

Skew circuits and circumference in a binary matroid

Sean McGuinness
 Dept. of Mathematics
 Thompson Rivers University
 McGill Road, Kamloops BC
 V2C5N3 Canada
 email: smcguinness@tru.ca

Abstract

For disjoint sets X and Y in a matroid M having ground set E we define $\kappa_M(X, Y) = \min_{X \subseteq A \subseteq E - Y} r(A) + r(E - A) - r(M)$. Let C_1 and C_2 be two disjoint circuits, where $r(C_1 \cup C_2) = r(C_1) + r(C_2)$, in a binary matroid M having circumference c . We show that for every nonnegative integer k , there is an integer $\alpha(k)$ such if $\kappa_M(C_1, C_2) \geq \alpha(k)$, then $|C_1| + |C_2| \leq 2c - k$.

AMS Subject Classifications (2012): 05D99,05B35.

1 Introduction

Many properties of cycles in graphs have their counterparts for circuits in matroids. Our starting point for investigation, is understanding in what way the property of intersection of long cycles graphs can be extended to matroids. For graphs, connectivity plays a significant role in forcing long cycles to intersect and of particular interest here is an old conjecture of Smith (see [3]):

1.1 Conjecture (Smith, 1984)

If C and D are longest cycles in a k -connected graph, where $k \geq 2$, then C and D meet in at least k vertices.

The conjecture remains unsolved, and perhaps the best known result related to it can be found in [4], where it is shown that two longest cycles in

a k -connected graph must meet in at least $ck^{\frac{3}{5}}$ vertices ($c \approx 0.2615$) In [7], the properties of longest cycles sharing 3, 4, or 5 vertices are studied and Smith's conjecture is verified for $k \leq 6$.

The above conjecture raises some natural questions for matroids. For a matroid M having at least one circuit, we define the **circumference**, denoted $c(M)$ to be the length of the longest circuit in M . A k -connected matroid is defined in the following way (see [11]). Let M be a matroid having rank function r . For sets X and Y , let $\square_M(X, Y) = r(X) + r(Y) - r(X \cup Y)$. The **connectivity function** for M is the function $\lambda_M : 2^{E(M)} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ where $\lambda_M(A) = r(A) + r(E(M) - A) - r(M)$; that is, $\lambda_M(A) = \square_M(A, E(M) - A)$. For disjoint subsets X and Y we define $\kappa_M(X, Y) = \min_{X \subseteq A \subseteq E(M) - Y} \lambda_M(A)$ which we refer to as the **linkage** between X and Y . For a subset $A \subset E(M)$, we say that A (or the partition $(A, E(M) - A)$) is **k -separating** if $\lambda_M(A) < k$. The matroid M is said to be **k -connected** if it has no $(k - 1)$ -separating partition $(A, E(M) - A)$ where $\min\{|A|, |E(M) - A|\} \geq k - 1$. It follows from the definition of a k -connected matroid, that if $|M| \geq 2k - 3$, then all circuits must have size at least k . When $|E(M)| < 2k - 3$, it is possible that M can have small circuits and as such, the linkage between two disjoint circuits can be less than k .

Finding lower bounds on the circumference for highly connected matroids is a much more complex problem than that for graphs. Previous results show that two edge-disjoint long cycles in a highly connected graph must intersect in a number of vertices. The key tool here is Menger's theorem (see [3]) which guarantees the existence of many vertex-disjoint paths between two edge-disjoint cycles in a highly connected graph. Correspondingly, one would expect that for two long, highly-linked, disjoint circuits C_1 and C_2 in a matroid, $\square(C_1, C_2)$ would be large. As is the case for cycles in graphs, one might also expect that for two highly-linked circuits C_1 and C_2 where $\square_M(C_1, C_2)$ is small, the combined length $|C_1| + |C_2|$ must be significantly smaller than twice the circumference. Generally, this is false. However, when $\square_M(C_1, C_2) = 0$, that is, when C_1 and C_2 are *skew* circuits, this appears to be true. In [8], it is shown that if M is a k -connected regular matroid with circumference at least k , and C_1 and C_2 are skew circuits, then $|C_1| + |C_2| \leq 2(c - k + 1)$. In [9], the authors show that if C_1 and C_2 are skew circuits in a 2-connected matroid (ie. connected matroid), then $|C_1| + |C_2| \leq 2c - 2$. The case of large circuits in cographic matroids is studied in [12], where the intersection of largest bonds in k -connected graphs is studied. Generally, finding similar bounds for matroids of higher connectivity is hard. Instead, we address the problem of finding a bound of

the form $2c - k$ when the linkage between two skew circuits is much larger than k . The following is the main result of this paper.

1.2 Theorem

Let C_1 and C_2 be skew circuits in a binary matroid M having circumference c . Then for all nonnegative integers k there exists an integer $\alpha(k)$, depending only on k , such that if $\kappa_M(C_1, C_2) \geq \alpha(k)$, then $|C_1| + |C_2| \leq 2c(M) - k$.

The existence of the constant $\alpha(k)$ follows implicitly from the proof of the above theorem, and we give no explicit value other than to say that it is large. It should be noted that if one removes the assumption that C_1 and C_2 are skew, then the above theorem is false.

2 Sufficient conditions for the main theorem

If for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $|C_i| \leq c(M) - k$, then the conclusion of Theorem 1.2 is immediate. As such, one can assume that for $i = 1, 2$, $|C_i| > c(M) - k$. The proof of Theorem 1.2 boils down to finding a certain pair of circuits of which there are two possible scenarios.

We define a **cycle** of M to be a disjoint union of circuits, including the empty set. We let \mathcal{C}_M denote the set of all cycles in M and for a subset $X \subseteq E(M)$, we let $\mathcal{C}_M(X)$ be the set of cycles contained in X . For cycles C_1 and C_2 , we define addition $C_1 + C_2 := C_1 \Delta C_2$ (where Δ denotes the symmetric difference operation).

Suppose M , C_1 , C_2 , and k are as in the statement of Theorem 1.2. To prove this theorem, it will suffice to show that at least one of two things must occur:

- S1)** There is a circuit C where $C + C_1$ and $C + C_2$ are circuits and $|C - (C_1 \cup C_2)| \geq \frac{k}{2}$.
- S2)** There are disjoint circuits C'_1 and C'_2 where $C_1 + C_2 + C'_i$, $i = 1, 2$ are circuits and $|C_1 \cup C_2 - (C'_1 \cup C'_2)| \geq k$.

If S1) occurs, then we have

$$2c(M) \geq |C + C_1| + |C + C_2| \geq |C_1| + |C_2| + 2|C - (C_1 \cup C_2)| \geq |C_1| + |C_2| + k.$$

If S2) occurs, then we have

$$2c(M) \geq \sum_{i=1}^2 |C_1 + C_2 + C'_i| \geq |C_1| + |C_2| + |(C_1 \cup C_2) - (C'_1 \cup C'_2)| \geq |C_1| + |C_2| + k.$$

2.1 Notation

For the most part, we shall follow the definitions and notation for matroids given in [11], with the exception of some notation for sets. For finite sets X and Y of a universal set U we write $X \parallel Y$ if $X \cap Y = \emptyset$ and we write $X \subseteq Y$ (resp. $X \subsetneq Y$) if either $X \subset Y$ or $Y \subset X$ (resp. $X \subseteq Y$ or $Y \subseteq X$). We write $\overline{X} \bowtie_U Y$ if $U - X \parallel U - Y$, where we drop the index U when it is implicit. We write $X \bowtie Y$ if either $X \parallel Y$ or $X \bowtie_U Y$.

For a set X and a nonnegative integer k , we let $\binom{X}{k}$ denote the set of all k -subsets of X . For subsets of integers U and V , we write $U < V$ if $\max\{u \in U\} < \min\{v \in V\}$.

For a set X and elements x, y we will often write $X - x$ in place of $X - \{x\}$ and $X - x + y$ in place of $(X - \{x\}) \cup \{y\}$. More generally, for elements x_1, \dots, x_k and y_1, \dots, y_ℓ , $X - x_1 - \dots - x_k + y_1 + \dots + y_\ell$ will denote the set $(X - \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}) \cup \{y_1, \dots, y_\ell\}$.

