

A Lower Bound for the Rank of Matroid Intersection

Liu Tianyu

*Department of Mathematics
University of Chinese Academy of Sciences
China-100049*

Abstract

Matroid is a generalization of many fundamental objects in combinatorial mathematics, and matroid intersection problem is a classical subject in combinatorial optimization. However, only the intersection of two matroids are well understood. The solution of the intersection problem of more than three matroids is proved to be **NP-hard**. We will give a lower bound estimate on the maximal cardinality of the common independent sets in matroid intersections. We will also study some properties of the intersection of more than two matroids and deduce some analogous results for Edmonds' Min-max theorems for matroids intersection.

1 Introduction

Matroid was firstly introduced by Hassler Whitney in 1935 [[whitney1935abstract](#)] and also independently discovered by Takeo Nakasawa, whose work was forgotten for many years [[nishimura2009lost](#)]. In 1950s and 1960s, T. Tutte made the prominent contributions to matroid theory in his outstanding papers (Interested readers can check [[tutte1959matroids](#)] [[tutte1964lectures](#)]). For a detailed introduction to matroid theory, the readers are referred to [[neel2009matroids](#)] [[oxley2006matroid](#)] [[welsh2010matroid](#)]. Other major contributors include Jack Edmonds, Jim Geelen, Eugene Lawler, László Lovász, Gian-Carlo Rota, P. D. Seymour, and Dominic Welsh. Without extra announcement a matroid is always meant to be a finite matroid. In this paper we will not discuss infinite matroid.

Many problems in combinatorial optimization can be reformulated as: given a system $(E, \mathcal{F})$ where E is a finite set and $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^E$, and a valued function $c : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we intend to find an element of $\mathcal{F}$ maximizing or minimizing c . And many problems in combinatorial optimization can be restated as matroid problems. In this paper we restrict our discussion on matroids.

Firstly let's recall Edmonds' min-max theorem for the intersection of two matroids, which plays an important role in Edmonds' algorithm for matroid intersection.

Theorem 1.1 (Edmonds,1970[[edm](#)]). *Let $(E, \mathcal{F}_1)$ and $(E, \mathcal{F}_2)$ two matroids, with rank functions r_1 and r_2 respectively. Then we have*

$$\max\{|X| : X \in \mathcal{F}_1 \cap \mathcal{F}_2\} = \min\{r_1(Q) + r_2(E \setminus Q) : Q \subseteq E\}.$$

For intersections of more than two matroids , no analogous result of **Theorem 1**. has been known to the author . And it has been proved that finding a subset with the maximal cardinality of the intersection of more than two matroids , is an **NP – hard** problem (c.f.[**kor**] Chapter 15 , Exercice 14 (c)) . However , if we make some futher assumptions on given matroids (more than two) , we can formally generalize 1.1 to the following .

Proposition 1.1. *Let $(E, \mathcal{F}_1)$, $(E, \mathcal{F}_2)$, ... , $(E, \mathcal{F}_m)$ be m matroids with rank functions $r_1, \dots, r_m$ respectively . And assume that $(E, \mathcal{F}_1 \cap \mathcal{F}_2)$, $(E, \mathcal{F}_1 \cap \mathcal{F}_2 \cap \mathcal{F}_3)$, ... , $(E, \bigcap_{i=1}^m \mathcal{F}_i)$ are all matroids . And for any $X \subseteq E$ we take a increasing filtration of X randomly :*

$$X \subseteq X_1 \subseteq X_2 \subseteq \dots \subseteq X_{m-2} \subseteq E$$

Then we have the following min-max result :

$$\max\{|S| : S \in \bigcap_{i=1}^m \mathcal{F}_i\} = \min\{r_1(X) + r_2(X_1 \setminus X) + \dots + r_{m-1}(X_{m-2} \setminus X_{m-3}) + r_m(E \setminus X_{m-2}) : X \subseteq X_1 \subseteq X_2 \subseteq \dots \subseteq X_{m-2} \subseteq E\} \quad (1)$$

In fact the above theorem can be intuitively obtained by inductions . We will give a proof in Section 3 . However , it seems that the assumption we put on the above proposition is too strong : the intersection $\bigcap_{i=1}^k \mathcal{M}_i$ are all matroids for $k = 1, \dots, m$.

We have the following rough upper bound estimation for matroid intersection .

