

Realizability of matroid quotients

Alessio Borzì

March 7, 2024


Vita quieta, mente lieta, moderata dieta.

Abstract

We characterize the realizability of a quotient of matroids, over an infinite field K , in terms of the realizability over K of a single matroid associated to it, called the *Higgs major*. This result extends to realizability of flag matroids. Further, we provide some applications to the relative realizability problem for Bergman fans in tropical geometry.

1 Introduction

Matroids are central objects in modern combinatorics. A matroid M can be seen as a combinatorial abstraction of a linear space. In a similar way, a *matroid quotient* $M \rightarrow N$ can be seen as a combinatorial abstraction of an inclusion of two linear spaces. Even if M and N are realizable matroids, this does not guarantee that the quotient as a whole is realizable. An example of this was given in [4, §1.7.5. Example 7], and is as follows. Let P be the non-Pappus matroid, and let e be one of the points of the "non-line". Then, the contraction P/e is a matroid quotient of the deletion $P \setminus e$ and both matroids are realizable. However, the matroid quotient $P \setminus e \rightarrow P/e$ is not realizable. It is interesting to note that the non-realizability of the above quotient depends on the non-realizability of the non-Pappus matroid.



The aim of this paper is to characterize the realizability of a matroid quotient in terms of the realizability of a matroid associated to it. We will do so by using the notions of *factorization* and *major* of a matroid quotient, both appearing in a work of Kennedy [20]. The matroid we will associate to a matroid quotient is called the *Higgs major* (see also [21]).

Theorem A (Theorem 3.10). *Let $f : M_1 \twoheadrightarrow M_2$ be a quotient of matroids, and let K be an infinite field. The following statements are equivalent:*

1. *f is realizable over K ,*
2. *the Higgs factorization of f is realizable over K ,*
3. *the Higgs major of f is realizable over K .*

A natural context in which to consider matroid quotients is flag varieties. A sequence of matroid quotients $M_1 \twoheadrightarrow M_2 \twoheadrightarrow \cdots \twoheadrightarrow M_n$ is a *flag matroid*. Flag matroids are related to flag varieties in the same natural way as matroids are related to Grassmannians (see for instance [14] and [9]).

Tropical analogues of flag varieties were studied in [7, 5, 6, 15]. In particular, in [7] a notion of *flag Dressian* was introduced, and in order to compare it

with the tropical flag variety, it was proved that for ground sets of cardinality up to five, all flag matroids are realizable. This result, in the non-valuation case, can be now seen as an immediate consequence of the above theorem (in the form of Corollary 3.11), combined with the fact that matroids with ground set of small enough cardinality are realizable. A similar reasoning might be applied accordingly for the linear degenerate flag Dressian defined in [5].

Another natural application of our main theorem is about relative realizability in tropical geometry (see for instance [19, Question C] and [13, Question 1.1]).

Problem 1.1 (Relative realizability problem). Given a pair of tropical varieties $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ and an algebraic variety X tropicalizing to \mathcal{X} , does there exist a subvariety $Y \subseteq X$ tropicalizing to \mathcal{Y} ?

There are many situations in which the above problem has a negative answer. One of the most famously known is when considering tropical lines contained in a tropical cubic surface. From the Cayley-Salmon theorem we know that a cubic surface contains just 27 lines, while there are examples of tropical cubic surfaces that contain infinitely many tropical lines [25].

Even in the case when \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} in Problem 1.1 are linear, the answer might still be negative. An example of this was provided in [22] in the context of tropical Fano schemes, and further studied in [19]. Our main theorem offers another perspective on this phenomena (see Section 4.1 for more details). Roughly speaking, in a similar way as a tropical linear space has an underlying matroid, an inclusion of tropical linear spaces has an underlying matroid quotient, and the corresponding relative realizability problem is related to the realizability problem of the matroid quotient. We also make some remarks about the nonlinear case in Section 4.3.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we recall some basic notions about matroid quotients and review factorizations and majors, in Section 3 we prove our main result (Theorem 3.10). In Section 4 we discuss some applications to the relative realizability problem in tropical geometry, and finally in Section 5 we list some questions.

Acknowledgements I would like to thank Diane Maclagan, Bernd Sturmfels and Alex Fink for useful discussions and email exchanges. A special thank to Alheydis Geiger for insights about the relative realizability problem for lines on a cubic surface and to Hamdi Dervodeli for sharing his notes on the Veronese embedding. Further thanks to Hannah Markwig and Victoria Schleis for fruitful exchanges that partly inspired this work.

2 Preliminaries

We assume that the reader is familiar with the basics of matroid theory [24].

2.1 Morphisms, strong maps and quotients

Let M_1 and M_2 be matroids on the ground sets E_1 and E_2 respectively.

Definition 2.1. A *morphism* of matroids $f : M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ is a function of sets $f : E_1 \rightarrow E_2$ such that for every flat F of M_2 , $f^{-1}(F)$ is a flat of M_1 .

For a set E and an element o not in E , we will denote $E \cup \{o\}$ by E_o . Let o be an element not in $E_1 \cup E_2$, and let E_{i_o} be the ground set of $M_i \oplus U_{0,1}$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

Definition 2.2. A *strong map* of matroids $f : M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ is a morphism of matroids $f_o : M_1 \oplus U_{0,1} \rightarrow M_2 \oplus U_{0,1}$ such that $f_o(o) = o$.

From the definition, it is easy to see that the composition of two strong maps is a strong map. Therefore, matroids together with strong maps form a category. This category was studied in [17].

There are two natural examples of strong maps of matroids:

- **Extensions:** if M is a matroid on E , and N is an extension of M on $E \cup S$, then the inclusion map $E_o \subseteq (E \cup S)_o$ is a strong map from M to N .
- **Contractions:** if $I \subseteq E$, then the map $f : E_o \rightarrow E_o \setminus I$ defined by $f(o) = o$ and for every $e \in E$

$$f(e) = \begin{cases} e & \text{if } e \notin I, \\ o & \text{if } e \in I, \end{cases}$$

is a strong map from M to M/I .

Definition 2.3. If M_1 and M_2 have the same ground set E , and the identity on E is a morphism of matroids, then M_2 is a *quotient* of M_1 , and the identity map on E_o is the *quotient map* from M_1 to M_2 .

Quotients will be denoted by $M_1 \twoheadrightarrow M_2$ or by $f : M_1 \twoheadrightarrow M_2$ to emphasize the underlying quotient map.

As explained in [21, Section 8.1], in order to study strong maps of matroids, often times one can essentially restrict to study matroids quotients.

2.2 Realizability

Definition 2.4. A rank r matroid M on E is *realizable* (or *representable*) over a field K if there exists a K -vector space V of dimension r and a map $\varphi : E \rightarrow V$ such that $A \subseteq E$ is independent on M if and only if the vectors $\varphi(A)$ are linearly independent.

Let M be a matroid realizable over K , and let $\varphi_i : E \rightarrow V_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ be two maps realizing M . We say that φ_1 and φ_2 are *equivalent* if there exists an isomorphism $\psi : V_1 \rightarrow V_2$ such that $\varphi_2 = \psi \circ \varphi_1$. A *realization* of M over K is an equivalence class of such maps.

If E has cardinality n , a map $\varphi : E \rightarrow V$ realizing M is often regarded as an $r \times n$ matrix A with coefficients in K once a basis of V is fixed. Thus, an equivalence class is obtained by multiplying A on the left by all invertible $r \times r$ matrices. Such an equivalence class can be identified with the r -dimensional vector subspace of K^n generated by the rows of A . This can be also thought as a point in the Grassmannian $\text{Gr}(r, n)$, which can be given by its Plücker coordinates, via the Plücker embedding of $\text{Gr}(r, n)$ into $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{n}{r}-1}$.

Definition 2.5. Let M_i be a matroid on E_i for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. A morphism of matroids $f : M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ is *realizable* over a field K if both M_1 and M_2 are realizable over K , and there exists a map $\varphi_i : E_i \rightarrow V_i$ realizing M_i for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and a linear map $g : V_1 \rightarrow V_2$ such that the following diagram is commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E_1 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} & V_1 \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow g \\ E_2 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_2} & V_2 \end{array}$$

A strong map (or quotient) of matroids is *realizable* over a field K if so is as a morphism of matroids.