For a positive integer k , we let $[k] = \{1, \dots, k\}$ and we let $[k]^e$ (resp. $[k]^o$) denote the set of even (resp. odd) integers in $[k]$. For integers $k < \ell$, we let $[k, \ell] = \{k, k+1, \dots, \ell\}$ and we let $[k, \ell]^e$ (resp. $[k, \ell]^o$) denote the set of even (resp. odd) integers in $[k, \ell]$.

3 Exploiting linkage

We shall make use of the following result of Tutte [13] known as *Tutte's linking lemma*, which, in the case of graphic matroids, implies Menger's theorem. We shall use a stronger version of this theorem found in [5].

3.1 Lemma

Let M be a matroid and let X, Y be disjoint subsets of elements. Then there is a minor N of M such that, $E(N) = X \cup Y$, $\kappa_N(X, Y) = \kappa_M(X, Y)$, and $N|X = M|X$, $N|Y = M|Y$.

For our purposes, we shall need a stronger version of the above lemma which can be found in [6]:

3.2 Lemma

Let M be a matroid and let $m \geq 1$ be an integer. Suppose that for a subset $X \subset E(M)$ and subsets $Y_i \subset E(M)$, $i \in [m]$, we have $Y_1 \subseteq Y_2 \subseteq \dots \subseteq Y_m \subseteq E(M) - X$. Then M has a minor N with ground set $X \cup Y_m$ such that for all $i \in [m]$, $\kappa_N(X, Y_i) = \kappa_M(X, Y_i)$, and $N|X = M|X$ and $N|Y_1 = M|Y_1$.

The first step in the proof of Theorem 1.2 is to reduce the proof to a matroid N where $C_1 \cup C_2$ spans N and $\kappa_N(C_1, C_2) = \kappa_M(C_1, C_2)$. This can be done using the following lemma.

3.3 Lemma

Let X and Y be disjoint sets of a matroid M . Then there exists a minor N such that $X \cup Y \subseteq E(N)$, $X \cup Y$ spans N , $\square_N(X, Y) = \square_M(X, Y)$, $\kappa_N(X, Y) = \kappa_M(X, Y)$ and $N|X = M|X$, $N|Y = M|Y$.

Proof. By induction on $|E(M) - X - Y|$. The lemma is clearly true if $X \cup Y$ spans M (since taking $N = M$ will suffice). Thus we may assume that $X \cup Y$ does not span M and that the lemma is true for all matroids M' where $|E(M') - X - Y| < |E(M) - X - Y|$. Let $e \in E(M) - \text{cl}_M(X \cup Y)$. Let $Y_1 = Y$ and $Y_2 = E(M) - X - e$. By Lemma 3.2, there exists a minor M_1 with ground set $X \cup Y_2 = E(M) - e$ such that $\kappa_{M_1}(X, Y) = \kappa_M(X, Y)$. We note that since $e \notin \text{cl}_M(X \cup Y)$, we have $\square_{M_1}(X, Y) = \square_M(X, Y)$, $M_1|X = M|X$, $M_1|Y = M|Y$ (since either $M_1 = M/e$ or $M_1 = M \setminus e$). By induction, there exists a minor N of M_1 containing $X \cup Y$ such that $X \cup Y$ spans N and $\kappa_N(X, Y) = \kappa_{M_1}(X, Y) = \kappa_M(X, Y)$, $\square_N(X, Y) = \square_{M_1}(X, Y) = \square_M(X, Y)$. Moreover, $N|X = M_1|X = M|X$ and $N|Y = M_1|Y = M|Y$. \square

3.1 Reducing the problem to a minor N

The advantage of the previous lemmas is that they allow us to reduce the proof of Theorem 1.2 to a minor N of M for which $\kappa_N(C_1, C_2) = \kappa_M(C_1, C_2)$ and $\square_N(C_1, C_2) = \square_M(C_1, C_2) = 0$.

For the remainder of this paper, we shall let $C_i = \{e_{i1}, \dots, e_{in_i}\}$, $i = 1, 2$ be two disjoint circuits in a binary matroid M where $\square(C_1, C_2) = 0$. By Lemma 3.3, there is a minor M' of M containing $C_1 \cup C_2$ where $C_1 \cup C_2$ spans M' , $\kappa_{M'}(C_1, C_2) = \kappa_M(C_1, C_2)$, $\square_{M'}(C_1, C_2) = \square_M(C_1, C_2) = 0$, and $M'|C_1 = M|C_1$, $M'|C_2 = M|C_2$. Furthermore, we may assume that for $i = 1, 2$, $\text{cl}_{M'}(C_i) = C_i$.

By Lemma 3.1, there exists a minor $N' = M'/X \setminus Y$ of M' such that $E(N') = C_1 \cup C_2$, and $\square_{N'}(C_1, C_2) = \kappa_{N'}(C_1, C_2) = \kappa_{M'}(C_1, C_2)$ and $N'|C_i = M'|C_i$, $i = 1, 2$. Here we may assume that X is independent, since if contracting some elements of X results in a loop $e \in X$, then deleting or contracting e yields the same matroid, in which case one could assume that $e \in Y$. Since for $i = 1, 2$, $N'|C_i = M'|C_i = M|C_i$, it follows that for $i = 1, 2$, C_i is the only circuit in $M'|C_i \cup X$.

Let $N = M' \setminus Y$ and let $\kappa_N(C_1, C_2) = t$. We claim that $|X| = t$. To see this, let $C_1 \subseteq A \subset E(N) - C_2$. Let $X_1 = A \cap X$ and let $X_2 = X - A$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_N(A) &= r_N(A) + r_N(E(N) - A) - r(N) \\ &= r_N(C_1) + |X_1| + r_N(C_2) + |X_2| - r(N) = |X|.\end{aligned}$$

Thus it follows that $t = \kappa_N(C_1, C_2) = |X|$.

For the remainder of this paper, we let $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_t\}$ and let N be as described above. To prove Theorem 1.2, it will suffice to prove it for the matroid N .

For all subsets $A \subseteq E(N)$ and for all $j \in \{1, 2\}$, we shall let A^j denote the set $A \cap C_j$.

3.2 The circuits D_i

Given that $C_1 \cup C_2$ spans N , for all $i \in [t]$, there is a circuit in N which contains x_i and which is contained in $(C_1 \cup C_2) + x_i$. For all $i \in [t]$, we let D_i be such a circuit. For all subsets $\emptyset \neq I \subseteq [t]$, let $D_I = \sum_{i \in I} D_i$. It is seen that D_I a cycle in $\mathcal{C}_N - \mathcal{C}_N(C_1 \cup C_2)$. Recalling that for $j = 1, 2$, C_j is the only circuit in $C_j \cup X$, it follows that for all $\emptyset \neq I \subseteq [t]$, and for all $j \in \{1, 2\}$, $\emptyset \neq D_I^j \subset C_j$. Note that if I and I' are distinct, nonempty subsets of $[t]$, then for $j = 1, 2$, $D_I^j \neq D_{I'}^j$; for if $D_I^j = D_{I'}^j$, then we would have for $I'' = I \Delta I'$, $D_{I''}^j = \emptyset$, contradicting the previous statement.

3.3 When $D_I + C_j$ is not a circuit

Let $I \subseteq [t]$ and let $j \in \{1, 2\}$. When the cycle $D_I + C_j$ is not a circuit (in N), it must split into two disjoint cycles, and these are described the lemma below.

3.4 Lemma

Let $I \subseteq [t]$ and let $j \in \{1, 2\}$. If $D_I + C_j$ is not a circuit, then there is a partition $I = I_1 \dot{\cup} I_2$ such that i) $D_{I_1}^j \subsetneq D_{I_2}^j$ and ii) $D_{I_1}^{3-j} \not\ll D_{I_2}^{3-j}$. Furthermore, if $D_I + C_1 + C_2$ is not a circuit, then there is a partition $I = I_1 \dot{\cup} I_2$ such that for $i = 1, 2$, $D_{I_1}^i \subsetneq D_{I_2}^i$.

