

Tensor Product of Polymatroids and Common Information

Carles Padró

Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain

February 11, 2025

Abstract

The common information property and the existence of a tensor product with the uniform matroid of rank two on three elements are two different necessary conditions for a polymatroid to be linearly representable. Each of them implies the Ingleton's inequality, which is another necessary condition. Additional connections between those conditions are discussed in this paper.

1 Introduction

This short note is motivated by a question posed in [2, Section 5] about the connections between two necessary conditions for a polymatroid to be linearly representable. Namely, the common information property [1, 3, 6] and the existence of tensor products with regular matroids [2, 8, 9].

Another necessary condition is given by Ingleton's inequality [7]. Its original proof [7] deals with intersections of two and three vector spaces. A simpler proof using only one intersection of two subspaces was presented in [6]. As a consequence, the inequality holds for every polymatroid satisfying the common information property. Subsequently, other linear rank inequalities were found [3] by using the common information property.

An alternative proof for the Ingleton's inequality has been recently presented [2]. Specifically, a polymatroid satisfies the Ingleton's inequality if it admits a tensor product with the uniform matroid $U_{2,3}$, which implies that the inequality holds for every linearly representable polymatroid.

Some questions arise from that proof, as the one posed in [2]: which are the connections between common information and tensor products? Or are those two necessary conditions essentially different? Is it possible to find new linear rank inequalities by using tensor products?

A partial answer to those questions is presented in this work. First, we notice that the rank function of the tensor product of a linearly representable polymatroid with $U_{2,3}$ depends on the dimension of the intersection of three vector subspaces (Proposition 2.1). Second, we prove that some bounds that are derived from that fact apply to every tensor product with $U_{2,3}$ (Proposition 2.2). And third, we use those bounds to present a more transparent proof for the fact that the Ingleton's inequality is satisfied by every polymatroid that admits a tensor product with $U_{2,3}$ (Proposition 2.3).

The intersection of three vector subspaces provides a common information for a triple of sets. So we can conclude that there is a connection between common information and tensor products with $U_{2,3}$.

2 Yet Another Proof of Ingleton's Inequality

A compact notation for set unions is used, that is, we write XY for $X \cup Y$. Given $A \subseteq E$ and $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, we notate A^i for the subset $A \times \{i\}$ of $E \times \{1, 2, 3\}$. For example, $A^1 B^2 (CD)^3$ denotes the set $(A \times \{1\}) \cup (B \times \{2\}) \cup ((C \cup D) \times \{3\})$.

Given a collection $(V_x)_{x \in E}$ of vector subspaces of a vector space V , the set function f on E defined by $f(X) = \dim(\sum_{x \in X} V_x)$ for every $X \subseteq E$ is monotone and submodular, so it is the *rank function* of a *polymatroid* on the *ground set* E . In that situation, the collection $(V_x)_{x \in E}$ is a *linear representation* of the polymatroid (E, f) . By using linear algebra, one can prove in different ways [3, 6, 7] that, for every four subsets A, B, C, D of the ground set E ,

$$f(AB) + f(AC) + f(BC) + f(AD) + f(BD) \geq f(A) + f(B) + f(ABC) + f(ABD) + f(CD)$$

That is *Ingleton's inequality*, a necessary condition for a polymatroid to be linearly representable.

Consider a polymatroid (E, f) and sets $A_1, A_2, A_3 \subseteq E$. Take $s = f(A_1 A_2 A_3)$ and $r_i = f(A_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. In addition, for $\{i, j, k\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$, take $s_i = f(A_j A_k)$ and $t_i = r_j + r_k - s_i$.

Let $(V_x)_{x \in E}$ be a linear representation of a polymatroid (E, f) . Given three sets $A_1, A_2, A_3 \subseteq E$ consider, for each $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, the vector subspace $U_i = \sum_{x \in A_i} V_x$. A proof for following well known basic inequalities can be found, for example, in [5, Section 7.2].

$$\max \left\{ 0, s - \sum s_i + \sum r_i \right\} \leq \dim(U_1 \cap U_2 \cap U_3) \leq \min\{t_1, t_2, t_3\} \quad (1)$$

Proposition 2.1. *A linear representation $(V_x)_{x \in E}$ of (E, f) , together with the obvious linear representation for $U_{2,3}$, determine a tensor product $(E \times \{1, 2, 3\}, g)$ of those two polymatroids. Consider $A_1, A_2, A_3 \subseteq E$ and, for each $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, the vector subspace $U_i = \sum_{x \in A_i} V_x$. Then*

$$g(A_1^1 A_2^2 A_3^3) = f(A_1) + f(A_2) + f(A_3) - \dim(U_1 \cap U_2 \cap U_3)$$

Proof. Use the properties of the tensor product of vector spaces. □

Take

$$\alpha(A_1, A_2, A_3) = r_1 + r_2 + r_3 - \max \left\{ 0, s - \sum s_i + \sum r_i \right\} = \min \left\{ \sum r_i, \sum s_i - s \right\}$$

and

$$\beta(A_1, A_2, A_3) = r_1 + r_2 + r_3 - \min\{t_1, t_2, t_3\} = \max\{s_1 + r_1, s_2 + r_2, s_3 + r_3\}$$

By combining the inequalities in (1) and Proposition 2.1, the bounds in (2) are satisfied under the hypotheses of Proposition 2.1. We prove next that those bounds apply to every tensor product with $U_{2,3}$.