Assume that the morphism of matroids $f : M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ is realized over K by the following two commutative diagrams:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E_1 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} & V_1 \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow g \\ E_2 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_2} & V_2 \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} E_1 & \xrightarrow{\varphi'_1} & V'_1 \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow g' \\ E_2 & \xrightarrow{\varphi'_2} & V'_2 \end{array}$$

The above commutative diagrams realizing f are *equivalent* if there exist two isomorphisms $\psi_i : V_i \rightarrow V'_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ such that the following diagram is

commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & E_1 & & \\
 & \varphi_1 \swarrow & | & \searrow \varphi'_1 & \\
 V_1 & \xrightarrow[\sim]{\psi_1} & & \xrightarrow{\quad} & V'_1 \\
 & & \downarrow f & & \\
 & & E_2 & & \\
 & \varphi_2 \swarrow & | & \searrow \varphi'_2 & \\
 V_2 & \xrightarrow[\sim]{\psi_2} & & \xrightarrow{\quad} & V'_2 \\
 & & \downarrow g & & \downarrow g'
 \end{array}$$

A *realization* of $f : M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ over K is an equivalence class of such commutative diagrams.

For example, if E_1 and E_2 are the same set with cardinality n , and the matroid M_i has rank r_i for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, a realization of the quotient $M_1 \twoheadrightarrow M_2$ can be thought to be a realization of M_i given by an r_i -dimensional K -vector space $U_i \subseteq K^n$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ (in the sense we have described above) such that $U_2 \subseteq U_1$. Therefore, a realization of $M_1 \twoheadrightarrow M_2$ can be thought of as a point in the flag variety $\text{Fl}(r_1, r_2; n)$, which can be given by its Plücker coordinates once we embed the flag variety in a product of Grassmannians $\text{Fl}(r_1, r_2; n) \subseteq \text{Gr}(r_1, n) \times \text{Gr}(r_2, n) \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{\binom{n}{r_1}-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{\binom{n}{r_2}-1}$.

Definition 2.6. A *diagram of matroids* consists of a set of matroids $\{M_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ and a set of some morphisms between them $\{f : M_\lambda \rightarrow M_{\lambda'}\}$.

The previous definition can be recast in terms of category theory. Denote by \mathbf{Mat} the category of matroids with their morphisms. A diagram of matroids can be thought as a functor $D : \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbf{Mat}$, where \mathbf{I} is some index category.

Definition 2.7. A diagram of matroids $(\{M_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}, \{f : M_\lambda \rightarrow M_{\lambda'}\})$ is *realizable* over a field K if for every $\lambda \in \Lambda$ there exists a map $\varphi_\lambda : E_\lambda \rightarrow V_\lambda$ that realizes M_λ , and for every morphism $f : M_\lambda \rightarrow M_{\lambda'}$ in the diagram, there exists a linear map $g : V_\lambda \rightarrow V_{\lambda'}$ such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 E_\lambda & \xrightarrow{\varphi_\lambda} & V_\lambda \\
 \downarrow f & & \downarrow g \\
 E_{\lambda'} & \xrightarrow{\varphi_{\lambda'}} & V_{\lambda'}
 \end{array}$$

Two such family of maps $(\{\varphi_{i,\lambda} : E_\lambda \rightarrow V_{i,\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}, \{g_i : V_{i,\lambda} \rightarrow V_{i,\lambda'}\})$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ are *equivalent* if for every $\lambda \in \Lambda$ there exists an isomorphism

$\psi_\lambda : V_{1,\lambda} \rightarrow V_{2,\lambda}$ such that, for every morphism $f : M_\lambda \rightarrow M_{\lambda'}$ in the diagram of matroids, the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & E_\lambda & & \\
 & \varphi_{1,\lambda} \swarrow & \downarrow & \searrow \varphi_{2,\lambda} & \\
 V_{1,\lambda} & \xrightarrow[\sim]{\psi_\lambda} & & \xrightarrow{\quad} & V_{2,\lambda} \\
 \downarrow g_1 & & \downarrow f & & \downarrow g_2 \\
 & \varphi_{1,\lambda'} \swarrow & E_{\lambda'} & \searrow \varphi_{2,\lambda'} & \\
 V_{1,\lambda'} & \xrightarrow[\sim]{\psi_{\lambda'}} & & \xrightarrow{\quad} & V_{2,\lambda'}
 \end{array}$$

A *realization* of a diagram of matroids is an equivalence class of families of maps $(\varphi_{i,\lambda}, g_i)$ as above.

The above definitions can be more compactly recast in terms of category theory. We will follow a similar point of view taken in [10, Remark 2.1].

Let $\mathbf{Mat}(K)$ be the category in which an object is a map $\varphi : E \rightarrow V$ realizing a matroid $M(\varphi)$ on the ground set E over a field K , and a morphism from φ_1 to φ_2 is a commutative diagram of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 E_1 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} & V_1 \\
 \downarrow f & & \downarrow g \\
 E_2 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_2} & V_2
 \end{array}$$

realizing a morphism $f : M(\varphi_1) \rightarrow M(\varphi_2)$. From the definition, we have a functor $\mathcal{F} : \mathbf{Mat}(K) \rightarrow \mathbf{Mat}$ defined by $\varphi \mapsto M(\varphi)$.

Now let $D : \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbf{Mat}$ be a diagram of matroids. Without loss of generality, we can assume that D is injective on objects. Thus the image of D is a subcategory $\text{im}(D)$ of \mathbf{Mat} . Then, the diagram D is realized over a field K by a functor $F : \text{im}(D) \rightarrow \mathbf{Mat}(K)$ such that $\mathcal{F} \circ F$ is the identity on $\text{im}(D)$. Two such functors realizing D are equivalent if they are naturally isomorphic, and a realization of D is an isomorphism class of such naturally isomorphic functors.

Question 2.8. Let $D : \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbf{Mat}$ be a diagram of matroids. Does the notion of realizability of Definition 2.7 give rise to a stratification of the quiver Grassmannian corresponding to D (defined as in [26])?

2.3 Modular cuts and weak maps

Following [21, Section 7.3], we now recall the notions of one element extensions of a matroid and modular cuts.

An *extension* of a matroid M on E is a matroid N on $E \cup S$ such that $N \setminus S = M$. If $S = \{e\}$ then N is said a *one element extension* of M , denoted $M + e$. In order to define a one element extension $M + e$ of M , we need just to specify, for each flat F of M , whether or not F and $F \cup \{e\}$ are flats of N . Thus, we can partition the family $\mathcal{F}(M)$ of flats of M into three families:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_1 &= \{F \in \mathcal{F}(M) : F \in \mathcal{F}(M + e), F \cup \{e\} \in \mathcal{F}(M + e)\}, \\ \mathcal{F}_2 &= \{F \in \mathcal{F}(M) : F \in \mathcal{F}(M + e), F \cup \{e\} \notin \mathcal{F}(M + e)\}, \\ \mathcal{F}_3 &= \{F \in \mathcal{F}(M) : F \notin \mathcal{F}(M + e), F \cup \{e\} \in \mathcal{F}(M + e)\}.\end{aligned}$$

Now \mathcal{F}_1 is downward closed, i.e. any flat contained in a flat in \mathcal{F}_1 is in \mathcal{F}_1 . On the other hand, \mathcal{F}_3 is upward closed, i.e. any flat that contains a flat in \mathcal{F}_3 is in \mathcal{F}_3 . Finally, a flat is in \mathcal{F}_2 if and only if it is not in \mathcal{F}_3 and it is covered by a flat in \mathcal{F}_3 . In light of the previous statements, this partition is uniquely determined by \mathcal{F}_3 . Families of flats of type \mathcal{F}_3 are called *modular cuts*, and they can be characterized as follows. A family \mathcal{M} of flats of M is a modular cut of M if and only if

- \mathcal{M} is upward closed and nonempty,
- if $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$ are such that $\text{rk}(A) + \text{rk}(B) = \text{rk}(A \cap B) + \text{rk}(A \cup B)$, then $A \cap B \in \mathcal{M}$.

It is now clear that, the one element extensions of M are one to one with modular cuts of M . We will denote by $M +_{\mathcal{M}} e$ the one element extension of M corresponding to the modular cut \mathcal{M} .

Definition 2.9. Let M_i be a matroid on E_i for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. A *weak map* is a function of sets $f : E_1 \rightarrow E_2$ such that if I is an independent set of M_2 , then $f^{-1}(I)$ is an independent set of M_1 .

Weak maps provide the following partial order on matroids on a common ground set E : if the identity on E is a weak map from M_1 to M_2 then $M_1 \leq M_2$.

Lemma 2.10 ([20, Section 2.6]). *Let M be a matroid on E , and let \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 be two modular cuts of M . The following are equivalent:*

1. $\mathcal{M}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{M}_2$,
2. $M +_{\mathcal{M}_1} e \leq M +_{\mathcal{M}_2} e$,
3. $(M +_{\mathcal{M}_1} e)/e \leq (M +_{\mathcal{M}_2} e)/e$.

2.4 Factorizations and majors

In this section we recall the basics of factorizations and majors of matroid quotients. Our main reference here is [20].

