such that  $\underline{X}$  is minimal and  $|\underline{X} \cap \underline{X}^*| \leq 1$ , then  $\mathcal{C}$  is an antisymmetric  $k$ -circuit set.

Now we show how antisymmetric matroids over tracts generalize matroids over tracts. We briefly review the theory of matroids with coefficients in tracts by Baker and Bowler [2], which extends earlier works of Semple and Whittle [24] and Dress and Wenzel [15, 16].

**Definition 5.10** ([2]). Let  $F$  be a tract and  $0 \leq r \leq n$  be integers. A *Grassmann-Plücker function of rank  $r$  on  $[n]$  with coefficients in  $F$*  is a function  $\psi : \binom{[n]}{r} \rightarrow F$  such that  $\psi$  is not identically zero and satisfies the *Grassmann-Plücker relations*:

$$\sum_{x \in S \setminus T} (-1)^{|S \setminus x| + |T \setminus x|} \psi(S - x) \psi(T + x) \in N_F$$

for every  $S \in \binom{[n]}{r+1}$  and  $T \in \binom{[n]}{r-1}$ . Two Grassmann-Plücker functions  $\psi$  and  $\psi'$  are *equivalent* if  $\psi' = c \cdot \psi$  for some  $c \in F^\times$ . An  *$F$ -matroid* (or a *matroid over  $F$* ) is an equivalence class  $[\psi]$  of Grassmann-Plücker functions with coefficients in  $F$ .

For a Grassmann-Plücker function  $\psi$  of rank  $r$  on  $[n]$ , let  $\psi^\perp : \binom{[n]}{n-r} \rightarrow F$  be a function such that  $\psi^\perp([n] \setminus B) := \text{sign}(B) \cdot \psi(B)$ , where  $\text{sign}(B)$  is the sign of the permutation mapping  $i$  to the  $i$ -th smallest element in  $B$  if  $i \leq r$  and to the  $(i - r)$ -th smallest element in  $[n] \setminus B$  if  $i > r$ . Then  $\psi^\perp$  is a Grassmann-Plücker function of rank  $n - r$  on  $[n]$ . We call  $M^\perp := [\psi^\perp]$  the *dual* of  $M = [\psi]$ .

The  *$F$ -Grassmannian*  $\text{Gr}_F(r, n)$  is the set of  $F$ -matroids of rank  $r$  on  $[n]$ . If  $F = k$  is a field, then it is the ordinary Grassmannian over  $k$ . Note that  $\mathbb{S}$ -matroids and  $\mathbb{T}$ -matroids are equal to oriented matroids [5] and valuated matroids [17], respectively, and the set  $\text{Gr}_{\mathbb{T}}(r, n)$  of valuated matroids is called the *Dressian*  $\text{Dr}(r, n)$ .

We show that every  $F$ -matroid naturally induces an antisymmetric  $F$ -matroid, extending that the Grassmannian is a subset of the Lagrangian Grassmannian.

**Lemma 5.11.** *Let  $\psi$  be a Grassmann-Plücker function of rank  $r$  on  $[n]$  with coefficients in a tract  $F$ . Then a function  $\varphi : \mathcal{T}_n \sqcup \mathcal{A}_n \rightarrow F$  such that for each  $B \in \mathcal{T}_n$ ,*

$$\varphi(B) = \begin{cases} \psi(B \cap [n]) \cdot \psi^\perp(B^* \cap [n]) & \text{if } |B \cap [n]| = r, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

*is a restricted G–P function.*

*Proof.* We first show that  $\varphi$  satisfies (Sym). It suffices to check for  $A \in \mathcal{A}_n$  such that  $A = (B - i + j) \cup ([n] \setminus B)^*$  for some  $B \in \binom{[n]}{r}$ ,  $i \in B$ , and  $j \in [n] \setminus B$ . Note that  $\{i, i^*\} \cap A = \emptyset$ ,  $\{j, j^*\} \subseteq A$ , and  $\text{sign}(B) \cdot \text{sign}(B - i + j) = (-1)^m$  where  $m := 1 + \sum_{z \in \{i, i^*, j, j^*\}} |(A + \{i, i^*\}) < z|$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi((B - i + j) \cup ([n] \setminus B)^*) &= \psi(B - i + j) \cdot \psi^\perp([n] \setminus B) \\ &= (-1)^m \cdot \psi^\perp([n] \setminus (B - i + j)) \cdot \psi(B) \\ &= (-1)^m \cdot \varphi(B \cup ([n] \setminus (B - i + j))^*). \end{aligned}$$



Now we claim (rGP). We can assume that either  $|S \cap [n]^*| = |T \cap [n]^*| = n - r$  or  $|S \cap [n]| = |T \cap [n]| = r$ . Let  $S_1 = S \cap [n]$ ,  $S_2 = S \cap [n]^*$ ,  $T_1 = T \cap [n]$ , and  $T_2 = T \cap [n]^*$ . In the former case,  $|S_1| = r + 1$  and  $|T_1| = r - 1$ , and thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{x \in S \setminus T} (-1)^{|S \setminus x| + |T \setminus x|} \varphi(S - x) \varphi(T + x) \\ &= \psi^\perp(S_2) \psi^\perp(T_2) \sum_{x \in S_1 \setminus T_1} (-1)^{|S_1 \setminus x| + |T_1 \setminus x|} \psi(S_1 - x) \psi(T_1 + x) \in N_F. \end{aligned}$$

The latter case holds similarly.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.12.** *Let  $F$  be a tract. There is an injective map  $\text{Gr}_F(r, n) \rightarrow \text{Lag}_F(n, 2n)$  such that the following diagram commutes,*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Gr}_F(r, n) & \longrightarrow & \text{Lag}_F(n, 2n) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{Gr}_{\mathbb{K}}(r, n) & \longrightarrow & \text{Lag}_{\mathbb{K}}(n, 2n) \end{array}$$

where the vertical arrows mean taking underlying matroids or underlying antisymmetric matroids.  $\square$

By Theorem 5.12, every oriented matroid is an oriented antisymmetric matroid. Also, every valuated matroid is a valuated antisymmetric matroid, equivalently, the Dressian  $\text{Dr}(r, n) = \text{Gr}_{\mathbb{T}}(r, n)$  is a subset of the Lagrangian Grassmannian  $\text{Lag}_{\mathbb{T}}(n, 2n)$  over the tropical hyperfield.

*Remark 5.13.* There are several other approaches for understanding tropical and oriented analogue of symmetric matrices or Lagrangian Grassmannians. First, Balla and Olarte [4] introduced five different tropical analogues of the symplectic Grassmannian. The *symplectic Dressian*  $\text{SpDr}(r, 2n)$  is defined by tropical counterparts of the linear and quadratic relations cut out the symplectic Grassmannian in the sense of De Concini [13], which is a subset of the Dressian  $\text{Dr}(r, 2n)$ . By discarding coordinates  $B \in \binom{[n] \cup [n]^*}{n}$  other than transvesals and almost-transversals, we deduce that  $\text{SpDr}(n, 2n)$  is embedded into  $\text{Lag}_{\mathbb{T}}(n, 2n)$ . Second, Booth, Borovik, Gelfand, and White [7] studied oriented Lagrangian matroids which are symmetric matroids equipped with positive and negative signs on the pairs of bases. Third, Boege, D'Alì, Kahle, and Sturmfels [6] introduced oriented and valuated gaussoids, where a *gaussoid* is a matroid-like object characterizing properties of almost-principal minors of a symmetric matrix.

$F$ -matroids have several equivalent definitions [2, 1] in terms of circuits and vectors. It is straightforward to show that a *dual pair of  $F$ -signature of a matroid  $M$*  [2] induces an antisymmetric  $F$ -circuit set such that the circuit set of the underlying antisymmetric matroid is exactly  $\mathcal{C}(\text{lift}(M))$ . This generalizes a fact that  $V \oplus V^\perp \in \text{Lag}_k(n, 2n)$  for each linear subspace  $V$  in  $k^n$ .

In [19], the author introduced *orthogonal matroids over tracts* as a generalization of both matroids over tracts and the Lagrangian orthogonal Grassmannian  $\text{OG}(n, 2n)$ , where an orthogonal matroid is another name for an even symmetric matroid. Three equivalent definitions of orthogonal  $F$ -matroids were provided, and we review one of them. An *orthogonal  $F$ -matroid* is a set  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq F^{[n] \cup [n]^*}$  such that  $\underline{\mathcal{C}} = \{\underline{X} : X \in \mathcal{C}\}$  is the set of circuits of an orthogonal matroid, i.e., an even symmetric matroid, and

$$(\text{Orth}'') \quad \sum_{i=1}^n (X(i)Y(i) + X(i)Y(i^*)) \in N_F \text{ for every } X, Y \in \mathcal{C}.$$

Recall that by Theorem 3.18, the circuit set of an orthogonal matroid is the circuit set of an antisymmetric matroid. Therefore, we deduce the next result generalizing that over a field of characteristic two, every skew-symmetric matrix (with zero diagonals) is a symmetric matrix. Here we assume Theorem 6.1, the cryptomorphism of antisymmetric  $F$ -matroids and antisymmetric  $F$ -circuit sets.