Proof. We first observe that no cycle of $\mathcal{C}_N(C_1 \cup C_2)$ is contained in $D_I + C_j$. Since $D_I + C_j$ is not a circuit, there are disjoint cycles $G_i \in \mathcal{C}_N - \mathcal{C}_N(C_1 \cup C_2)$, $i = 1, 2$ for which $D_I + C_j = G_1 \dot{\cup} G_2$. Then there is a partition $I_1 \dot{\cup} I_2 = I$ of I such that for $i = 1, 2$, let $G_i \cap X = \{x_j \in X \mid j \in I_i\}$. Since $D_{I_1} \cap X = G_1 \cap X$, it follows that $D_{I_1} + G_1 = H$, for some $H \in \mathcal{C}_N(C_1 \cup C_2)$. Let $H' = (C_1 \cup C_2) + H$. Given that $D_I + C_j = D_{I_1} + D_{I_2} + C_j = G_1 + G_2$, it

follows that $D_{I_2} + H + C_j = G_2$, and hence $D_{I_2} = G_2 + H + C_j$. Thus we have

$$\text{a) } D_{I_1}^j + G_1^j = H^j \text{ and } D_{I_2}^j + G_2^j = (H')^j \text{ and for } i = 1, 2, D_{I_i}^{3-j} + G_i^{3-j} = H^{3-j}.$$

By the above, for $i = 1, 2$, $G_i^{3-j} = D_{I_i}^{3-j} + H^{3-j} = (D_{I_i}^{3-j} \cap (H')^{3-j}) \cup (H^{3-j} - D_{I_i}^{3-j})$. Given that $G_1 \parallel G_2$, it follows that

$$\text{b) } D_{I_1}^{3-j} \cap (H')^{3-j} \parallel D_{I_2}^{3-j} \cap (H')^{3-j} \text{ and } H^{3-j} - D_{I_1}^{3-j} \parallel H^{3-j} - D_{I_2}^{3-j}.$$

By a), $G_1^j = D_{I_1}^j + H^j$ and $G_2^j = D_{I_2}^j + (H')^j$. Since $G_1 \parallel G_2$, it follows that $(D_{I_1}^j + H^j) \parallel (D_{I_2}^j + (H')^j)$; that is, $((D_{I_1}^j - H^j) \cup (H^j - D_{I_1}^j)) \parallel ((D_{I_2}^j - (H')^j) \cup ((H')^j - D_{I_2}^j))$. Thus $D_{I_1}^j - H^j \parallel (H')^j - D_{I_2}^j$ and $H^j - D_{I_1}^j \parallel D_{I_2}^j - (H')^j$.

Thus we have

$$\text{c) } D_{I_2}^j \cap H^j \subseteq D_{I_1}^j \cap H^j \text{ and } D_{I_1}^j \cap (H')^j \subseteq D_{I_2}^j \cap (H')^j.$$

Since $H^{3-j} = \emptyset$ or C_{3-j} , b) implies ii). Similarly, since $H^j = \emptyset$ or C_j , c) implies i).

To prove the second part, suppose $D_I + C_1 + C_2$ is not a circuit. Let $i \in I$ and replace D_i with $D'_i = D_i + C_1$. Let $D'_I = D'_i + D_{I-i}$. Then $D'_I + C_2$ is not a circuit and hence by the first part, there is a partition $I = I_1 \dot{\cup} I_2$ where, assuming $i \in I_1$, $(D')_{I_1}^1 \not\parallel (D')_{I_2}^1$ and $(D')_{I_1}^2 \subseteq (D')_{I_2}^2$. Here $(D')_{I_1} = D'_i + D_{I_1-i}$ and $(D')_{I_2} = D_{I_2}$. Given that $(D')_{I_1}^1 = D_{I_1}^1 + C_1$, $(D')_{I_1}^2 = D_{I_2}$, it follows that $D_{I_1}^1 \subseteq D_{I_2}^1$ and $D_{I_1}^2 \subseteq D_{I_2}^2$. This proves the second part. \square

4 Ramsey's Theorem and forbidden configurations in matrices

A key component in the proof of Theorem 1.2 involves an application of *Ramsey's theorem* in its form for hypergraphs (see [10]). The **complete r-uniform hypergraph** on a set of vertices S is the hypergraph whose edges are all the r -subsets of S . For $|S| = n$, we let K_n^r denote the complete r -hypergraph on n vertices. Ramsey's theorem for hypergraphs can be stated as follows:

4.1 Theorem

Suppose s_1, \dots, s_k are positive integers, all at least r . Then there is an integer $R^r(s_1, \dots, s_k)$ such that if $n \geq R^r(s_1, \dots, s_k)$, then for any k -colouring of the edges of K_n^r with colours $1, \dots, k$, there exists $i \in [k]$ and a complete r -uniform subhypergraph $K_{s_i}^r$ on s_i vertices, all of whose edges have colour i .

As an application of the above theorem, we shall show that a circuit C as described in S1) exists unless for some $j \in \{1, 2\}$ there are large subsets $I \subseteq [t]$ such that for all $J \in \binom{I}{k}$, $D_J + C_j$ is not a circuit. This follows from the next lemma.

4.2 Lemma

Suppose that there are constants $\alpha_i(k)$, $i = 1, 2$, depending only on k , such that for all subsets $I \subseteq [t]$, if $|I| \geq \alpha_i$, then there is an k -subset $J \subseteq I$, such that $D_J + C_i$ is a circuit. Then there is a constant $\alpha(k)$ such that for all subsets $I \subseteq [t]$ where $|I| \geq \alpha$, there is a k -subset $J \subseteq I$ such that for $i = 1, 2$, $D_J + C_i$ is a circuit.

Proof. Let $I \subseteq [t]$ and let $I' \subseteq I$. Suppose we colour the k -subsets of I' blue or red in such a way that a k -subset J is coloured blue if $D_J + C_1$ is a circuit; otherwise, it is coloured red. By Theorem 4.1, there is a constant $R^k(\alpha_1, \alpha_1)$ such that if $|I'| \geq R^k(\alpha_1, \alpha_1)$ then for any 2-colouring of the uniform k -hypergraph on I' , there is an α_1 -subset $I'' \subseteq I'$ whose associated k -hypergraph is monochromatic. By assumption, I'' must contain at least at least one blue hyperedge, and hence each hyperedge of I'' is blue. Let $\alpha = R^k(R^k(\alpha_2, \alpha_2), \alpha_1)$ and suppose that $|I| \geq \alpha$. Then either there exists a $R^k(\alpha_2, \alpha_2)$ -subset $I' \subseteq I$ all of whose k -subsets are blue, or there exists an α_1 -subset all of whose k -subsets are coloured red. By our assumptions on α_1 , the latter is impossible and thus the former holds. Let $I' \subseteq I$ be a $R^k(\alpha_2, \alpha_2)$ -subset all of whose k -subsets are blue. Now if we colour the k -subsets J of I' green or yellow, depending on whether $D_J + C_2$ is a circuit or not, it follows by Theorem 4.1 that there is a α_2 -subset of $I'' \subseteq I'$ whose k -uniform hypergraph is monochromatic. By our assumptions on α_2 , all the k -subsets of I'' must be green. Thus every k -subset J of I'' is both blue and green and thus for $i = 1, 2$, $D_J + C_i$ is a circuit. \square

4.1 A theorem on forbidden configurations in matrices

A matrix is **simple** if it has no repeated rows. For matrices A and B we write $B \prec A$ if B can be obtained from a submatrix of A by permuting certain rows and columns of the submatrix.

For a positive integer $\ell \geq 1$, I_ℓ will denote the $\ell \times \ell$ identity matrix and I_ℓ^c will denote the $0, 1$ - matrix which is its complement. We let T_ℓ (resp. T_ℓ') denote the $\ell \times \ell$ $0, 1$ - matrix having a 1 in position (i, j) if and only if $i \leq j$ (resp. $j \leq i$). We say that two square $0, 1$ -matrices B_1 and B_2 have the same *type* if for some integers ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 either $B_1 = I_{\ell_1}$ and $B_2 = I_{\ell_2}$, or $B_1 = I_{\ell_1}^c$ and $B_2 = I_{\ell_2}^c$, or $B_1 = T_{\ell_1}$ and $B_2 = T_{\ell_2}$,

We shall make use of the following theorem of Balogh and Bollobás [1, 2]:

4.3 Theorem

Let A be a simple $m \times n$ $0, 1$ -matrix. If $m \geq (2\ell)^{2^\ell}$, then there exists $B \in \{I_\ell, I_\ell^c, T_\ell\}$ for which $B \prec A$.