Corollary 1.1. *Let $\{\mathcal{M}_i(E, \mathcal{F}_i)\}_{i=1}^m$ be a set of m matroids on E and r_i is the rank function of $\mathcal{M}_i$, then we have*

$$\max_{I \in \mathcal{B}(\bigcap_{i=1}^m \mathcal{M}_i)} |I| \leq \min \sum_{i=1}^m r_i(X_i) \quad (2)$$

where the minimum in the right-hand-side is taken over all the partition $\bigsqcup_{i=1}^m X_i = E$ of E .

The following result is fundamental for studying the union of matroids over a common ground set and is useful in our proof of main results in this paper .

Theorem 1.2 (Nash-Williams,1967[**whi**]). *Let $\mathcal{M}_1 = (E, \mathcal{F}_1)$, $\mathcal{M}_2(E, \mathcal{F}_2)$, ... , $\mathcal{M}_m(E, \mathcal{F}_m)$ be matroids with rank functions $r_1, \dots, r_n$ respectively . And denote their (disjoint) union as $(E, \mathcal{F}) = (E, \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}_i)$. Then $(E, \mathcal{F})$ is a matroid with rank function*

$$r(X) = \min_{A \subseteq X} \left(|X \setminus A| + \sum_{i=1}^k r_i(A) \right).$$

Using some properties of the duality of a matroid , we've proved the following main result of this paper which can give an lower bound for the maximal cardinality of the intersection of n matroids :

Proposition 1.2. Let $\mathcal{M}_1 = (E, \mathcal{F}_1)$, $\mathcal{M}_2 = (E, \mathcal{F}_2)$, $\dots$, $\mathcal{M}_m = (E, \mathcal{F}_m)$ be m matroids on the ground set E , with rank functions $r_1, \dots, r_m$ respectively, here E is a finite set. And set $(E, \mathcal{F}_j^*)$ the duality of $(E, \mathcal{F}_j)$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$. Moreover we assume that $(E, \bigcap_{i=1}^m \mathcal{F}_i)$ is an independent system with rank function $\bar{r}$ (Notice that the intersection of matroids are not generally a matroid). Then we have

$$\bar{r}^*(X) \leq \min_{A \subseteq E} \left(|X| + (n-1)|A| + \sum_{i=1}^m r_i(E \setminus A) - \sum_{i=1}^m r_i(E) \right)$$

Here $\bar{r}^*$ is the rank function of $(E, (\bigcap_{i=1}^m \mathcal{F}_i)^*)$. Especially if we take $X = E$, we have the following :

$$\max\{|X| : X \in \bigcap_{i=1}^m \mathcal{F}_i\} \geq \max_{A \subseteq E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^m r_i(E) - \sum_{i=1}^m r_i(E \setminus A) - (m-1)|A| \right).$$

If we restrict ourselves on two matroids $(E, \mathcal{F}_1), (E, \mathcal{F}_2)$, and furthermore assume that $\mathcal{F}_1 \cap \mathcal{F}_2$ is a matroid. The two inequalities above are actually equalities.

In fact, the lower bound of the maximum cardinality in the matroid intersection we deduce above is too weak to be interesting. We will give a stronger lower bound estimation for the maximum cardinality in the following theorem. In this paper, we use $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{M})$ to denote the set of bases in a given independent system $\mathcal{M}$.

Theorem 1.3. We set $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^m$ is a covering and co-covering of E , here covering means that $\bigcup_{i=1}^m T_i = E$ and co-covering means $\bigcup_{i=1}^m T_i^c = E$, where $T_i^c = E - T_i$ is the complement of T_i for $i = 1, \dots, m$. And let $\mathcal{M}_1 = (E, \mathcal{F}_1)$, $\mathcal{M}_2 = (E, \mathcal{F}_2)$, $\dots$, $\mathcal{M}_m = (E, \mathcal{F}_m)$ be m matroids as above. Moreover we assume that $T_i \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{M}_i)$ resp. for all i , then we have :

$$\max_{S \in \mathcal{B}(\bigcap_{i=1}^m \mathcal{F}_i)} |S| \geq \max_{A \subseteq E} \left(2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^m r_i(E) - (m-1)|A| - \sum_{i=1}^m r_i(E - A \cap T_i^c) \right) \quad (3)$$

Organization. The remaining part of this paper is organized as follow : In section 2 we will recall the definition of matroid and list their basic properties without proofs. In section 3 we show the relations of the maximal cardinality of the independent sets of a matroid and its duality, using these dual relations we can give a proof of **Proposition 1.2** and **Theorem 1.3**.