**Proposition 5.14.** *Let  $F$  be a tract with  $1 = \epsilon$ . Then an orthogonal  $F$ -matroid is an antisymmetric  $F$ -matroid.  $\square$*

**Example 5.15.** The tropical hyperfield  $\mathbb{T}$  is a tract with  $1 = \epsilon$ . Thus, every valuated orthogonal matroid in [19], which is equivalent to a valuated  $\Delta$ -matroid in [27] and a tropical Wick vector in [23], is a valuated antisymmetric matroid.

## 6 Cryptomorphism

In Section 5, we define two concepts generalizing Lagrangian subspaces in the standard symplectic vector space. First, antisymmetric  $F$ -matroids are defined by the restricted G–P relations over tracts. Second, antisymmetric  $F$ -circuit sets are defined by a maximal set of vectors that are orthogonal to each other, subject to a certain condition on their supports. We show that those two notions are equivalent.

**Theorem 6.1.** *There is a natural bijection between antisymmetric  $F$ -matroids and antisymmetric  $F$ -circuit sets.*

A proof of Theorem 6.1 is provided in Section 6.3. Theorem 6.1 generalizes not only the cryptomorphism on antisymmetric matroids but also the parametrization of the Lagrangian Grassmannian into the projective space of dimension  $2^{n-2}(n + \binom{n}{2})$ , which is also explained in Section 6.3. In Section 6.1, we construct an antisymmetric  $F$ -circuit set from an antisymmetric  $F$ -matroid. In Section 6.2, we oppositely build an antisymmetric  $F$ -matroid from an antisymmetric  $F$ -circuit set. Those two constructions are apparently a reverse step of each other, and hence we deduce Theorem 6.1.

### 6.1 Constructing an antisymmetric $F$ -circuit set

In this subsection, we let  $\varphi : \mathcal{T}_n \sqcup \mathcal{A}_n \rightarrow F$  be a restricted G–P function on  $E := [n] \cup [n]^*$  with coefficients in a tract  $F$ . We denote the underlying antisymmetric matroid of  $\varphi$  by  $M = (E, \mathcal{B})$ . The goal is to construct an antisymmetric  $F$ -circuit set from  $\varphi$ .

Let  $S \subseteq E$  be a subset of size  $n + 1$  which contains exactly one skew pair, say  $\{x, x^*\}$ . Suppose that  $S - x$  or  $S - x^*$  is a basis. Let  $X_S \in F^E$  be a vector defined as follows:

- $\text{supp}(X_S) \subseteq S$  and
- $X_S(y) = (-1)^{\chi(y) + |S < y|} \varphi(S - y)$  for each  $y \in S$ .

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the set of all  $cX_S$  such that  $c \in F^\times$  and  $S = B + x^*$  with  $B \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{T}_n$  and  $x \in B$ .

**Theorem 6.2.**  *$\mathcal{C}$  is an antisymmetric  $F$ -circuit set.*

*Proof.* It is clear that  $\mathcal{C}$  is prepared and satisfies (Max'). Hence it suffices to show (Orth'), i.e.,  $\omega(X, Y) \in N_F$  for all  $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$ .

Fix  $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$ . Let  $S, T$  be subsets of size  $n + 1$  in  $E$  such that  $\underline{X} \subseteq S, \underline{Y} \subseteq T$ , and for some  $x, y \in E$ ,  $S - x^*$  and  $T - y^*$  are bases. Applying the restricted G–P relation (rGP) to  $S$  and  $T' := T \setminus \{y, y^*\}$ , we have

$$\sum_{z \in S \setminus T'} (-1)^{|S < z| + |T' < z|} \cdot \varphi(S - z) \cdot \varphi(T' + z) \in N_F.$$

Note that  $S \setminus T' = (S \cap \{y, y^*\}) \sqcup (S \setminus T)$ . Let  $m := |T' < y| + |T' < y^*|$ . Then for each  $z \in \{y, y^*\}$ , we have  $|T < z^*| = |T' < z^*| + \chi(z^*) \equiv |T' < z| + m + \chi(z^*) \pmod{2}$  and thus  $Y(z^*) = (-1)^{|T < z^*| + \chi(z^*)} \varphi(T - z^*) = (-1)^{|T' < z| + m} \varphi(T' + z)$ .

For  $z \in S \setminus T$ , we have  $1 + \sum_{w \in \{y, y^*, z, z^*\}} |(T + z) < w| \equiv |T' < z| + |T < z^*| + \chi(z^*) + m \pmod{2}$ . Then by (Sym),  $Y(z^*) = (-1)^{\chi(z^*) + |T < z^*|} \varphi(T - z^*) = (-1)^{|T' < z| + m} \varphi(T' + z)$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(X, Y) &= \sum_{z \in S \setminus T'} (-1)^{\chi(z)} X(z) Y(z^*) \\ &= (-1)^m \sum_{z \in S \setminus T'} (-1)^{|S < z| + |T' < z|} \cdot \varphi(S - z) \cdot \varphi(T' + z) \in N_F. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

### 6.2 Constructing an antisymmetric $F$ -matroid

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an antisymmetric  $F$ -circuit set on  $E = [n] \cup [n]^*$ , and let  $M$  be its underlying antisymmetric matroid, i.e.,  $\mathcal{C}(M) = \mathcal{C}$ . We will construct a restricted G–P function by approaching a reverse step of Section 6.1.

**Definition 6.3.** Let  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  be bases of  $M$  such that  $S := B_1 \cup B_2$  has exactly one skew pair. We denote by  $\{x\} = S \setminus B_1$  and  $\{y\} = S \setminus B_2$ , and we define

$$\gamma(B_1, B_2) := (-1)^{\chi(x) + \chi(y) + |S < x| + |S < y|} \frac{X(y)}{X(x)},$$

where  $X$  is a vector in  $\mathcal{C}$  such that  $\underline{X} \subseteq S$ .

**Definition 6.4.** The *basis graph* of  $M$  is a graph  $G_M$  on  $\mathcal{B}(M)$  such that two vertices  $B$  and  $B'$  are adjacent if and only if  $|B \setminus B'| = 1$ .

One natural candidate of a restricted G–P function  $\varphi : \mathcal{T}_n \sqcup \mathcal{A}_n \rightarrow F$  can be constructed as follows.

- (i) Fix a basis  $B_0 \in \mathcal{B}(M)$  and let  $\varphi(B_0) = 1 \in F^\times$ .
- (ii) For each  $B \in \mathcal{B}(M)$ , let  $\varphi(B) = \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \gamma(B_i, B_{i+1}) \in F^\times$  where  $B_0 B_1 \dots B_k$  be a path from  $B_0$  to  $B_k := B$  in the basis graph  $G_M$ .
- (iii) For  $B \in (\mathcal{T}_n \sqcup \mathcal{A}_n) \setminus \mathcal{B}(M)$ , let  $\varphi(B) = 0$ .

By similar proof of Theorem 6.2, we can show that  $\varphi$  is a restricted G–P function on  $E$  with coefficients in  $F$ ; see Theorem 6.14. However, one of the hardest part is to show that  $\varphi$  is well defined, i.e., for different paths  $P = B_0 \dots B_k$  and  $P' = B'_0 \dots B'_\ell$  from  $B_0 = B'_0$  to  $B_k = B'_\ell = B$ , we should prove that  $\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \gamma(B_i, B_{i+1}) = \prod_{i=0}^{\ell-1} \gamma(B'_i, B'_{i+1})$ . Henceforth, we devoted most of the subsection to show that  $\varphi$  is well defined using the Homotopy Theorem (Theorem 4.3).

**Lemma 6.5.**  $\gamma(B_1, B_2) = \gamma(B_2, B_1)^{-1}$  for each  $B_1 B_2 \in E(G_M)$ . □

**Lemma 6.6.** Let  $B$  be a transversal basis, and let  $A$  and  $A'$  be distinct almost-transversal bases such that  $A = B + x^* - y$  and  $A' = B - x + y^*$  for some  $x, y \in B$ . Then

$$\gamma(B, A) = (-1)^m \gamma(B, A'),$$

where  $m := 1 + \sum_{z \in \{x, x^*, y, y^*\}} |(B + x^* + y^*) < z|$ .

