MATROID FRAGILITY AND RELAXATIONS OF CIRCUIT HYPERPLANES

JIM GEELEN AND FLORIAN HOERSCH

Abstract. We relate two conjectures that play a central role in the reported proof of Rota’s Conjecture. Let \( \mathbb{F} \) be a finite field. The first conjecture states that: the branch-width of any \( \mathbb{F} \)-representable \( N \)-fragile matroid is bounded by a function depending only upon \( \mathbb{F} \) and \( N \). The second conjecture states that: if a matroid \( M_2 \) is obtained from a matroid \( M_1 \) by relaxing a circuit-hyperplane and both \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) are \( \mathbb{F} \)-representable, then the branch-width of \( M_1 \) is bounded by a function depending only upon \( \mathbb{F} \). Our main result is that the second conjecture implies the first.

1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to relate two concepts, \( N \)-fragile matroids and circuit-hyperplane relaxations, which both play a central role in the reported proof of Rota’s Conjecture [1].

A matroid \( M \) is \( N \)-fragile if \( N \) is a minor of \( M \), but there is no element \( e \in E(M) \) such that \( N \) is a minor of both \( M \setminus e \) and \( M/e \) or, equivalently, there is a unique partition \((C, D)\) of \( E(M) - E(N) \) such that \( N = M/C \setminus D \). Note that here we want \( N \), itself, as a minor, not just an isomorphic copy of \( N \).

For a finite field \( \mathbb{F} \) of order \( q \), we let \( \mathbb{F}^k \) denote an extension field of \( \mathbb{F} \) of order \( q^k \). We prove the following result.

Theorem 1.1. Let \( \mathbb{F} \) be a finite field, let \( N \) be a matroid with \( k \) elements, let \( B \) be a basis of \( N \), and let \( M \) be an \( \mathbb{F} \)-representable \( N \)-fragile matroid. Then there exist \( \mathbb{F}^{2k^2} \)-representable matroids \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) on the same ground set and elements \( c, d \in E(M_1) \) such that \( M_2 \) is obtained from \( M_1 \) by relaxing a circuit-hyperplane and \( M/B \setminus (E(N) - B) = M_1/c \setminus d \).
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The proof of Rota’s Conjecture relies on the reported proofs of the following two conjectures by Geelen, Gerards, and Whittle.

**Conjecture 1.2.** Let $F$ be a finite field and let $N$ be a matroid. Then the branch-width of any $F$-representable $N$-fragile matroid is bounded by a constant depending only upon $|F|$ and $|N|$.

For the definition of branch-width see Oxley [2]. For this paper it suffices to know that branch-width is a parameter associated with a matroid $M$, which we denote here by $bw(M)$, and that for any minor $N$ of $M$ we have

$$bw(M) - (|E(M)| - |E(N)|) \leq bw(N) \leq bw(M).$$

**Conjecture 1.3.** Let $H$ be a circuit-hyperplane in a matroid $M_1$ and let $M_2$ be the matroid obtained by relaxing $H$. If $M_1$ and $M_2$ are both representable over a finite field $F$, then the branch-width of $M_1$ is bounded by a constant depending only upon $|F|$.

Theorem 1.1 shows that Conjecture 1.3 implies Conjecture 1.2.

Our proof of Theorem 1.1 is via a sequence of results on matrices, but those results have interesting consequences for matroids, which we state below.

We call a matroid *isolated* if each of its components has only one element. Thus an isolated matroid consists only of loops and coloops; the set of coloops is the unique basis. The isolated matroid on ground set $E$ with basis $B$ is denoted $ISO(B, E)$. For integers $r$ and $n$ with $0 \leq r \leq n$ we denote $ISO(\{1, \ldots, r\}, \{1, \ldots, n\})$ by $ISO(r, n)$.

The following result shows that, in order to prove Theorem 1.1 it suffices to consider the case that $N$ is an isolated matroid.