For all positive integers ℓ , let $\beta(\ell) = (2\ell)^{2^\ell}$. The above theorem will allow us to choose a large subset of circuits of $\{D_1, \dots, D_t\}$ in a favorable way. Recalling that $C_i = \{e_{i1}, \dots, e_{in_i}\}$, $i = 1, 2$, for $\ell = 1, 2$ we define a $t \times n_i$ $0, 1$ -matrix $A_\ell = [a_{ij}^{(\ell)}]$ where $a_{ij}^{(\ell)} = 1$ if and only if $e_{\ell j} \in D_i^\ell = D_i \cap C_\ell$. We observe that the matrix A_ℓ is simple. Let A be the $t \times (n_1 + n_2)$ matrix obtained by concatenating A_1 with A_2 ; that is, A_1 (resp. A_2) corresponds to the submatrix of A formed by the first n_1 (resp. last n_2) columns of A .

For the remainder, we shall assume that p is an integer which will be chosen to be sufficiently large, depending on k . Suppose that $t \geq \beta(\beta(p)) = (2\beta(p))^{2^{\beta(p)}}$. Since A_1 is simple, it follows by Theorem 4.3 that for some $B_1 \in \{I_{\beta(p)}, I_{\beta(p)}^c, T_{\beta(p)}\}$, $B_1 \prec A_1$. By permuting the rows of A and its first n_1 columns, we may assume that B_1 is the submatrix of A whose entries occupy the first $\beta(p)$ rows and first $\beta(p)$ columns of A . Now let A' be the $\beta(p) \times (n_1 + n_2)$ submatrix of A corresponding to the first $\beta(p)$ rows of A and let A'_1 (resp. A'_2) be the submatrix of A' formed by the first n_1 (resp. last n_2) columns of A' , noting that A'_i , $i = 1, 2$ are simple since A_i , $i = 1, 2$ are. It follows by Theorem 4.3 that there is a matrix $B_2 \in \{I_p, I_p^c, T_p\}$ where $B_2 \prec A'_2$. Suppose $B_1 \in \{I_{\beta(p)}, I_{\beta(p)}^c\}$ or $B_2 \in \{I_p, I_p^c\}$. Then it is seen that one can permute the rows of A' and the columns of A'_1 and/or the columns of A'_2 , so as to obtain a matrix A'' and submatrices A''_i , $i = 1, 2$ corresponding to A'_i , $i = 1, 2$, where for $i = 1, 2$, the submatrix B'_i formed by the first p columns of A''_i has the same type as B_i .

If $B_1 = T_{\beta(p)}$ and $B_2 = T_p$, the situation is slightly different. In this case, it is seen that one can permute the rows of A' and the columns of A'_1 and/or the columns of A'_2 to obtain a matrix A'' and submatrices A''_i , $i = 1, 2$ corresponding to A'_i , $i = 1, 2$ where for $i = 1, 2$ the submatrix B'_i formed by the first p columns of A''_i is such that $B'_1 = T_p$ and $B'_2 \in \{T_p, T_p'\}$. In summation, we have the following observation:

4.4 Observation

With one exception (when $B_1 = T_{\beta(p)}$, $B_2 = T_p$) one can permute the rows of A' and the columns of A'_1 and/or the columns of A'_2 so that the resulting matrix A'' and submatrices A''_i , $i = 1, 2$ (corresponding to A'_i , $i = 1, 2$) is such that for $i = 1, 2$, the submatrix B'_i formed by the first p columns of A''_i has the same type as B_i . When $B_1 = T_{\beta(p)}$, and $B_2 = T_p$, the rows of A' can be permuted and the columns of A'_1 and/or the columns of A'_2 permuted so that for the resulting matrix A'' and submatrices A''_i , $i = 1, 2$, the submatrix B'_1 formed by the first p columns of A''_1 is the matrix T_p , but submatrix B'_2 formed by the first p columns of A''_2 is either T_p or T'_p .

By re-indexing, we may assume that the elements of $C_1 \cup C_2$ and circuits D_i , $i \in [p]$ are indexed so that e_{ij} is the element corresponding to the j 'th column of A''_i and D_i corresponds to the i 'th row of the matrix A'' , where A'' and A''_i are the matrices as described in Observation 4.4. Furthermore, for the remainder of the paper, B'_i , $i = 1, 2$ will refer to the matrices described in the above observation.

4.2 The case where $B'_1 = B'_2$

When $B'_1 = B'_2$, proving Theorem 1.2 for N is fairly simple as one can easily find a circuit C as described in S1) (with N in place of M). This we accomplish in the next lemma.

4.5 Lemma

Let $I \in \binom{[2, p-1]}{k}$ and assume that k is even. If $B'_1 = B'_2$ or $B'_1 = T_p$ and $B'_2 = T'_p$, then for $j = 1, 2$, $D_I + C_j$ is a circuit.

Proof. Assume first that $B'_1 = B'_2$ and let $I \in \binom{[2, p-1]}{k}$. By symmetry, it suffices to prove that $D_I + C_1$ is a circuit. Suppose that this is not the case. Then by Lemma 3.4, there is a partition $I = I_1 \dot{\cup} I_2$ of I such that i) $D_{I_1}^1 \subsetneq D_{I_2}^1$ and ii) $D_{I_1}^2 \not\ll D_{I_2}^2$. Consequently, (almost) the same holds when we restrict to the elements of $\{e_{11}, \dots, e_{1p}\}$ in C_1 and the elements of $\{e_{21}, \dots, e_{2p}\}$ in C_2 . That is,

$$\text{iii) } D_{I_1}^1 \cap \{e_{11}, \dots, e_{1p}\} \subsetneq D_{I_2}^1 \cap \{e_{11}, \dots, e_{1p}\} \text{ and}$$

$$\text{iv) } D_{I_1}^2 \cap \{e_{21}, \dots, e_{2p}\} \not\ll D_{I_2}^2 \cap \{e_{21}, \dots, e_{2p}\}.$$

However, given that $B'_1 = B'_2$, it follows by iii) and symmetry that we also have

$$\text{v) } D_{I_1}^2 \cap \{e_{21}, \dots, e_{2p}\} \subsetneq D_{I_2}^2 \cap \{e_{21}, \dots, e_{2p}\}.$$

Since iv) and v) both hold, for at least one $i \in \{1, 2\}$, we must have $D_{I_i}^2 \cap \{e_{21}, \dots, e_{2p}\} = \emptyset$. We may assume without loss of generality that this holds for $i = 1$. Clearly, $B'_2 \neq I_p$. Suppose $B'_2 = I_p^c$. In this case, if $j \in I_1$, then $e_{2j} \notin D_j^2$ but $e_{2j} \in D_{I_1}^2$ if $|I_1|$ is even. Thus $|I_1|$ is odd. However, if $j \in I_2$ then $j \notin I_1$ and it follows that $e_{2j} \in D_{I_1}^2$ since $|I_1|$ is odd. In either case $D_{I_1}^2 \cap \{e_{21}, \dots, e_{2p}\} \neq \emptyset$, yielding a contradiction. Lastly, suppose $B'_2 = T_p$. Let $i_1 = \min\{j \in I_1\}$. Since $B'_2 = T_p$, it is seen that $e_{2i_1} \in D_{I_1}^2$, again yielding a contradiction. It follows that iv) and v) can not both hold and hence when $B'_1 = B'_2$, $D_I + C_1$ must be a circuit.

Suppose that $B'_1 = T_p$ and $B'_2 = T'_p$. By iii), we may assume without loss of generality that $D_{I_1}^1 \cap \{e_{11}, \dots, e_{1p}\} \supseteq D_{I_2}^1 \cap \{e_{11}, \dots, e_{1p}\}$. Since $k = |I|$ is even, $|I_1|$ and $|I_2|$ have the same parity. Let $i_1 = \min\{i \in I_1\}$ and $j_1 = \min\{i \in I_2\}$. For all $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$, let $F_{i,j} = D_{I_j}^i \cap \{e_{i1}, \dots, e_{ip}\}$. By assumption, we have that $F_{1,2} \subseteq F_{1,1}$. We shall show that iv) can not hold; that is, we will show that $F_{2,1} \not\# F_{2,2}$.