*Proof.* Let  $S = B + x^*$ ,  $T = B + y^*$ , and  $U = B + x^* + y^*$ . Let  $X, Y$  be vectors in  $\mathcal{C}$  such that  $\text{supp}(X) \subseteq S$  and  $\text{supp}(Y) \subseteq T$ . Then  $\omega(X, Y) = (-1)^{\chi(x^*)} X(x^*)Y(x) + (-1)^{\chi(y)} X(y)Y(y^*) \in N_F$ . Note that  $|S < x^*| + |T < y^*| = |U < x^*| + |U < y^*| - 1$ ,  $|S < y| = |U < y| - \chi(y)$ , and  $|T < x| = |U < x| - \chi(x)$ . Therefore,

$$\gamma(B, A)\gamma(B, A')^{-1} = (-1)^{|S < x^*| + |T < y^*| + |S < x| + |T < y|} \frac{X(y)Y(y^*)}{X(x^*)Y(x)} = (-1)^m. \quad \square$$

**Lemma 6.7.** Let  $B_1 B_2 B_3 B_4 B_1$  be a 4-cycle in  $G_M$ . Then  $\prod_{i=1}^4 \gamma(B_i, B_{i+1}) = 1$ , where  $B_5 := B_1$ .

*Proof.* If  $B_i$  is an almost-transversal, then  $B_{i-1}$  and  $B_{i+1}$  are transversals. Hence, by relabelling, we may assume that  $B_1$  and  $B_3$  are transversals. As  $B_1 B_2 B_3 B_4 B_1$  is a 4-cycle in  $G_M$ ,  $|B_2 \setminus B_1| = |B_4 \setminus B_1| = 1$  and  $|B_3 \setminus B_1| = 2$ . Then  $B_3 = B_1 \triangle \{x, x^*, y, y^*\}$  for some  $x, y \in B$ .

**Case I.** Both  $B_2$  and  $B_4$  are almost-transversals. Then by symmetry, we may assume that  $B_2 = B_1 + x^* - y = B_3 + x - y^*$  and  $B_4 = B_1 - x + y^* = B_3 - x^* + y$ . Therefore,  $\gamma(B_1, B_2)\gamma(B_2, B_3) = \gamma(B_1, B_4)\gamma(B_4, B_3)$  by Lemma 6.6.

**Case II.**  $B_2$  is a transversal and  $B_4$  is an almost-transversal. Then by symmetry, we may assume that  $B_2 = B_1 \triangle \{x, x^*\}$ . Then  $B_4$  is either  $B_1 - y + x^*$  or  $B_1 - x + y^*$ . By Case I, we can assume that  $B_4 = B_1 - y + x^*$ . We denote by  $B'_4 := B_1 - x + y^*$ .

Let  $S := B_1 + x^*$  and  $T := B_3 + y$ . Let  $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$  be vectors such that  $\underline{X} \subseteq S$  and  $\underline{Y} \subseteq T$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(B_1, B_2)\gamma(B_2, B_3) &= (-1)^{|S < x| + |S < x^*| + |T < y| + |T < y^*|} \frac{X(x)}{X(x^*)} \frac{Y(y)}{Y(y^*)}, \\ \gamma(B_1, B_4)\gamma(B'_4, B_3) &= (-1)^{|S < y| + |S < x^*| + |T < y| + |T < x^*|} \frac{X(y)}{X(x^*)} \frac{Y(y)}{Y(x^*)}. \end{aligned}$$

As  $\omega(X, Y) \in N_F$ , we have  $\frac{X(x)}{Y(y^*)} = (-1)^{\chi(x)+\chi(y)+1} \frac{X(y)}{Y(x^*)}$ . By Lemma 6.6, we obtain the desired equality.

**Case III.** Both  $B_2$  and  $B_4$  are transversals. Then by symmetry,  $B_2 = B_1 \triangle \{x, x^*\} = B_3 \triangle \{y, y^*\}$  and  $B_4 = B_1 \triangle \{y, y^*\} = B_3 \triangle \{x, x^*\}$ . If  $B_1 - x + y^*$  is a basis, then applying Case II twice, we can deduce the desired equality. Therefore, we can assume that  $B_1 - x + y^*$  is not a basis.

Let  $X, Y, Z, W \in \mathcal{C}$  be vectors such that  $\underline{X} \subseteq B_1 \cup B_2$ ,  $\underline{Y} \subseteq B_2 \cup B_3$ ,  $\underline{Z} \subseteq B_1 \cup B_4$ , and  $\underline{W} \subseteq B_4 \cup B_3$ . Because neither  $B_1 - x + y^*$  nor  $B_1 + x^* - y$  is a basis,  $X(y) = Y(x^*) = Z(x) = W(y^*) = 0$ . Then  $\underline{W} \subseteq (B_4 \cup B_3) - y^* \subseteq B_1 \cup B_2$  and thus  $\underline{X} = \underline{W}$  by Lemma 3.4. Similarly,  $\underline{Y} = \underline{Z}$ . Hence  $\frac{X(x)}{X(x^*)} = \frac{W(x)}{W(x^*)}$  and  $\frac{Y(y)}{Y(y^*)} = \frac{Z(y)}{Z(y^*)}$ . Therefore,  $\gamma(B_1, B_2)\gamma(B_2, B_3) = \gamma(B_1, B_4)\gamma(B_4, B_3)$ .  $\square$

**Definition 6.8.** For two transversal bases  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  of  $M$  such that  $|B_1 \setminus B_2| = 2$ , let

$$\gamma(B_1, B_2) := \gamma(B_1, B)\gamma(B, B_2)$$

where  $B$  is an arbitrary basis such that  $BB_1, BB_2 \in E(G_M)$ . It is well defined by Lemma 6.7.

Recall that the transversal basis graph  $\mathcal{G}_M$  is a graph on  $\mathcal{B}(M) \cap \mathcal{T}_n$  together with weights  $\eta(BB') = |B \setminus B'| \in \{1, 2\}$  on its edges  $BB'$ . We say two cycles  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  in  $\mathcal{G}_M$  are *homotopic*, denoted by  $C_1 \simeq C_2$ , if they are the same element in the homology group  $H_M$  of  $\mathcal{G}_M$ .

**Lemma 6.9.** *Let  $C$  be an irreducible cycle of weight 6 in  $\mathcal{G}_M$ . Then  $C \simeq B_1 B_2 \dots B_k B_1$  such that*

- (i)  $k = 3$  and  $\eta(B_1 B_2) = \eta(B_2 B_3) = \eta(B_3 B_1) = 2$ , or
- (ii)  $k = 4$  and  $\eta(B_1 B_2) = \eta(B_3 B_4) = 1$  and  $\eta(B_2 B_3) = \eta(B_4 B_1) = 2$ .

*Proof.* Let  $C'$  be an irreducible cycle homotopic to  $C$ , which maximizes the number  $|E(C') \cap \eta^{-1}(2)|$  of edges  $e \in E(C')$  such that  $\eta(e) = 2$ .

**Claim 6.9.1.** *For each  $B \in V(C')$ , there are no three consecutive vertices  $D_1, D_2, D_3$  in  $C'$  such that  $\eta(D_1 D_2) = \eta(D_2 D_3) = 1$ ,  $\text{dist}_M(B, D_1) = \text{dist}_M(B, D_3) = 2$ , and  $\text{dist}_M(B, D_2) = 3$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that such vertices  $D_1, D_2, D_3$  exist. If  $D_1 D_3 \in E(\mathcal{G}_M)$ , then it contradicts our choice of  $C'$ . Thus,  $D_1 D_3 \notin E(\mathcal{G}_M)$  and hence there is a transversal basis  $D'$  of  $M$  such that  $|D' \setminus D_i| = 1$  for  $i \in \{1, 3\}$ . Then  $|D' \setminus B| = 1$ . Hence  $C'$  is generated by three cycles of weight 4, a contradiction.  $\blacksquare$

By the claim, we can easily deduce that  $C' = B_1 \dots B_k B_1$  satisfies either (i) or (ii).  $\square$

**Lemma 6.10.** *Let  $C = B_1 B_2 \dots B_k B_1$  be a cycle of weight 6 in  $\mathcal{G}_M$ . Then  $\sum_{i=1}^k \gamma(B_i, B_{i+1}) = 1$ , where  $B_{k+1} := B_1$ .*

*Proof.* We may assume that  $C$  is irreducible by Lemma 6.7. Then by Lemma 6.9 and rotational symmetry, either

- (i)  $k = 3$  and  $\eta(B_i B_{i+1}) = 2$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ , or
- (ii)  $k = 4$  and  $\eta(B_1 B_2) = \eta(B_3 B_4) = 1$  and  $\eta(B_2 B_3) = \eta(B_4 B_1) = 2$ .

In the case (i),  $B_i = T \triangle \{x_i, x_i^*\}$  for some transversal  $T$  and elements  $x_1, x_2, x_3 \in T$ . Since  $C$  is irreducible,  $T$  is not a basis of  $M$ . Then  $A_i := T + x_i^* - x_{i+1}$  with  $1 \leq i \leq 3$  are bases, where we read the subscripts modulo 3. Then  $B_1 A_1 B_2 A_2 B_3 A_3 B_1$  is a 6-cycle in  $G_M$ ; see Figure 3(left).