**Theorem 1.4.** Let $F$ be a finite field, let $B$ be a basis of a matroid $N$, and let $M$ be an $F$-representable $N$-fragile matroid. Then there exists an $F$-representable $ISO(B, E(N))$-fragile matroid $M'$ such that $E(M') = E(M)$ and $M'/B = M/B$.

The following result shows that, in order to prove Theorem 1.1 it suffices to consider the case that $N = ISO(1, 2)$.

**Theorem 1.5.** Let $F$ be a finite field, let $X_1$ and $X_2$ be disjoint finite sets with $|X_1 \cup X_2| = k$, let $M$ be an $F$-representable $ISO(X_1, X_1 \cup X_2)$-fragile matroid, and let $c$ and $d$ be distinct elements not in $M$. Then there exists an $\mathbb{F}^{k^2}$-representable $ISO(\{c\}, \{c, d\})$-fragile matroid $M'$ such that $E(M') = E(M) - (X_1 \cup X_2) \cup \{c, d\}$ and $M'/c \cup d = M/X_1 \setminus X_2$. 

The final result shows that an $\mathbb{F}$-representable ISO(1, 2)-fragile matroid has a circuit-hyperplane whose relaxation results in an $\mathbb{F}^2$-representable matroid.

**Theorem 1.6.** Let $N = \text{ISO}([c], [c, d])$ where $c \neq d$, let $M$ be an $N$-fragile matroid representable over a finite field $\mathbb{F}$, and let $C$ and $D$ be disjoint subsets of $E(M)$ such that $N = M/C \backslash D$. Then $C \cup \{d\}$ is a circuit-hyperplane of $M$ and the matroid obtained from $M$ by relaxing $C \cup \{d\}$ is $\mathbb{F}^2$-representable.

Observe that Theorem 1.1 is an immediate consequence of Theorems 1.4, 1.5, and 1.6.

We assume that the reader is familiar with elementary matroid theory; we use the terminology and notation of Oxley [2].

### 2. Fragile matrices

In this section we will give a matrix interpretation for minor-fragility in representable matroids. Towards this end, we develop convenient terminology for viewing a representable matroid with respect to a fixed basis.

For a basis $B$ of a matroid $M$ and a set $X \subseteq E(M)$ we denote the minor $M/(B - X) \backslash (E(M) - (B \cup X))$ of $M$ by $M[X, B]$. The following result is routine and well-known.

**Lemma 2.1.** If $N$ is a minor of a matroid $M$, then there is a basis $B$ of $M$ such that $N = M[E(N), B]$.

If $B$ is a basis of a matroid $M$ and $N = M[E(N), B]$, then we say that $B$ displays $N$.

When we refer to a matrix $A \in \mathbb{F}^{S_1 \times S_2}$ we are implicitly defining $\mathbb{F}$ to be a field and $S_1$ and $S_2$ to be finite sets. Let $A \in \mathbb{F}^{S_1 \times S_2}$ be a matrix where $S_1$ and $S_2$ are disjoint. We let $[I, A]$ denote the matrix obtained from $A$ by appending an $S_1 \times S_1$ identity matrix; thus $[I, A] \in \mathbb{F}^{S_1 \times (S_1 \cup S_2)}$. For $X \subseteq S_1 \cup S_2$, we let $A[X]$ denote the submatrix $A[X \cap S_1, X \cap S_2]$.

If $B$ is a basis of an $\mathbb{F}$-representable matroid $M$, then there is a matrix $A \in \mathbb{F}^{B \times E(M) - B}$ such that $M = M([I, A])$; we call $A$ a **standard representation** with respect to $B$. Note that, if $N$ is a minor of $M$ displayed by $B$ and $A$ is a standard representation of $M$ with respect to $B$, then $A[E(N)]$ is a standard representation of $N$ with respect to the basis $B \cap E(N)$.