For all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $j \in [p]$, let $a_{ij} = |\{\ell \in I_i \mid \ell \leq j\}|$ and $b_{ij} = |\{\ell \in I_i \mid j \leq \ell\}|$. Given that $B'_1 = T_p$ and $B'_2 = T'_p$, it is straightforward to show that for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$, and $j \in [p]$, $e_{1j} \in F_{1,i}$ iff a_{ij} is odd and $e_{2j} \in F_{2,i}$ iff b_{ij} is odd. Clearly $a_{1i_1} = a_{2j_1} = 1$ and hence $e_{1i_1} \in F_{1,1}$ and $e_{1j_1} \in F_{1,2}$. By assumption it follows that $e_{1j_1} \in F_{1,1}$ and thus $i_1 < j_1$. This in turn implies that $e_{1i_1} \notin F_{1,2}$.

Let $\{i \in I_1 \mid i < j_1\} = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_r\}$ where $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_r$. Suppose $|I_1|$ (and $|I_2|$) is odd. Then both $b_{1i_1} = |I_1|$ and $b_{2i_1} = |I_2|$ are odd and hence $e_{2i_1} \in F_{2,1} \cap F_{2,2}$. On the other hand, since $I \subseteq [2, p-1]$, we have that $b_{1p} = b_{2p} = 0$ and hence for $j = 1, 2$, $e_{2p} \notin F_{2,j}$. Thus $F_{2,1} \not\# F_{2,2}$. Suppose $|I_1|$ (and $|I_2|$) is even. If r is even, then a_{1j_1} is even but $a_{2j_1} = 1$ is odd, implying that $e_{1j_1} \in F_{1,2}$ but $e_{1j_1} \notin F_{1,1}$ a contradiction. Suppose r is odd. Then b_{1j_1} and b_{2j_1} are both odd and hence $e_{2j_1} \in F_{2,1} \cap F_{2,2}$. However, we also have that both b_{1i_1} and b_{2i_1} are both even and hence for $j = 1, 2$, $e_{2i_1} \notin F_{2,j}$. This implies that $F_{2,1} \not\# F_{2,2}$, contradicting iv). It follows that when $B'_1 = T_p$ and $B'_2 = T'_p$, we have that $D_I + C_1$ is a circuit. This completes the proof. \square

5 The case where $B'_1 \neq B'_2$

Since it clearly suffices to prove Theorem 1.2 when k is even, we may assume this for the remainder of this paper. By Lemma 4.5, we may also assume

that $B'_1 \neq B'_2$. Furthermore, if $B'_1 = T_p$, we may assume that $B'_2 \neq T'_p$.

Suppose that there are constants α_i , $i = 1, 2$ such that for $i = 1, 2$, if $I \subseteq [p]$ and $|I| \geq \alpha_i$, then there is a k -subset $J \subseteq I$ for which $D_J + C_i$ is a circuit. In such a case, Lemma 4.2 implies that there is a constant α such that if $I \subseteq [p]$ and $|I| \geq \alpha$, then there is a k -subset $J \subseteq I$ for which both $D_J + C_1$ and $D_J + C_2$ are circuits. That is, $C = D_J$ is a circuit satisfying S1) (with N in place of M). As such, we may assume that at most one of constants α_i , $i = 1, 2$ can exist. Without loss of generality, we may assume that no such constant α_1 exists. Given that p can be chosen as large as we want, we may assume that there is no k -subset $I \subseteq [p]$ for which $D_I + C_1$ is a circuit. Consequently, for all k -subsets $I \subseteq [p]$, there is a partition $I = I_1 \dot{\cup} I_2$ such that $D_I + C_1 = G_1 + G_2$ where G_i , $i = 1, 2$ are disjoint cycles such that for $i = 1, 2$, $D_{I_i} \cap X = G_i \cap X$. For each k -subset $I \in \binom{[p]}{k}$, we assign a partition $I = I_1 \dot{\cup} I_2$ to I where $D_I + C_1 = G_{I,1} + G_{I,2}$, $G_{I,1}$ and $G_{I,2}$ being disjoint cycles for which $D_{I_i} \cap X = G_{I,i} \cap X$, $i = 1, 2$. We shall adopt the convention that the least integer in I belongs to I_1 . Let $H_I = D_{I_1} + G_{I,1}$, noting that $H_I \in \mathcal{C}_N(C_1 \cup C_2) = \{\emptyset, C_1, C_2, C_1 \cup C_2\}$. We shall refer to (I_1, I_2, H_I) as the *associated I-triple*, and $(I_1, I_2, H_I, G_{I,1}, G_{I,2})$ as the *associated I-quintuple*.

In general, suppose $I \subseteq [p]$. If $I = S_1 \dot{\cup} S_2$ is a partition of I where $D_I + C_1 = G_1 \dot{\cup} G_2$, G_1, G_2 being disjoint cycles such that for $i = 1, 2$, $D_{S_i} \cap X = G_i \cap X$, then we refer to (S_1, S_2) as an **I-pair**. If $G_1 + S_1 = H$, we refer to (S_1, S_2, H) as an *I-triple* and (S_1, S_2, H, G_1, G_2) as a *I-quintuple*.

For each $I \in \binom{[p]}{k}$, we assign a binary vector $\tau(I) = (a_1, \dots, a_k) \in \mathbb{Z}_2^k$ (called the **sign** of I) as follows: Let $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ where $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k$. Then for $j = 1, \dots, k$, $a_j = 1$ iff $i_j \in I_1$ (noting that by convention, $i_1 \in I_1$ and hence $a_1 = 1$).

We also define a vector $\varsigma(I) = (s_1, \dots, s_\ell)$ iteratively as follows: Let s_1 be the maximum value of i such that $a_1 = \dots = a_i = 1$. Suppose s_1, \dots, s_j have been defined for some $j \geq 1$. If $\sum_{i=1}^j s_i = k$, then we are done and $\ell = j$. Otherwise, let s_{j+1} be the maximum value of i such that $a_{s_{j+1}} = \dots = a_{s_j+i}$ and continue with $j+1$ in place of j .

We say that a finite sequence of integers b_1, b_2, \dots, b_m is **balanced** if $b_m - b_{m-1} + \dots + (-1)^{m+1} b_1 = 0$ and for $i = 1, \dots, m-1$, $b_i - b_{i-1} + \dots + (-1)^{i+1} b_1 \geq 0$.

We have two important observations.

5.1 Observation

$B'_1 = T_p$ and $B'_2 \in \{I_p, I_p^c\}$.

Proof. Let $I \in \binom{[p]}{k}$. By Lemma 3.4, we have i) $D_{I_1}^1 \subsetneq D_{I_2}^1$ and ii) $D_{I_1}^2 \not\subseteq D_{I_2}^2$. Now i) implies that $D_{I_1}^1 \cap \{e_{11}, \dots, e_{1p}\} \subsetneq D_{I_2}^1 \cap \{e_{11}, \dots, e_{1p}\}$ and this in turn implies that $B'_1 \neq I_p$. Suppose $B'_1 = \overline{I}_p^c$. Given that $k = |I|$ is even, it follows that $|I_1|$ and $|I_2|$ have the same parity. Let $i \in I_1$. Then $e_{1i} \notin D_i^1$ but $\forall j \in I_1 - i, e_{1i} \in D_j^1$. Moreover, for all $j \in I_2, e_{1i} \in D_j^1$. Thus if $|I_1|$ is even, $e_{1i} \in D_{I_1}^1 - D_{I_2}^1$ and if $|I_1|$ is odd, then $e_{1i} \in D_{I_2}^1 - D_{I_1}^1$. However, the same observation applies for I_2 in place of I_1 . Thus $D_{I_1}^1 - D_{I_2}^1 \neq \emptyset$ and $D_{I_2}^1 - D_{I_1}^1 \neq \emptyset$ contradicting the fact that $D_{I_1}^1 \subsetneq D_{I_2}^1$. We conclude that $B'_1 \neq \overline{I}_p^c$ and hence $B'_1 = I_p$. It follows from our assumptions that $B'_2 \neq \overline{I}_p^c$. Moreover, since $B'_1 \neq B'_2$, it follows that $B'_2 \in \{I_p, \overline{I}_p^c\}$. \square

5.2 Observation

For all $I \in \binom{[p]}{k}$, $D_I + C_2$ and $D_I + C_1 + C_2$ are circuits.

