

CONTRACTING A SINGLE ELEMENT IN A TRANSVERSAL MATROID

SAM BASTIDA

ABSTRACT. It is well known that the class of transversal matroids is not closed under contraction or duality. The complexity of deciding whether a minor or dual of a transversal matroid remains transversal is in Σ_2 and thus far there has been no improvement on this bound. We explore this issue, providing a polynomial time algorithm for determining whether a single element contraction of a transversal matroid remains transversal. If so, our algorithm also provides a transversal representation. We then develop the techniques used in search of a polynomial time algorithm for determining whether the dual of a transversal matroid remains transversal.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Motivation. Transversal matroids are an important class of matroids. In introductory texts to matroid theory the theory of transversal matroids is often well developed [14], and they are regularly given as an example of naturally arising matroids alongside the original classes, representable and graphic matroids [12]. However, while finding representable duals or minors of a representable matroid can be done in polynomial time, and the same is true of graphic matroids, we know of no such algorithm for finding transversal representations of contractions and duals of transversal matroids.

Indeed, the class of transversal matroids is not closed under contraction or duality and so in order to find a transversal contraction or dual one must first determine whether the matroid one is looking at is transversal to begin with. This gives us the following problem where our transversal matroids are represented by bipartite graphs in the usual way.

TRANSVERSAL CONTRACTION

INSTANCE: A bipartite graph, $G = (V_0, V_1, E)$, and a subset, X , of V_0 .

QUESTION: If M is the transversal matroid represented by G with ground set V_0 ; is M/X transversal?

We are able to check, in polynomial time, if a set $B \subseteq V_0 - X$ is a basis of M/X by simply checking if $B \cup (X - L)$ is a basis of M where L is the set of loops of M . Similarly for any transversal matroid, M_T , with a transversal representation, we can check if B is a basis of M_T . This means that if we are given a transversal matroid, M_T , on the same ground set as

M/X we can check in polynomial time whether a basis of one is a basis of the other. In order for us to obtain a positive answer to TRANSVERSAL CONTRACTION there must exist a matroid, M_T , such that for all B we have that B is not a basis of exactly one of M/X or M_T . This alternation of quantifiers puts TRANSVERSAL CONTRACTION into Σ_2 [6] (see Section 2 for more details).

We also investigate another problem, where we once again use bipartite graphs to represent our matroids.

TRANSVERSAL DUAL

INSTANCE: A bipartite graph, $G = (V_0, V_1, E)$.

QUESTION: If M is the transversal matroid represented by G with ground set V_0 ; is M^* transversal?

We can solve TRANSVERSAL DUAL similarly to TRANSVERSAL CONTRACTION by finding a transversal matroid on the appropriate ground set and comparing bases. Once again in order to obtain a positive answer there must exist a transversal matroid, M_T , such that for all B , we have that B is not a basis of exactly one of M^* or M_T ; and so TRANSVERSAL DUAL is also in Σ_2 .

We seek to drastically improve these bounds, obtaining a polynomial time algorithm for TRANSVERSAL CONTRACTION in the case where X is a single element. While this is an interesting result in its own right it is further motivated by the goal of obtaining a polynomial time algorithm for TRANSVERSAL DUAL which has been the subject of many conjectures. In [13], which was published in 1971, Problem 29 states asks for a characterisation of the matroids that are both transversal and co-transversal while in [2], which was published in 2010, Open Problem 6.1 asks the same thing, showing that this problem has been open for a long time.

A fundamental basis of a matroid, M , is a basis, B_F , of M such that for any cyclic flat Z of M we have that $B_F \cap Z$ spans Z . As we explain in Section 5, if a polynomial time algorithm existed that could solve TRANSVERSAL CONTRACTION in polynomial time in the case when X is a fundamental basis of M , then a polynomial time algorithm for TRANSVERSAL DUAL would also exist. Therefore, while we can currently only contract a single element in polynomial time, if our methods can be built upon, we may be able to provide the first real progress toward these conjectures in over 50 years.

1.2. Strategy. Our approach to obtaining a polynomial time algorithm will examine the duals of transversal matroids. The class of co-transversal matroids is exactly the class of strict gammoids [9]. Strict gammoids have their own graphical representation [11] which we shall discuss in Section 2.

Instead of working directly with transversal representations we will work with strict gammoids. This allows us to examine restrictions of strict gammoids instead of contractions of transversal matroids. Restrictions of strict gammoids are called gammoids and they have their own graphical representation. This allows us to quickly determine any matroid properties such as independence or closure that we might need from the restricted matroid for our algorithm.

Gammoids are interesting in their own right as they are closed under minors and since any transversal matroid is also a gammoid [12] they are a minor closed class containing transversal matroids. In fact they are exactly the class of transversal matroids and their minors [12]. Representing gammoids graphically can be a challenge though as it was only recently that a bound was put on the size of a graphic representation of a gammoid [10]. Our work approaches this problem from another direction, assuming that we already have a small representation of a gammoid and finding a representation that is one vertex smaller or determining that no such representation exists.

1.3. Our Contribution. We provide a solution to a special case of TRANSVERSAL CONTRACTION, namely we obtain a polynomial time algorithm to solve the following problem.

SINGLE ELEMENT TRANSVERSAL CONTRACTION

INSTANCE: A bipartite graph, $G = (V_0, V_1, E)$ and a vertex $e \in V_0$.

QUESTION: If M is the transversal matroid represented by G with ground set V_0 , is M/e transversal?

In fact we provide a proof for the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *There exists a polynomial time algorithm that solves SINGLE ELEMENT TRANSVERSAL CONTRACTION. If this algorithm obtains a positive answer then it also provides the transversal representation of M/e .*

We do this by solving the dual of SINGLE ELEMENT TRANSVERSAL CONTRACTION.

SINGLE ELEMENT STRICT GAMMOID DELETION

INSTANCE: A directed graph, $D = (V, A)$ with sink set $S \subseteq V$ and vertex $e \in V$.

QUESTION: If M is the strict gammoid represented by (D, V, S) ; is $M \setminus e$ a strict gammoid?

That is, we provide a proof for the following theorem which, through duality, also proves Theorem 1.

Theorem 2. *There exists a polynomial time algorithm that solves SINGLE ELEMENT STRICT GAMMOID DELETION. If this algorithm obtains a*

positive answer then it also provides the strict gammoid representation of $M \setminus e$.

We then work toward solving TRANSVERSAL CONTRACTION in the case where X is a fundamental basis of M . We do not solve this problem but some of the results used for the single element case still apply, in new forms, for this case as shown in Section 5.

1.4. Organisation. The remainder of this paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we introduce some basic concepts in matroid theory and the theory of transversal matroids. In Section 3, we convert many known theorems and results about transversal matroids into their dual results about strict gammoids. These results are already known but we provide direct proofs for completeness. In Section 4 we develop the necessary theory and then prove Theorem 2 which of course also proves Theorem 1. In Section 5 we then examine the potential of extending our ideas toward obtaining a polynomial algorithm to determine if a transversal matroid is co-transversal. Then in Section 6 we conclude the paper with some conjectures about extensions of our results.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Notation. If S is a set we let $S + x$ be $S \cup \{x\}$. We use $[n]$ to denote the set $\{0, 1, 2, \dots, n\}$. For sets S and S' we use $S \subseteq S'$ to denote that S is a subset of S' and $S \subset S'$ to denote that S is a proper subset of S' . If M is a matroid and X is a subset of M we use $M|X$ to represent $M \setminus (M - X)$, that is, M restricted to X .

2.2. Transversals. Let E be a finite set. We define a *set system* (E, \mathcal{A}) to be E along with a multiset $\mathcal{A} = (A_j : j \in [n])$ of subsets of E where $n = |\mathcal{A}|$. Thus the same set may appear multiple times in \mathcal{A} , indexed by different elements of $[n]$.

A set system (E, \mathcal{A}) can be represented by a bipartite graph whose vertex set is $\mathcal{A} \cup E$; an edge connects $A_j \in \mathcal{A}$ with $e \in E$ if and only if $e \in A_j$. Similarly each bipartite graph can be seen as representing a set system.

A *transversal* of the set system (E, \mathcal{A}) is a subset T of E for which there is a bijection $\phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow T$ with $e \in \phi(A_j)$ for all $A_j \in \mathcal{A}$. We refer to the bijection, ϕ , as a *matching*. A transversal is sometimes referred to as a *system of distinct representatives*, as ϕ provides a unique representative for each set in \mathcal{A} , however we will not use this term.

A well known theorem of Hall determines necessary and sufficient conditions for when a set system has a transversal [7].

Theorem 3. *A finite set system $(E, (A_j : j \in [n]))$ has a transversal if and only if for all $K \subseteq [n]$,*

$$|\bigcup_{j \in K} A_j| \geq |K|.$$

If T is a transversal of set system (E, \mathcal{A}) and T' is a proper subset of T then we say T' is a *partial transversal* of the system (E, \mathcal{A}) .

2.3. Lattices. A lattice is a set, L , with a partial order such that any two elements, e_0 and e_1 have a unique least upper bound, called the *join* of e_0 and e_1 , denoted $e_0 \vee e_1$, and a unique greatest lower bound, called the *meet* of e_0 and e_1 , denoted $e_0 \wedge e_1$. We will only consider finite lattices. Such a lattice will have both a minimum element, 0_L and a maximum element 1_L .

We say a set system is a *lattice under inclusion* if the partial ordering imposed on the sets in the system by containment gives rise to a lattice.