For a finite set $X$, a matrix $A \in \mathbb{F}^{S_1 \times S_2}$ is called **$X$-fragile** if

- $S_1$ and $S_2$ are disjoint,
\[ X \subseteq S_1 \cup S_2, \]
\[ A[X] = 0, \text{ and} \]
\[ \text{for each nonempty subset } Y \text{ of } (S_1 \cup S_2) - X, \text{ we have } \text{rank}(A[X \cup Y]) > \text{rank}(A[Y]). \]

Note that, if \( A \in \mathbb{F}^{S_1 \times S_2} \) is an \( X \)-fragile matrix, then \( M([I, A[X]]) = \text{ISO}(X \cap S_1, X) \).

The following result provides us with a matrix interpretation of minor-fragility for representable matroids.

**Lemma 2.2.** Let \( N \) be a matroid, let \( M \) be an \( \mathbb{F} \)-representable \( \mathcal{M} \)-fragile matroid, let \( B \) be a basis of \( M \) that displays \( N \), and let \( A \) be a standard representation of \( M \) with respect to \( B \). If \( A' \) is the matrix obtained from \( A \) by replacing each entry in the submatrix \( A[E(N)] \) with 0, then \( A' \) is \( E(N) \)-fragile.

**Proof.** Let \( X = E(N) \). Suppose that \( A' \) is not \( X \)-fragile. Then there is a non-empty set \( Y \subseteq E(M) - X \) such that \( \text{rank}(A'[X \cup Y]) = \text{rank}(A'[Y]) \). By removing the other elements, we may assume that \( E(M) = X \cup Y \). Let \( C = B \cap Y, D = Y - B \), and let \( B_N = B \cap E(N) \).

Observe that \( \text{rank}(A') = \text{rank}(A[C, D]) \) by the choice of \( Y \). We will obtain a contradiction to the fact that \( M \) is \( N \)-fragile by showing that \( N = M/D \setminus C \).

We start by constructing an isomorphic copy \( A_0 \) of \( A'[B, X - B] \) by relabelling the columns so that the indices form a set \( Z \) disjoint from \( E(N) \). Now let \( A_1 = [A, A_0] \) and \( M_1 = M([I, A_1]) \).

We claim that:

(i) \( N = (M_1/Z)|X, \) and
(ii) \( B_N \) is independent in \( M_1/(D \cup Z), \) and
(iii) \( Z \) is a set of loops in \( M_1/D \).

Note that \( Z \) is a set of loops in \( M_1/C \) and \( N \) is a minor of \( M_1/C \), so \( M_1/Z \) contains \( N \) as a minor. To show that \( N \) is a restriction of \( M_1/Z \), it suffices to show that \( B_N \) spans \( E(N) \) in \( M_1/Z \), or, equivalently, that \( B_N \cup Z \) spans \( E(N) \) in \( M_1 \), which is clear from the construction. This proves (i).

Note that \( r_{M_1}(B_N \cup D \cup Z) = |B_N| + \text{rank}(A_1[C, D \cup Z]) = |B_N| + \text{rank}(A'[C, D \cup X]) = |B_N| + \text{rank}(A[C, D]) = |B_N| + \text{rank}(A[B, D]), \) since \( \text{rank}(A') = \text{rank}(A[C, D]) \). Therefore \( B_N \) is independent in \( M_1/(D \cup Z) \), proving (ii).

Now (iii) follows directly from the fact that \( \text{rank}(A') = \text{rank}(A[C, D]) \).

By (iii), we have \( M/D = (M_1/D) \setminus Z = (M_1/D)/Z \). By (i), \( N \) is a restriction of \( M_1/Z \). By (ii), the sets \( B_N \) and \( D \) are skew in \( M_1/Z \).
(that is, \(r_{M/Z}(B_N \cup D) = r_{M/Z}(B_N) + r_{M/Z}(D)\)), and hence \(N\) is a restriction of \(M/(D \cup Z)\). However \(M/D = M/(D \cup Z)\), contradicting the fact that \(M\) is \(N\)-fragile.