Let  $X_1, X_2, X_3, Y_1, Y_2, Y_3 \in \mathcal{C}$  be vectors such that  $\underline{X}_i \subseteq B_i \cup A_i = T + x_i$  and  $\underline{Y}_i \subseteq A_i \cup B_{i+1}$ . Because  $T$  is not a basis, by Lemma 3.4,  $\underline{X}_i \subseteq T$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq 3$  and thus  $\underline{X}_1 = \underline{X}_2 = \underline{X}_3$ . By multiplying elements in  $F^\times$ , we can assume that  $X_1 = X_2 = X_3 =: X$ .

Because  $\omega(X, Y_i) \in N_F$ , we have  $\frac{Y_i(x_i^*)}{Y_i(x_{i+1}^*)} = (-1)^{1+\chi(x_i)+\chi(x_{i+1})} \frac{X(x_{i+1})}{X(x_i)}$ . Note that  $\sum_{i=1}^3 (|(T+x_i^*) < x_i| + |(T+x_i^*) < x_{i+1}| + |(T \triangle \{x_{i+1}, x_{i+1}^*\} + x_i^*) < x_{i+1}^*| + |(T \triangle \{x_{i+1}, x_{i+1}^*\} + x_i^*) < x_i^*|) \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ . Therefore,

$$\gamma(B_1, B_2)\gamma(B_2, B_3)\gamma(B_3, B_1) = -\frac{X(x_2) Y_1(x_1^*) X(x_3) Y_2(x_2^*) X(x_1) Y_3(x_3^*)}{X(x_1) Y_1(x_2^*) X(x_2) Y_2(x_3^*) X(x_3) Y_3(x_1^*)} = 1.$$




Figure 3: Two descriptions of the cycle  $C$  of weight 6 in  $\mathcal{G}_M$  in the proof of Lemma 6.10. The cycle  $C$  can be identified with a 6-cycle in  $G_M$ , where solid dots represent transversal bases and hollow dots represent almost-transversal bases of  $M$ .

Now, we prove the case (ii). For some  $x_1, x_2, x_3 \in B_1$ , we have  $B_2 = B_1 \triangle \{x_1, x_1^*\}$ ,  $B_3 = B_1 \triangle \{x_1, x_1^*, x_2, x_2^*, x_3, x_3^*\}$ , and  $B_4 = B_1 \triangle \{x_2, x_2^*, x_3, x_3^*\}$ ; see Figure 3(right).

Suppose that  $D := B_1 \triangle \{x_1, x_1^*, x_2, x_2^*\}$  is a basis. Then  $B_1 \triangle \{x_2, x_2^*\}$  is not a basis since  $C$  is irreducible. By Lemma 3.2,  $DB_1$  and  $DB_4$  are edges of weight 2 in  $\mathcal{G}_M$ . Then by Lemma 6.7 and the case (i), we have  $\prod_{i=1}^k \gamma(B_i, B_{i+1}) = 1$ . Thus, we can assume that  $B_1 \triangle \{x_1, x_1^*, x_2, x_2^*\}$  is not a basis. Similarly, we can assume that none of  $B_1 \triangle \{x_1, x_1^*, x_3, x_3^*\}$ ,  $B_1 \triangle \{x_2, x_2^*\}$ , and  $B_1 \triangle \{x_3, x_3^*\}$  is a basis. Then for each  $(i, j) \in [3]^2 \setminus \{(2, 3), (3, 2)\}$ , neither  $B_1 - x_i + x_j^*$  nor  $B_3 + x_i - x_j^*$  is a basis.

Let  $X_1, X_2, X_3, Y_1, Y_2, Y_3 \in \mathcal{C}$  be vectors such that  $\underline{X}_1 \subseteq B_1 + x_1$ ,  $\underline{X}_2 \subseteq B_2 + x_2^*$ ,  $\underline{X}_3 \subseteq B_3 + x_2$ ,  $\underline{Y}_1 \subseteq B_3 + x_1^*$ ,  $\underline{Y}_2 \subseteq B_4 + x_2$ , and  $\underline{Y}_3 \subseteq B_1 + x_2^*$ . Because of the previous observations on non-bases of  $M$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(X_1, Y_1) &= (-1)^{\chi(x_1)} X_1(x_1) Y_1(x_1^*) + (-1)^{\chi(x_1^*)} X_1(x_1^*) Y_1(x_1) \in N_F, \\ \omega(X_2, Y_2) &= (-1)^{\chi(x_2^*)} X_2(x_2^*) Y_2(x_2) + (-1)^{\chi(x_3)} X_2(x_3) Y_2(x_3^*) \in N_F, \\ \omega(X_3, Y_3) &= (-1)^{\chi(x_2)} X_3(x_2) Y_3(x_2^*) + (-1)^{\chi(x_3^*)} X_3(x_3^*) Y_3(x_3) \in N_F. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $\gamma(B_1, B_2)\gamma(B_2, B_3) = \gamma(B_1, B_4)\gamma(B_4, B_3)$ . □

**Lemma 6.11.** *Let  $C$  be an irreducible cycle of weight 8 in  $\mathcal{G}_M$ . Then  $C \simeq B_1 B_2 B_3 B_4 B_1$  for some bases  $B_1, \dots, B_4$  such that*

- (i)  $B_2 = U + x_1^* + x_2^* + x_3 + x_4$ ,  $B_3 = U + x_1^* + x_2^* + x_3^* + x_4^*$ , and  $B_4 = U + x_1 + x_2 + x_3^* + x_4^*$ , where  $x_1, \dots, x_4$  are distinct elements of  $B_1$  and  $U := B_1 \setminus \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ .
- (ii)  $V(\mathcal{G}_M) \cap \{U \cup X : X \subseteq \{x_1, \dots, x_4, x_1^*, \dots, x_4^*\}\} = \{B_1, \dots, B_4\}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $C'$  be an irreducible cycle homotopic to  $C$ , which maximizes the number of edges  $e \in E(C')$  such that  $\eta(e) = 2$ . We will show that  $C'$  satisfies the desired properties (i) and (ii).

**Claim 6.11.1.** *For each  $B \in V(C')$ , there are no three consecutive vertices  $D_1, D_2, D_3$  in  $C'$  such that  $\eta(D_1 D_2) = \eta(D_2 D_3) = 1$ ,  $\text{dist}_M(B, D_1) = \text{dist}_M(B, D_3) = 3$ , and  $\text{dist}_M(B, D_2) = 4$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that such vertices  $D_1, D_2, D_3$  exist. By our choice of  $C'$ ,  $D_1 D_3$  is not an edge in  $\mathcal{G}_M$ . Thus, there is a basis  $D' \neq D_2$  such that  $\text{dist}_M(D_1, D') = \text{dist}_M(D_3, D') = 1$ . Then  $\text{dist}_M(B, D') = 2$ . Let  $C''$  be a cycle obtained from  $C'$  by replacing a vertex  $D_2$  with  $D'$ . Then  $C''$  is homotopic to  $C'$  and it is reducible by Lemma 4.6, contradicting that  $C'$  is irreducible. ■

**Claim 6.11.2.** *There are no edges  $D_1 D_2, D_3 D_4$  of  $C'$  such that  $\eta(D_1 D_2) = 1$ ,  $\eta(D_3 D_4) = 2 = \text{dist}_M(D_4, D_1)$ , and  $\text{dist}_M(D_2, D_3) = 3$ .*



*Proof.* Suppose such edges exist. Then for some  $y_1, \dots, y_4 \in D_1$ , we have  $D_2 = D_1 \Delta \{y_3, y_3^*\}$ ,  $D_3 = D_1 \Delta \{y_1, y_1^*, \dots, y_4, y_4^*\}$ , and  $D_4 = D_1 \Delta \{y_1, y_1^*, y_2, y_2^*\}$ . Let  $S := D_1 + y_3^*$  and  $T := D_4 + y_3^*$ . Then by Lemma 3.4, there are circuits  $c \subseteq S$  and  $c' \subseteq T$ .

Suppose that  $D' := T - y_3 = D_4 \Delta \{y_3, y_3^*\}$  is a basis. Then  $|D' \setminus D_2| = |\{x_1^*, x_2^*\}| = 2$ . Let  $O$  be a cycle obtained from  $C'$  by replacing an edge  $D_3 D_4$  with a path  $D_3 D' D_4$ . Then  $O$  is homotopic to  $C'$  and it is reducible by Lemma 4.6. It contradicts that  $C'$  is irreducible. Thus,  $T - y_3$  is not a basis.

Suppose that  $D'' := (T - y_3) \Delta \{y_1, y_1^*\} = D_4 \Delta \{y_1, y_1^*, y_3, y_3^*\}$  is a basis. Then  $|D' \setminus D_2| = 1$  and  $|D' \setminus D_i| = 2$  for  $i \in \{1, 3, 4\}$ . Hence  $C'$  is generated by four cycles of weight at most six, a contradiction. Thus,  $(T - y_3) \Delta \{y_1, y_1^*\}$  is not a basis.