The *nullity* of a morphism of matroids $f : M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ (or strong map, or quotient) is the integer $n(f) = \text{rk}(M_1) - \text{rk}(M_2)$. Quotients $M_1 \twoheadrightarrow M_2$ of nullity one are called *elementary*. In this case, M_2 is said to be an *elementary quotient* of M_1 , and M_2 can be obtained from M_1 by a one element extension followed by a contraction of the element added. Since, as we have seen in the previous section, one element extensions correspond to modular cuts, so do elementary quotients.

In the remainder of this section, if not stated otherwise, $f : M_1 \twoheadrightarrow M_2$ is a quotient of nullity k of matroids sharing a common ground set E of cardinality n .

Definition 2.11. A *factorization* of a quotient $f : M_1 \twoheadrightarrow M_2$ is a sequence of matroids $N = (N_0, N_1, \dots, N_k)$ such that we have a chain of elementary quotients as follows:

$$M_1 = N_0 \twoheadrightarrow N_1 \twoheadrightarrow \dots \twoheadrightarrow N_{k-1} \twoheadrightarrow N_k = M_2. \quad (1)$$

The *length* (or *nullity*) of a factorization is equal to the nullity of its quotient.

The nullity of a subset $A \subseteq E$ is $n(A) = \text{rk}_{M_1}(A) - \text{rk}_{M_2}(A)$. From [21, Proposition 8.1.6] the nullity is an increasing set function. We will frequently use this fact in the rest of the paper.

Proposition-Definition 2.12 (Higgs lift [21, Lemma 8.1.6]). *Given a quotient $f : M_1 \twoheadrightarrow M_2$, the flats of M_2 together with the flats of M_1 with nullity strictly less than i are the flats of a matroid $L^i(f)$, called the i -th Higgs lift of f .*

The Higgs lifts of f form a chain of elementary quotients:

$$M_1 = L^k(f) \twoheadrightarrow L^{k-1}(f) \twoheadrightarrow \dots \twoheadrightarrow L^1(f) \twoheadrightarrow L^0(f) = M_2.$$

Therefore, the sequence $(L^i(f))_i$ is a factorization of f , called the *Higgs factorization*. Hence, every quotient has at least one factorization, but in general factorizations are not unique (see [20]).

Factorizations are particular instances of diagrams of matroids. Thus we can consider realizability and realizations of factorizations in the sense of Definition 2.7.

Definition 2.13. A *major* of a quotient $f : M_1 \twoheadrightarrow M_2$ of nullity k is a matroid H on the ground set $E \cup K$, where K is of cardinality k and disjoint from E , such that $M_1 = H \setminus K$ and $M_2 = H/K$.

In other words, if H is a major of $f : M_1 \twoheadrightarrow M_2$, then f can be factored into an extension followed by a contraction: $M_1 \rightarrow H \rightarrow M_2$.

Theorem 2.14 (Higgs [18]). *Every matroid quotient admits a major.*

The major constructed by Higgs in the proof of the above theorem is called *Higgs major*. The Higgs major of $f : M_1 \twoheadrightarrow M_2$ is constructed by taking the k -th Higgs lift of the quotient $M_1 \oplus U_{k,k} \twoheadrightarrow M_2 \oplus U_{0,k}$. See [21, Theorem 8.2.7] for more details.

In general, majors of a quotient are not unique. See [20, Example 3.14] for an example of a quotient admitting two distinct majors.

Lemma 2.15 ([20, Lemma 3.3-3.4]). *Let M be a matroid on E , $e \in E$ and f an element not in E .*

1. *If \mathcal{M} is a modular cut of M/e , then $\mathcal{M} \cup e = \{F \cup \{e\} : F \in \mathcal{M}\}$ is a modular cut of M .*
2. $(M/e) +_{\mathcal{M}} f = (M +_{\mathcal{M} \cup e} f)/e$.


We now introduce some more notation: arrows of type $\xrightarrow[\mathcal{M}]{e}$ denote a strong map arising from a one element extension by an element e with respect to the modular cut \mathcal{M} ; arrows of type \xrightarrow{e} denote the strong map arising from the quotient by the element e . With this notation, the above lemma can be rephrased simply by saying that the following diagram of matroids and strong maps, called the *standard extension-contraction diamond* in [20], commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & M_2 & \\
 f \nearrow & & \searrow e \\
 M_1 & & M_3 \\
 e \searrow & & \nearrow f \\
 & M_4 &
 \end{array}
 \quad (2)$$

Now let $N = (N_0, \dots, N_k)$ be a factorization of a quotient $f : M_1 \twoheadrightarrow M_2$ of nullity k . Every elementary quotient $N_{i-1} \twoheadrightarrow N_i$ can be factored into an extension by one element e_i with modular cut \mathcal{M}_i followed by a contraction by e_i . In particular, this means that we can go from $M_1 = N_0$ to $M_2 = N_k$ by

extending and then contracting e_i for i from 1 to k . By repeatedly applying Lemma 2.15, we can first extend M_1 by $e_1, e_2, e_3, \dots, e_k$ with respect to the modular cuts $\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2 \cup e_1, \mathcal{M}_3 \cup e_1 \cup e_2, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k \cup e_1 \cup \dots \cup e_{k-1}$ respectively, and then contract by e_1, \dots, e_k all at once. Thus, the matroid we obtain after all such extensions is, by definition, a major of f . This major will be denoted by $\mathfrak{M}(N)$, and clearly it depends on the factorization N we started with.

The above procedure can be better displayed by constructing a triangular commutative diagram associated with the factorization. Starting with the extension and contraction maps along the base of the triangle, each successive level is constructed by applying Lemma 2.15. We illustrate this procedure with the following triangular commutative diagram of a factorization of a quotient of nullity 3.



We now wish to construct a factorization from a major. Let H be a major of $f : M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ on the ground set $E \cup K$, where $K = \{e_1, \dots, e_k\}$. We define the factorization $\mathfrak{F}(H) = (\mathfrak{F}(H)_i)$ of f by

$$\mathfrak{F}(H)_i = (H / \{e_1, \dots, e_i\}) \setminus \{e_{i+1}, \dots, e_k\}.$$

Let \mathcal{F}_f denote the set of factorizations of the quotient f , and let \mathcal{M}_f denote the set of majors of f . Thus far, we have defined the following two maps:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{M} &: \mathcal{F}_f \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_f, \\
\mathfrak{F} &: \mathcal{M}_f \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_f.
\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 2.16 (Kennedy [20]).

1. The map \mathfrak{F} is surjective but not injective, whereas \mathfrak{M} is injective but not surjective.

2. The map $\mathfrak{F} \circ \mathfrak{M}$ is the identity on \mathcal{F}_f , whereas $\mathfrak{M} \circ \mathfrak{F}$ is a coclosure operator on \mathcal{M}_f with the partial order given by the identity on the ground set being a weak map.
3. The map \mathfrak{F} applied to the Higgs major gives us the Higgs factorization and conversely \mathfrak{M} applied to the Higgs factorization gives us the Higgs major.

3 Realizability of quotients of matroids

Lemma 3.1. *Every elementary quotient $f : M_1 \twoheadrightarrow M_2$ has a unique major.*

Proof. Existence follows from Theorem 2.14. For uniqueness, let H_1 and H_2 be two majors of f . Then H_1 and H_2 are obtained by extending M_1 with an element e with respect to the modular cuts \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 respectively. From Lemma 2.10 we have that $H_1 \leq H_2$ if and only if $H_1/e \leq H_2/e$. Since $H_1/e = H_2/e = M_2$, it follows that $H_1 = H_2$. \square

There are several results in the literature that are similar or implicitly related to the next result. See for instance [7, Section 5.1] and [19, Section 2.2].

Proposition 3.2. *Let $f : M_1 \twoheadrightarrow M_2$ be an elementary quotient. The realizations of f are in one-to-one correspondence with the realizations of its unique major.*

Proof. Let H be the major of f on the ground set $E \cup e$, for some $e \notin E$. Let $\varphi : E \cup e \rightarrow W$ be a realization of H , and let U be the space generated by $\varphi(e)$. Then a realization of f is given by the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E_o & \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} & W \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow g \\ E_o & \xrightarrow{\varphi_2} & W/U \end{array}$$

where φ_1 is the restriction to E_o of φ , and φ_2 is the composition of φ_1 and the quotient map by U . Conversely, consider a realization of f . We can assume that such a realization is represented by a diagram as above, where again the space U is one dimensional, since f is elementary. Thus, U is generated by some nonzero vector v , and the map $\varphi : E \cup e \rightarrow W$ defined by $\varphi|_{E_o} = \varphi_1$ and $\varphi(e) = v$ is a realization of H .