2.4. Matroids. We will use the terms; *independent sets*, *dependent sets*, *loops*, *coloops*, *bases*, *circuits*, *cyclic sets*, *rank*, *closure*, *flats*, *cyclic flats*, *span*, *contraction*, *deletion*, *minors*, and *duality* without providing definitions. We refer the reader to [12] for details on matroids.

We have from [3] that it is possible to define a matroid from its set of cyclic flats and their ranks in the following way:

Definition 4. Let $(E(M), \mathcal{Z})$ be a set system where all sets in \mathcal{Z} are distinct and let r be an integer-valued function on \mathcal{Z} . There is a matroid for which \mathcal{Z} is the collection of cyclic flats and r is the rank function restricted to the sets in \mathcal{Z} if and only if

- Z1 \mathcal{Z} is a lattice under inclusion.
- Z2 $r(0_{\mathcal{Z}}) = 0$.
- Z3 $0 < r(Y) - r(X) < |Y - X|$ for all sets $X, Y \in \mathcal{Z}$ with $X \subset Y$.
- Z4 For all sets $X, Y \in \mathcal{Z}$,

$$r(X) + r(Y) \geq r(X \vee Y) + r(X \wedge Y) + |(X \cap Y) - (X \wedge Y)|.$$

We let $\mathcal{Z}(M)$ be the collection of all cyclic flats of a matroid M . We will also define the *nullity* function, $n : 2^{E(M)} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ as $n(A) = |A| - r(A)$. Therefore we see that we can equivalently define a matroid using its set of cyclic flats and their nullities. We also have from [12, Chapter 2.1 Exercise 13a] that a set is a cyclic flat of a matroid, M , if and only if its complement is a cyclic flat of, M^* , the dual of M . We will also make use of the following equation for the dual rank function:

$$(1) \quad r_{M^*}(X) = r_M(\overline{X}) + |X| - r_M(M).$$

Now let $(E(M), \mathcal{A})$ be a set system and let \mathcal{I} be the set of partial transversals on $(E(M), \mathcal{A})$. Then $(E(M), \mathcal{I})$ is a matroid [2]. We call any matroid arising in this way a *transversal matroid*. We define an important function called the β function recursively on all subsets of a matroid

$$(2) \quad \beta(X) = r(M) - r(X) - \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): X \subset Z} \beta(Z).$$

Though they did not formulate their theorem in this way we have the following theorem from [8] and [5] (the proof that this is equivalent to the formulations of [8] and [5] can be found in [2]).

Theorem 5. *A matroid, M , is transversal if and only if $\beta(X) \geq 0$ for all $X \subseteq E(M)$.*

2.5. Complexity Theory. Let S be a set of characters. We call a sequence of characters from S a *word*. We call a set of words, L , a *language*. Complexity theory examines the *complexity* of algorithms that determine if a given word belongs to a given language. For our purposes we can imagine our words as inputs to a Turing Machine coded with an algorithm that will eventually accept the word if it belongs to the language and reject it otherwise. If we can bound the number of steps the Turing Machine will take by some polynomial function, n^k , where n is the size of the word and k is some constant then we say that the algorithm runs in *polynomial time*.

We classify languages based on their complexity and thus build a structure known as the *polynomial hierarchy*. The first level of the polynomial hierarchy is P . A language, L , is in P if there exists an algorithm which will determine that a word belongs to L in polynomial time.

The next level of the polynomial hierarchy is best viewed through an example. Let L_S be the language of satisfiable boolean formulae. We let L'_S be the language consisting of words of the form (F, A) where F is a boolean formula and A is an assignment of the variables of F such that F evaluates to true. Clearly a word, F , belongs to L_S if and only if there exists a word, (F, A) , belonging to L'_S . A polynomial time algorithm for determining whether a word belongs to L_S does not exist as far as we know, however, a polynomial time algorithm for determining whether a word belongs to L'_S does exist, one simply needs to evaluate F with A to ensure that F evaluates to true.

This example gives us our definition of the next set of the polynomial hierarchy we are examining, Σ_1 , also known as NP. A language, L , of words, W , is in Σ_1 if and only if there exists some language, $L' \in P$, of pairs, (W, V) , where a word, W is in L if and only if there exists some V such that $(W, V) \in L'$. Therefore, since L'_S is in P we see that L_S is in Σ_1 .

Of course “there exists” is not the only quantifier we can consider. Our next example will be the language of tautological formulae, L_T , that is, those logical formulae for which every assignment of boolean variables results in the formula evaluating to true. Here we let L'_T be the language consisting of words of the form (F, A) where F is a logical formula and A can be anything except an assignment of variables to F such that F evaluates to false. Clearly a word, F , belongs to L_T if and only if “for all” A we have that $(F, A) \in L'_T$. Once again we have that L'_T is in P but there exists no known polynomial time algorithm to verify that a formula belongs to L_T .

This example gives us our definition of the next set that we are examining, Π_1 (or co-NP), which can be thought of as being at the same level of the hierarchy as Σ_1 but distinct from it. A language, L , of words, W , is in Π_1 if and only if there exists some language, $L' \in P$, of pairs (W, V) , where a

word, W is in L if and only if for all V we have that $(W, V) \in L'$. Therefore, since L'_T is in P we see that L_T is in Π_1 .

We can construct further levels of the polynomial hierarchy by alternating quantifiers. For our purposes we need only construct one more set, Σ_2 . A language, L , of words, W , is in Σ_2 if and only if there exists some language, $L' \in \Pi_1$, of pairs, (W, V) , where a word W belongs to L if and only if there exists a V such that $(W, V) \in L'$.

We will now show that both TRANSVERSAL CONTRACTION and TRANSVERSAL DUAL are in Σ_2 . To see this we first have the fact that if given the associated bipartite graph for a set system (E, \mathcal{A}) , we may determine whether a subset of E is a transversal or not in polynomial time [12].

We first examine TRANSVERSAL CONTRACTION. Let M_T be a transversal matroid on the same ground set as M/X for which we have the transversal representation. Let L_T be the language of triples of the form $(M/X, M_T, B)$ where B can be anything except a set which is a basis in one of M/X or M_T but not the other. Since we can check in polynomial time if B is a basis in M/X or M_T we have that $L_T \in P$.

Now let L_X be the language of pairs of the form $(M/X, M_T)$ where $M/X \cong M_T$. We have that a word, $(M/X, M_T)$ is in L_X if and only if for all B we have that $(M/X, M_T, B) \in L_T$. Therefore L_X is in Π_1 .

Finally we have the language, L , with words of the form M/X where M/X is a transversal matroid. We see that determining whether a word is in L is equivalent to solving TRANSVERSAL CONTRACTION. A word, M/X , is in L if and only if there exists some transversal matroid M_T such that $M/X \cong M_T$, that is if $(M/X, M_T) \in L_X$. Since $L_X \in \Pi_1$ this means that $L \in \Sigma_2$.

For TRANSVERSAL DUAL the argument is the same except that instead of M/X we use M^* . That is, for a given transversal matroid M_T with representation, the language of triples of the form (M^*, M_T, B) where B is not a basis of only one of M^* or M_T , is in P . Therefore, the language of pairs of the form (M^*, M_T) where $M^* \cong M_T$, is in Π_1 . Therefore, the language of words, M^* , for which an M_T exists such that $M^* \cong M_T$, is in Σ_2 .

This means that determining if a dual or minor of a transversal matroid is also transversal is in Σ_2 , even if we are only contracting a single element. One might suspect that L should be at least in Π_1 given Equation 2, as all one has to do to verify that M is not a transversal matroid is to find a set, X , for which $\beta(X) < 0$, however, even if such an X is found there could be exponentially many cyclic flats that strictly contain X and so verifying the β value of X in polynomial time is likely to require some other technique, leaving the problem in Σ_2 .

3. CO-TRANSVERSAL MATROIDS AND STRICT GAMMOIDS

3.1. Co-Transversal Matroids. We begin this section by calculating the dual of (2). That is, we wish to obtain a function which will be non-zero on all sets of a matroid if and only if that matroid is co-transversal.

At first, we have

$$\beta^*(Y) = r^*(M) - r^*(Y) - \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M^*): Y \subset Z} \beta^*(Z).$$

We can use (1) to get

$$\beta^*(Y) = |E(M)| - r(M) - r(\bar{Y}) - |Y| + r(M) - \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M^*): Y \subset Z} \beta^*(Z).$$

We may cancel the $r(M)$ terms and combine the cardinality terms

$$\beta^*(Y) = |\bar{Y}| - r(\bar{Y}) - \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M^*): Y \subset Z} \beta^*(Z).$$

We wish to replace Y with \bar{Y} in the range of the summation. To do this note that if $Y \subset Z$ then $\bar{Z} \subset \bar{Y}$, this gives us

$$\beta^*(Y) = |\bar{Y}| - r(\bar{Y}) - \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M^*): \bar{Z} \subset \bar{Y}} \beta^*(Z).$$

The first two terms in the sum are of course the nullity of \bar{Y} which is defined as $n(\bar{Y}) = |\bar{Y}| - r(\bar{Y})$, while in the summation term it would help if we just examined \bar{Z} directly. This is fortunately, quite easy, as the cyclic flats of M are exactly the complements of cyclic flats of M^* , hence we have

$$\beta^*(Y) = n(\bar{Y}) - \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): \bar{Z} \subset \bar{Y}} \beta^*(\bar{Z}).$$

We now relabel \bar{Y} to be X and then we have

$$\beta^*(\bar{X}) = n(X) - \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset X} \beta^*(\bar{Z}).$$

Now we define a new function $\gamma(X)$ which is simply $\beta^*(\bar{X})$, we can then replace both of our β^* terms as follows

$$(3) \quad \gamma(X) = n(X) - \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset X} \gamma(Z)$$

and so we obtain our γ function. Since the γ function checks the same sets as the β^* function we obtain the following Corollary.