2 Some Preliminaries for Matroid Theory

2.1 Basic Properties of Matroids

In this subsection we will give the definition of matroids and list some basic facts without proofs just give the standard references for interested readers.

Almost all notations in this paper are followed as [kor] except that we will use a different notation for the union of matroids and introduce some new concepts. In this paper we use " $\sqcup$ " to denote disjoint union of sets and union of matroids.

Definition 2.1. A system of a set is a pair $(E, \mathcal{F})$ where E is a finite set and $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^E$. And an **matroid** is a system of set that satisfying the following three axioms:

- (M1) $\emptyset \in \mathcal{F}$;
- (M2) If $X \subseteq Y \in \mathcal{F}$, $X \in \mathcal{F}$;
- (M3) If $X, Y \in \mathcal{F}$ and $|X| > |Y|$, then there exists an element $x \in X \setminus Y$ such that $Y \cup \{x\} \in \mathcal{F}$.

Definition 2.2. The **rank** of a matroid is $r(X) := \max\{|Y| : Y \subseteq X, Y \in \mathcal{F}\}$, for any $X \subseteq E$.

The following properties of rank function of a matroid can be straightforwardly obtained by definitions :

Proposition 2.1. Set $(E, \mathcal{F})$ a matroid with rank function r , then we have : for all $X, Y \subseteq E$

- (R1) $r(X) \leq |X|$;
- (R2) If $X \subset Y$, then $r(X) \leq r(Y)$;
- (R3)[**submodularity**] $r(X \cup Y) + r(X \cap Y) \leq r(X) + r(Y)$.

To make things down to earth we give some examples of matroids in the following propositions. And it's easy to check that the following three systems satisfy the three axioms of matroids.

Proposition 2.2. The following systems are all matroids:

- (a) A is a matrix over a field $\mathbb{F}$, E the set consisting of columns of A , and $\mathcal{F} := \{F \subseteq E : \text{the columns in } F \text{ is linearly independent over } \mathbb{F}\}$.
- (b) E is the set consisting all edges of a given undirected graph G , $\mathcal{F} := \{F \subseteq E : (V(G), F)\}$ is a forest.
- (c) Let E be a finite set, k be an integer, $\mathcal{F} := \{F \subseteq E : |F| \leq k\}$.

Another basic notion in matroid theory is the duality of a matroid which is important in our proof of main result in this paper.

Definition 2.3. Let $(E, \mathcal{F})$ be a independent system (i.e., systems satisfying merely axioms M1 and M2 in the definition of matroids). Then the duality of $(E, \mathcal{F})$ is denoted as $(E, \mathcal{F}^*)$, here:

$$\mathcal{F}^* = \{F \subseteq E : \text{There is a basis } B \text{ of } (E, \mathcal{F}) \text{ such that } F \cap B = \emptyset\}.$$

It's clear that the duality of an independent system is also an independent system.

Proposition 2.3. $(E, \mathcal{F}^{**}) = (E, \mathcal{F})$.

Proof. $F \in \mathcal{F}^{**} \iff$ there is a basis B^* of $(E, \mathcal{F}^*)$ such that $F \cap B^* = \emptyset \iff$ there is a basis B of $(E, \mathcal{F})$ s.t. $F \cap (E \setminus B) = \emptyset \iff F \in \mathcal{F}$. $\square$

We will introduce two basic but important constructions called the **deletion** and **contraction** of a given matroid $\mathcal{M}$.

Definition 2.4 (Deletion). Given a matroid $\mathcal{M} = (E, \mathcal{F})$ and a subset X of E , the deletion $\mathcal{M} \setminus X$ is a matroid $(E \setminus X, \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M} \setminus X))$, where

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M} \setminus X) = \{C \subseteq E - X : C \in \mathcal{F}\}$$

It is easy to check that $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M} \setminus X)$ satisfies three matroid axioms .

Definition 2.5 (Contraction). Let $\mathcal{M}$ and X be as above, then the contraction of X in $\mathcal{M}$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{M}/X := (\mathcal{M}^* \setminus X)^*$$

Proposition 2.4. *i) $(\mathcal{M} \setminus X)^* = \mathcal{M}^*/X$,*

ii) $(\mathcal{M}/X)^ = \mathcal{M}^* \setminus X$,*

iii) $r_{\mathcal{M}/X}(A) = r_{\mathcal{M}}(A \cup X) - r_{\mathcal{M}}(X)$.