Proposition 2.2. *Let (E, f) be a polymatroid that admits a tensor product $(E \times \{1, 2, 3\}, g)$ with $U_{2,3}$. Then*

$$\beta(A_1, A_2, A_3) \leq g(A_1^1 A_2^2 A_3^3) \leq \alpha(A_1, A_2, A_3) \quad (2)$$

for every $A_1, A_2, A_3 \subseteq E$.

Proof. Take $X = A_1^1 A_2^2 A_3^3$ and $Y = (A_1 A_2)^1 A_3^3$. Then $XY = (A_1 A_2)^1 A_2^2 A_3^3$ and $X \cap Y = A_1^1 A_3^3$. Then $g(Y) = s_3 + r_3$ and $g(X \cap Y) = r_1 + r_3$. In addition

$$g(XY) = g((A_1 A_2)^1 A_2^2 (A_2 A_3)^3) \geq s_3 + s_1$$

because $g(A_2^3 | A_2^1 A_2^2) = 0$. Therefore,

$$g(X) + s_3 + r_3 = g(X) + g(Y) \geq g(XY) + g(X \cap Y) \geq s_3 + s_1 + r_1 + r_3$$

and hence $g(X) \geq s_1 + r_1$. By symmetry, the first inequality holds. Clearly,

$$g(A_1^1 A_2^2 A_3^3) \leq g(A^1) + g(B^2) + g(C^3) = r_1 + r_2 + r_3$$

Consider $Z = (A_1 A_3)^1 (A_2 A_3)^2 A_3^3$ and $T = A_1^1 (A_2 A_3)^2 (A_1 A_2 A_3)^3$. Then

$$ZT = (A_1 A_2 A_3 \times \{1, 2, 3\}) \setminus A_2^1$$

and $Z \cap T = X = A_1^1 A_2^2 A_3^3$. Observe that $g(Z) = s_1 + s_2$ and $g(T) = s_3 + s$, while $g(ZT) = 2s$. Therefore,

$$s_1 + s_2 + s_3 + s = g(Z) + g(T) \geq g(ZT) + g(Z \cap T) = 2s + g(X)$$

which concludes the proof of the second inequality. \square

Proposition 2.3. *Let (E, f) be a polymatroid that admits a tensor product $(E \times \{1, 2, 3\}, g)$ with $U_{2,3}$. Then (E, f) satisfies the Ingleton's inequality.*

Proof. Let A, B, C, D be four subsets of E . Take $X = A^1 B^2 C^3$ and $Y = A^1 B^2 D^3$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} g(X) + g(Y) &\leq \alpha(A, B, C) + \alpha(A, B, D) \\ &\leq 2f(AB) + f(AC) + f(BC) + f(AD) + f(BD) - f(ABC) - f(ABD) \end{aligned}$$

Since $XY = A^1 B^2 (CD)^3$ and $X \cap Y = A^1 B^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} g(XY) + g(X \cap Y) &\geq \beta(A, B, CD) + f(A) + f(B) \\ &\geq f(AB) + f(CD) + f(A) + f(B) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$2f(AB) + f(AC) + f(BC) + f(AD) + f(BD) - f(ABC) - f(ABD) \geq f(AB) + f(CD) + f(A) + f(B)$$

and hence

$$f(AB) + f(AC) + f(BC) + f(AD) + f(BD) \geq f(A) + f(B) + f(ABC) + f(ABD) + f(CD)$$

and the proof is concluded. \square

References

- [1] Michael Bamiloshin, Oriol Farràs, Carles Padró: A Note on Extension Properties and Representations of Matroids. arXiv.org, arXiv:2306.15085 (2023).
- [2] Kristóf Bérczi, Boglárka Gehér, András Imolay, László Lovász, Balázs Maga, Tamás Schwarcz: Matroid products via submodular coupling. arXiv.org, arXiv:2411.02197 (2024).
- [3] Randall Dougherty, Chris Freiling, Kenneth Zeger: Linear rank inequalities on five or more variables. arXiv.org, arXiv:0910.0284 (2009).
- [4] Randall Dougherty, Chris Freiling, Kenneth Zeger: Non-Shannon Information Inequalities in Four Random Variables. arXiv.org, arXiv:1104.3602 (2011).

- [5] Oriol Farràs, Jaume Martí-Farré, Carles Padró. Ideal Multipartite Secret Sharing Schemes. *J. Cryptology* **25** 434–463 (2012).
- [6] Daniel Hammer, Andrei Romashchenko, Alexander Shen, Nikolai Vereshchagin: Inequalities for Shannon entropy and Kolmogorov complexity. *Journal of Computer and Systems Sciences* 60, 442–464 (2000).
- [7] A. W. Ingleton: Representation of matroids. In: *Combinatorial Mathematics and its Applications*, D.J.A Welsh (ed.), pp. 149–167. Academic Press, London (1971).
- [8] Michel Las Vergnas: On products of matroids. *Discrete Mathematics* 36, 49–55 (1981).
- [9] László Lovász: Flats in matroids and geometric graphs. In *Combinatorial Surveys (Proc. 6th British Combinatorial Conference)* pages 45–86 (1977).