Now suppose that $\psi_i : E_o \cup e \rightarrow W_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ represent two realizations of H such that they give rise to the same realization of f . This means that we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& & E_o & & \\
& \swarrow \varphi_1 & \downarrow & \searrow \varphi_2 & \\
W_1 & \xrightarrow[h_1]{\sim} & & \xrightarrow{\quad} & W_2 \\
\downarrow /U_1 & & \downarrow f & & \downarrow /U_2 \\
& & E_o & & \\
& \swarrow /U_1 \circ \varphi_1 & & \searrow /U_2 \circ \varphi_2 & \\
W_1/U_1 & \xrightarrow[h_2]{\sim} & & \xrightarrow{\quad} & W_2/U_2
\end{array}$$

where U_i is the space generated by $\psi_i(e)$, $\varphi_i = \psi_i|_{E_o}$, and h_i is an isomorphism, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Since the diagram is commutative, h_1 sends U_1 to U_2 . Further, U_1 and U_2 are one-dimensional, so U_i is generated by some nonzero vector v_i for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Hence, h_1 sends v_1 to a scalar multiple of v_2 , therefore ψ_1 and ψ_2 represent the same realization of H . \square

Lemma 3.3. *Consider the standard extension-contraction diamond as in (2) and let K be an infinite field. Then, M_2 is realizable over K if and only if the subdiagram $M_1 \xrightarrow{e} M_4 \xrightarrow[\mathcal{M}]{f} M_3$ obtained from (2) is realizable over K .*

Proof. Since M_1 , M_3 and M_4 are minors of M_2 , if the latter is realizable, then it is clear that the lower part of the diagram is realizable.

Conversely, assume the lower part of the diagram is realizable. Let E be the cardinality n ground set of M_1 , so that $E \cup f$, $E \cup f \setminus e$ and $E \setminus e$ are the ground sets of M_2 , M_3 and M_4 respectively. If e is a loop of M_1 , then it is also a loop of M_2 , and contracting e is the same as deleting e . Thus a realization of M_2 is given by extending the realization of M_3 by sending e to the zero vector. Therefore, we can assume that e is not a loop of M_1 and part of a basis. In addition, if f is a coloop of M_3 , this will imply $\mathcal{M} = \emptyset$, so we will have $\mathcal{M} \cup e = \emptyset$ as well, that is, f will be a coloop also of M_2 and a realization of M_2 can be constructed by extending a realization $\varphi : E \rightarrow V$ of M_1 to $E \cup f$ by sending f to $\underline{0} \oplus 1 \in V \oplus K$. Therefore we can assume that f is not a coloop of M_3 . Thus, if M_1 is of rank r then M_2 has rank r as well and M_3 and M_4 have rank $r - 1$.

Now, up to equivalence, the diagram $M_1 \xrightarrow{e} M_4 \xrightarrow[\mathcal{M}]{f} M_3$ is realized by a

commutative diagram of the following form:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
E_o & \longrightarrow & E_o \setminus e & \longrightarrow & E_o \cup f \setminus e \\
\downarrow \varphi_1 & & \downarrow \varphi_2 & & \downarrow \varphi_3 \\
K^r & \xrightarrow{g} & K^{r-1} & \xrightarrow{id_{K^{r-1}}} & K^{r-1}
\end{array}$$

where $\varphi_1(e) = e_1 \in K^r$, $g : K^r \rightarrow K^{r-1}$ is the quotient map by e_1 and $\varphi_3(f) = (f_2, \dots, f_r) \in K^{r-1}$. Now a realization of M_2 is given by a function $\varphi : E_o \cup f \rightarrow K^r$ defined by $\varphi|_{E_o} = \varphi_1$ and $\varphi(f) = (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_r) \in K^r$, where the element $f_1 \in K$ is chosen such that the vector $\varphi(f)$ is in the subspace of K^r generated by $\varphi_1(F)$, for F a flat of M_1 , if and only if $F \in \mathcal{M} \cup e$. In the remainder of the proof, we will show that such a choice is possible.

First, if F is a flat of M_1 in $\mathcal{M} \cup e$, then $e \in F$ and $F \setminus e \in \mathcal{M}$ by definition. Thus, (f_2, \dots, f_r) belongs to the space generated by $\varphi_2(F \setminus e)$, and, since $\varphi_1(e) = e_1$, this implies that $(f_1, \dots, f_r) \in \langle \varphi_1(F) \rangle$ for every $f_1 \in K$. Now let F be a flat of M_1 such that the space $L = \langle \varphi_1(F) \rangle$ contains the affine line $A = \{(x, f_2, \dots, f_r) \in K^r : x \in K\}$. This means that L contains e_1 , so the flat F contains e . In particular, the image of L under the quotient map g contains the vector (f_2, \dots, f_r) , and this implies that $F \setminus e \in \mathcal{M}$, that is $F \in \mathcal{M} \cup e$. Thus, for any flat F of M_1 not in $\mathcal{M} \cup e$, the space $L = \langle \varphi_1(F) \rangle$ does not contain the affine line A , hence it intersects A in at most one point p_F . Now it is enough to choose f_1 such that $\varphi(f) \in A \setminus \{p_F : F \notin \mathcal{M} \cup e\}$. This last set is not empty since the points p_F are finitely many, as the flats of M_1 are finite, while the affine space A contains infinitely many points since K is infinite. \square

The above result is easily seen to be not true for finite fields, as the following example shows.

Example 3.4. Let $K = \{0, 1\}$ be the field with two elements. Consider the following standard extension-contraction diamond:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
& U_{2,4} & \\
f \nearrow & & \searrow e \\
U_{2,3} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{M} \cup e} & U_{1,3} \\
e \searrow & & \nearrow f \\
& U_{1,2} & \\
& \xrightarrow{\mathcal{M}} &
\end{array}$$

Up to permutations, the matroids $U_{2,3}$, $U_{1,3}$ and $U_{1,2}$ have each a unique realization over K . These realizations constitute also a realization of the diagram $U_{2,3} \xrightarrow{e} U_{1,3} \xrightarrow[\mathcal{M}]{f} U_{1,2}$ over K , while $U_{2,4}$ is not realizable over K .

Corollary 3.5. *A factorization N of a strong map $f : M_1 \twoheadrightarrow M_2$ is realizable over an infinite field K if and only if so is its major $\mathfrak{M}(N)$.*

Proof. Let $\Delta(N)$ be the triangular diagram induced by N , constructed by following the procedure we illustrated in (3). Then, the statement follows by applying Proposition 3.2 along the base of the triangle, and by repeatedly applying Lemma 3.3 on all standard extension-contraction diamonds. \square

Lemma 3.6. *Let $f : M_1 \twoheadrightarrow M_2$ be a quotient of matroids with common ground set E . A flat F of M_1 is not closed in M_2 if and only if it is covered by a flat of M_1 of nullity $n(F) + 1$.*

Proof. Since from [21, Proposition 8.1.6] the nullity is a non-decreasing function, any flat that covers F has nullity greater or equal than F . Suppose that F is closed in M_2 . Then, for every $a \in E \setminus F$ we have $r_{M_1}(F \cup a) = r_{M_1}(F) + 1$ and $r_{M_2}(F \cup a) = r_{M_2}(F) + 1$, thus $n(F \cup a) = n(F)$. Let G be the closure of $F \cup a$ in M_1 , then $r_{M_1}(G) = r_{M_1}(F \cup a)$, also from [21, Proposition 8.1.6], G is contained in the closure of $F \cup a$ in M_2 , so $r_{M_2}(G) = r_{M_2}(F \cup a)$. Hence $n(G) = n(F)$, so all the flats of M_1 that cover F have the same nullity of F . On the other hand, if F is not closed in M_2 , then there exists $a \in E \setminus F$ such that $r_{M_2}(F \cup a) = r_{M_2}(F)$, and for the same reasoning above, we have $n(F \cup a) = n(F) + 1$, so the closure of $F \cup a$ in M_1 is a flat of M_1 of nullity $n(F) + 1$ that covers F . \square

Lemma 3.7. *Let $f : M_1 \twoheadrightarrow M_2$ be a quotient of matroids of nullity k and let $(L^i(f))_i$ be its Higgs factorization. Then, the modular cut of M_1 associated to the elementary quotient $M_1 \twoheadrightarrow L^{k-1}(f)$ is given by all the nullity k flats of M_1 .*

Proof. From Lemma 3.6 all nullity k flats of M_1 are closed in M_2 . Therefore, from Proposition-Definition 2.12, the flats of $L^{k-1}(f)$ consists of the flats of M_1 that are either closed in M_2 or do not have nullity $k - 1$. From Lemma 3.6, this means that we are removing from M_1 all the flats covered by a nullity k flat. This shows that the modular cut of this elementary quotient is given by the nullity k flats. \square

As an application of the above lemma, we compute the Higgs major of quotients of uniform matroids.