The following proposition (especially property (ii)) is useful in our proof .

Proposition 2.5. Let $(E, \mathcal{F})$ be an independent set, $(E, \mathcal{F}^*)$ be its duality. And put r and r^* be the rank function of $(E, \mathcal{F})$ and $(E, \mathcal{F}^*)$ respectively. Then we have

(i) $(E, \mathcal{F})$ is a matroid i.f.f. $(E, \mathcal{F}^*)$ is a matroid .

(ii) If $(E, \mathcal{F})$ is a matroid, then the following equality

$$r^*(\mathcal{F}) = |F| + r(E \setminus F) - r(E)$$

holds for all $F \subseteq E$.

Finally in this section we will define the union of matroids over a common ground set E . Set $(E, \mathcal{F}_1), \dots, (E, \mathcal{F}_n)$ be n matroids and $(E, \mathcal{F}_1^*), \dots, (E, \mathcal{F}_n^*)$ their dualities respectively. We call a set $X \subseteq E$ is *partible* if there is a partition $X = X_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup X_n$, such that $X_i \in \mathcal{F}_i$ holds for every $i = 1, \dots, n$. And let $\bigsqcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}_i$ be the family consisting of all the partible sets in E associated to $(E, \mathcal{F}_1), \dots, (E, \mathcal{F}_n)$. Then we call $\bigsqcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}_i$ the **union** or **sum** of $(E, \mathcal{F}_1), \dots, (E, \mathcal{F}_n)$. In fact, the union of matroid need not be operated on the same ground set. Generally let $\mathcal{M}_i = (E_i, \mathcal{F}_i)$, then we have the notion called **general union** in this paper;

$$\bigvee_{i \in J} \mathcal{M}_i := (\bigcup_{i \in J} E_i, \bigvee_{i \in J} \mathcal{F}_i)$$

, where $\bigvee_{i \in J} \mathcal{F}_i$ is defined as

$$\bigvee_{i \in J} \mathcal{F}_i = \{I \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in J} E_i : I = \bigcup_{i \in J} I_i, I_i \in \mathcal{F}_i\}$$

here J is a finite index set .

Note. As standard notations we use $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{M})$ to denote the set of all basis in a given matroid $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{M})$ to denote the set of all independent sets in $\mathcal{M}$.

3 Proof of Main Results

Before proving the main results we are intend to propose a basic problem which is motivated by the set-theoretical complementary relationship . In this paper , we say two independent systems $\mathcal{M}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{M}_2$ which means that $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{M}_1) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{M}_2)$ on a common ground set , where $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{M})$ denotes the set consisting of independent sets in a given independent system $\mathcal{M}$.

Question 3.1. *Does the following equality*

$$(E, (\bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}_i)^*) = (E, \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}_i^*)$$

hold or not ? If this equality does not hold generally , when does it hold ?

Generally this equality does not hold because $(E, (\bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}_i)^*)$ is not a matroid generally . However , applying (i) of 2.5 if the above equality holds , it implies that $(E, (\bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}_i)^*)$ must be a matroid for the reason that $(E, \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}_i^*)$ is a matroid which is easily to check to be an basic property for the union of matroids . Before giving the answer of this question , we need some set-theoretical preparations .

Lemma 3.1. *Let $(E, \mathcal{F}_1), \dots, (E, \mathcal{F}_n)$ be as above .*

If $X \subseteq E$ and $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^n X_i$, where $X_i \in \mathcal{F}_i$ respectively , then X is partible , i.e. , $X = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n X_i'$, here $X_i' \subseteq X_i$ respectively for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Proof. We will prove this lemma by induction . For the case $n = 1$ the lemma is true automatically . Suppose that the property is true when $n = k$, that is , for any set X that is the union of k subsets of X , explicitly $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^k X_i$, then we have $X = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^k X_i'$, where $X_i' \subseteq X_i$ respectively for $i = 1, \dots, k$.