Corollary 6. *A matroid, M , is co-transversal if and only if $\gamma(X) \geq 0$ for all $X \subseteq E(M)$.*

We now have a way to test if a matroid is co-transversal. We will next describe the class of strict gammoids and prove that not only are they co-transversal but that they are exactly the class of co-transversal matroids. That is, we will reprove the following theorem from [9]

Theorem 7. *A matroid is co-transversal if and only if it is a strict gammoid.*

Everything we are proving in this subsection is already known but we require certain formulations of these results which have only been proved in the dual case for transversal matroids and so we provide the direct proof in the strict gammoid case for completeness.

3.2. Strict Gammoids. For this section, and future sections, we refer to the ground set of a matroid as E and an element of the ground set as e . This is standard for matroids but we mention it because the elements of our matroid will be vertices of a graph rather than edges, which are often also labelled as e . Our edges will be directed and so we will refer to them as arcs in order to distinguish them from elements of the matroid.

Let D be a directed graph and let S be a set of “sink” vertices for D . We do not require that there are no outgoing arcs from vertices of S as the existence of such arcs will not affect the matroid we will construct. We say a set of vertices, $I \subseteq V(D)$ has a *linking* into S if there exists a set of $|I|$ disjoint directed paths, each beginning at a vertex in I and ending at a vertex in S . Note that a path may consist of a single vertex if that vertex is in both I and S .

If D is a directed graph and E and S subsets of the vertex set of D then the set system consisting of the subsets of E with linkings into S is a matroid, M , called a *gammoid*, and denoted $M(D, E, S)$ [11]. In the case where $E = V(D)$ we call M a *strict gammoid*.

Let e be a vertex of a directed graph D . We call the set of vertices, v , such that $(e, v) \in A(D)$ the *forward neighbourhood* of e , denoted $N_D^+(e)$. We call the set $N_D^+(e) + e$ the *closed forward neighbourhood* of e and denote it $N_D^+[e]$.

We construct a multiset, \mathcal{N} . For each vertex, $e \in V(D) - S$, we add $N_D^+[e]$ to \mathcal{N} and label it N_e . In this way we have a set system where instead of indexing over $[n]$ we index over $V(D) - S$. Thus the set $N_{e'} \in \mathcal{N}$ is the closed forward neighbourhood, $N_D^+[e']$. This means that any bijection from elements of $V(D)$ to sets in \mathcal{N} will be a map from $V(D) - S$ rather than a map from $V(D)$ to $[n]$. We can construct such a bijection, ϕ_0 , from $V(D) - S$ to \mathcal{N} by letting $\phi_0(e) = N_e$. Therefore we show that $V(D) - S$ is a transversal of \mathcal{N} .

We first have the following Proposition from [4]:

Proposition 8. *A set B is a basis of $M(D, V(D), S)$ if and only if \overline{B} is a transversal of $(V(D), \mathcal{N})$.*

We see that if we have a strict gammoid we can construct the dual of it as a transversal matroid by taking the set system $(V(D), \mathcal{N})$ by Proposition 8. Therefore we have shown one direction of Theorem 7.

To show the other direction we first have a few preliminary results.

Proposition 9. *Let $M = M(D, V(D), S)$ be a strict gammoid and let Y be a subset of vertices of $V(D)$. Let $X \subseteq Y$ be the set of vertices such that $x \in X$ if and only if $x \notin S$ and $N_D^+[x] \subseteq Y$. Then $r_M(Y) \leq |Y - X|$.*

Proof. By the definition of a strict gammoid we have that $r_M(Y)$ is equal to the maximum number of disjoint directed paths, each beginning at a vertex in Y and ending at a vertex in S . Let \mathcal{P} be a maximum set of such paths.

Let P be one of the paths of \mathcal{P} . Let y be the last vertex of P in Y . We show by contradiction that $y \notin X$. Assume for contradiction that $y \in X$. Since $X \cap S = \emptyset$ we have that $y \notin S$ and so there must be at least one vertex, z , that is on P after y . Therefore there is some vertex, z' , that is directly after y on P and since y is the last vertex of P in Y we have that $z' \notin Y$. Therefore the arc (y, z') is in $A(D)$. Therefore $N_D^+[y] \not\subseteq Y$ and so $y \notin X$, a contradiction. Therefore P has at least one vertex, y in $Y - X$. Therefore every path of \mathcal{P} contains at least one vertex of $Y - X$ and since all such paths are distinct this means that $|\mathcal{P}| \leq |Y - X|$ as required. \square

We now take a co-transversal matroid and construct a strict gammoid from it in the following way. Let M be a co-transversal matroid. This of course means that all γ values of subsets of M are nonzero by Corollary 6. We will construct our strict gammoid from our set of cyclic flats with nonzero γ values. For each such cyclic flat, X , we will construct $\gamma(X)$ closed forward neighbourhoods equal to that cyclic flat. To do this we need an element for each set in our set system that will serve as the vertex whose closed forward neighbourhood will equal the set. That is, we need a transversal for \mathcal{N} and a matching, ϕ_0 , of that transversal.

Proposition 10. *Let M be a co-transversal matroid and let \mathcal{A} be the set system of cyclic flats of M with nonzero γ values, each with multiplicity equal to its γ value. There exists a transversal with matching, ϕ_0 , of \mathcal{A} from the elements of $E(M)$.*

Proof. We will show that for all subcollections, $\mathcal{A}' \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ we have that

$$|\cup \mathcal{A}'| \geq |\mathcal{A}'|.$$

and the result will follow from Theorem 3.

That is, for every subcollection, \mathcal{A}' , the cardinality of the union of sets in that collection is at least the number of sets in that collection.

Let \mathcal{A}' be a subcollection and let \mathcal{A}'_0 be the union of \mathcal{A}' with all sets, A , in \mathcal{A} for which $A \subseteq \cup \mathcal{A}'$. Since every set we add gives us no new elements in $E(M)$ doing this will give us $|\mathcal{A}'| \leq |\mathcal{A}'_0|$ but $|\cup \mathcal{A}'| = |\cup \mathcal{A}'_0|$. Therefore it suffices to show that

$$|\cup \mathcal{A}'_0| \geq |\mathcal{A}'_0|.$$

Since the multiplicity in \mathcal{A} of any set is equal to its γ value and for any set in \mathcal{A}'_0 all copies of that set are in \mathcal{A}'_0 by construction we have that

$$|\mathcal{A}'_0| = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}'_0} \gamma(A)$$

but because the sets $A \in \mathcal{A}'_0$ are exactly the sets contained in $\cup \mathcal{A}'$ this is

$$|\mathcal{A}'_0| = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}: A \subseteq \cup \mathcal{A}'} \gamma(A)$$

and of course since all cyclic flats in M either have a γ value of 0 or are in \mathcal{A} this means we are actually summing over all cyclic flats in M contained in $\cup \mathcal{A}'$. That is

$$|\mathcal{A}'_0| = \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subseteq \cup \mathcal{A}'} \gamma(Z).$$

There are two cases, either $\cup \mathcal{A}'$ is a cyclic flat in M with nonzero γ value. Or $\cup \mathcal{A}'$ is not a cyclic flat in M with nonzero γ value. In the first case $\gamma(\cup \mathcal{A}')$ appears in the sum and so may remove it from the sum, changing the range from $Z \subseteq \cup \mathcal{A}'$ to $Z \subset \cup \mathcal{A}'$

$$|\mathcal{A}'_0| = \gamma(\cup \mathcal{A}') + \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset \cup \mathcal{A}'} \gamma(Z).$$

Which, by (3) implies that

$$|\mathcal{A}'_0| = n(\cup \mathcal{A}')$$

and since $n(\cup \mathcal{A}') \leq |\cup \mathcal{A}'|$ we obtain the result in this case. In the second case $\gamma(\cup \mathcal{A}')$ is not in the sum and so we have

$$|\mathcal{A}'_0| = \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset \cup \mathcal{A}'} \gamma(Z).$$

Which, by (3) implies that

$$|\mathcal{A}'_0| = n(\cup \mathcal{A}') - \gamma(\cup \mathcal{A}')$$

and since $\gamma(\cup \mathcal{A}') \geq 0$ and $n(\cup \mathcal{A}') \leq |\cup \mathcal{A}'|$ we obtain the result in this case as well. \square

Let M be a co-transversal matroid. Let ϕ_0 be the matching obtained by Proposition 10. We now construct our strict gammoid from ϕ_0 , such that the resultant strict gammoid will represent M . We construct a directed graph D with vertex set equal to $E(M)$. Then, for each vertex, e in the domain of ϕ_0 , we direct an arc from e to each vertex in $\phi_0(e) - e$. This means that $N_D^+[e] = \phi_0(e)$. Recall that $\phi_0(e)$ is a set in \mathcal{A} and therefore a cyclic flat of M with nonzero γ value. Hence our closed forward neighbourhoods will be exactly the cyclic flats of M with positive γ values. We now let S be the set of all vertices not in the domain of ϕ_0 . That is, those vertices not used in the matching. We now prove that $M = M(D, V(D), S)$.

Lemma 11. $M = M(D, V(D), S)$.