Example 3.8 (Higgs major of a quotient of uniform matroids). Consider the quotient $f : U_{r+k,n} \twoheadrightarrow U_{r,n}$ of uniform matroids on the common ground set E . The Higgs major of f is $U_{r+k,n+k}$. We can prove this by induction on k . In fact, from Lemma 3.7 the modular cut of the elementary quotient

$U_{r+k,n} \twoheadrightarrow L^{k-1}(f)$ is given by the nullity k flats of $U_{r+k,n}$, which in this case those consist of just the set E . This means that the corresponding one element extension of $U_{r+k,n}$ give rise to the uniform matroid $U_{r+k,n+1}$. Now, $L^{k-1}(f)$ is the contraction of $U_{r+k,n+1}$ by the extended element, so we have $L^{k-1}(f) = U_{r+k-1,n}$. Now by induction, this means that the Higgs factorization of f is $U_{r+k,n} \twoheadrightarrow U_{r+k-1,n} \twoheadrightarrow \cdots \twoheadrightarrow U_{r+1,n} \twoheadrightarrow U_{r,n}$, and the Higgs major is $U_{r+k,n+k}$.

Proposition 3.9. *Let $f : M_1 \twoheadrightarrow M_2$ be a quotient of matroids of nullity k . A realization of f over an infinite field K induces a realization of the Higgs factorization $(L^i(f))_i$ over K .*

Proof. Fix a realization of f given by the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E_o & \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} & V_1 \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow g \\ E_o & \xrightarrow{\varphi_2} & V_2 \end{array}$$

where E is the common ground set of M_1 and M_2 . Set $U = \ker g$, so we have $\dim U = k$. Up to equivalence, we can assume that $V_2 \simeq V_1/U$ and g is the quotient map by U . We proceed by induction on the nullity k of f . If $k = 0$, then $M_1 = M_2$ and there is nothing to prove. Now assume $k > 0$. By Lemma 3.7 the modular cut of M_1 associated to the elementary quotient $M_1 \twoheadrightarrow L^{k-1}(f)$ is given by the family of flats of nullity k . Now, for every flat F of M_1 we denote by L_F the subspace of V_1 generated by $\varphi_1(F)$. The nullity of F is equal to the dimension of $L_F \cap U$. In fact, we have

$$n(F) = r_{M_1}(F) - r_{M_2}(F) = \dim(L_F) - \dim(L_F/(L_F \cap U)) = \dim(L_F \cap U).$$

Therefore, if the nullity of F is k then L_F contains U . Now the set difference $W = U \setminus \bigcup_{n(F)=k-1} L_F$ is nonempty since the base field K is infinite. Thus we can choose a vector $v \in W$. The vector v is in U , thus it belongs to L_F if F is a flat of M_1 of nullity k , but it does not if F has nullity $k - 1$. Hence, the quotient map by $\langle v \rangle$ is a realization of $M \twoheadrightarrow L^{k-1}(f)$, and the quotient map from $V_1/\langle v \rangle$ to V_2 by $U/\langle v \rangle$ is a realization of the quotient $L^{k-1}(f) \twoheadrightarrow M_2$. From [20, Proposition 4.8] the sequence $(L^{k-1}(f), \dots, L^0(f))$ is the Higgs factorization of $L^{k-1}(f) \twoheadrightarrow M_2$. Thus, we can apply induction, so the realization of $L^{k-1}(f) \twoheadrightarrow M_2$ induces a realization of the factorization starting from $k - 1$ to 0. Further, note that in every step, we did not change the realizations of M_1 and M_2 we started with. Therefore, we can adjoin the realization of $M_1 \twoheadrightarrow L^{k-1}(f)$ with that of the rest of the factorization. \square

Theorem 3.10. *Let $f : M_1 \twoheadrightarrow M_2$ be a quotient of matroids, and let K be an infinite field. The following statements are equivalent:*

1. f is realizable over K ,
2. the Higgs factorization of f is realizable over K ,
3. the Higgs major of f is realizable over K .

Proof. The implication (1) \Rightarrow (2) is Proposition 3.9 and (2) \Rightarrow (1) is clear. Finally, (2) \Leftrightarrow (3) follows from Corollary 3.5. \square

The above theorem can be generalized to flag matroids. A *flag matroid* of length l is a chain of matroid quotients of the form $M_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} M_2 \xrightarrow{f_2} \dots \xrightarrow{f_l} M_{l+1}$, and a flag matroid is realizable over a field K if it is so as a diagram of matroids. If we factor each quotient f_i with the Higgs factorization, we obtain a chain of elementary quotients that constitute a factorization of the quotient $M_1 \twoheadrightarrow M_{l+1}$ (note that this is not necessarily equal to the Higgs factorization of this last quotient). We call such a factorization the *Higgs factorization* of the flag matroid, and the major of this factorization the *Higgs major* of the flag matroid.

Corollary 3.11. *Let $M_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} M_2 \xrightarrow{f_2} \dots \xrightarrow{f_l} M_{l+1}$ be a length l flag matroid, and let K be an infinite field. The following statements are equivalent:*

1. the flag matroid is realizable over K ,
2. the Higgs factorization of the flag matroid is realizable over K ,
3. the Higgs major of the flag matroid is realizable over K .

Proof. For (1) \Rightarrow (2) it is enough to apply Proposition 3.9 on each quotient f_i . The rest of the proof is analogous to the proof of Theorem 3.10. \square

Now we interpret Theorem 3.10 in terms of maps of realization spaces. Let $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$, and denote by $\binom{[n]}{r}$ the subsets of $[n]$ of cardinality r . Let M be a rank r matroid on $[n]$. The *realization space* of M is the subset

$$\mathcal{R}(M) = \left\{ (p_B)_{B \in \binom{[n]}{r}} \in \text{Gr}(r, n) : p_B \neq 0 \Leftrightarrow B \in \mathcal{B}(M) \right\} \subseteq \text{Gr}(r, n).$$

If N is a rank $s \leq r$ matroid on $[n]$ such that $M \twoheadrightarrow N$, then the *realization space* of this quotient is the subset

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(M \twoheadrightarrow N) &= \left\{ (p_B)_{B \in \binom{[n]}{r} \cup \binom{[n]}{s}} \in \text{Fl}(s, r, n) : p_B \neq 0 \Leftrightarrow B \in \mathcal{B}(M) \cup \mathcal{B}(N) \right\} \\ &\subseteq \text{Fl}(s, r; n) \subseteq \text{Gr}(s, n) \times \text{Gr}(r, n). \end{aligned}$$

Now let H be the Higgs major of $M \twoheadrightarrow N$ on the ground set $[n] \cup [\bar{k}]$ where $[\bar{k}] = \{\bar{1}, \bar{2}, \dots, \bar{k}\}$. Then, there is a surjective map $\varphi : \mathcal{R}(H) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(M \twoheadrightarrow N)$ defined by

$$\varphi \left((p_B)_{B \in \binom{[n] \cup [\bar{k}]}{r}} \right) = (p_{B'})_{B' \in \binom{[n]}{r}} \times (p_{B'' \cup [\bar{k}]})_{B'' \in \binom{[n]}{s}}.$$

In other words, φ is projecting away the coordinates p_B of $\mathcal{R}(H)$ for all $B \in \binom{[n] \cup [\bar{k}]}{r}$ that are not contained in $[n]$ and do not contain $[\bar{k}]$. Since $\mathcal{R}(M \twoheadrightarrow N) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(M) \times \mathcal{R}(N)$, a point in the realization space of $M \twoheadrightarrow N$ can be viewed as a particular pair of realizations of M and N respectively. Consider a realization of H , corresponding to a point $(p_B)_{B \in \binom{[n] \cup [\bar{k}]}{r}}$ in $\mathcal{R}(H)$. The map φ is sending this realization of H to the pair of realizations of M and N by identifying the realization of M with the point in $\mathcal{R}(M)$ with coordinates $(p_{B'})_{B' \in \binom{[n]}{r}}$ and the realization of N with the point in $\mathcal{R}(N)$ with coordinates $(p_{B'' \cup [\bar{k}]})_{B'' \in \binom{[n]}{s}}$.

The fact that φ is well defined can be verified directly from comparing the Plücker relations of $\mathcal{R}(H)$ and the incidence Plücker relations of $\mathcal{R}(M \twoheadrightarrow N)$. The surjectivity of φ is essentially a reformulation of (1) \Rightarrow (3) of Theorem 3.10.

4 Applications and examples

In this section, we explain how quotients of matroids relate in a natural way to relative realizability problems in tropical geometry.