Suppose that $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k+1} X_i$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcup_{i=1}^{k+1} X_i &= \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^k X_i \right) \cup X_{k+1} \\ &= \left(\bigsqcup_{i=1}^k X_i' \right) \cup X_{k+1} \\ &= \left(\bigsqcup_{i=1}^k X_i' \right) \sqcup \left(X_{k+1} \setminus \left(\bigsqcup_{i=1}^k X_i' \right) \right) \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $X_i' \in X_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$ by assumption . Moreover , because the subset of an independent set is also an independent set , we complete the proof .

□

Lemma 3.2. *Let $(E, \mathcal{F}_1), \dots, (E, \mathcal{F}_n)$ be as above . Then we have the following containment relationship :*

$$\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}_i \right)^* \subseteq \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}_i^* .$$

Proof. For every $X \subseteq E$, $X \in (\bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}_i)^* \iff$ there is a basis $B_0 \in \bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}_i$ such that $X \cap B_0 = \emptyset$. Now we extend B_0 to $B_1, \dots, B_n$ respectively, which are bases for $\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_n$ respectively. On the one hand,

$$(E \setminus B_0) = (E \setminus B_1) \bigcup \dots \bigcup (E \setminus B_n)$$

and it is obvious that $E \setminus B_i \in \mathcal{F}_i^*$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Nextly using **Lemma 12** we obtain that $E \setminus B_0$ is partible, hence $E \setminus B_0 \in \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}_i^*$. On the other hand, for $(X \subseteq E) \setminus B_0$, it results that $X \in \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}_i^*$. This verifies the containment relation. $\square$

Actually we have a stronger version of the following easy fact which enables us to deduce a nontrivial lower bound for the maximum cardinality of the common independent sets in the intersection of several matroids.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{M}_i(E, \mathcal{F}_i)$ be n matroids where $i = 1, \dots, n$. And set $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is a covering and co-covering of E which we have explained in **Theorem 1.3**. Furthermore we assume $T_i \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{M}_i)$. Then we have*

$$\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_i\right)^* \subseteq \bigvee_{i=1}^n (\mathcal{M}_i / T_i)^*$$

.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{B}_i$ denote the set of all bases in $\mathcal{M}_i$ and $\bar{\mathcal{B}}$ the set of bases in $\bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_i$. Then following the definition of the dual, we have

$$\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_i\right)^* = \{C \subseteq E : C \cap B = \emptyset, B \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}\}$$

It suffices to show that every basis C in $(\bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_i)^*$ can be covered by the union of n bases in $(\mathcal{M}_i / T_i)^*$ respectively. There is a basis $B \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}$ such that $C \cap B = \emptyset$. On the one hand, by the assumptions on $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^n$ we can see that $C \cap (\bigcup_{i=1}^n T_i) = C$ and $C \cap (\bigcup_{i=1}^n T_i^c) = \bigcup_{i=1}^n (C \cap T_i^c) = C$. On the other hand, for $T_i \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{M}_i)$, it is evident that $T_i^c \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{M}_i^*)$. It follows that $C \cap T_i^c \in \mathcal{F}_i^*$. Next, we can extend $C \cap T_i^c$ to a basis $B_i^* \in \mathcal{F}_i^*$ resp. for all i . Therefore $C = \bigcup_{i=1}^n (B_i^* \setminus T_i)$. This yields a covering of C by n distinct bases in $\mathcal{M}_i^* \setminus T_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

And we know that $(\mathcal{M}_i / T_i)^* = \mathcal{M}_i^* \setminus T_i$. This leads to the proof. $\square$

Proposition 3.2. *Let $(E, \mathcal{F}_1)$ and $(E, \mathcal{F}_2)$ be two matroids and assume their intersection is also a matroid. Then the dual relation in **Question 3.1** holds. That is:*

$$(E, (\bigcap_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{F}_i)^*) = (E, \bigcup_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{F}_i^*).$$

Proof. It is equivalent to prove that:

$$(E, (\bigcap_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{F}_i)) = (E, (\bigcup_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{F}_i^*)^*)$$

We just need to show that , (1) for every $Y \in \bigcap_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{F}_i$, there is a basis $C \in \bigcup_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{F}_i^*$ such that $Y \cap C = \emptyset$; (2) for every $Y' \in (\bigcup_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{F}_i^*)^*$, Y' is also in $\bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}_i$.