Proof. We must prove two results. First that every dependent set in M is dependent in $M(D, V(D), S)$ and second that every independent set in M is independent in $M(D, V(D), S)$. For the first result it suffices to show that every circuit of M is dependent in $M(D, V(D), S)$.

To see this let C be an arbitrary circuit of M and let $cl_M(C)$ be the closure of C in M . Note that $cl_M(C)$ is a cyclic flat of M and therefore $cl_M(C) \in \{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M) : Z \subseteq cl_M(C)\}$. Therefore we may rearrange (3) to obtain

$$n_M(cl_M(C)) = \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M) : Z \subseteq cl_M(C)} \gamma(Z)$$

where we use \subseteq instead of \subset since we are combining the summation term with $\gamma(cl_M(C))$.

However, this sum is also equal to the number of sets in \mathcal{A} that are contained in $cl_M(C)$ counted with multiplicity. Each of these sets has a vertex of $V(D) - S$ matched to it by ϕ_0 and each of those vertices has a closed forward neighbourhood equal to the set it is matched with in $M(D, V(D), S)$. So there are $n_M(cl_M(C))$ vertices among the vertices representing $cl_M(C)$ whose closed forward neighbourhoods are contained in $cl_M(C)$, none of which are in S . Therefore the rank of $cl_M(C)$ in $M(D, V(D), S)$ is at most $|cl_M(C)| - n_M(cl_M(C))$ by Proposition 9. But of course $|cl_M(C)| - n_M(cl_M(C)) = r_M(cl_M(C))$, so the rank of $cl_M(C)$ in $M(D, V(D), S)$ is at most the rank in M of $cl_M(C)$. Therefore the rank of C in $M(D, V(D), S)$ must be at most the rank of C in M and so C is dependent in $M(D, V(D), S)$ as required.

We now show that any independent set in M is independent in $M(D, V(D), S)$. It will suffice to show this for bases of M . Let B be a basis of M .

From Proposition 8 it suffices to show that \overline{B} is a transversal of \mathcal{A} . By Theorem 3 it suffices to show that

$$|(\cup \mathcal{A}') - B| \geq |\mathcal{A}'|$$

where \mathcal{A}' is any subcollection of \mathcal{A} . As in the proof of Proposition 10 we may assume that every set of \mathcal{A} contained in $\cup \mathcal{A}'$ is in \mathcal{A}' . This means that

$$|\mathcal{A}'| = \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M) : Z \subseteq \cup \mathcal{A}'} \gamma(Z).$$

But as in the proof of Proposition 10 we have that

$$\sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M) : Z \subseteq \cup \mathcal{A}'} \gamma(Z) \leq n_M(\cup \mathcal{A}').$$

Then since $|(\cup \mathcal{A}') \cap B|$ is independent in M we have that $|(\cup \mathcal{A}') \cap B| \leq r_M(\cup \mathcal{A}')$ and so $|(\cup \mathcal{A}') - B| \geq n_M(\cup \mathcal{A}')$ and therefore we obtain the result. \square

Lemma 11 gives us a way to construct a strict gammoid that is isomorphic to any given co-transversal matroid. Therefore we prove the other direction of Theorem 7 and obtain a full proof of Theorem 7.

Note that we could also use this method with any collection of cyclic flats with nonzero γ values provided they had a matching. If M' were a matroid with a collection of cyclic flats with nonzero γ values then we could try to obtain a matching for the cyclic flats and if we found one we could try to construct a strict gammoid as described. If M' were a cotransversal matroid then the strict gammoid we constructed would equal M' provided we were using all the cyclic flats of M' with nonzero γ values, however, if M' was not a cotransversal matroid the strict gammoid we constructed would not be equal to M' although this might not be immediately apparent. We explore this procedure later and in our case we will provide a method to determine if the original matroid and the strict gammoid constructed from it are equal or not.

We end this section with a few brief corollaries.

Corollary 12. *Let M be any matroid and let \mathcal{F} be the collection of cyclic flats of M with positive γ values. If \mathcal{F} does not have a transversal from the elements of $E(M)$ then M is not a strict gammoid. If \mathcal{F} does have a transversal from the elements of $E(M)$ then let $M' = M(D, V(D), S)$ where D and S are constructed as in Lemma 11. Then if M is a strict gammoid $M = M'$.*

Proof. The transversal result comes from Proposition 10. The rest follows from Lemma 11 and the discussion above. \square

Corollary 13. *Let M be a strict gammoid. Then*

$$\sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subseteq E(M)} \gamma(Z) \leq n(E(M)).$$

Proof. By Theorem 7 we have that M is co-transversal and therefore by Corollary 6 we have that $\gamma(E(M)) \geq 0$, substituting in (3) and rearranging gives the result. \square

Corollary 14. *Let M be a co-transversal matroid with $k = |E(M)|$ and let \mathcal{A} be its collection of cyclic flats with nonzero γ values. Let X be a set of $E(M)$. Then, given only the collection \mathcal{A} along with each of their γ values it is possible to determine whether or not X is independent in polynomial time with respect to k .*

Proof. We use Lemma 11 to construct a strict gammoid representation of M . This can be done using only the sets in \mathcal{A} and their γ values. It can be done in polynomial time since for each set, A , in \mathcal{A} we are adding at most $k\gamma(A)$ edges and we never have to remove edges. We also have from Corollary 13 that both $\gamma(A)$ and $|\mathcal{A}|$ are bounded by k . We can then use standard maximum flow algorithms [1] to determine in polynomial time if X has a linking to S . \square

This justifies the techniques we will use which deal mostly with the collection \mathcal{A} and γ values of its members. However, we must also consider the case when we are given a strict gammoid in the form of a directed graph. How do we obtain \mathcal{A} in polynomial time? We have shown a method to obtain a strict gammoid from the collection \mathcal{A} complete with its γ values, however we have not shown that the reverse is possible. We will demonstrate how this is done in the next subsection. The techniques used there are related to the graphical representations of strict gammoids and gammoids and we shall not use such techniques for our proofs in the later sections but we provide them for completeness.

3.3. Directed Graph Properties. Let D be a directed graph with sink set $S \subseteq V(D)$.

Lemma 15. *Let $M = M(D, V(D), S)$ be a strict gammoid. Let I be an independent set in M and let e be a vertex in $cl(I) - I$. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of paths linking I into S such that e is on no path of \mathcal{P} . Then $N_D^+[e] \subseteq cl(I)$.*

Proof. Let f be a vertex in $N_D^+[e]$. Assume for contradiction that $f \notin cl(I)$. This means that $I + f$ is independent in M . Let \mathcal{P}_f be a set of paths linking $I + f$ into S and let P_f be the path of \mathcal{P}_f that begins at f . If no path of \mathcal{P}_f intersects e then we may extend P_f backward by one vertex to e since there is an arc from e to f in D . We would then have a set of paths linking $I + e$ into S , contradicting the fact that $e \in cl(I)$. Therefore we assume that there is some path, P_e , of \mathcal{P}_f that intersects e . Let the first vertex of P_e be v_0 .

We now construct a linking, \mathcal{P}_e , of $I + e$. To do this first add all paths from \mathcal{P}_f to \mathcal{P}_e except for the part of P_e before e . That is, the part of P_e from v_0 to e . This gives us a set of paths linking $I + e + f - v_0$ into S . We will be done when we can add a path from v_0 into this set of paths while maintaining paths from all other vertices, except perhaps f .

To do this note that $v_0 \in I$ and therefore there is some path, $P_0 \in \mathcal{P}$ which links v_0 to S and does not intersect e . This is the only property we need and all the following arguments can be repeated for any vertex in I . We add P_0 to \mathcal{P}_e arc by arc until we either reach S , in which case we are done, or until we intersect some other path already in \mathcal{P}_e . As we add these arcs and vertices we colour them red.

Assume that the path we are adding intersects with a path already in \mathcal{P}_e . Note that the path we are adding, which is red, cannot intersect any other red path since all red paths are in \mathcal{P} and so do not intersect each other. Let the non-red path we have intersected with be P'_0 and let the first vertex of P'_0 be v_1 . We have three possibilities for v_1 . First we could have $v_1 = f$ in which case we let P_0 follow P'_0 after they intersect and remove the earlier part of P'_0 from \mathcal{P}_e . We will therefore obtain a linking of all the vertices in $I + e + f$ except for f and therefore obtain a linking of $I + e$ as required. If this happens we are done so in all other cases we can assume we still have

a path from f to S in our set of paths. The second case is that $v_1 = e$. In this case similarly we let P_0 follow P'_0 after they intersect and remove the part of P'_0 before the intersection from \mathcal{P}_e . We now have a linking of $I + f$ into S , however, note that P_0 does not intersect e by construction so this is a set of paths that does not intersect e . We therefore extend the path from f back by one vertex to e and obtain our desired linking.

The final case is that v_1 is not equal to either f or e . In which case we have that $v_1 \in I$ and therefore there is a path, $P_1 \in \mathcal{P}$, that links v_1 to S and does not intersect e . Similar to before we let P_0 follow P'_0 after they intersect, making sure not to colour the rest of this new path red, and we delete the earlier part of P'_0 from \mathcal{P}_e . We now begin our process again following P_1 from v_1 . Note that our process never crosses a red path and so since there are only a finite number of vertices in D we must finish this process. Therefore we obtain a set of paths, \mathcal{P}_e that links $I + e$ into S . Therefore we obtain the result by contradiction. \square

Lemma 16. *Let $M = M(D, V(D), S)$ be a strict gammoid. Let I be an independent set in M such that for every set of paths, \mathcal{P} , linking I into S the arc (e, f) appears on some path in \mathcal{P} . Let \mathcal{P} be such a linking and let P_e be the path that (e, f) appears on in \mathcal{P} .*

Let v_0 be the first vertex of P_e . Then, $I' = I - v_0 + e$ is independent and for every set of paths linking I' into S we have that (e, f) appears on one of the paths.