4.1 Linear case

Let M be a rank r matroid with ground set $E = \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$. We recall that a *cycle* of a matroid is a union of circuits. Denote by $\mathcal{C}(M)$ the set of circuits of M , and by $\mathcal{V}(M)$ the set of cycles of M . A family \mathcal{V} of subsets of E is the set of cycles of a matroid if and only if it satisfies the following axioms [8]:

1. $\emptyset \in \mathcal{V}$,
2. \mathcal{V} is closed under taking unions,
3. if $V_1, V_2 \in \mathcal{V}$ and $e \in V_1 \cap V_2$ there exists $V \in \mathcal{V}$ such that

$$(V_1 \cup V_2) \setminus (V_1 \cap V_2) \subseteq V \subseteq (V_1 \cup V_2) \setminus \{e\}.$$

For a subset $A \subseteq E$ define $\text{trop}(A)$ to be the set of vectors $v = (v_0, \dots, v_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ such that the minimum of the numbers v_i is attained at least twice as i ranges in A . Since if $v \in \text{trop}(A)$ then also $v + \lambda \mathbf{1} \in \text{trop}(A)$ for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, where $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, we regard $\text{trop}(A)$ as a subset of the quotient space $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}/\mathbf{1}\mathbb{R} \simeq \mathbb{R}^n$.

Proposition-Definition 4.1 (Tropical linear space). *Let M be a matroid on $E = \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$. The tropical linear space of M is the set*

$$\text{trop}(M) = \bigcap_{C \in \mathcal{C}(M)} \text{trop}(C) = \bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{V}(M)} \text{trop}(V) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Proof. We need to prove the second equality of the above equation. The inclusion $\bigcap_{C \in \mathcal{C}(M)} \text{trop}(C) \supseteq \bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{V}(M)} \text{trop}(V)$ is obvious since every circuit is a cycle by definition. For the reverse inclusion, let $v \in \bigcap_{C \in \mathcal{C}(M)} \text{trop}(C)$ and let V be a cycle of M . It is enough to show that $v \in \text{trop}(V)$. Suppose that the minimum of the coordinates v_i of v , for i ranging in V , is attained at v_j for some $j \in V$. Since V is a union of circuits, there exists a circuit C of M that contains j . Now, by the choice of v , we have $v \in \text{trop}(C)$, so the minimum of the numbers v_i for i ranging in C is attained at least twice. Since $C \subseteq V$ and v_j was the minimum of the numbers v_i for $i \in V$, the minimum in V is also attained at least twice, hence $v \in \text{trop}(V)$. \square

We can give the set $\text{trop}(M)$ various fan structures, and such a fan is usually called *Bergman fan* (see [23, Section 4.2] or [11] for more information).

Let M_1 and M_2 be two matroids on the common ground set $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$. From [27, Proposition 7.4.7] we have that $M_1 \leftarrow M_2$ if and only if every circuit of M_2 is a union of circuits of M_1 (i.e. a cycle of M_1). It is easy to see that this is equivalent to the condition that every cycle of M_2 is a cycle of M_1 . This observation, together with Proposition-Definition 4.1 imply the following fact.

Corollary 4.2. *Let M_1 and M_2 be two matroids on a common ground set. We have*

$$M_1 \leftarrow M_2 \iff \text{trop}(M_1) \subseteq \text{trop}(M_2).$$

Let I be a homogeneous ideal of $K[x_0, \dots, x_n]$. We denote by $\text{trop}(V(I))$ the tropicalization of $V(I) \cap T^n$, where T^n is the algebraic torus of \mathbb{P}^n . If K is infinite and I is linear then the supports of the degree one polynomials in I are the cycles of a matroid M , called the underlying matroid of I (see Lemma 4.6 below). In this situation we have the following (set-theoretic) equality: $\text{trop}(V(I)) = \text{trop}(M)$ (see [23, Chapter 4]).

In this paper, all tropicalizations are done with respect to the trivial valuation. By a *tropical variety* here we mean a pure-dimensional balanced polyhedral complex obtained as the tropicalization of an algebraic variety, that is, an object of the form $T = \text{trop}(V(I))$ for some homogeneous ideal I of $K[x_0, \dots, x_n]$. Let T_1 and T_2 be two tropical varieties such that $T_1 \subseteq T_2$. We say that such an inclusion is *realizable* over a field K if there exists I_1 and I_2 two homogeneous ideals of $K[x_0, \dots, x_n]$ such that $T_i = \text{trop}(V(I_i))$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $V(I_1) \subseteq V(I_2)$.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $T_i = \text{trop}(V(I_i))$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ be two tropical varieties such that $T_1 \subseteq T_2$, where I_1 and I_2 are homogeneous linear ideals of $K[x_0, \dots, x_n]$, and let M_1 and M_2 be the underlying matroids of I_1 and I_2 respectively. The inclusion $T_1 \subseteq T_2$ is realizable over K if and only if so is the quotient of matroids $M_1 \leftarrow M_2$.*

Proof. First assume that $T_1 \subseteq T_2$ is realizable over K . This means that there exist two homogeneous ideals J_1 and J_2 of $K[x_0, \dots, x_n]$ such that $T_i = \text{trop}(V(J_i))$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $V(J_1) \subseteq V(J_2)$. Since T_1 and T_2 are linear tropical varieties, this implies that J_1 and J_2 are linear ideals (see for instance [12, Theorem 4.7]). In particular, J_1 and J_2 have the same underlying matroid of I_1 and I_2 respectively. Now let U_i be the vector space of polynomials of degree one in J_i , for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Since $V(J_1) \subseteq V(J_2)$ and J_1 and J_2 are linear, in particular radical, we have $J_1 \supseteq J_2$, so $U_1 \supseteq U_2$, and this last inclusion is a realization of $M_1 \leftarrow M_2$ in the sense we discussed in Section 2.2.

Conversely, assume that $M_1 \leftarrow M_2$ is realizable. Then there exist two linear subspaces $U_1 \supseteq U_2$ of K^{n+1} that realize this quotient. The vectors in U_i can be thought as linear polynomials in $K[x_0, \dots, x_n]$, and we let J_i be the linear homogeneous ideal generated by these polynomials, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. By construction $J_1 \supseteq J_2$, so $V(J_1) \subseteq V(J_2)$, and $T_i = \text{trop}(V(J_i))$ as J_i and I_i have the same underlying matroid, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. \square

4.2 Tropical Fano schemes

In [22] Lamboglia studied *tropical Fano schemes* and tropicalizations of Fano schemes. The Fano scheme $F_r(X)$ of a projective variety X is the fine moduli space parametrizing linear spaces of dimension r contained in X . The tropicalization $\text{trop}(F_r(X))$ of $F_r(X)$ inside $\text{trop}G(r+1, n+1)$ parametrizes the tropicalization of linear spaces contained in X . On the other hand, the tropical Fano scheme $F_r(\text{trop}(X))$ of the tropical variety $\text{trop}(X)$ is a tropical prevariety parametrizing tropicalized linear spaces of dimension r contained

in $\text{trop}(X)$. From the definition, it is immediate to observe that

$$\text{trop}(F_r(X)) \subseteq F_r(\text{trop}(X)).$$

However, the above inclusion might be strict, already when X is just a linear space. In fact, [22, Theorem 3.1] describes a family of planes in \mathbb{P}^n with this property. Every plane L of such family tropicalizes to the standard tropical plane in $\mathbb{R}^n \simeq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}/\mathbf{1}\mathbb{R}$. The tropicalization thus contains the (realizable) tropical line Γ whose rays are $\text{pos}(e_i, e_{i+1})$ for i ranging in all the even numbers in $\{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$. However, no line contained in L tropicalize to Γ .

Now the combination of Proposition 4.3 and Theorem 3.10 offers another perspective on the above phenomenon. In fact, since L tropicalize to the standard tropical plane, its underlying matroid is $U_{3,n+1}$. Further, the underlying matroid of Γ is the matroid M_2 of rank 2 on ground set $E = \{0, \dots, n\}$ with no loops and parallel elements given by the disjoint pairs of consecutive numbers: $\{0, 1\}$, $\{2, 3\}$ up to $\{n-1, n\}$ or $\{n-2, n-1\}$ depending on the parity of n . Now since $\Gamma \subseteq \text{trop}(L)$, from Corollary 4.2 we have $U_{3,n+1} \twoheadrightarrow M_2$. The Higgs major of this quotient is a matroid $M_3 = U_{3,n+1} + e$ of rank 3 on the ground set $\{0, \dots, n\} \cup \{e\}$ where the cardinality 3 dependent subsets are all of the form $\{i, i+1, e\}$ where $\{i, i+1\}$ are parallel elements in M_2 . Such a matroid is realizable over \mathbb{C} , and from Theorem 3.10 every realization of M_3 gives us a realization of the quotient $U_{3,n+1} \twoheadrightarrow M_2$, which in turn, from Proposition 4.3, provides us a pair of a line contained in a plane $\ell \subseteq L$ that tropicalize to Γ and the standard tropical plane respectively. The crucial point here is that if we fix a realization of $U_{3,n+1}$ over \mathbb{C} , it is not guaranteed that this realization can be extended to a realization of M_3 . This means that we cannot realize the quotient $U_{3,n+1} \twoheadrightarrow M_2$ with this fixed realization of $U_{3,n+1}$. We further illustrate this phenomenon with the examples discussed in [22].