The converse of Lemma 2.2 is not true in general, but the following result is a weak converse, and it implies Theorem 3.

**Lemma 2.3.** If \(A \in \mathbb{F}^{s_1 \times s_2}\) is an \(X\)-fragile matrix, where \(X \subseteq S_1 \cup S_2\), then \(M([I, A])\) is ISO\((X \cap S_1, X)\)-fragile.

**Proof.** Let \(M = M([I, A])\). Note that \(M[X, S_1] = \text{ISO}(X \cap S_1, X)\). Let \(C\) and \(D\) be a partition of \(E(M) - X\) such that \(C \neq S_1 - X\). We will prove that \(M/C\backslash D \neq \text{ISO}(X \cap S_1, X)\). By contracting \(C \cap S_1\) and deleting \(D - S_1\) we may assume that \(D = S_1 - X\) and that \(C = S_2 - X\).

Since \(A\) is \(X\)-fragile, \(\text{rank}(A[D, C]) < \text{rank}(A)\). Now either

(i) \(\text{rank}(A[D, C]) < \text{rank}(A[S_1, C])\), or

(ii) \(\text{rank}(A[S_1, C]) < \text{rank}(A)\).

In case (i), we have \(r_{M/C}(S_1 \cap X) = r_M(C \cup (S_1 \cap X)) - r_M(C) = |S_1 \cap X| + \text{rank}(A[D, C]) - \text{rank}(A[S_1, C]) < |S_1 \cap X|\). So \(S_1 \cap X\) is dependent in \(M/C\) and hence \(M/C\backslash D \neq \text{ISO}(X \cap S_1, X)\), as required.

In case (ii), we have \(r_{M/C}(X - S_1) = r_M((X - S_1) \cup C) - r_M(C) = \text{rank}(A) - \text{rank}(A[S_1, C]) > 0\), so \(M/C\backslash D \neq \text{ISO}(X \cap S_1, X)\), as required.

3. Reduction to ISO\((1, 2)\)-fragility

The results in this section prove Theorem 1.5.

Let \(F\) be a flat of a matroid \(M\). We say that a matroid \(M'\) is obtained by adding an element \(e\) freely to \(F\) in \(M\) if \(M'\) is a single-element extension by a new element \(e\) in such a way that \(F\) spans \(e\) and that each flat of \(M'\backslash e\) that spans \(e\) contains \(F\).

**Lemma 3.1.** Let \(M\) be an ISO\((X_1, X_1 \cup X_2)\)-fragile matroid, where \(X_1\) and \(X_2\) are disjoint finite sets, and let \(M'\) be obtained from \(M\) by adding a new element \(d\) freely into the flat spanned by \(X_2\). Then \(M'\backslash X_2\) is ISO\((X_1, X_1 \cup \{d\})\)-fragile.

**Proof.** Let \((C, D)\) be a partition of \(E(M) - (X_1 \cup X_2)\). It suffices to show that \(M/C\backslash D = \text{ISO}(X_1, X_1 \cup X_2)\) if and only if \((M'\backslash X_2)/C\backslash D = \text{ISO}(X_1, X_1 \cup \{d\})\). Note that \(M'\backslash C\backslash D\) is obtained from \(M/C\backslash D\) by adding \(d\) freely to the flat spanned by \(X_2\). If \(M/C\backslash D = \text{ISO}(X_1, X_1 \cup X_2)\), then \(M'\backslash C\backslash D = \text{ISO}(X_1, X_1 \cup X_2 \cup \{d\})\) and hence \((M'\backslash X_2)\backslash C\backslash D = \text{ISO}(X_1, X_1 \cup \{d\})\). Conversely, if \((M'\backslash X_2)/C\backslash D = \text{ISO}(X_1, X_1 \cup \{d\})\), then \(M'\backslash C\backslash D = \text{ISO}(X_1, X_1 \cup X_2 \cup \{d\})\) and hence \((M'\backslash \{d\})/C\backslash D = \text{ISO}(X_1, X_1 \cup X_2)\), as required.