Proof. Let $I \in \binom{[p]}{k}$ and suppose that $D_I + C_2$ is not a circuit. Then it follows by Lemma 3.4 that there is a partition $I = S_1 \dot{\cup} S_2$ of I for which $D_{S_1}^2 \subsetneq D_{S_2}^2$. It then follows that $D_{S_1}^2 \cap \{e_{11}, \dots, e_{1p}\} \subsetneq D_{S_2}^2 \cap \{e_{11}, \dots, e_{1p}\}$. By Observation 5.1, $B'_2 \in \{I_p, \overline{I}_p^c\}$. Clearly $B'_2 \neq I_p$ and hence it follows that $B'_2 = \overline{I}_p^c$. Since k is even, one can show, using similar arguments as before, that $D_{S_1}^2 - D_{S_2}^2 \neq \emptyset$ and $D_{S_2}^2 - D_{S_1}^2 \neq \emptyset$ which contradicts the fact that $D_{S_1}^2 \subsetneq D_{S_2}^2$. Thus $D_I + C_2$ is a circuit.

To show that $D_I + C_1 + C_2$ is a circuit, we note that if this is not the case, then Lemma 3.4 implies that there is a partition $I = S_1 \dot{\cup} S_2$ of I such that for $i = 1, 2, D_{S_1}^i \subsetneq D_{S_2}^i$. Clearly $B'_2 \neq I_p$ and thus $B'_2 = \overline{I}_p^c$. However, one can now show as before that $D_{S_1}^2 - D_{S_2}^2 \neq \emptyset$ and $D_{S_2}^2 - D_{S_1}^2 \neq \emptyset$ which contradicts the fact that $D_{S_1}^2 \subsetneq D_{S_2}^2$. \square

5.3 Observation

We may assume that $B'_2 = I_p$.

To justify the above, suppose that for all $j \in [p]$, we replace D_j by the circuit $D'_j = D_j + C_2$. Given that k is even, it follows that $D'_I = \sum_{j \in I} D'_j = D_I$. By the above observation, $D'_I + C_2$ is a circuit. Thus we may assume as before that for all $I \in \binom{[p]}{k}$, $D'_I + C_1$ is not a circuit. Notably, if $B'_2 = \overline{I}_p^c$, then the corresponding matrix B'_2 for the circuits $D'_j, j \in [p]$ will be \overline{I}_p^c . Because of this, we may assume without loss of generality that $B'_2 = I_p$.

5.4 Lemma

There is a constant $\xi(k, q)$, depending only on k and q , such that provided $p \geq \xi$, there is a q -subset $Q \subset [p]$ such that for all $I, J \in \binom{[p]}{k}$, $\tau(I) = \tau(J)$ and $H_I = H_J$.

Proof. We begin by colouring each k -subset $I \in \binom{[p]}{k}$ with the pair $(H_I, \tau(I))$, of which there are at most $4 \cdot 2^k = 2^{k+2}$ possible colours. It follows by

Theorem 4.1 that there is a constant $R^k(\overbrace{q, \dots, q}^{2^{k+2}})$ such that provided $p \geq R^k(q, \dots, q)$, there is a q -subset $Q \subset [p]$ such that all k -subsets of Q are monochromatic; that is, for all $I, J \in \binom{Q}{k}$, $H_I = H_J$ and $\tau(I) = \tau(J)$. Thus $\xi = R^k(q, \dots, q)$ is the required constant. \square

By the above, we shall assume that $Q \subseteq [p]$ is such that for all $I \in \binom{Q}{k}$, $\tau(I) = (a_1, \dots, a_k)$, $\varsigma(I) = (s_1, \dots, s_\ell)$ and $H_I = H$. Furthermore, for convenience, we may assume that $Q = [q]$.

5.1 Finding disjoint sets

To complete the proof of Theorem 1.2, we shall show that one can find circuits in N satisfying S2). Towards this goal, we shall prove the following lemma which is the main result of this section.

5.5 Lemma

Assuming q is large enough, there are pairwise disjoint sets U_1, \dots, U_m in $[q]$ such that for all $1 \leq i < j \leq m$, (U_i, U_j, H) is a $(U_i \cup U_j)$ -triple and $|U_i \cup U_j| \geq k$.

Suppose $I \in \binom{[q]}{k}$. By assumption, (I_1, I_2, H) is a I -triple and $\varsigma(I) = (s_1, \dots, s_\ell)$. Assuming that $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ where $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k$, it follows that $I_1 = \bigcup_{j \in [\ell]^o} \{i_{s_{j-1}+1}, \dots, i_{s_{j-1}+s_j}\}$ and $I_2 = \bigcup_{j \in [\ell]^e} \{i_{s_{j-1}+1}, \dots, i_{s_{j-1}+s_j}\}$, where $s_0 := 0$. Our first task is to show that one can substitute the sets $\{i_{s_{j-1}+1}, \dots, i_{s_{j-1}+s_j}\}$ in I_1 or I_2 with larger sets so as to achieve sets I'_1, I'_2 for which (I'_1, I'_2, H) is a $I'_1 \cup I'_2$ -triple. This gives us the needed flexibility when constructing the sets U_1, \dots, U_m described in Lemma 5.5.

5.6 Lemma

For $i = 1, 2, \dots, \ell$, let $Q_i = \{q_{i1}, \dots, q_{it_i}\} \subseteq [q]$ be disjoint subsets of $[q]$ such that $q_{i1} < q_{i2} < \dots < q_{it_i}$ and $Q_1 < Q_2 < \dots < Q_\ell$. Suppose that for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, $t_i \geq s_i$ and t_i and s_i have the same parity. Then for $R_1 = \bigcup_{i \in [\ell]^o} Q_i$, $R_2 = \bigcup_{i \in [\ell]^e} Q_i$ and $R = R_1 \cup R_2$, we have that (R_1, R_2, H) is a R -triple.

Proof. For $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, let $P_i = \{q_{i1}, \dots, q_{is_i}\}$ and let $I = \bigcup_i P_i$. Then $I \in \binom{[q]}{k}$, $\tau(I) = (a_1, \dots, a_k)$ and $\varsigma(I) = (s_1, \dots, s_\ell)$. We also have that $I_1 = \bigcup_{i \in [\ell]^o} P_i$ and $I_2 = \bigcup_{i \in [\ell]^e} P_i$ (and (I_1, I_2, H) is the associated I -triple).

For $h = 0, \dots, \ell$, we shall define Γ^h as follows: We define $\Gamma^0 := I$ and for $h \geq 1$, $\Gamma^h := Q_1 \cup \dots \cup Q_h \cup P_{h+1} \cup \dots \cup P_\ell$; that is, Γ^h is obtained from I by replacing the sets P_1, \dots, P_h with the sets Q_1, \dots, Q_h , respectively. Furthermore, we define $\Gamma_1^h := \left(\bigcup_{i \in [h]^o} Q_i \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{i \in [h+1, \ell]^o} P_i \right)$ and $\Gamma_2^h := \left(\bigcup_{i \in [h]^e} Q_i \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{i \in [h+1, \ell]^e} P_i \right)$. It will suffice to prove that for all h , $(\Gamma_1^h, \Gamma_2^h, H)$ is a Γ^h -triple. We shall use induction on h , where the assertion is seen to be true for $h = 0$,

Assume that the assertion holds for some fixed $h \geq 0$; that is, $(\Gamma_1^h, \Gamma_2^h, H)$ is a Γ^h -triple. Let $(\Gamma_1^h, \Gamma_2^h, H, G_{\Gamma^h, 1}, G_{\Gamma^h, 2})$ be the corresponding Γ^h -quintuple. For convenience, we shall assume h is even; the case where h is odd being similar. If $t_{h+1} = s_{h+1}$, then $Q_{h+1} = P_{h+1}$, and the assertion is seen to hold for $h+1$, since it holds for h . Thus we may assume that $t_{h+1} > s_{h+1}$. Let $\gamma = t_{h+1} - s_{h+1}$, noting that γ is even since t_i and s_i have the same parity. Let $P_{h+1, 0} = P_{h+1}$ and for $i = 1, \dots, \gamma$, let $P_{h+1, i} = P_{h+1} - q_{(h+1)s_{h+1}} + q_{(h+1)(s_{h+1}+i)}$. Given that γ is even, we have the symmetric difference $\Delta_{i=0}^\gamma P_{h+1, i} = Q_{h+1}$.