By Lemma 3.2,  $T - y_1^*$  is not a basis. Similarly,  $T - y_2^*$  is not a basis. Therefore,  $c' \subseteq T - \{y_1^*, y_2^*, y_3\} \subseteq S$  by Lemma 3.4. Note that  $y_3 \in c \subseteq S$  and so  $c \neq c'$ . It contradicts Lemma 3.4.  $\blacksquare$

By Claims 6.11.1 and 6.11.2,  $C' = B_1 B_2 B_3 B_4 B_1$  such that  $\eta(B_i B_{i+1}) = 2$  for all  $i$ , where  $B_5 := B_1$ . Then one can denote by  $B_2 = U + x_1^* + x_2^* + x_3 + x_4$ ,  $B_3 = U + x_1^* + x_2^* + x_3^* + x_4^*$ , and  $B_4 = U + x_1 + x_2 + x_3^* + x_4^*$  for some elements  $x_1, \dots, x_4$  of  $B_1$  and  $U := B_1 \setminus \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ . As  $C'$  is irreducible,  $B_1 \Delta \{x_i, x_i^*, x_j, x_j^*\}$  is not a basis for each  $1 \leq i \leq 2$  and  $3 \leq j \leq 4$ .

**Claim 6.11.3.**  $B_1 \Delta \{x_1, x_1^*\}$  is not a basis.

*Proof.* Suppose to the contrary that  $B_1 \Delta \{x_1, x_1^*\}$  is a basis. Since  $C'$  is irreducible,  $B_4 \Delta \{x_1, x_1^*\}$  is not a basis. Let  $S = B_1 + x_1^*$  and  $T = B_4 + x_1^*$ . Let  $c$  and  $c'$  be circuits of  $M$  such that  $c \subseteq S$  and  $c' \subseteq T$ . Then  $x_1 \in c$  because  $S - x_1 = B_1 \Delta \{x_1, x_1^*\}$  is a basis. Since  $T - x_1 = B_4 \Delta \{x_1, x_1^*\}$  is not a basis,  $x_1 \notin c'$ . Hence  $c \neq c'$ . Because  $(T - x_1) \Delta \{x_3, x_3^*\} = B_1 \Delta \{x_1, x_1^*, x_4, x_4^*\}$  is not a basis,  $T - x_3^*$  is not a basis by Lemma 3.2. Similarly,  $T - x_4^*$  is not a basis. Hence  $c' \subseteq T - x_3^* - x_4^* \subseteq S$ , contradicting Lemma 3.4.  $\blacksquare$

Similarly, none of  $B_i \Delta \{x_j, x_j^*\}$  with  $i, j \in [4]$  is a basis. Therefore, (ii) holds.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.12.** Let  $C = B_1 B_2 \dots B_k B_1$  be a cycle of weight 8 in  $\mathcal{G}_M$ . Then  $\sum_{i=1}^k \gamma(B_i, B_{i+1}) = 1$ , where  $B_{k+1} := B_1$ .

*Proof.* We may assume that  $C$  is irreducible by Lemmas 6.7 and 6.10. By Lemma 6.11, we can assume that  $C = B_1 B_2 B_3 B_4 B_1$  for some bases  $B_1, \dots, B_4$  such that  $B_2 = U + x_1^* + x_2^* + x_3 + x_4$ ,  $B_3 = U + x_1^* + x_2^* + x_3^* + x_4^*$ , and  $B_4 = U + x_1 + x_2 + x_3^* + x_4^*$ , where  $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4$  are distinct elements in  $B_1$  and  $U := B_1 \setminus \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ .

Let  $S_1 = B_1 + x_1^*$ ,  $S_2 = B_2 + x_1$ ,  $S_3 = B_3 + x_3^*$ , and  $S_4 = B_4 + x_3$  for some  $x_1, \dots, x_4 \in B_1$ . Let  $T_1 = B_1 + x_3^*$ ,  $T_2 = B_2 + x_3$ ,  $T_3 = B_3 + x_1^*$ , and  $T_4 = B_4 + x_1$ . Then  $S_1 \Delta T_3 = S_2 \Delta T_4 = \{x_3, x_3^*, x_4, x_4^*\}$  and  $S_3 \Delta T_1 = S_4 \Delta T_2 = \{x_1, x_1^*, x_2, x_2^*\}$ . Let  $X_i$  and  $Y_i$  be vectors in  $\mathcal{C}$  such that  $\underline{X}_i \subseteq S_i$  and  $\underline{Y}_i \subseteq T_i$ . By Lemmas 6.11 and 3.4,  $\text{supp}(X_i) = \text{supp}(Y_{i+2})$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq 4$ , where the subscripts are read modulo 4. Thus,  $X_i = c_i Y_{i+2}$  for some  $c_i \in F^\times$ . Therefore, for some  $m \in \{0, 1\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(B_1, B_2) \gamma(B_2, B_3) &= (-1)^m \frac{X_1(x_2) X_2(x_1) X_3(x_4) X_4(x_3)}{X_1(x_1^*) X_2(x_2^*) X_3(x_3^*) X_4(x_4^*)} \\ &= (-1)^m \frac{Y_1(x_4) Y_2(x_3) Y_3(x_2) Y_4(x_1)}{Y_1(x_3^*) Y_2(x_4^*) Y_3(x_1^*) Y_4(x_2^*)} = \gamma(B_1, B_4) \gamma(B_4, B_3). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

**Proposition 6.13.** For two bases  $B$  and  $B'$  of  $M$ , let  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  be two paths in the basis graph  $G_M$  from  $B$  to  $B'$ . Then  $\gamma(P_1) = \gamma(P_2)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $C$  be a cycle in  $G_M$  consisting of  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ , and let  $C'$  be the corresponding cycle in  $\mathcal{G}_M$ . By Homotopy Theorem 4.3 and Lemmas 6.7, 6.10, 6.12,  $\gamma(C) = \gamma(C') = 1$ . Thus,  $\gamma(P_1) = \gamma(P_2)$  by Lemma 6.5.  $\square$

By Proposition 6.13, the function  $\varphi : \mathcal{T}_n \sqcup \mathcal{A}_n \rightarrow F$  described below Definition 6.4 is well defined. We finally show that  $\varphi$  satisfies the restricted Grassmann-Plücker relations ( $\diamond'$ ).

**Theorem 6.14.**  $\varphi$  is a restricted  $G$ - $P$  function.

*Proof.* By Lemma 6.6,  $\varphi$  satisfies (Sym).

Let  $S \in \binom{E}{n+1}$  and  $T \in \binom{E}{n-1}$  be sets such that  $S$  contains exactly one skew pair, say  $\{x, x^*\}$ , and  $T$  has no skew pair. Let  $\{y, y^*\}$  be the unique skew pair not contained in  $T$ , and let  $T' := T + \{y, y^*\}$ . We claim that  $\varphi$  satisfies ( $\diamond$ ). We can assume that for some  $z \in S \setminus T$ , both  $S - z$  and  $T + z$  are bases of  $M$ . Then by Lemma 3.2,  $S - x$  or  $S - x^*$  is a transversal basis of  $M$ . Also,  $T + y$  or  $T + y^*$  is a transversal basis. Hence there are  $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $\underline{X} \subseteq S$  and  $\underline{Y} \subseteq T'$ .

By symmetry, we can assume that  $S - x$  and  $T + y$  are bases. Then  $\varphi(S - x)$ ,  $\varphi(T + y)$ ,  $X(x)$ , and  $Y(y^*)$  are nonzero in  $F$ . For each  $z \in S \setminus T$ , we have  $\frac{\varphi(S-z)}{\varphi(S-x)} = \gamma(S - x, S - z) = (-1)^{\chi(x) + \chi(z) + |S \setminus x| + |S \setminus z|} \frac{X(z)}{X(x)}$ . We also have

$$\frac{\varphi(T + y^*)}{\varphi(T + y)} = \gamma(T + y, T + y^*) = (-1)^{\chi(y) + \chi(y^*) + |T' \setminus y| + |T' \setminus y^*|} \frac{Y(y)}{Y(y^*)} = (-1)^{|T \setminus y| + |T \setminus y^*|} \frac{Y(y)}{Y(y^*)}.$$

For  $z \in S \setminus T'$ , let  $U_z := T + y + z$  and let  $Y_z$  be a vector in  $\mathcal{C}$  such that  $\underline{Y}_z \subseteq U_z$ . Since  $\omega(Y, Y_z) = (-1)^{\chi(y^*)} Y(y^*) Y_z(y) + (-1)^{\chi(z^*)} Y(z^*) Y_z(z) \in N_F$ , we have

$$\frac{\varphi(T + z)}{\varphi(T + y)} = (-1)^{\chi(y) + \chi(z) + |U_z \setminus y| + |U_z \setminus z|} \frac{Y_z(y)}{Y_z(z)} = (-1)^{|T \setminus y| + |T \setminus z|} \frac{Y(z^*)}{Y(y^*)}.$$

Let  $c := (-1)^{\chi(x) + |S \setminus x| + |T \setminus y|} \frac{\varphi(S-x)\varphi(T+y)}{X(x)Y(y^*)} \in F^\times$ . Note that  $X(z) = 0$  if  $z \in E \setminus S$ , and  $Y(z^*) = 0$  if  $z \in T$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{z \in S \setminus T} (-1)^{|S \setminus z| + |T \setminus z|} \varphi(S - z) \varphi(T + z) &= c \sum_{z \in S \setminus T} (-1)^{\chi(z)} X(z) Y(z^*) \\ &= c \sum_{z \in E} (-1)^{\chi(z)} X(z) Y(z^*) \in N_F. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

### 6.3 Equivalence

In Section 6.1, we constructed an antisymmetric  $F$ -circuit set from an antisymmetric  $F$ -matroid. Conversely, we built an antisymmetric  $F$ -matroid from an antisymmetric  $F$ -circuit set in Section 6.2. By definition, these two constructions are the reverse step of each other, and thus we deduce Theorem 6.1 as follows.