Proof. Note that we can shorten P_e to start at e and therefore obtain a linking of I' , hence I' is clearly independent.

Assume for contradiction that \mathcal{P}' is some set of paths linking I' into S without using (e, f) . We now construct a set of paths, \mathcal{P}'' , linking I into S without using (e, f) . To do this we first add all paths of \mathcal{P}' to \mathcal{P}'' . We now need to find a path from v_0 to S while maintaining paths from all other vertices except perhaps e .

To do this note that $v_0 \in I$ and therefore there is some path, $P_0 \in \mathcal{P}$ from v_0 to S . This is the only property we need and all the following arguments can be repeated for any vertex in I . We add P_0 to \mathcal{P}'' arc by arc until we either reach S , in which case we are done, or until we intersect some other path already in \mathcal{P}'' . As we add these arcs and vertices we colour them red.

Assume that the path we are adding intersects with a path already in \mathcal{P}'' . Note that the path we are adding, which is red, cannot intersect any other red paths since all red paths are in \mathcal{P} and so do not intersect each other. Let the non-red path we have intersected with be P'_0 and let the first vertex of P'_0 be v_1 . We have two possibilities for v_1 . First we could have $v_1 = e$ in which case we let P_0 follow P'_0 after they intersect and remove the earlier part of P'_0 from \mathcal{P}'' . We will then have obtained a linking of $I' + v_0 - e$ which is a linking of I . Note that this process will prevent our path from using (e, f) as in order to use this edge P_0 must first reach e which would mean it

would intersect with P'_0 at e and by construction P'_0 , after e , does not use (e, f) . Therefore we cannot add a path that uses (e, f) to \mathcal{P}'' .

In the other possibility we have that $v_1 \neq e$, in which case $v_1 \in I$ and therefore there is a path, $P_1 \in \mathcal{P}$, that links v_1 to S . Similar to before we let P_0 follow P'_0 after they intersect, making sure not to colour the rest of this path red, and we delete the earlier part of P'_0 from \mathcal{P}'' . We now begin our process again following P_1 from v_1 . Note that our process never crosses a red path and so since there are only a finite number of vertices in D we must finish this process. Therefore we obtain a set of paths, \mathcal{P}'' that links I into S without using (e, f) . Therefore we obtain the result by contradiction. \square

Lemma 17. *Let $M = M(D, V(D), S)$ be a strict gammoid. Let I be an independent set in M such that for every set of paths, \mathcal{P} , linking I into S the vertex $e \notin I$ appears on some path in \mathcal{P} . Let \mathcal{P} be such a linking and let P_e be the path that e appears on in \mathcal{P} .*

Let f be the vertex of P_e before e on P_e . Then $f \in cl(I)$.

Proof. Assume for contradiction that $f \notin cl(I)$. Then there exists some set of paths, \mathcal{P}_f , linking $I + f$ into S . We now construct a set of paths, \mathcal{P}_0 that links I into S such that no path of \mathcal{P}_0 intersects e . To do this we first add all paths of \mathcal{P}_f to \mathcal{P}_0 . If none of these paths intersect e then we are done, otherwise we assume that one of the paths, P_0 , intersects e . Let the first vertex of P_0 be v_0 , we now have two cases.

In the first case $v_0 = f$. In this case since we are trying to link I not $I + f$ we can simply delete P_0 and obtain our required linking. In the second case $v_0 \neq f$ and therefore $v_0 \in I$, this means that the path from f in P_0 does not intersect e . Since $v_0 \in I$ there is some path, $P_0 \in \mathcal{P}$ linking v_0 to S . We add P_0 to \mathcal{P}_0 arc by arc until we either reach, S , in which case we are done, or until we intersect some other path already in \mathcal{P}_0 . As we add these vertices we colour them red.

Assume that the path we are adding intersects with a path, P_1 , already in \mathcal{P}_0 . We let P_0 follow P_1 after they intersect, making sure not to colour those vertices red, and we remove the part of P_1 before the intersection from \mathcal{P}_0 . We then examine the first vertex of P_1 and repeat this process there. Once again we are guaranteed to never intersect a red path since they are all in \mathcal{P} , therefore this process must terminate. We are also guaranteed to never intersect e since the only path in \mathcal{P} that intersects e intersects f first and if $v_0 \neq f$ then the path from f in \mathcal{P}_f cannot intersect f so we could follow the same procedure except we would not have to start again with new vertex v_1 . Therefore we obtain the result. \square

Lemma 18. *Let $M = M(D, V(D), S)$ be a strict gammoid. Let e and f be vertices of D such that $(e, f) \notin A(D)$ and $e \notin S$. Then $M' = M(D + (e, f), V(D), S) = M$ if and only if $f \in cl_M(N_D^+[e])$.*

Proof. We first prove that if $f \in cl_M(N_D^+[e])$ then $M' = M$.

Note that all sets that can be linked into S in D can be linked into S in $D + (e, f)$ by the same paths. Therefore it suffices to show that no set is dependent in M and independent in M' . For contradiction assume that I is such a set. Note that every set of paths, \mathcal{P} , linking I into S in $D + (e, f)$ must use the arc (e, f) as otherwise those paths would exist in D and I would be independent in M . Let P_e be the path of \mathcal{P} that uses (e, f) and let v be the first vertex of P_e . By Lemma 16 we also have that $I' = I - v + e$ is independent in M' and has the property that any set of paths linking I' into S uses (e, f) . Therefore I' must be dependent in M . Therefore to obtain our contradiction it suffices to examine I' instead of I .

Note that since $e \in I'$ and the edge (e, f) is used in every set of paths linking I' into S there exists a set of paths, \mathcal{P}_e , linking I' into S where the path, P'_e linking e to S , contains (e, f) . Note that $\mathcal{P}_e - P'_e$ is a linking of $I' - e$ that does not use the arc (e, f) and therefore exists in D . Hence $I' - e$ is independent in M but I' is not. Therefore $e \in cl_M(I' - e)$. Furthermore $\mathcal{P}_e - P'_e$ is a linking of $I' - e$ that does not intersect e at all. Therefore by Lemma 15 we have that $N_D^+[e] \subseteq cl_M(I' - e)$.

However, since the first arc of P'_e is (e, f) we can shorten it to start at f instead of e and obtain a set of paths linking $I' - e + f$ into S that does not use the arc (e, f) and therefore exists in D . Therefore $I' - e + f$ is independent in M and so $f \notin cl_M(I' - e)$. However $f \in cl_M(N_D^+[e])$ and $N_D^+[e] \subseteq cl_M(I' - e)$, and so $cl_M(N_D^+[e]) \subseteq cl_M(I' - e)$ therefore we obtain our contradiction.

For the other direction assume that $f \notin cl_M(N_D^+[e])$. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of paths that links the maximum number of vertices in $N_D^+[e]$ into S . Let the set of vertices at the beginning of paths in \mathcal{P} be I . Note that $r_M(N_D^+[e]) = |I|$. Observe that we may assume for any such linking of any such I that e does not appear on any path of \mathcal{P} as if $e \in P$ for some $P \in \mathcal{P}$ then let e' be the vertex after e in P . Such a vertex exists since $e \notin S$ so P cannot end at e . We then obtain a new linking for a new independent set by shortening P to start at e' . Since $e' \in N_D^+[e]$ this new independent set is a maximum sized independent set contained in $N_D^+[e]$ as required.

Note that $f \notin cl_M(N_D^+[e])$ and therefore if I is a maximum sized independent set contained in $N_D^+[e]$ we have that $f \notin cl_M(I)$. Therefore there exists a linking, \mathcal{P}_f , of $I + f$ in D . Let P_f be the path of \mathcal{P}_f that begins at f . Note that $\mathcal{P}_f - P_f$ is a linking of a maximum sized independent set contained in $N_D^+[e]$ and so we can assume, as above, that no path of $\mathcal{P}_f - P_f$ passes through e . We also see that P_f does not pass through e as if it did we could shorten it to start at e and obtain a linking of $I + e$, contradicting the fact that I was a maximum sized independent set contained in $N_D^+[e]$. Therefore no path of \mathcal{P}_f passes through e .

This means that in $D + (e, f)$ we can extend P_f backward to e through the arc (e, f) and obtain a linking of $I + e$. Therefore $r_{M'}(N_D^+[e]) > r_M(N_D^+[e])$ and therefore $M' \neq M$ as required. \square

Lemma 18 gives us a way to add arcs to our strict gammoids without changing the strict gammoid. If D_M is a directed graph representation of a strict gammoid, M , such that there are no arcs from vertices in S and adding any arc from a vertex $e \notin S$ to D_M prevents it from being a representation of M then we say that D_M is a *maximal representation*. Since we can determine closures of given sets in polynomial time for a given representation it is easy to obtain a maximal representation of a strict gammoid in polynomial time. We simply use Lemma 18 to determine if we can add an arc or not for each missing arc of which there are at most $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ where n is the number of vertices.