\(\square\)
Note that, by Lemma 3.1, we can reduce an ISO\((X_1, X_1 \cup X_2)\)-fragile matroid to an ISO\((X_1, X_1 \cup \{d\})\)-fragile matroid. Repeating this in the dual we can further reduce to an ISO\((\{c\}, \{c, d\})\)-fragile matroid.

We can add an element freely into a flat in a represented matroid by going to a sufficiently large extension field; this is both routine and well-known.

**Lemma 3.2.** Let \(A \in \mathbb{F}^{S_1 \times S_2}\), let \(M = M(A)\), let \(X \) be a \(k\)-element subset of \(S_2\), and let \(M'\) be the matroid obtained from \(M\) by adding a new element \(e\) freely into the flat spanned by \(X\). Then there is a vector \(b \in (\mathbb{F}^k)^{S_1}\) such that \([A, b]\) is a representation of \(M'\) over \(\mathbb{F}^k\).

**Proof.** Let \(A_v\) denote the column of \(A\) that is indexed by \(v\). The elements of the field \(\mathbb{F}^k\) form a vectorspace of dimension \(k\) over \(\mathbb{F}\); let \((\alpha_v : v \in X)\) be a basis of this vectorspace. Now let \(b = \sum_{v \in X} \alpha_v A_v\) and let \(M' = M([A, b])\). By construction, the new element \(e\) of \(M'\) is spanned by \(X\). It remains to show that each flat of \(M' \setminus e\) that spans \(e\) also spans \(X\). Consider an independent set \(I \subseteq E(M)\) that does not span \(X\) in \(M\). We may apply elementary row-operations over \(\mathbb{F}\) so that each column of \(I\) contains exactly one non-zero entry. Let \(R \subseteq S_1\) denote the set of rows containing non-zero entries in \(A[S_1, I]\). Since \(I\) does not span \(X\), there exists \(i \in S_1 \setminus R\) such that \(A[\{i\}, X]\) is not identically zero. However the entries of \(A[\{i\}, X]\) are all in \(\mathbb{F}\) and the values \((\alpha_v : v \in X)\) are linearly independent over \(\mathbb{F}\), so \(b_i = \sum_{v \in X} \alpha_v A_{i,v} \neq 0\). Hence \(I\) does not span \(e\) in \(M'\), as required. \(\square\)

4. RELAXING A CIRCUIT-HYPERPLANE

The following result implies Theorem 1.6

**Lemma 4.1.** Let \(\mathbb{F}\) be a field and \(\mathbb{F}'\) be a field extension. Now let \(A_1 \in \mathbb{F}^{S_1 \times S_2}\) be a \((c, d)\)-fragile matrix where \(c \in S_1\) and \(d \in S_2\) and let \(A_2\) be obtained from \(A_1\) by replacing the \((c, d)\)-entry with an element in \(\mathbb{F}' - \mathbb{F}\). Then \((S_1 - \{c\}) \cup \{d\}\) is a circuit-hyperplane in \(M([I, A_1])\) and \(M([I, A_2])\) is the matroid obtained from \(M([I, A_1])\) by relaxing \((S_1 - \{c\}) \cup \{d\}\).