To prove (1) we just need to construct such C . C can be obtained in the following way : since $Y \in \bigcap_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{F}_i$ we extend Y to B_0 , which is a basis for $\mathcal{F}_1 \cap \mathcal{F}_2$ (Since $\mathcal{F}_1 \cap \mathcal{F}_2$ is a matroid , the following extension is well-defined) . We nextly find a minimum cardinality subset $E \supseteq B_m \supseteq B_0$ satisfying that $B_m = B_1 \cup B_2$ where B_1, B_2 are bases for $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2$ respectively and they both contain B_m . Then we assert that $E \setminus B_m$ is a basis for $(\bigcap_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{F}_i)^*$.

Fisrtly $E \setminus B_m = E \setminus (B_1 \cup B_2) = (E \setminus B_1) \cup (E \setminus B_2)$ is obviously in $\bigcup_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{F}_i^*$. Then we just need to prove that $E \setminus B_m$ is a maximal cardinality independent set in $\bigcup_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{F}_i^*$. If this is not true , there are another two bases B'_1, B'_2 of $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2$ respectively such that $(B'_1 \cup B'_2) \cap (E \setminus B_m) = \emptyset$ and $|B'_1 \cup B'_2| < |B_1 \cup B_2| = |B_m| \iff |B'_1 \cap B'_2| > |B_1 \cap B_2| = |B_m|$ for the reason that $|B'_1| = |B_1|$ and $|B'_2| = |B_2|$ and the inclusion and exclusion principle . However $|B_1 \cap B_2| = |B_m|$ is the maximal cardinality set in $\mathcal{F}_1 \cap \mathcal{F}_2$, this lead to a contradiction . Therefore $E \setminus B_m$ is a basis for $(\bigcap_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{F}_i)^*$. Put $C = E \setminus B_m$, we can finish the proof of (1) .

It remains to prove (2) . By definition , there is a basis $D \in \bigcup_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{F}_i^*$, such that $Y' \cap D = \emptyset$. We can write $D = D_1 \sqcup D_2$, here $D_i \in \mathcal{F}_i^*$ for $i = 1, 2$ respectively . Extend D_1 to a basis of $\mathcal{F}_1^*$ denoted as $\bar{D}_1$. However , since $D = D_1 \sqcup D_2$ is a basis , adding any elements in $E \setminus D$ wouldn't change the rank of D , that is to say , $\bar{D}_1$ must contains in D no matter how we extend D_1 . On the other hand , since $Y' \cap D = \emptyset$, it forces $Y' \cap \bar{D}_1 = \emptyset$. We therefore can assert that $Y' \in \mathcal{F}_1$. In the same way we can also prove that $Y' \in \mathcal{F}_2$. Then we conclude that $Y' \in \bigcap_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{F}_i$. This leads to the proof of (2) . □

Corollary 3.1 (Proposition 1.2). *Let $(E, \mathcal{F}_1), \dots, (E, \mathcal{F}_n)$ be the same as stated in **Proposition 1.1** . And set $(E, \mathcal{F}_j^*)$ the duality of $(E, \mathcal{F}_j)$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$. Moreover we assume that $(E, \bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}_i)$ is an independent system with rank function $\bar{r}$ (Notice that the intersection of matroids are not generally a matroid) . Then we have*

1.

$$\bar{r}^*(X) \leq \min_{A \subseteq X} \left(|X| + (n-1)|A| + \sum_{i=1}^n r_i(E \setminus A) - \sum_{i=1}^n r_i(E) \right)$$

Here $\bar{r}^*$ is the rank function of $(E, (\bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}_i)^*)$. Especially if we take $X = E$, we have the following :

$$\max\{|X| : X \in \bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}_i\} \geq \max_{A \subseteq E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n r_i(E) - \sum_{i=1}^n r_i(E \setminus A) - (n-1)|A| \right).$$

2. If we restrict ourselves on two matroids $(E, \mathcal{F}_1), (E, \mathcal{F}_2)$, and furthermore assume that $\mathcal{F}_1 \cap \mathcal{F}_2$ is a matroid , then the two following inequalities are actually equalities which agree with Edmonds' **min – max Theorem 1.1** .