Lemma 19. *Let $M = M(D, V(D), S)$ be a strict gammoid. Let D_M and D'_M be maximal representations for M obtained by adding arcs to D and removing arcs from vertices in S . Then $D_M = D'_M$.*

Proof. Let D' be a representation obtained from D by adding all arcs that can possibly be added using Lemma 18. Then if $N_D^+[e]$ is a closed forward neighbourhood of a vertex e in D we must have that $N_{D'}^+[e] = cl_M(N_D^+[e])$. Since both D_M and D'_M must be obtained in this way and by the "only if" condition on Lemma 18 we cannot add any other arcs, we have that $N_{D_M}^+[e] = N_{D'_M}^+[e]$ for all $e \notin S$ and since there are no arcs from vertices in S we also have that $N_{D_M}^+[s] = N_{D'_M}^+[s]$ for all $s \in S$. Therefore $D_M = D'_M$. \square

Observe that in a maximal representation every closed forward neighbourhood must be a flat as if there is some element in the closure of such a neighbourhood it must be in the neighbourhood.

Corollary 20. *Let $M = M(D, V(D), S)$ be a strict gammoid and let Z be a cyclic flat of M . Then Z is a union of closed forward neighbourhoods of D .*

Proof. Since any cyclic flat is a union of closures of circuits it suffices to prove that a closure of a circuit is a union of closed forward neighbourhoods.

Let C be a circuit in M and let $cl(C)$ be its closure. Let e be a vertex in $cl(C)$. Let I be a maximum independent set of C that does not contain e , since C is a circuit such a set exists. We have two cases.

First, assume that there is some set of paths, \mathcal{P} , linking I into S such that no path of \mathcal{P} intersects e . If $e \in S$ then we may simply add e to I and obtain an independent set and so $e \notin cl(I)$, a contradiction. Therefore we have that $e \notin S$ and so by Lemma 15 we have that $N_D^+[e] \subseteq cl(I)$ and so there is a closed forward neighbourhood in $cl(C)$ that contains e .

In the second case we assume that in every set of paths, \mathcal{P} , linking I into S , there is a path, P_e , that intersects e . Let f be the first vertex of P_e and let f' be the vertex of P_e before e . By Lemma 17 we have that $f' \in cl(I)$ and therefore $f' \in cl(C)$. Since $e \in cl(C)$ and $cl(I) = cl(C)$ we have that $cl(I + e) = cl(C)$. We also have that $I - f + e$ is independent since we can obtain a set of paths linking $I - f + e$ into S from \mathcal{P} by simply shortening P_e to

start at e instead of f . Therefore, since I is a maximum sized independent set contained in $cl(C)$ we have that $I - f + e$ is also a maximum sized independent set contained in $cl(C)$. Therefore $cl(C) = cl(I - f + e)$. Note that $f' \in cl(I - f + e)$ since $f' \in cl(C)$ and we have just found a set of paths linking $I - f + e$ into S such that none of the paths intersect f' . Therefore by Lemma 15 we have that $N_D^+[f'] \subseteq cl(I - f + e)$ and so there is a closed forward neighbourhood in $cl(C)$ containing e .

So in both cases e is contained in some closed forward neighbourhood contained in $cl(C)$. Therefore $cl(C)$ is a union of closed forward neighbourhoods as required. \square

Proposition 21. *Let e be a vertex of $V(D) - S$. Then $N_D^+[e]$ is cyclic in M .*

Proof. Let \mathcal{B}_N be the collection of maximal independent sets contained in $N_D^+[e]$. It suffices to show that no element in $N_D^+[e]$ appears in every set in \mathcal{B}_N .

We first show that e does not appear in every set in \mathcal{B}_N . Let B_0 be some set in \mathcal{B}_N and let \mathcal{P}_0 be a set of paths linking B_0 to S in D . If $e \notin B_0$ then we are done. Otherwise there is some path, $P_e \in \mathcal{P}_0$ beginning at e and ending at a vertex in S . Since $e \notin S$ there is some vertex, f , on P_e such that P_e uses the arc (e, f) . Since there is an arc $(e, f) \in A(D)$ we have that $f \in N_D^+[e]$ and since a path goes through f we have that $f \notin B_0$. If we shorten P_e to start at f instead of e we obtain a new set of paths linking $B_0 - e + f$ into S . Therefore $B_0 - e + f$ is an independent set and since it has the same size as B_0 is in \mathcal{B}_N . Therefore e is not in every set of \mathcal{B}_N .

Now let f be some element in $N_D^+[e]$ such that $f \neq e$. We now show that f is not in every set in \mathcal{B}_N . This time let B_1 be some set of \mathcal{B}_N . If $f \notin B_1$ then we are done so we assume that $f \in B_1$. This means that there is some set of paths \mathcal{P}_1 , linking B_1 into S and one of these paths, P_f , begins at f . If e appears on no paths of \mathcal{P}_1 then let $B'_1 = B_1$. Otherwise let P_e be the path of \mathcal{P}_1 that e appears on. Let the first vertex of P_e be e' and let the vertex after e on P_e be f' . Note that since f' is not the first vertex on its path $f' \neq f$. We obtain a new set of paths, \mathcal{P}'_1 , by shortening P_e to start at f' instead of e' . Since the arc $(e, f') \in A(D)$ we have that $f' \in N_D^+[e]$ and so as before the set, B'_1 , linked by \mathcal{P}'_1 is a maximal independent set of $N_D^+[e]$ and therefore $B'_1 \in \mathcal{B}_N$. We have that $B'_1 = B_1 - e' + f'$. If $e' = f$ then we are done, otherwise, in both cases, we now have a set $B'_1 \in \mathcal{B}_N$ with a set of paths, \mathcal{P}'_1 , linking it into S such that no path of \mathcal{P}'_1 intersects e and one path, P_f , which starts at f .

Since $f \in N_D^+[e]$ the arc $(e, f) \in A(D)$ and so we may extend P_f back one arc by adding (e, f) to it and therefore making $P_f + (e, f)$ a path that links e to S . Since no path of \mathcal{P}'_1 intersects e adding this edge still results in a linking. Therefore $B'_1 - f + e$ is another maximal independent set of $N_D^+[e]$ and so $B'_1 - f + e \in \mathcal{B}_N$. Therefore f is not in every set in \mathcal{B}_N and therefore we obtain the result. \square

Proposition 22. *Let X be a flat of M . Let X_N be the set of vertices of X in $V(D) - S$ whose closed forward neighbourhoods are contained in X . Then $n(X) = |X_N|$.*

Proof. Let B_X be a maximal independent set in X . Let \mathcal{P} be a set of paths linking B_X to S in D . Let x be an element of $X - X_N$ that does not appear on any path of \mathcal{P} . Since B_X is a maximal independent set in X we have that $X \in cl(B_X)$ and so $x \in cl(B_X)$, therefore by Lemma 15 we have that $N_D^+[x] \subseteq cl(B_X)$, therefore $N_D^+[x] \subseteq cl(X)$ and so since X is a flat $N_D^+[e] \subseteq X$. This contradicts the fact that $x \notin X_N$. Therefore every vertex x in $X - X_N$ appears on some path of \mathcal{P} .

Now let \mathcal{P}' be the set of paths obtained from \mathcal{P} in the following way. Let P_0 be a path in \mathcal{P} and let x_0 be the last vertex of X on P_0 . That is, if e is the first vertex of P_0 then the only vertices on P_0 that can be in X are those between e and x_0 inclusive, on P_0 . Observe that x_0 cannot be in X_N as then it would not be in S and so there would be some vertex x_1 on P_0 directly after x_0 and so x_1 would be in $N_D^+[x_0]$. Therefore if x_0 was in X_N we would have that x_1 would be in X , contradicting the fact that x_0 is the last vertex in X on P_0 .

We shorten P_0 to begin at x_0 instead of at e and then we add P_0 to \mathcal{P}' . We do this for every path in \mathcal{P} and therefore we obtain the same number of paths in \mathcal{P}' . Since all paths in \mathcal{P}' start at vertices in X and there are the same number of them as in \mathcal{P} we have that the set \mathcal{P}' links, B'_X , is a maximal independent set in X . Therefore, by our above argument each $x_0 \in X - X_N$ must appear on a path of \mathcal{P}' . However, by construction each path of \mathcal{P}' has exactly one vertex of $X - X_N$ on it. Therefore there are exactly $|X - X_N|$ paths in \mathcal{P}' and so $r(X) = |X - X_N|$ and therefore $n(X) = |X_N|$. \square

Let D be a directed graph and let X be a subset of $V(D)$. We define $N_c(X)$ to be the set of vertices, $e \in V(D)$, such that $N_D^+[e] \subseteq X$. We define $N(X)$ to be the set of vertices, $e \in V(D)$, such that $N_D^+[e] = X$. Finally if M is a matroid and X is a subset of the ground set of M we define $Z_c(X)$ to be the number of cyclic flats of M contained in X .

Theorem 23. *Let D_M be a maximal representation of a strict gammoid, M . Let X be a subset of $E(M)$. Then X is a closed forward neighbourhood of D_M if and only if X is a cyclic flat of M with nonzero γ value and $|N(X)| = \gamma(X)$.*

Proof. We prove this by induction on $|N_c(X)| + |Z_c(X)|$.

For the base case let X be a set that contains no cyclic flats of M and no closed forward neighbourhoods of D_M . This means that X cannot be a cyclic flat or a closed forward neighbourhood and so we prove the base case.

For the induction step let X be either a closed forward neighbourhood or a cyclic flat with nonzero γ value and assume the result holds for all closed forward neighbourhoods and cyclic flats with nonzero γ value strictly contained in X . For the first direction let X be a closed forward neighbourhood.