**Proof.** Let \(M_1 = M([I, A_1])\), \(M_2 = M([I, A_2])\), and \(H = (S_1 - \{c\}) \cup \{d\}\). We claim that \(H\) is a circuit of \(M_1\); suppose otherwise. Note that \(S_1\) is a basis, so \(S_1 \cup \{d\}\) contains a unique circuit \(C\). Since \(A_1\) is \((c, d)\)-fragile, we have \(A[\{c\}, \{d\}] = 0\), and hence \(c \not\in C\). Since \(H\) is not a circuit, there exists \(e \in S_1 - \{c\}\) such that \(e\) is a coloop of \(M_1|(S_1 \cup \{d\})\). Then \((M_1|(S_1 \cup \{d\}))\setminus e = (M_1|(S_1 \cup \{d\}))/e\). But then \(M_1\) is not ISO\((\{c\}, \{c, d\})\)-fragile, contrary to Lemma 2.3. Thus \(H\) is a circuit as claimed.
Note that $M_1^* = M([A_1^T, I])$ and that $A_1^T$ is $\{c, d\}$-fragile. Then, by duality, $E(M_1) - H$ is a cocircuit and, hence, $H$ is a circuit-hyperplane.

To prove that $M_2$ is obtained from $M_1$ by relaxing $H$ it suffices to show, for each set $Z \subseteq S_1 \cup S_2$, that $\text{rank } A_1[Z] \neq \text{rank } A_2[Z]$ if and only if $Z = \{c, d\}$. Note that $\text{rank } A_1[\{c, d\}] \neq \text{rank } A_2[\{c, d\}]$. Consider a set $Z \subseteq S_1 \cup S_2$ such that $\text{rank } A_1[Z] \neq \text{rank } A_2[Z]$.

**Claim:** We have $\text{rank } A_1[Z] < \text{rank } A_2[Z]$.

**Proof of claim.** Suppose for a contradiction that $\text{rank } A_1[Z] > \text{rank } A_2[Z]$ and consider a minimal subset $X \subseteq Z$ such that $\text{rank } A_1[X] > \text{rank } A_2[X]$. Thus $A_1[X]$ is square and non-singular, $A_2[X]$ is singular, and $c, d \in X$. Let $B(x)$ denote the matrix obtained from $A_1[X]$ by replacing the $(c, d)$-entry with a variable $x$ and let $p(x) = \det(B(x))$. Note that $p(x) = \alpha x + \beta$ where $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F}$. Since $A_1[X]$ is non-singular, we have $p(0) \neq 0$. Therefore $p(x)$ has at most one root and, since $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F}$, if $p(x)$ has a root, that root is in $\mathbb{F}$. However, this contradicts the fact that $A_2[X]$ is singular. 

By construction, $c, d \in Z$ and we may assume that $Z \neq \{c, d\}$. Then, since $A_1$ is $\{c, d\}$-fragile,

\[
\text{rank } A_1[Z - \{c, d\}] \leq \text{rank } A_1[Z] - 1 \\
\leq \text{rank } A_2[Z] - 2 \\
\leq \text{rank } A_2[Z - \{c, d\}] \\
= \text{rank } A_1[Z - \{c, d\}].
\]

Hence $\text{rank } A_1[Z] = \text{rank } A_1[Z - \{c, d\}] + 1$ and $\text{rank } A_2[Z] = \text{rank } A_2[Z - \{c, d\}] + 2$. This second equation implies that $\text{rank } A_2[Z - \{c\}] = \text{rank } A_2[Z - \{c, d\}] + 1$. Therefore $\text{rank } A_1[Z - \{c\}] = \text{rank } A_1[Z - \{c, d\}] + 1$ and hence $\text{rank } A_1[Z - \{c\}] = \text{rank } A_1[Z]$. Thus the row $c$ of $A_1[Z]$ is a linear combination of the other rows. But then the row $c$ of $A_1[Z - \{d\}]$ is a linear combination of the other rows. So $\text{rank } A_1[Z - \{d\}] = \text{rank } A_1[Z - \{c, d\}]$ and, hence, $\text{rank } A_2[Z - \{d\}] = \text{rank } A_2[Z - \{c, d\}]$. However, this contradicts the fact that $\text{rank } A_2[Z] = \text{rank } A_2[Z - \{c, d\}] + 2$. 
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