Proof. Due to **Proposition 3.2** we have

$$\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}_i\right)^* \subseteq \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}_i^*.$$

therefore

$$\bar{r}^*(X) \leq \hat{r}(X)$$

here $\hat{r}(X)$ is the rank function for $\bigsqcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}_i^*$. Applying **Theorem ??** and **Proposition (ii)** 2.5 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{r}(X) &= \min_{A \subseteq X} (|X \setminus A| + \sum_{i=1}^n r_i^*(A)) \\ &= \min_{A \subseteq X} (|X \setminus A| + \sum_{i=1}^n (|A| + r_i(E \setminus A) - r_i(E))) \\ &= \min_{A \subseteq X} \left((n-1)|A| + |X| + \sum_{i=1}^n (r_i(E \setminus A) - r_i(E)) \right) \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

hence

$$\bar{r}^*(X) \leq \min_{A \subseteq X} \left(|X| + (n-1)|A| + \sum_{i=1}^n r_i(E \setminus A) - \sum_{i=1}^n r_i(E) \right)$$

What's more, since

$$\bar{r}^*(X) = |X| + \bar{r}(E \setminus X) - \bar{r}(X)$$

Taking $X = E$ we obtain

$$|E| - \bar{r}(E) = |E| - \max\{|X| : X \in \bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}_i\} \leq \min_{A \subseteq E} \left(|E| + (n-1)|A| + \sum_{i=1}^n r_i(E \setminus A) - \sum_{i=1}^n r_i(E) \right)$$

After eliminating $|E|$ in both side we get

$$\max\{|X| : X \in \bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}_i\} \geq \max_{A \subseteq E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n r_i(E) - \sum_{i=1}^n r_i(E \setminus A) - (n-1)|A| \right).$$

This proves part 1. And part 2 is evident for the reason that both inequalities in part 1 can be strengthened to be equalities according to **Proposition 3.2**. $\square$

Corollary 3.2 (Theorem1.3). *We omit the statement of Theorem1.3. For details the readers can check Section 1.*

Proof. The proof is similar with that of **Proposition 1.2** . Applying **Proposition 3.1** , we briefly write $\bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_i$ as $\mathcal{P}$, write $\bigvee_{i=1}^n (\mathcal{M}_i/T_i)^*$ as $\mathcal{N}$, then we have

$$r_{\mathcal{P}}^*(S) \leq r_{\mathcal{N}}(S)$$

for any $S \subseteq E$. Notice that we cannot apply **Theorem 1.2** to $r_{\mathcal{N}}(S)$. However after extending the domain of each matroid $\mathcal{M}_i/T_i$ to E trivially , i.e. adding elements of T_i to the ground set of $\mathcal{M}_i/T_i$ acting as $|T_i|$ loops which means that these additional elements vanish in the rank functions . Then we can utilise **Theorem 1.2** to compute $r_{\mathcal{N}}(S)$. And combining **Proposition 2.4 iii)** and **Proposition 2.5** , **Theorem 1.3** can be deduced after some straightforward computations .

□

The remaining part of this paper is left to prove **Proposition 1.1** and **corollary 1.1** . Let's recall what **Theorem 1.1** tells us .

Theorem 3.1 (Theorem 1.1). *Let $(E, \mathcal{F}_1)$, $(E, \mathcal{F}_2)$, ... , $(E, \mathcal{F}_n)$ be n matroids with rank functions $r_1, \dots, r_n$ respectively . And assume that $(E, \mathcal{F}_1 \cap \mathcal{F}_2)$, $(E, \mathcal{F}_1 \cap \mathcal{F}_2 \cap \mathcal{F}_3)$, ... , $(E, \bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}_i)$ are all matroids . And for any $X \subseteq E$ we take a increasing filtration of X randomly :*

$$X \subseteq X_1 \subseteq X_2 \subseteq \dots \subseteq X_{n-2} \subseteq E$$

Then we have the following min-max result :

$$\max\{|S| : S \in \bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}_i\} = \min\{r_1(X) + r_2(X_1 \setminus X) + \dots + r_{n-1}(X_{n-2} \setminus X_{n-3}) + r_n(E \setminus X_{n-2}) : X \subseteq X_1 \subseteq X_2 \subseteq \dots \subseteq X_{n-2} \subseteq E\} \quad (6)$$

Before proving this theorem , we will introduce two new concepts : **submatroid** of a given matroid and **restriction** of a matroid to its subset . Set $M = (E, \mathcal{F})$ a matroid , here E is a finite set .