Then by Proposition 21 we have that X is cyclic and by Lemma 18 we have that X is a flat since D_M is a maximal representation. Therefore X is a cyclic flat. All that remains to show is that $|N(X)| = \gamma(X)$. Before we do this we examine the other direction. In this case let X be a cyclic flat, then by Corollary 20 we have that X is a union of closed forward neighbourhoods. All that remains is to show that $|N(X)| = \gamma(X)$.

In both cases observe that for each closed forward neighbourhood, $Y = N_D^+[e]$ strictly contained in X we have that $|N(Y)| = \gamma(Y)$ by induction. We also have that for each cyclic flat Y strictly contained in X that either $\gamma(Y) = 0$ or $|N(Y)| = \gamma(Y)$ by induction. Therefore the total number of closed forward neighbourhoods strictly contained in X is exactly

$$\sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset X} \gamma(Z).$$

Observe that the number we have just calculated is precisely the difference between $|N_c(X)|$ and $|N(X)|$ since $N_c(X)$ includes all such neighbourhoods and $N(X)$ does not. Therefore

$$|N(X)| = |N_c(X)| - \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset X} \gamma(Z).$$

But by Proposition 22 since in both cases X is a flat we have that $|N_c(X)| = n(X)$ and so this is actually

$$|N(X)| = n(X) - \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset X} \gamma(Z) = \gamma(X)$$

as required. \square

Therefore we can take any strict gammoid presented to us as a directed graph and obtain the maximal representation from which we can read off \mathcal{A} and the γ values of each set in \mathcal{A} , all in polynomial time.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Flats. We require some results concerning flats of matroids. Some of these results pertain to general matroids rather than simply strict gammoids.

Proposition 24. *Let X be a subset of a matroid, M and let L^* be the set of coloops of $M|X$. Then $X - L^*$ is the unique maximal cyclic set contained in X and $n(X) = n(X - L^*)$.*

Furthermore if X is a flat then $X - L^$ is a cyclic flat.*

Proof. Removing L^* from X decreases the size and the rank of X by the same amount so we see that $n(X) = n(X - L^*)$. If X is closed $cl(X - L^*) \subseteq X$ and since adding any elements from L^* would increase the rank of $X - L^*$ we see that $cl(X - L^*) = X - L^*$ and finally since $M|(X - L^*)$ contains no coloops $X - L^*$ is a cyclic flat.

Also any other maximal cyclic set X' could not contain any elements in L^* since they are coloops of $M|X$ and therefore would be contained in $X - L^*$, hence $X - L^* = X'$ and therefore $X - L^*$ is unique. \square

We can use Proposition 24 to see that in a strict gammoid, M , we have

$$(4) \quad n(M) = \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M)} \gamma(Z).$$

Which we can see by letting Z_ω be the maximum cyclic flat contained in $E(M)$ described by Proposition 24, then

$$\gamma(Z_\omega) = n(Z_\omega) - \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M) - Z_\omega} \gamma(Z)$$

but by Proposition 24 we see that $n(Z_\omega) = n(M)$ and so rearranging gives the result. This gives another proof of Corollary 13. Next we have two results about the γ function that we will use later.

Lemma 25. *Let X be a non-cyclic set in any matroid and let L^* be the set of coloops of $M|X$. If $X - L^*$ is not a cyclic flat then $\gamma(X) = \gamma(X - L^*)$, and if $X - L^*$ is a cyclic flat then $\gamma(X) = 0$.*

Proof. First assume that $X - L^*$ is not a cyclic flat. Then, since no cyclic flats in X can contain elements of L^* we have that the collection of cyclic flats strictly contained in $X - L^*$ is the same as the collection of cyclic flats strictly contained in X . Therefore

$$\sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset X} \gamma(Z) = \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset X - L^*} \gamma(Z).$$

Also by Proposition 24 we have that $n(X) = n(X - L^*)$ and therefore

$$n(X) - \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset X} \gamma(Z) = n(X - L^*) - \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset X - L^*} \gamma(Z)$$

which is of course

$$\gamma(X) = \gamma(X - L^*)$$

as required.

On the other hand if $X - L^*$ is a cyclic flat then the collection of cyclic flats strictly contained in X , that is $Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M), Z \subset X$, contains one cyclic flat more than the collection of cyclic flats strictly contained in $X - L^*$, namely, $X - L^*$ is a cyclic flat strictly contained in X but not in $X - L^*$. This means that

$$(Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M) : Z \subset X) = (Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M) : Z \subset X - L^*) + (X - L^*)$$

this gives us

$$n(X) - \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset X} \gamma(Z) = n(X - L^*) - \left(\sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset X - L^*} \gamma(Z) \right) - \gamma(X - L^*)$$

$$\gamma(X) = \gamma(X - L^*) - \gamma(X - L^*) = 0$$

as required. \square

Note that if X in Lemma 25 is a flat then we have from Proposition 24 that $X - L^*$ will be a cyclic flat and so we obtain the following corollary:

Corollary 26. *Let F be a non-cyclic flat in any matroid. Then $\gamma(F) = 0$.*

Lemma 27. *Let X be a flat in a strict gammoid. Then for every $x \in X$ such that x is not a coloop of $M|X$, there is some cyclic flat $F_x \subseteq X$ such that $x \in F_x$ and $\gamma(F_x) > 0$.*

Proof. Let x be an element of X and let there be no cyclic flat $F_x \subseteq X$ such that $x \in F_x$ and $\gamma(F_x) > 0$. Clearly we have that if X is a cyclic flat $\gamma(X) = 0$ since $x \in X$. By the definition of γ we have

$$\gamma(X) = n(X) - \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset X} \gamma(Z).$$

If X is cyclic then we can rearrange this as follows:

$$(5) \quad n(X) = \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subseteq X} \gamma(Z).$$

If X is not cyclic then by Proposition 24 there exists a unique maximal cyclic flat $Z_X \subseteq X$ and $n(X) = n(Z_X)$. Since Z_X is unique and maximal we see that all cyclic flats contained in X are contained in Z_X , this gives us

$$n(X) = n(Z_X) = \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subseteq X} \gamma(Z).$$

Therefore (5) still holds even though X is not cyclic. But since x is not a coloop of X we have that $r(X - x) = r(X)$ and so

$$(6) \quad n(X - x) = |X - x| - r(X - x) = |X| - r(X) - 1 = n(X) - 1.$$

We now examine the sum of γ values of cyclic flats contained in X . If X is not a cyclic flat it is not in the sum and if it is a cyclic flat then it contains x and so must have γ value zero by assumption, either way we can remove it from the sum without changing the value of the sum.

Similarly, every other cyclic flat contained in X that contains x must have γ value of zero and so we can remove all of these cyclic flats from the sum as well, leaving only cyclic flats contained in $X - x$.

$$(7) \quad \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subseteq X} \gamma(Z) = \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset X} \gamma(Z) = \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset X - x} \gamma(Z)$$

where we do not need \subseteq for the last sum because if such a cyclic flat existed it would clearly contain x in its closure. We now examine the γ value of $X - x$ to get

$$\gamma(X - x) = n(X - x) - \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset X - x} \gamma(Z)$$

and by (6) this is

$$\gamma(X - x) = n(X) - 1 - \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset X - x} \gamma(Z)$$

substituting in (5) gives us

$$\gamma(X - x) = \left(\sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subseteq X} \gamma(Z) \right) - 1 - \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset X - x} \gamma(Z)$$

then we use (7) to get

$$\gamma(X - x) = \left(\sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset X - x} \gamma(Z) \right) - 1 - \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset X - x} \gamma(Z)$$

cancelling gives

$$\gamma(X - x) = -1$$

which contradicts the fact that our matroid was a strict gammoid, giving us the result. \square

4.2. The Lattice of Cyclic Flats. By Definition 4 we see that the collection of cyclic flats of a matroid forms a lattice under inclusion. Specifically if Z_0 and Z_1 are cyclic flats then their join, $Z_0 \vee Z_1$, is the closure of their union, and their meet, $Z_0 \wedge Z_1$ is the union of all circuits contained in their intersection. Note that the set of all loops of a matroid is a cyclic flat even if it is empty. If given a set of cyclic flats $\mathcal{Z} = \{Z_0, Z_1, \dots, Z_n\}$ we define $\vee \mathcal{Z}$ to be $Z_0 \vee Z_1 \vee \dots \vee Z_n$ and $\wedge \mathcal{Z}$ to be $Z_0 \wedge Z_1 \wedge \dots \wedge Z_n$. It is clear that given any pair of cyclic flats in a gammoid their join and meet can be obtained in polynomial time, however, there may be exponentially many cyclic flats in the matroid and so it is not feasible to examine all of them in polynomial time.

Our goal is to examine a one element deletion from a strict gammoid and determine if the resulting gammoid remains a strict gammoid. Naively in order to do this we would have to check the γ values of every subset of the ground set of the resulting matroid which clearly could not be done in polynomial time. In fact, even checking all the cyclic flats could not be done in polynomial time. However, recall that by Corollary 13 the number of cyclic flats with nonzero γ values in the original matroid is bounded by the size of the ground set. While that may not be true for our new matroid we can use this information to help us obtain information about it in polynomial time. As such we first examine the relationship between the lattices of cyclic flats for each matroid.

Let M^+ be a matroid with $e \in E(M^+)$, let $M = M^+ \setminus e$. We obtain a function $f : \mathcal{Z}(M^+) \rightarrow 2^{E(M)}$ which is defined as $f(Z) = Z - e$. Note that $f(Z)$ may or may not be a cyclic flat in M . We now prove the following properties about f .