Example 4.4 ([22, Example 3.4]). Let $L_1 \subseteq \mathbb{P}^5$ be the plane spanned by the rows of the following matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 5 & 7 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 & -1 & -1 \\ 1 & 4 & -1 & -3 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{3,6}.$$

The above matrix realizes $U_{3,6}$ over \mathbb{C} , therefore the tropicalization of L_1 is the standard tropical plane. Now this realization can be extended to a realization of M_3 given by the following matrix, obtained by adding the column vector $(1, 0, 0) \in \mathbb{C}^3$:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 5 & 7 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 & -1 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 4 & -1 & -3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{3,7}.$$

Now, by simply quotienting by the vector $(1, 0, 0) \in \mathbb{C}^3$ corresponding to the element e of $M_3 = U_{3,6} + e$, we obtain the following realization of M_2 :

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 & -1 & -1 \\ 1 & 4 & -1 & -3 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{2,6}.$$

The row space of the above matrix is a 2-dimensional vector space in \mathbb{C}^6 corresponding to a line ℓ in \mathbb{P}^5 contained in L_1 , that tropicalizes to Γ .

Example 4.5 ([22, Example 3.3]). Let $L_2 \subseteq \mathbb{P}^5$ be the plane spanned by the rows of the following matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & -271 & -92 & 0 & -13 & -54 \\ 0 & -18 & -7 & -1 & 0 & -4 \\ -1 & 12293 & 4173 & 0 & 588 & 2450 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{3,6}.$$

The above matrix realizes $U_{3,6}$ over \mathbb{C} , therefore the tropicalization of L_1 is the standard tropical plane. Now this realization cannot be extended to a realization of M_3 . In fact, a realization of M_3 would be given by a matrix of the following form

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -271 & -92 & 0 & -13 & -54 & x_1 \\ 0 & -18 & -7 & -1 & 0 & -4 & x_2 \\ -1 & 12293 & 4173 & 0 & 588 & 2450 & x_3 \end{bmatrix}.$$

In particular, the determinant of the square submatrices indexed by the dependent subsets of cardinality 3 should be zero. Therefore we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \det(A_{0,1,e}) &= -18x_1 + 271x_2 &= 0 \\ \det(A_{2,3,e}) &= 4173x_1 + 92x_3 &= 0 \\ \det(A_{4,5,e}) &= 2352x_1 + 98x_2 + 52x_3 &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

The above linear system has only one solution: $(x_1, x_2, x_3) = (0, 0, 0)$, but this is impossible since M_3 has no loops. Therefore, the realization of $U_{3,6}$ given by L_2 cannot be extended to a realization of M_3 . Thus, by Theorem 3.10 no realization of the quotient $U_{3,6} \twoheadrightarrow M_2$ can be constructed with such a realization of $U_{3,6}$. From Proposition 4.3 and Theorem 3.10, this implies that there is no line ℓ contained in L_2 tropicalizing to Γ .

4.3 Nonlinear case

Let I be a homogeneous ideal of $K[x_0, \dots, x_n]$. For every $d \in \mathbb{N}$ denote by I_d the the degree d part of I , that is, the set of polynomials of degree d in I . Let Mon_d be the set of monomials of degree d in $K[x_0, \dots, x_d]$. The *support* $\text{supp}(f)$ of a polynomial $f \in K[x_0, \dots, x_n]$ is the set of monomials with nonzero coefficients in f .

Lemma 4.6. *Let K be an infinite field. For every $d \in \mathbb{N}$ the set of supports of polynomials in I_d is the set of cycles of a matroid $M(I_d)$.*

Proof. We need to show that the set \mathcal{V} of supports of I_d satisfies the axioms 4.1. The zero vector is in I_d by convention, so $\emptyset \in \mathcal{V}$ and \mathcal{V} satisfies axiom 1.

For axiom 2, let $V_1, V_2 \in \mathcal{V}$, and let $f_1, f_2 \in I_d$ such that $\text{supp}(f_i) = V_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Let a_m (resp. b_m) be the coefficient in f_1 (resp. f_2) of the monomial $m \in \text{Mon}_d$. Since K is infinite, there exists $c \in K$ that is not equal to $-a_m/b_m$ for every $m \in \text{Mon}_d$ such that $b_m \neq 0$. By construction, there are no cancellations in the polynomial $f = f_1 + cf_2 \in I_d$, therefore $V = \text{supp}(f) = V_1 \cup V_2 \in \mathcal{V}$.

For axiom 3, let $V_1, V_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ and $e \in V_1 \cap V_2$, then there exists $f_1, f_2 \in I_d$ such that $V_i = \text{supp}(f_i)$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Now let $c_i \in K$ be the coefficient of the monomial e in f_i for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Then the polynomial $f = f_1 - (c_1/c_2)f_2 \in I_d$ has support $V = \text{supp}(f) \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $V \subseteq (V_1 \cup V_2) \setminus \{e\}$ by construction, further $(V_1 \cup V_2) \setminus (V_1 \cap V_2) \subseteq V$ as no cancellation can happen outside $V_1 \cap V_2$. \square

Let $\nu_d : \mathbb{P}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^N$ be the degree d Veronese embedding, where $N = \binom{n+d}{d} - 1$. Let $U_{n,d} = \{u \in \mathbb{N}^{n+1} : \sum_i u_i = d\}$ and let $K[z_u : u \in U_{n,d}]$ be the coordinate ring of \mathbb{P}^N . Now, let I be a homogeneous ideal of $K[x_0, \dots, x_n]$ and choose $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $V(I) = V(I_d)$. We have

$$\nu_d(V(I)) = \nu_d(\mathbb{P}^n) \cap L_{I,d} \quad (4)$$

where $L_{I,d}$ is some linear subspace of \mathbb{P}^N which linear equations are obtained by substituting x^u with z_u for every $u \in U_{n,d}$ in the polynomials $f \in I_d$ (see [16, Exercise 2.9]). Further, note that, if K is infinite, the underlying matroid of the linear space $L_{I,d}$ is $M(I_d)$, hence $\text{trop}(L_{I,d}) = \text{trop}(M(I_d))$.

Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N, n+1}$ be the matrix whose rows consists of the vectors $u \in U_{n,d}$. Let $\ell_A : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ be the linear map given by the multiplication by A . Since $\ell_A(\mathbf{1}_{n+1}) = d \cdot \mathbf{1}_N$, the map ℓ_A induces a linear map $\text{trop}(\nu_d) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ obtained by quotienting by $\mathbf{1}_{n+1}$ and identifying \mathbb{R}^n with the quotient space $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}/\mathbf{1}\mathbb{R}$. Since the Veronese embedding ν_d is a monomial map, from [23, Corollary 3.2.13] we have the following result.

Lemma 4.7. *Let I be an homogeneous ideal of $K[x_0, \dots, x_n]$. For every $d \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

$$\text{trop}(\nu_d(V(I))) = \text{trop}(\nu_d)(\text{trop}(V(I))).$$

Lemma 4.8. *Let I be a homogeneous ideal of $K[x_0, \dots, x_n]$ and let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\text{trop}(V(I)) = \bigcap_{f \in I_d} \text{trop}(V(f))$ and $V(I) = V(I_d)$. We have*

$$\text{trop}(\nu_d(V(I))) = \text{trop}(\nu_d(\mathbb{P}^n)) \cap \text{trop}(L_{I,d}).$$

Proof. From (4) we have $\text{trop}(\nu_d(V(I))) \subseteq \text{trop}(\nu_d(\mathbb{P}^n)) \cap \text{trop}(L_{I,d})$. For the reverse inclusion, let $v \in \text{trop}(\nu_d(\mathbb{P}^n)) \cap \text{trop}(L_{I,d})$. From Lemma 4.7 we have that $v \in \text{trop}(\nu_d(\mathbb{P}^n)) = \text{trop}(\nu_d(\mathbb{R}^n))$, that is v is in the image of $\text{trop}(\nu_d)$, so there exists $w \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}/\mathbf{1}\mathbb{R} \simeq \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $v = \text{trop}(\nu_d)(w)$. Now $v = \text{trop}(\nu_d)(w) \in \text{trop}(L_{I,d})$ implies that the minimum in $\text{trop}(f)(w)$ is achieved at least twice for every $f \in I_d$, that is $w \in \bigcap_{f \in I_d} \text{trop}(V(f)) = \text{trop}(V(I))$. Hence $v = \text{trop}(\nu_d)(w) \in \text{trop}(\nu_d)(\text{trop}(V(I))) = \text{trop}(\nu_d(V(I)))$, where in the last equality we applied Lemma 4.7. \square