Definition 3.1 (Submatroid). *A submatroid M_0 of M is a matroid $(S, \mathcal{F}_S)$ where $S \subseteq E$ is a subset of E and $\mathcal{F}_S$ is defined as follow :*

$$\mathcal{F}_S = \{F \in 2^S : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$$

It is easy to check that $(S, \mathcal{F}_S)$ satisfies all the matroid axioms $(M_1), (M_2), (M_3)$. Hence the notion of submatroid is well defined .

Definition 3.2 (Restriction of a matroid). *Let $M = (E, \mathcal{F})$ be a matroid as above with rank function r . For every subset $C \subseteq E$, the **restriction** of M to C is nothing but the submatroid $(C, \mathcal{F}_C)$ defined as above , for brevity we denote it as $M|_C$ or $(E, \mathcal{F})|_C$.*

And furthermore we denote the rank function of $M|_C$ as $r|_C$.

Lemma 3.3. *If $K \subseteq E$ and even satisfying that $K \subseteq C \subseteq E$, then we have*

$$r(K) = r|_C(K). \quad (7)$$

Proof. On the one hand , by definition of rank function obviously we have :

$$r(K) \geq r|_C(K)$$

On the other hand for every $K \subseteq C$, let P be the maximal cardinality independent set contained in K . It is straightforward to see that $P \subseteq C$, it implies that P is also in $\mathcal{F}_C$. Therefore

$$r(K) \leq r|_C(K)$$

Finally we can conclude that

$$r(K) = r|_C(K).$$

□

Proof of Proposition 1.1. Our strategy is to prove by induction . For $n = 2$, **Proposition 1.1** is nothing but a special case of Edmonds' min-max Theorem (**Theorem 1.1**) .

Assume that equality (4) holds for $n \leq k$, here k is a positive integer bigger than 2 . And set $\bar{r}_k$ the rank function for $(E, \bigcap_{i=1}^k \mathcal{F}_i)$. Due to **Theorem 1.1** we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{|S| : S \in \bigcap_{i=1}^{k+1} \mathcal{F}_i\} &= \max\{|S| : S \in (\bigcap_{i=1}^k \mathcal{F}_i) \cap \mathcal{F}_{k+1}\} \\ &= \min\{\bar{r}_k(X) + r_{k+1}(E \setminus X) : X \subseteq E\} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The second equality is a direct result of application of Edmonds' min-max Theorem for $\bigcap_{i=1}^k \mathcal{F}_i$ and $\bigcap_{i=1}^k \mathcal{F}_i$.

And observe that $\bar{r}_k(X) = \bar{r}_k|_X(X)$ according to **Lemma 3.3** . Here $\bar{r}_k|_X$ is the rank function for a submatroid $(X, (\bigcap_{i=1}^k \mathcal{F}_i)|_X)$ of $(E, \bigcap_{i=1}^k \mathcal{F}_i)$. What's more , we notice that

$$(\bigcap_{i=1}^k \mathcal{F}_i)|_X = \bigcap_{i=1}^k (\mathcal{F}_i|_X)$$

Applying the inductive hypothesis to $(X, \bigcap_{i=1}^k (\mathcal{F}_i|_X))$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{r}_k(X) &= \bar{r}_k|_X(X) \\ &= \min\{r_1|_X(A) + r_2|_X(A_1 \setminus A) + \cdots + r_{k-1}|_X(A_{k-2} \setminus A_{k-3}) + r_k|_X(X \setminus A_{k-2}) : \\ &\quad A \subseteq A_1 \subseteq A_2 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq A_{n-2} \subseteq X\} \\ &= \min\{r_1(A) + r_2(A_1 \setminus A) + \cdots + r_{k-1}(A_{k-2} \setminus A_{k-3}) + r_k(X \setminus A_{k-2}) : \\ &\quad A \subseteq A_1 \subseteq A_2 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq A_{n-2} \subseteq X\} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Finally combining (6) and (7) leads to a proof .

□

Proof of Corollary 1.1 . We just need to show that for any partition $\bigsqcup_{i=1}^m Y_i = E$ and every $I \in \mathcal{B}(\bigcap_{j=1}^m \mathcal{M}_j)$ we have

$$|I| \leq \sum_{i=1}^m r_i(Y_i) \quad (10)$$

It's clear that $I = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^m I \cap Y_i$ and $r_i(Y_i) \geq |I \cap Y_i|$, so the inequality 10 follows from the above facts .

□

Acknowledgements: The author thanks the University of Chinese Academy of Sciences and his classmates and friends for their selfless help when he wrote this paper .