*Proof of Theorem 6.1.* Let  $M = [\varphi]$  be an antisymmetric  $F$ -matroid on  $E = [n] \cup [n]^*$ , and let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the antisymmetric  $F$ -circuit set constructed from  $\varphi$  in the sense of Section 6.1. Let  $\varphi'$  be a restricted G-P function constructed from  $\mathcal{C}$  in the sense of Section 6.2. Then the underlying matroids of  $\varphi$ ,  $\varphi'$ , and  $\mathcal{C}$  are the same. Let  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  be bases such that  $|B_1 \setminus B_2| = 1$ , and let  $X \in \mathcal{C}$  be a vector whose support  $\underline{X}$  is a subset of  $S := B_1 \cup B_2$ . We denote by  $\{x\} = S \setminus B_1$  and  $\{y\} = S \setminus B_2$ . Then

$$\frac{\varphi(B_2)}{\varphi(B_1)} = (-1)^{\chi(x) + \chi(y) + |S \setminus x| + |S \setminus y|} \frac{X(y)}{X(x)} = \frac{\varphi'(B_2)}{\varphi'(B_1)}.$$

Therefore,  $M = [\varphi']$ .

Let  $\mathcal{C}'$  be the antisymmetric  $F$ -circuit set constructed from  $\varphi'$ . Then similarly we can deduce that  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}'$ . Thus, there is a natural bijection between antisymmetric  $F$ -matroids and antisymmetric  $F$ -circuit sets.  $\square$

Theorem 6.1 implies the image of the parameterization  $\Phi$ , defined in Section 2, of the Lagrangian Grassmannian is exactly the solutions of the restricted G-P relations ( $\diamond$ ). We point out that by Proposition 3.8, the underlying antisymmetric matroids  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  of  $W \in \text{Lag}_k(n, 2n)$  and  $\Phi(W) \in \mathbb{P}^{2^{n-2}(4+\binom{n}{2})}(k)$  are different, but  $\mathcal{B}(M_1) = \mathcal{B}(M_2)^*$ . Note that  $W^* := \{X^* : X \in W\}$  is also a Lagrangian subspace in  $k^E$ , where  $X^* \in k^E$  such that  $X^*(i) = X(i^*)$  for each  $i \in E$ , and  $M(W^*) = M_2$ . Thus, Theorem 6.1 suffices to conclude the following.

**Corollary 6.15.** *Let  $k$  be a field. The Lagrangian Grassmannian  $\text{Lag}_k(n, 2n)$  is parameterized by  $\Phi$  into the projective space  $\mathbb{P}^{2^{n-2}(4+\binom{n}{2})}(k)$ , and the image of  $\Phi$  is cut out by the restricted Grassmann-Plücker relations ( $\diamond$ ).  $\square$*

## 7 Analogue of Tutte's theorem

The following theorem is a fundamental result in matroid theory and linear algebra. To our best knowledge, it was first proved by Tutte [25] in terms of circuits and chain-group representations of matroids. We refer to [3] for the following statement and its proof. A *3-term Grassmann-Plücker relation* is a Grammann-Plücker relation (†) satisfying  $|S \setminus T| = 3$ .

**Theorem 7.1.** *For a field  $k$ , let  $p \in \mathbb{P}^{\binom{n}{r}-1}(k)$  be a point. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (i)  $p$  satisfies all Grassmann-Plücker relations.
- (ii)  $p$  satisfies all 3-term Grassmann-Plücker relations and the support of  $p$  forms a matroid.
- (iii) There is an  $r \times n$  matrix  $A$  over  $k$  such that  $p_B = \det(A[r, B])$  for all  $B \in \binom{[n]}{r}$ .

Now we show Theorem 1.1, an analog of Tutte's theorem for antisymmetric matroids and Lagrangian Grassmannians. It is restated as Theorem 7.3.

**Definition 7.2.** A *weak restricted G-P function* on  $E = [n] \cup [n]^*$  with coefficients in a tract  $F$  is a nontrivial function  $\varphi : \mathcal{T}_n \sqcup \mathcal{A}_n \rightarrow F$  such that the support of  $\varphi$  form the set of bases of an antisymmetric matroid on  $E$  and  $\varphi$  satisfies (Sym) and the following weaker replacement of (rGP):

(rGP') For  $S \in \binom{E}{n+1}$  and  $T \in \binom{E}{n-1}$  such that  $S$  contains exactly one skew pair and  $T$  has no skew pair, if  $|S \setminus T| \leq 4$ , then

$$\sum_{x \in S \setminus T} (-1)^{|S \setminus x| + |T \setminus x|} \varphi(S - x) \varphi(T + x) \in N_F.$$

A *weak antisymmetric F-matroid* is an equivalence class of weak restricted G-P functions.

**Theorem 7.3.** *For a field  $k$ , let  $\varphi \in \mathbb{P}^{2^{n-2}(4+\binom{n}{2})-1}(k)$ . Then the following are equivalent.*

- (i)  $\varphi$  is a restricted G-P function.
- (ii)  $\varphi$  is a weak restricted G-P function.
- (iii) There is an  $n \times E$  matrix  $A$  over  $F$  such that the row-space of  $A$  is in  $\text{Lag}(n, 2n)$  and  $\varphi(B) = \det(A[n, B])$  for all  $B \in \mathcal{T}_n \sqcup \mathcal{A}_n$ .

Note that in Theorem 7.3(iii), the row-space of  $A = [A_1 \mid A_2]$  is Lagrangian if and only if  $A_1 A_2^t$  is symmetric. We show two lemmas before proving Theorem 7.3.

**Lemma 7.4.** *Let  $M$  be an antisymmetric matroid on  $[n] \cup [n]^*$  such that  $[n]$  is a basis. Let  $X, Y \subseteq [n]$  be sets such that  $|X| = |Y| \geq 2$  and  $|X \setminus Y| \leq 1$ . If  $[n] - X + Y^*$  is a basis, then there is  $Z \subseteq X \cap Y$  such that  $|X \setminus Z| = |Y \setminus Z| \in \{1, 2\}$  and  $[n] - Z + Z^*$  is a basis.*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $X = Y$ . By (Exch),  $[n] - (X - e) + (Y - f)^*$  is a basis for some  $e, f \in X$ . We may assume that  $e \neq f$ . Then by Lemma 3.2,  $[n] - (X - e) + (X - e)^*$  or  $[n] - (X - e - f) + (X - e - f)^*$  is a basis. Therefore, we may assume that  $X \neq Y$ . We denote by  $\{x\} = X - Y$  and  $\{y\} = Y - X$ . By (Exch),  $[n] - (X - x) + (Y - g)^*$  is a basis for some  $g \in Y$ . We may assume that  $g \neq y$ . Then by Lemma 3.2,  $[n] - (X - x) + (Y - y)^*$  or  $[n] - (X - x - g) + (Y - y - g)^*$  is a basis.  $\square$

**Lemma 7.5.** *For  $S \subseteq [n]$ , let  $\Psi_S : F^E \rightarrow F^E$  be a function such that for each  $i \in [n]$ ,*

$$\mathbf{e}_i \mapsto \begin{cases} \mathbf{e}_i & \text{if } i \notin S, \\ \mathbf{e}_{i^*} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{e}_{i^*} \mapsto \begin{cases} \mathbf{e}_{i^*} & \text{if } i \notin S, \\ -\mathbf{e}_i & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

*Then  $\Psi_S$  induces a bijection from  $\text{Lag}(n, 2n)$  to itself such that for every  $W \in \text{Lag}(n, 2n)$ , a set  $B \in \mathcal{T}_n \cup \mathcal{A}_n$  is a basis of  $M(W)$  if and only if  $T \Delta (S \cup S^*)$  is a basis of  $M(\Psi_S(W))$ .*  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 7.3.* Obviously, (i) implies (ii). By Corollary 6.15, (i) and (iii) are equivalent. Hence we now prove that (ii) implies (iii).