Let $\Gamma^{h, 0} = \Gamma^h$. For $i = 1, \dots, \gamma$, we define $\Gamma^{h, i}$ to be the set obtained by replacing P_{h+1} with $P_{h+1, i}$ in Γ^h ; that is, $\Gamma^{h, i} = \Gamma^h - P_{h+1} + P_{h+1, i}$. Note that $\Delta_{i=0}^\gamma \Gamma^{h, i} = \Gamma^{h+1}$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_1^{h, i} &= \left(\bigcup_{j \in [h]^o} Q_j \right) \cup P_{h+1, i} \cup \left(\bigcup_{j \in [h+2, \ell]^o} P_j \right) \\ \Gamma_2^{h, i} &= \left(\bigcup_{j \in [h]^e} Q_j \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{j \in [h+2, \ell]^e} P_j \right) = \Gamma_2^h. \end{aligned}$$

By our inductive assumption, $(\Gamma_1^{h, i}, \Gamma_2^{h, i}, H)$ is a $\Gamma^{h, i}$ -triple.

For $i = 0, \dots, \gamma$, let $(\Gamma_1^{h, i}, \Gamma_2^{h, i}, H, G_{\Gamma^{h, i}, 1}, G_{\Gamma^{h, i}, 2})$ be the corresponding $\Gamma^{h, i}$ -quintuple. Then for $i = 0, \dots, \gamma$, we have $D_{\Gamma^{h, i}} + C_1 = G_{\Gamma^{h, i}, 1} + G_{\Gamma^{h, i}, 2}$ and $D_{\Gamma_1^{h, i}} + G_{\Gamma^{h, i}, 1} = H$ and $D_{\Gamma_2^{h, i}} + G_{\Gamma^{h, i}, 2} = H + C_1$. Since for $i = 0, \dots, \gamma$, $\Gamma_2^{h, i} = \Gamma_2^h$, it follows that for $i = 0, \dots, \gamma$, $G_{\Gamma^{h, i}, 2} = G_{\Gamma^h, 2}$. Since $\Delta_{i=0}^\gamma \Gamma^{h+1, i} = \Gamma^{h+1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{\Gamma^{h+1}} + C_1 &= \sum_{i=0}^{\gamma} (D_{\Gamma^{h,i}} + C_1) = \sum_{i=0}^{\gamma} (G_{\Gamma^{h,i,1}} + G_{\Gamma^{h,i,2}}) \\
&= \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\gamma} G_{\Gamma^{h,i,1}} \right) + G_{\Gamma^{h,2}}. \tag{1}
\end{aligned}$$

We note that $\sum_{i=0}^{\gamma} G_{\Gamma^{h,i,1}}$ and $G_{\Gamma^{h,2}}$ are disjoint cycles since for $i = 0, \dots, \gamma$, $G_{\Gamma^{h,i,1}}$ and $G_{\Gamma^{h,i,2}} = G_{\Gamma^{h,2}}$ are disjoint cycles. Since $\Gamma_1^{h+1} = \left(\bigcup_{i \in [h+1]^o} Q_i \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{i \in [h+2, \ell]^o} P_i \right)$ and $\Gamma_2^{h+1} = \left(\bigcup_{i \in [h+1]^e} Q_i \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{i \in [h+2, \ell]^e} P_i \right)$. We see that

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{\Gamma^{h+1}} + C_1 &= D_{\Gamma_1^{h+1}} + D_{\Gamma_2^{h+1}} + C_1 \\
&= D_{\Gamma_1^{h+1}} + D_{\Gamma_2^h} + C_1 \\
&= D_{\Gamma_1^{h+1}} + H + G_{\Gamma^{h,2}}. \tag{2}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus it follows from equations (1) and (2) that $D_{\Gamma_1^{h+1}} + H = \sum_{i=0}^{\gamma} G_{\Gamma^{h,i,1}}$. Consequently, $(\Gamma_1^{h+1}, \Gamma_2^{h+1}, H)$ is a Γ^{h+1} -triple. The lemma now follows by induction. \square

Let $t_i, i \in [\ell]$, be positive integers chosen such that for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, $t_i \geq s_i$ and s_i and t_i have the same parity. Given that $k = \sum_i s_i$ is even, it is a straightforward exercise to show that t_1, \dots, t_ℓ can be chosen so that it is a balanced sequence. We shall define integers $\mu_i, i = 0, 1, \dots, \ell$ as follows: let $\mu_0 := 0$, and for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, $\mu_i := t_i - t_{i-1} + \dots + (-1)^{i+1} t_1$. Since t_1, \dots, t_ℓ is balanced, it follows that $\mu_\ell = 0$, and for all $i \in [\ell - 1]$, $\mu_i \geq 0$. The sequence $\mu_i, i = 0, \dots, \ell$ has the favourable property that $i = 1, 2, \dots, \ell$, $\mu_{i-1} + \mu_i = t_i$.

As a consequence of Lemma 5.6, we have the following:

5.7 Observation

Let $Q_1 < Q_2 < \dots < Q_\ell$ be disjoint subsets of $[q]$, where for all $i \in [\ell]$, $|Q_i| = t_i$. Then for $R_1 = \bigcup_{i \in [\ell]^o} Q_i$, $R_2 = \bigcup_{i \in [\ell]^e} Q_i$, and $R = R_1 \cup R_2$, we have that (R_1, R_2, H) is an R -triple.

5.2 Proof of Lemma 5.5

We shall complete the proof of Lemma 5.5. Let $m \geq \ell$ be a positive integer. For convenience, we shall assume ℓ is even; the construction in the case where ℓ is odd being very similar.

Our objective is to construct pairwise disjoint sets U_1, \dots, U_m in $[q]$ such that for all $1 \leq i < j \leq m$, (U_i, U_j, H) is a $(U_i \cup U_j)$ -triple and $|U_i \cup U_j| \geq k$. Throughout, we may assume that q is as large as needed. To begin with, U_1 will be the union of disjoint subsets $U_{1,j}$, $j \in [\frac{\ell}{2}]$, and U_m will be the union of disjoint subsets $U_{m,j}$, $j \in [\frac{\ell}{2}]$. For all $i \in \{1, m\}$ and $j \in [\frac{\ell}{2}]$, the subset $U_{i,j} \subset [q]$ is defined as follows:

- For $j = 1, \dots, \frac{\ell}{2}$, $|U_{1,j}| = t_{2i-1}$ and $|U_{m,j}| = t_{2i}$.
- For all $j, j' \in [\frac{\ell}{2}]$, $U_{1,j} < U_{m,j'}$ if and only if $j \leq j'$, and $U_{m,j'} < U_{1,j}$ if and only if $j' < j$. Then we have

$$U_{1,1} < U_{m,1} < U_{1,2} < U_{m,2} < U_{1,3} < U_{m,3} < \dots < U_{1,\frac{\ell}{2}} < U_{m,\frac{\ell}{2}}.$$

Each set U_i , $i \in [2, m-1]$ will be the union of disjoint subsets $U_{i,j}$, $j \in [\ell]$ which are defined as follows:

- For all $i \in [2, m-1]$ and for all $j \in [\ell]$, $|U_{i,j}| = \mu_j$.
- For all $j \in [\ell]^o$, $U_{1,\frac{j+1}{2}} < U_{2,j} < U_{3,j} < \dots < U_{m-1,j} < U_{m,\frac{j+1}{2}}$.
- For all $j \in [\ell-2]^e$, $U_{m,\frac{j}{2}} < U_{m-1,j} < U_{m-2,j} < \dots < U_{2,j} < U_{1,\frac{j}{2}+1}$.
- $U_{m,\frac{\ell}{2}} < U_{m-1,\ell} < U_{m-2,\ell} < \dots < U_{2,\ell}$.

For example, in the case where $\ell = m = 4$, the sets $U_{i,j}$ are such that

$$U_{1,1} < U_{2,1} < U_{3,1} < U_{4,1} < U_{3,2} < U_{2,2} < U_{1,2} < U_{2,3} < U_{3,3} < U_{4,2} < U_{3,4} < U_{2,4}.$$

Note that since $\mu_\ell = 0$, we have that for all $i \in [2, m-1]$, $U_{i,\ell} = \emptyset$. Moreover, for all $i \in [2, m-1]$ and $j \in [2, \ell]$, $|U_{i,j-1} \cup U_{i,j}| = \mu_{j-1} + \mu_j = t_j$. We have that $U_{1,1} < U_{m,1} < U_{1,2} < U_{m,2} < \dots < U_{1,\frac{\ell}{2}} < U_{m,\frac{\ell}{2}}$. Furthermore, since for $j = 1, \dots, \frac{\ell}{2}$, $|U_{1,j}| = t_{2j-1}$ and $|U_{m,j}| = t_{2j}$ it follows from Observation 5.7 that (U_1, U_m, H) is a $(U_1 \cup U_m)$ -triple.