Proposition 4.9. *Let K be an infinite field, and let I and J be two homogeneous ideals of $K[x_0, \dots, x_n]$. There exists $d_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $d \geq d_0$ we have*

$$M(I_d) \leftarrow M(J_d) \implies \text{trop}(V(I)) \subseteq \text{trop}(V(J)).$$

Proof. By applying [1, Theorem 3.7] we can choose $d_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large such that for every $d \geq d_0$ the hypothesis of Lemma 4.8 are satisfied for both I and J . Since the underlying matroid of $L_{I,d}$ (resp. $L_{J,d}$) is $M(I_d)$ (resp. $M(J_d)$), from Proposition-Definition 4.1 we have $\text{trop}(L_{I,d}) \subseteq \text{trop}(L_{J,d})$. By intersecting with $\text{trop}(\nu_d(\mathbb{P}^n))$ and applying Lemma 4.7 and Lemma 4.8 we obtain

$$\text{trop}(\nu_d)(\text{trop}(V(I))) \subseteq \text{trop}(\nu_d)(\text{trop}(V(J)))$$

which implies $\text{trop}(V(I)) \subseteq \text{trop}(V(J))$ since $\text{trop}(\nu_d)$ is injective. \square

The reverse implication of the above proposition is not true in general, as the following example shows.

Example 4.10. Let $I = (x_0 + x_1 + x_2)$ and $J = (x_0^p + x_1^p + x_2^p)$ be two homogeneous ideals in $K[x_0, x_1, x_2]$, for some prime p . The tropicalization of the varieties of these two ideals is (set-theoretically) the same: the standard tropical line in \mathbb{R}^2 . In this situation, the number d_0 of Proposition 4.9 can be chosen equal to p , and we have that, if K has characteristic not equal to p , $M(I_p)$ is not a quotient of $M(J_p)$.

Remark 4.11. Another situation in which the reverse implication of Proposition 4.9 does not hold concerns *symmetric powers* of matroids. In fact, as explained in [2, Remark 2.18], if a matrix A , with coefficients in some field K , realizes a matroid M , the d -th Macaulay matrix of A realizes a d -th symmetric power of M . However, such a d -th symmetric power depends both on the characteristic of K and the matrix A we started with (not just on the matroid M). Thus, from two distinct realizations of M , we obtain two distinct realizable symmetric powers of M . These two matroids will then be the degree d part of two ideals tropicalizing to the same tropical variety,

despite the fact that the two underlying matroids in degree d are distinct (so one is not the quotient of the other).

Remark 4.12. While Proposition 4.3 essentially reduces the relative realizability problem for tropical varieties of degree one to a problem of realizability of matroid quotients, the same cannot be done directly for tropical varieties of higher degrees. Example 4.10 is already an example of this. One could still try to recover some non-realizability certificate from the non realizability of a finite list of matroid quotients, although an algorithmic implementation of such a procedure might not be feasible in practice.

5 Questions and future work

Theorem 3.10 and Corollary 3.11 characterize realizability of a (single) quotient of matroids and a flag of matroids in terms of realizability of a single matroid. It is natural to ask if something similar can be done more generally for a diagram of matroids.

Question 5.1. Can we characterize the realizability of a diagram of matroids in terms of the realizability of a single matroid?

Here we restricted ourselves to (classical) matroids. In light of the connection with relative realizability problems in tropical geometry, it is natural to ask if a similar theory could be developed for valuated matroids. Quotients of valuated matroids were studied in [7] and [5]. In particular, one could try to define a *valuated* Higgs lift, from which the notions of Higgs factorization and major could be constructed.

Question 5.2. Is there an analogue notion of Higgs lift for quotients of valuated matroids?

Let Mon_d be the set of monomials of degree d in $K[x_0, \dots, x_n]$. Let M_1 and M_2 be two matroids on the ground set Mon_d for some $d > 0$. Denote by

$$T_i = \text{trop}(\nu_d)^{-1}(\text{trop}(M_i) \cap \text{trop}(\nu_d(\mathbb{P}^n)))$$

for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. In light of Remark 4.11 it is natural to ask the following question.

Question 5.3. Under which conditions on M_1 and M_2 we have $T_1 = T_2$?

References

- [1] Daniele Alessandrini and Michele Nesci. On the tropicalization of the Hilbert scheme. *Collectanea mathematica*, 64:39–59, 2013.
- [2] Nicholas Anderson. Matroid products in tropical geometry. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.14771*, 2023.
- [3] Benoît Bertrand, Erwan Brugallé, and Lucía López De Medrano. Planar tropical cubic curves of any genus, and higher dimensional generalisations. *L’Enseignement Mathématique*, 64(3):415–457, 2019.
- [4] Alexandre V Borovik, Izrail Moiseevich Gelfand, and Neil White. *Coxeter matroids*. Springer, 2003.
- [5] Alessio Borzì and Victoria Schleis. Linear degenerate tropical flag varieties. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.04193*, 2023.
- [6] Lara Bossinger, Sara Lamboglia, Kalina Mincheva, and Fatemeh Mohammadi. Computing toric degenerations of flag varieties. *Combinatorial Algebraic Geometry: Selected Papers From the 2016 Apprenticeship Program*, pages 247–281, 2017.
- [7] Madeline Brandt, Christopher Eur, and Leon Zhang. Tropical flag varieties. *Advances in Mathematics*, 384:107695, 2021.
- [8] Thomas Brylawski. Appendix of Matroid Cryptomorphisms. *Theory of matroids*, (26):298, 1986.
- [9] Amanda Cameron, Rodica Dinu, Mateusz Michałek, and Tim Seynnaeve. Flag matroids: algebra and geometry. In *International Conference on Interactions with Lattice Polytopes*, pages 73–114. Springer, 2017.
- [10] Christopher Eur and June Huh. Logarithmic concavity for morphisms of matroids. *Advances in Mathematics*, 367:107094, 2020.
- [11] Eva Maria Feichtner and Sergey Yuzvinsky. Chow rings of toric varieties defined by atomic lattices. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 155(3):515–536, 2004.
- [12] Alex Fink. Tropical cycles and Chow polytopes. *Beiträge zur Algebra und Geometrie/Contributions to Algebra and Geometry*, 54:13–40, 2013.

- [13] Alheydis Geiger. On realizability of lines on tropical cubic surfaces and the Brundu-Logar normal form. *Le Matematiche*, 75(2):651–671, 2020.
- [14] Israel M Gelfand, R Mark Goresky, Robert D MacPherson, and Vera V Serganova. Combinatorial geometries, convex polyhedra, and Schubert cells. *Advances in Mathematics*, 63(3):301–316, 1987.
- [15] Mohammad Moinul Haque. Tropical incidence relations, polytopes, and concordant matroids. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1211.2841*, 2012.
- [16] Joe Harris. *Algebraic geometry: a first course*, volume 133. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [17] Chris Heunen and Vaia Patta. The category of matroids. *Applied Categorical Structures*, 26:205–237, 2018.
- [18] DA Higgs. Strong maps of geometries. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory*, 5(2):185–191, 1968.
- [19] Philipp Jell, Hannah Markwig, Felipe Rincón, and Benjamin Schröter. Moduli spaces of codimension-one subspaces in a linear variety and their tropicalization. *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, pages P2–31, 2022.
- [20] Daniel Kennedy. Majors of geometric strong maps. *Discrete Mathematics*, 12(4):309–340, 1975.
- [21] Joseph P. S. Kung. Strong maps. In *Theory of matroids*, volume 26 of *Encyclopedia Math. Appl.*, pages 224–253. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1986.
- [22] Sara Lamboglia. Tropical Fano schemes. *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society*, 54(4):1249–1264, 2022.
- [23] Diane Maclagan and Bernd Sturmfels. *Introduction to tropical geometry*, volume 161. American Mathematical Society, 2021.
- [24] James Oxley. *Matroid Theory*. Oxford University Press, 02 2011.
- [25] Marta Panizzut and Magnus Dehli Vigeland. Tropical lines on cubic surfaces. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 36(1):383–410, 2022.
- [26] Aidan Schofield. General representations of quivers. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 3(1):46–64, 1992.

[27] Neil White. *Theory of matroids*. Number 26. Cambridge University Press, 1986.

ALESSIO BORZÌ, MPI MIS LEIPZIG, INSELSTRASSE 22, 04103 LEIPZIG,
GERMANY

Email: alessio.borzi@mis.mpg.de