Let  $\varphi$  be a weak restricted G-P function on  $E$  and let  $M$  be its underlying antisymmetric matroid. By Lemma 7.5, we may assume that  $B_0 := [n]$  is a basis of  $M$ . Let  $a_{ij} = (-1)^{n-i} \varphi(B_0 - i + j^*) / \varphi(B_0)$  for all  $i, j \in [n]$ . By (Sym), we have  $a_{ij} = a_{ji}$  and thus  $\Sigma := (a_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$  is a symmetric matrix.

We claim that

$$\det(\Sigma[X, Y]) = (-1)^{kn + \binom{k}{2} + \sum_{x \in X} x} \varphi(B_0 - X + Y^*).$$

for all  $X, Y \subseteq [n]$  such that  $|X| = |Y| =: k$  and  $|X \setminus Y| \leq 1$ . Note that the row-space of an  $n \times E$  matrix  $A := [I_n | \Sigma]$  is Lagrangian, and  $\det(A[n, B_0 - X + Y^*]) = (-1)^{kn + \binom{k}{2} + \sum_{x \in X} x} \det(\Sigma[X, Y])$ . Thus, the claim suffices to conclude (iii).

We prove the claim by induction on  $|X|$ . By our choice of  $\Sigma$ , we may assume that  $|X| \geq 2$

**Case I.**  $X = Y$ . By relabelling, we can assume that  $X = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ . Let  $m := kn + \binom{k}{2} + \binom{k+1}{2}$ .

Suppose that none of  $B_0 - (X - 1) + (X - i)^*$  with  $i \in [m]$  is a basis. Then by (Exch),  $B_0 - X + X^*$  is not a basis. Also,  $\det(A[X - 1, X - i]) = 0$  for all  $i \in X$  by the induction hypothesis, and thus  $\det(A[X, X]) = 0 = \varphi(B_0 - X + X^*) / \varphi(B_0)$ . Therefore, we may assume that  $B_0 - (X - 1) + (X - j)^*$  is a basis for some  $j \in [m]$ . By Lemma 7.4, there is  $S \subseteq [k] - \{1, j\}$  such that  $\{2, \dots, k\} \setminus S \in \{1, 2\}$  and  $[n] - S + S^*$  is a basis. By relabelling, we may assume that  $S$  is either  $[k] \setminus \{1, 2\}$  or  $[k] \setminus \{1, 2, 3\}$ .

**Subcase I.1.**  $S = [k] \setminus \{1, 2\}$ . Applying the 3-term restricted G-P relation to  $\{1, 1^*, 2^*\} + (B_0 - X + S^*)$  and  $\{2\} + (B_0 - X + S^*)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(B_0 - S + S^*) \varphi(B_0 - X + X^*) + \varphi(B_0 - (S + 1) + (S + 1)^*) \varphi(B_0 - (S + 2) + (S + 2)^*) \\ - \varphi(B_0 - (S + 1) + (S + 2)^*) \varphi(B_0 - (S + 2) + (S + 1)^*) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

By the induction hypothesis, for  $i, j \in [n]$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\varphi(B_0 - S + S^*)}{\varphi(B_0)} &= (-1)^{m - 2n - (2k - 3) - 3} \det(\Sigma[S, S]), \\ \frac{\varphi(B_0 - (S + i) + (S + j)^*)}{\varphi(B_0)} &= (-1)^{m - n - (k - 1) - i} \det(\Sigma[S + i, S + j]). \end{aligned}$$

Then by the generalized Laplace expansion,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\varphi(B_0 - X + X^*)}{\varphi(B_0)} &= \frac{(-1)^m}{\det(\Sigma[S, S])} (\det(\Sigma[S + 1, S + 1]) \det(\Sigma[S + 2, S + 2]) \\ &\quad - \det(\Sigma[S + 1, S + 2]) \det(\Sigma[S + 2, S + 1])) \\ &= (-1)^m \det(\Sigma[X, X]). \end{aligned}$$

**Subcase I.2.**  $S = [k] \setminus \{1, 2, 3\}$ . By the induction hypothesis, for proper subsets  $I, J$  of  $[3]$  such that  $|I| = |J|$  and  $|I \setminus J| \leq 1$ , we have  $\varphi(B_0 - (S + I) + (S + J)^*) / \varphi(B_0) = (-1)^{m - t(I)} \det(A[S + I, S + J])$ , where  $t(I) := (n + k)(3 - |I|) + \binom{|I| + 1}{2} + (6 - \sum_{i \in I} i)$ . Then by the 4-term restricted G-P relation applied to  $\{1, 1^*, 2^*, 3^*\} + (B_0 - X + S^*)$  and  $\{2, 3\} + (B_0 - X + S^*)$  and the generalized Laplace expansion, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\varphi(B_0 - X + X^*)}{\varphi(B_0)} &= \frac{(-1)^m}{\det(\Sigma[S, S])} (\det(\Sigma[S + 1, S + 1]) \det(\Sigma[S + 2 + 3, S + 2 + 3]) \\ &\quad - \det(\Sigma[S + 1, S + 2]) \det(\Sigma[S + 2 + 3, S + 1 + 3]) \\ &\quad + \det(\Sigma[S + 1, S + 3]) \det(\Sigma[S + 2 + 3, S + 1 + 2])) \\ &= (-1)^m \det(\Sigma[X, X]). \end{aligned}$$

**Case II.**  $|X \setminus Y| = 1$ . By relabelling, we may assume that  $X = [k] \setminus \{1\}$  and  $Y = [k] \setminus \{2\}$ . Let  $m := (k - 1)n + \binom{k-1}{2} + \binom{k}{2} - 1$ .

Suppose that none of  $[n] - (X - i) + (Y - 1)^*$  with  $i \in X$  is a basis. By (Exch),  $B_0 - X + Y^*$  is not a basis. For each  $i \in X$ ,  $\det(A[X - i, Y - 1]) = 0$  by the induction hypothesis. Hence

$\det(A[X, Y]) = 0 = \varphi(B_0 - X + Y^*)/\varphi(B_0)$ . Therefore, we may assume that  $B_0 - (X - j) + (Y - 1)^*$  is a basis for some  $j \in X$ . By Lemma 7.4, there is  $S \subseteq [k] - \{1, 2, j\}$  such that  $|(X - j) \setminus S| \in \{1, 2\}$  and  $[n] - S + S^*$  is a basis. By relabelling, we may assume that  $S$  is either  $[k] \setminus \{1, 2, 3\}$  or  $[k] \setminus \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ .

**Subcase II.1.**  $S = [k] \setminus \{1, 2, 3\}$ . By the induction hypothesis, we have  $\varphi(B_0 - S + S^*) = (-1)^{m-2n-(2k-3)-5} \det(\Sigma[S, S])$  and  $\varphi(B_0 - (S + i) + (S + j)^*) = (-1)^{m-n-(k-1)+i} \det(\Sigma[S + i, S + j])$  for each  $i, j \in [3]$ . Then by the 3-term restricted G–P relation applied to  $\{1, 2, 1^*, 3^*\} + (B_0 - [k] + S^*)$  and  $\{1, 3\} + (B_0 - [k] + S^*)$  and the generalized Laplace expansion, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\varphi(B_0 - X + Y^*)}{\varphi(B_0)} &= \frac{(-1)^m}{\det(\Sigma[S, S])} (\det(\Sigma[S + 2, S + 1]) \det(\Sigma[S + 3, S + 3]) \\ &\quad + \det(\Sigma[S + 2, S + 3]) \det(\Sigma[S + 3, S + 1])) \\ &= (-1)^m \det(\Sigma[X, Y]). \end{aligned}$$

**Subcase II.2.**  $S = [k] \setminus \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ . By the induction hypothesis, we have  $\varphi(B_0 - S + S^*) = (-1)^{m-3n-(3k-6)-9} \det(\Sigma[S, S])$ . Also,  $\varphi(B_0 - (S + 2) + (S + i)^*) = (-1)^{m-2n-(2k-3)+7} \det(\Sigma[S + 2, S + i])$  for each  $i \in [4]$ , and  $\varphi(B_0 - (S + 3 + 4) + (S + i + j)^*) = (-1)^{m-n-(k-1)+2} \det(\Sigma[S + 3 + 4, S + i + j])$  for  $i \in [4]$  and  $j \in \{3, 4\}$ . Then by the 4-term restricted G–P relation applied to  $\{1, 2, 1^*, 3^*, 4^*\} + (B_0 - [m] + S^*)$  and  $\{1, 3, 4\} + (B_0 - [m] + S^*)$  and the generalized Laplace expansion, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\varphi(B_0 - X + Y^*)}{\varphi(B_0)} &= \frac{(-1)^m}{\det(\Sigma[S, S])} (\det(\Sigma[S + 2, S + 1]) \det(\Sigma[S + 3 + 4, S + 3 + 4]) \\ &\quad + \det(\Sigma[S + 2, S + 3]) \det(\Sigma[S + 3 + 4, S + 1 + 4]) \\ &\quad + \det(\Sigma[S + 2, S + 3]) \det(\Sigma[S + 3 + 4, S + 1 + 3])) \\ &= (-1)^m \det(\Sigma[X, Y]). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

If we moderated the definition of weak restricted G–P functions by replacing the 3-/4-term restricted G–P relations with the 3-term restricted G–P relations, then Theorem 7.3 does not hold anymore; see Example 7.6. We remark that an analogue of Tutte’s theorem holds for even symmetric matroids and Lagrangian orthogonal Grassmannians [3].