For $1 < i < i' < m$, we have that

$$U_{i,1} < U_{i',1} \cup U_{i',2} < U_{i,2} \cup U_{i,3} < \dots < U_{i,\ell-2} \cup U_{i,\ell-1} < U_{i',\ell-1} \cup U_{i',\ell}.$$

Moreover, since $|U_{i,1}| = t_1$, and for $j = 1, 2, \dots, \frac{\ell}{2}$, and

$$|U_{i,2j} \cup U_{i,2j+1}| = \mu_{2j} + \mu_{2j+1} = t_{2j+1}, \quad |U_{i',2j-1} \cup U_{i',2j}| = \mu_{2j-1} + \mu_{2j} = t_{2j},$$

it follows from Observation 5.7 that $(U_i, U_{i'}, H)$ is a $(U_i \cup U_{i'})$ -triple.

Let $1 < i < m$. Then we have

$$U_{1,1} < U_{i,1} \cup U_{i,2} < U_{1,2} < U_{i,3} \cup U_{i,4} < \dots < U_{1,\frac{\ell}{2}} < U_{i,2\ell-1} \cup U_{i,2\ell}.$$

Since for all $j \in [\frac{\ell}{2}]$, $|U_{1,j}| = t_{2j-1}$ and $|U_{i,2j-1} \cup U_{i,2j}| = t_{2j}$, it follows from Observation 5.7 that (U_1, U_i, H) is a $(U_1 \cup U_i)$ -triple. Similarly, we have

$$U_{i,1} < U_{m,1} < U_{i,2} \cup U_{i,3} < U_{m,2} < U_{i,4} \cup U_{i,5} < \dots < U_{i,\ell-2} \cup U_{i,\ell} < U_{m,\frac{\ell}{2}}.$$

Since $|U_{i,1}| = t_1$, $|U_{m,1}| = t_2$, and for all $j \in [2, \frac{\ell}{2}]$, $|U_{i,2j-2} \cup U_{i,2j-1}| = t_{2j-1}$ and $|U_{m,j}| = t_{2j}$, it follows again from Observation 5.7 that (U_i, U_m, H) is a $(U_1 \cup U_i)$ -triple.

From the above, U_1, \dots, U_m are seen to be the desired sets. This completes the proof of Lemma 5.5.

6 Proof of Theorem 1.2

By Lemma 5.5, there are disjoint subsets U_1, \dots, U_m in $[q]$ such that for all $1 \leq i < j \leq m$, (U_i, U_j, H) is an $U_i \cup U_j$ -triple. Additionally, the sets U_i , $i \in [m]$, were constructed such that $U_{1,1} < U_{2,1} < \dots < U_{m,1}$. Thus if for all $i \in [m]$, we define $u_i^* := \min\{u \mid u \in U_i\}$, then $u_1^* < u_2^* < \dots < u_m^*$ (noting that for all $i \in [m]$, $u_i^* \in U_{i,1}$). By Lemma 3.4, we have:

A) For all $1 \leq i < j \leq m$, $D_{U_i}^1 \subsetneq D_{U_j}^1$ and

B) for all $1 \leq i < j \leq m$, $D_{U_i}^2 \not\parallel D_{U_j}^2$.

Given that (by Observation 5.1) $B_1^1 = T_p$, it follows that for all $1 \leq i < j \leq q$, $D_i^1 \cap \{e_{11}, \dots, e_{1q}\} \supset D_j^1 \cap \{e_{11}, \dots, e_{1q}\}$. Now since $u_1^* < u_2^* < \dots < u_m^*$, it follows from A) that for all $1 \leq i < j \leq m$, $D_{U_i}^1 \supset D_{U_j}^1$.

Let $V_1 = U_1 \cup U_2$ and let $V_2 = U_{m-1} \cup U_m$. Then $D_{V_1} = D_{U_1} + D_{U_2}$ and $D_{V_2} = D_{U_{m-1}} + D_{U_m}$. By the above, $D_{V_1}^1 = D_{U_1}^1 - D_{U_2}^1$ and $D_{V_2}^1 = D_{U_{m-1}}^1 - D_{U_m}^1$, and hence $D_{V_1}^1 \parallel D_{V_2}^1$. Furthermore, by B), it follows that $D_{V_1}^2 \parallel D_{V_2}^2$. Thus $D_{V_1} \parallel D_{V_2}$. In addition, we see that $D_{U_2}^1 - D_{U_{m-1}}^1 \subset C_1 \cup C_2 - (D_{V_1} \cup D_{V_2})$, noting that $|D_{U_2}^1 - D_{U_{m-1}}^1| \geq m-3$. Suppose $D_{V_1} + C_1 + C_2$ is

not a circuit. Then Lemma 3.4 implies that there is a partition $V_1 = S_1 \dot{\cup} S_2$ such that for $i = 1, 2$, $D_{S_1}^i \subsetneq D_{S_2}^i$. However, given that (by Observation 5.3) $B'_2 = I_p$, it is clearly impossible that $D_{S_1}^2 \subsetneq D_{S_2}^2$. Thus $D_{V_1} + C_1 + C_2$ is a circuit, and similarly, $D_{V_2} + C_1 + C_2$ is also a circuit. We now see that when $m \geq k + 3$, the circuits $C'_i = D_{V_i}$, $i = 1, 2$ satisfy S2) (with N in place of M). This completes the proof.

7 A Conjecture

We conjecture that Theorem 1.2 is true for all matroids.

7.1 Conjecture

Let C_1 and C_2 be skew circuits in a matroid M having circumference c . Then for all nonnegative integers k there exists an integer $\alpha(k)$, depending only on k , such that if $\kappa_M(C_1, C_2) \geq \alpha(k)$, then $|C_1| + |C_2| \leq 2c - k$.

References

- [1] R. P. Anstee, L. Lu, *Unavoidable multicoloured families of configurations*, arXiv:1409.4123, 2014.
- [2] J. Balogh, B. Bollobás, *Unavoidable traces of set systems*, *Combinatorica*, **25**, 2005, 633-645.
- [3] J. Bondy, Basic Graph Theory: Paths and circuits, In: *Handbook of Combinatorics*, R.L. Graham, M. Grötschel, and L. Lovás, Eds., Vol. 1, pp. 3 - 110, Elsevier, Amsterdam, MIT Press, Cambridge, 1996.
- [4] G. Chen, R. Faudree, R. Gould, *Intersections of longest cycles in k -connected graphs*, *J. Comb. Theory Series B* **72** (1), 1998, 143-149.
- [5] J. Geelen, B. Gerards, G. Whittle, *Excluding a planar graph from $GF(q)$ -representable matroids*, *J. Comb. Theory Series B*, **97**, 2007, 971-998.
- [6] J. Geelen, P. Nelson, Z. Walsh, *Excluding a line from complex-representable matroids*, arXiv:2101.12000, to appear in *Mem. of AMS*.
- [7] M. Grötschel, *On intersections of longest cycles*, In: *Graph Theory and Combinatorics* (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 171-189, Academic press, London (1984).

- [8] S. McGuinness, *Circuits through cocircuits in a graph with extensions to matroids*, *Combinatorica* **25** (4), 2005, 451-463.
- [9] N. McMurray, T. Reid, B. Wei, H. Wu, *Largest circuits in matroids*, *Adv. applied Math*, **34** (1), 2005, 213 - 216.
- [10] D. Mubayi, A. Suk, *A Survey of hypergraph Ramsey problems*, In: *Discrete mathematics and applications*, SOIA, **165**, pp. 405-428, Springer, 2020.
- [11] J. Oxley, *Matroid Theory*, 2nd. ed., Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2011.
- [12] L. Sheppardson, *Intersections of largest bonds in k -connected graphs*, *Discrete Math*, **309** (12), 2009, 4116-4122.
- [13] W.T. Tutte, *Menger's theorem for matroids*, *J. Res. Natl. Bureau of Standards - B.Math. Math. Phys.* 69 B, 1965, 49-53.