**Example 7.6.** Let  $M = ([4] \cup [4]^*, \mathcal{B})$  be an antisymmetric matroid such that

$$\mathcal{B} := \{[4]\} \cup \{i^* j^* k l : ijkl = [4]\} \cup \left\{ i i^* j k : i j k \in \binom{[4]}{3} \right\} \cup \left\{ i i^* j k^* : i j k \in \binom{[4]}{3} \right\}.$$

Let  $\varphi : \mathcal{T}_n \sqcup \mathcal{A}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$  be a function whose support is  $\text{supp}(\varphi) = \mathcal{B}$ . Then  $\varphi$  satisfies all 3-term restricted G–P relations, but it does not satisfy 4-term restricted G–P relations. More precisely, it does not satisfy a 4-term restricted G–P relation ( $\diamond'$ ) applied to  $S = \{1, 2, 2^*, 3^*, 4^*\}$  and  $T = \{1^* 2, 3\}$ . Both  $S - x$  and  $T + x$  are bases for each  $x \in \{2^*, 3^*, 4^*\}$ , and  $S - 1$  is not a basis of  $M$ . Hence  $\sum_{x \in S-T} \varphi(S - x) \varphi(T + x) = 3 \neq 0$ .

## 8 Concluding remarks

Finally, we propose several questions motivated by matroid theory.

- By Lemma 3.13, the class of antisymmetric matroids representable over a field  $k$  is closed under taking minors. Thus, it is natural to ask for the excluded minors for antisymmetric matroids representable over a certain field. The easiest case is definitely the binary field  $\mathbb{F}_2$ , and we note that an antisymmetric matroid  $([2] \cup [2]^*, \mathcal{T}_2 \cup \mathcal{A}_2)$  is non-binary.
- The 3-term Grassmannian-Plücker relations provide a weaker notion of matroids over tracts, called *weak  $F$ -matroids* [2]. Remarkably, weak  $F$ -matroids are  $F$ -matroids in most interesting tracts  $F$  such as all partial fields, the sign hyperfield  $\mathbb{S}$ , the tropical hyperfield  $\mathbb{T}$ . Thus, it would be interesting to ask whether weak antisymmetric  $F$ -matroids are antisymmetric  $F$ -matroids if  $F = \mathbb{S}$  or  $\mathbb{T}$ . Theorem 7.3 proves it if  $F$  is a field, and the proof can be generalized for partial fields.

- It would be appealing to extend results on oriented matroids to oriented antisymmetric matroids, such as the topological representation theorem. It first demands the hyperplane or geometric lattice axiom for antisymmetric matroids.
- We reveal the connections of matroids and antisymmetric matroids in Sections 3.3 and 5.3. We showed that every matroid can be identified with an antisymmetric matroid extending its representability. We ask a kind of inverse question: For an antisymmetric matroid  $M$  on  $E = [n] \cup [n]^*$ , is there a matroid  $N$  on  $E$  such that  $\mathcal{B}(M) = \mathcal{B}(N) \cap (\mathcal{T}_n \cup \mathcal{A}_n)$ ? This question is true for antisymmetric matroids representable over fields, and it is motivated by *enveloping matroids* in [9, Section 3]. Remark that the same question is open for even symmetric matroids.
- Theorem 3.17 shows that every even symmetric matroid can be obtained from an antisymmetric matroid by discarding almost-transversal bases. It would be interesting to extend this result for general symmetric matroids or to find a counterexample.

## References

- [1] Laura Anderson, *Vectors of matroids over tracts*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **161** (2019), 236–270. MR 3861778
- [2] Matthew Baker and Nathan Bowler, *Matroids over partial hyperstructures*, Adv. Math. **343** (2019), 821–863. MR 3891757
- [3] Matthew Baker and Tong Jin, *Representability of orthogonal matroids over partial fields*, Algebr. Comb. **6** (2023), no. 5, 1301–1311. MR 4668929
- [4] George Balla and Jorge Alberto Olarte, *The tropical symplectic Grassmannian*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN (2023), no. 2, 1036–1072. MR 4537319
- [5] Anders Björner, Michel Las Vergnas, Bernd Sturmfels, Neil White, and Günter M. Ziegler, *Oriented matroids*, second ed., Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 46, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999. MR 1744046
- [6] Tobias Boege, Alessio D’Alì, Thomas Kahle, and Bernd Sturmfels, *The geometry of gaussoids*, Found. Comput. Math. **19** (2019), no. 4, 775–812. MR 3989713
- [7] Richard F. Booth, Alexandre V. Borovik, Israel M. Gelfand, and Neil White, *Oriented Lagrangian matroids*, European J. Combin. **22** (2001), no. 5, 639–656. MR 1845489
- [8] Richard F. Booth, Maria L. Moreira, and Maria R. Pinto, *A circuit axiomatisation of Lagrangian matroids*, Discrete Math. **266** (2003), no. 1-3, 109–118. MR 1991710
- [9] Alexandre V. Borovik, Israel M. Gelfand, and Neil White, *Coxeter matroids*, Progress in Mathematics, vol. 216, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2003. MR 1989953
- [10] André Bouchet, *Greedy algorithm and symmetric matroids*, Math. Program. **38** (1987), no. 2, 147–159. MR 904585
- [11] ———, *Representability of  $\Delta$ -matroids*, Combinatorics (Eger, 1987), Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai, vol. 52, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1988, pp. 167–182. MR 1221555
- [12] Ramaswamy Chandrasekaran and Santosh N. Kabadi, *Pseudomatroids*, Discrete Math. **71** (1988), no. 3, 205–217. MR 959006
- [13] Corrado De Concini, *Symplectic standard tableaux*, Adv. Math. **34** (1979), no. 1, 1–27. MR 547837
- [14] Andreas W. M. Dress and Timothy F. Havel, *Some combinatorial properties of discriminants in metric vector spaces*, Adv. Math. **62** (1986), no. 3, 285–312. MR 866162



- [15] Andreas W. M. Dress and Walter Wenzel, *Grassmann-Plücker relations and matroids with coefficients*, Adv. Math. **86** (1991), no. 1, 68–110. MR 1097028
- [16] ———, *Perfect matroids*, Adv. Math. **91** (1992), no. 2, 158–208. MR 1149622
- [17] ———, *Valuated matroids*, Adv. Math. **93** (1992), no. 2, 214–250. MR 1164708
- [18] James F. Geelen, *Matchings, matroids and unimodular matrices*, ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 1996, Thesis (Ph.D.)–University of Waterloo (Canada). MR 2694410
- [19] Tong Jin and Donggyu Kim, *Orthogonal matroids over tracts*, arXiv preprint [arXiv:2303.05353](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.05353) (2023).
- [20] Stephen B. Maurer, *Matroid basis graphs. I*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B **14** (1973), 216–240. MR 317971
- [21] George J. Minty, *On the axiomatic foundations of the theories of directed linear graphs, electrical networks and network-programming*, J. Math. Mech. **15** (1966), 485–520. MR 188102
- [22] James Oxley, *Matroid theory*, second ed., Oxford Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 21, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2011. MR 2849819
- [23] Felipe Rincón, *Isotropical linear spaces and valuated Delta-matroids*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **119** (2012), no. 1, 14–32. MR 2844079
- [24] Charles Semple and Geoff Whittle, *Partial fields and matroid representation*, Adv. Appl. Math. **17** (1996), no. 2, 184–208. MR 1390574
- [25] William T. Tutte, *A homotopy theorem for matroids. I, II*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **88** (1958), 144–174. MR 101526
- [26] Walter Wenzel,  *$\Delta$ -matroids with the strong exchange conditions*, Appl. Math. Lett. **6** (1993), no. 5, 67–70. MR 1349667
- [27] ———, *Pfaffian forms and  $\Delta$ -matroids*, Discrete Math. **115** (1993), no. 1-3, 253–266. MR 1217634
- [28] ———, *Maurer’s homotopy theory for even  $\Delta$ -matroids and related combinatorial geometries*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **71** (1995), no. 1, 19–59. MR 1335775
- [29] ———, *Pfaffian forms and  $\Delta$ -matroids with coefficients*, Discrete Math. **148** (1996), no. 1-3, 227–252. MR 1368291