Lemma 28. *The function f has the following properties for all $Z_0, Z_1 \in \mathcal{Z}(M^+)$ and $Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M)$:*

- 28.1. If $f(Z_0) = f(Z_1)$ then $Z_0 = Z_1$.*
- 28.2. $cl_M(f(Z_0) \cup f(Z_1)) = f(cl_{M^+}(Z_0 \cup Z_1))$*
- 28.3. Let L^* be the set of all coloops of $M|(f(Z_0) \cap f(Z_1))$. We have that*

$$(f(Z_0) \cap f(Z_1)) - L^* \subseteq f(Z_0 \wedge Z_1)$$

and if $f(Z_0 \wedge Z_1)$ is cyclic in M then

$$(f(Z_0) \cap f(Z_1)) - L^* = f(Z_0 \wedge Z_1).$$

- 28.4. There exists some $Z' \in \mathcal{Z}(M^+)$ such that $f(Z') = Z$.*
- 28.5. Either $f(Z_0) \in \mathcal{Z}(M)$ or $\gamma_M(f(Z_0)) = 0$.*

Proof. For the first result note that if $f(Z_0) = f(Z_1)$ and $Z_0 \neq Z_1$ then the symmetric difference of Z_0 and Z_1 would be the singleton element $\{e\}$ which is impossible for cyclic flats.

For the second result note that since Z_0 and Z_1 are both cyclic flats in M^+ we have that e is not a coloop of either $M^+|Z_0$ or $M^+|Z_1$ and therefore clearly isn't a coloop of $M^+|Z_0 \cup Z_1$. Hence $r_{M^+}((Z_0 - e) \cup (Z_1 - e)) = r_{M^+}(Z_0 \cup Z_1)$. Hence $cl_{M^+}(Z_0 \cup Z_1) = cl_{M^+}((Z_0 - e) \cup (Z_1 - e))$. Which means that

$$(8) \quad cl_{M^+}(Z_0 \cup Z_1) = cl_{M^+}(f(Z_0) \cup f(Z_1)).$$

Let $e_0 \neq e$ be an element in $cl_{M^+}(f(Z_0) \cup f(Z_1))$. If $e_0 \in f(Z_0) \cup f(Z_1)$ then $e_0 \in cl_M(f(Z_0) \cup f(Z_1))$ since $e_0 \neq e$. Otherwise e_0 is contained in a circuit, C_0 of M^+ , which is otherwise contained in $f(Z_0) \cup f(Z_1)$. Since $e \notin f(Z_0) \cup f(Z_1)$ and $e_0 \neq e$ we have that C_0 is a circuit of M and so $e_0 \in cl_M(f(Z_0) \cup f(Z_1))$. Therefore

$$f(cl_{M^+}(f(Z_0) \cup f(Z_1))) \subseteq cl_M(f(Z_0) \cup f(Z_1)).$$

Since $f(Z_0) \cup f(Z_1)$ is a subset of $Z_0 \cup Z_1$ and M is a restriction of M^+ we have that $cl_M(f(Z_0) \cup f(Z_1)) \subseteq f(cl_{M^+}(Z_0 \cup Z_1))$. Therefore we have

$$f(cl_{M^+}(f(Z_0) \cup f(Z_1))) \subseteq cl_M(f(Z_0) \cup f(Z_1)) \subseteq f(cl_{M^+}(Z_0 \cup Z_1)).$$

But by (8) we see that the Left hand side and right hand side are the same so we have equality,

$$cl_M(f(Z_0) \cup f(Z_1)) = f(cl_{M^+}(Z_0 \cup Z_1))$$

as required.

For the third result; any element, e_0 , in $f(Z_0) \cap f(Z_1)$ that is not in L^* must be in a circuit, C_0 of M , contained in $f(Z_0) \cap f(Z_1)$. Any circuit of M is also a circuit of M^+ and so e_0 is not a coloop of $M^+|(f(Z_0) \cap f(Z_1))$ and therefore also not a coloop of $M^+|(Z_0 \cap Z_1)$. Hence $e_0 \in (Z_0 \wedge Z_1)$ and therefore also in $f(Z_0 \wedge Z_1)$ as required.

If $f(Z_0 \wedge Z_1)$ is cyclic in M then any element $e_0 \in f(Z_0 \wedge Z_1)$ must be contained in a circuit C_0 in M that is contained in $f(Z_0 \wedge Z_1)$. Since $f(Z_0 \wedge Z_1) \subseteq (Z_0 \cap Z_1) - e$ we see that $C_0 \subseteq (Z_0 \cap Z_1) - e$. Since $(Z_0 \cap Z_1) - e =$

$(Z_0 - e) \cap (Z_1 - e)$ we see that C_0 is in both $f(Z_0)$ and $f(Z_1)$. Hence e_0 cannot be in L^* and so $e_0 \in f(Z_0) \cap f(Z_1) - L^*$ as required.

For the fourth result we find Z' by taking $cl_{M^+}(Z)$. Since every element in $cl_{M^+}(Z) - Z$ must complete a circuit with elements in Z that element would complete that same circuit with those elements in M and therefore the only element that can be in $cl_{M^+}(Z) - Z$ is e . Hence $cl_{M^+}(Z) = Z'$.

For the last result we have that $f(Z_0)$ is a flat of M from [12, Proposition 3.3.7(ii)] and therefore the result follows from Corollary 26. \square

Let \mathcal{L}^+ be the lattice of cyclic flats of M^+ and let \mathcal{L} be the lattice of cyclic flats of M . Lemma 28 tells us that f is almost an isomorphism from \mathcal{L}^+ and \mathcal{L} . The ‘almost’ coming from the fact that sometimes f sends cyclic flats to sets that are not cyclic flats and we have $f(Z_0) \wedge f(Z_1) \subseteq f(Z_0 \wedge Z_1)$ rather than $f(Z_0) \wedge f(Z_1) = f(Z_0 \wedge Z_1)$. We will use this near-isomorphic structure to obtain the results we need.

Lemma 29. *Let X be a cyclic set in M^+ such that $e \in X$. Then*

$$\gamma_{M^+}(X) - \gamma_M(X - e) - 1 = \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M^+): Z \subset X} (\gamma_M(Z - e) - \gamma_{M^+}(Z)).$$

On the other hand if $e \notin X$ and X is a flat of M^+ then $\gamma_{M^+}(X) - \gamma_M(X - e) = 0$.

Proof. To see the first result we begin with the following equation derived from the definition of the γ function:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{M^+}(X) - \gamma_M(X - e) &= n_{M^+}(X) - \left(\sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M^+): Z \subset X} \gamma_{M^+}(Z) \right) \\ &\quad - n_M(X - e) + \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset X - e} \gamma_M(Z). \end{aligned}$$

But since $e \in X$ and X is cyclic in M^+ we see that e is not a coloop of $M^+|X$, hence $r_{M^+}(X) = r_{M^+}(X - e)$ but of course $r_{M^+}(X - e) = r_M(X - e)$ and so $r_{M^+}(X) = r_M(X - e)$ and therefore $n_{M^+}(X) - 1 = n_M(X - e)$. Hence we have

$$\gamma_{M^+}(X) - \gamma_M(X - e) = 1 - \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M^+): Z \subset X} \gamma_{M^+}(Z) + \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset X - e} \gamma_M(Z).$$

We now wish to combine the two sums into one. In order to do this we must first change the range of the second sum from $Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M), Z \subseteq X - e$ to $Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M^+), Z \subseteq X$. Obviously these terms are not necessarily cyclic flats of M so the terms of the sum will become $\gamma_M(Z - e)$.

We need to show that changing the sum in this way leaves its total value the same. First we see by Lemma 28.4 that we have not lost any terms and so we need only worry about adding additional terms. We see from Lemma 28.1

that we are not adding any terms that we already have. Therefore we must only be adding terms that are not in $Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M) : Z \subset X - e$.

We are changing two parts to this range. First we are expanding from looking at cyclic flats of M to cyclic flats of M^+ . In doing so we may add terms which are not cyclic flats of M . However, by Lemma 28.5 all of these will have γ_M value of 0 and so adding them does not change the sum.

We are also expanding our range from $Z \subset X - e$ to $Z \subset X$. The only new subset of $E(M)$ that this change could potentially give us is $X - e$ itself. However since X is a cyclic set of M^+ we must have that $e \in cl_{M^+}(X - e)$ and so $X - e$ is not a cyclic flat of M^+ , therefore we are not adding $X - e$ to the range of the sum.

This means that all the terms we are adding have γ_M values of 0 and so do not change the sum, this allows us to obtain.

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{M^+}(X) - \gamma_M(X - e) &= 1 - \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M^+): Z \subset X} \gamma_{M^+}(Z) + \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M^+): Z \subset X} \gamma_M(Z - e) \\ \gamma_{M^+}(X) - \gamma_M(X - e) - 1 &= \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M^+): Z \subset X} (\gamma_M(Z - e) - \gamma_{M^+}(Z)) \end{aligned}$$

as required. For the second result note that for any set $X' \subseteq X$ we have that $n_M(X') = n_{M^+}(X')$ since no elements have been removed from X' . Similarly, for any flat $F \subseteq X$ in M^+ we have that F is still a flat in M [12] and for any cyclic flat $F \subsetneq X$ in M^+ we cannot have $F - e \subseteq X$ as since F is cyclic $e \in cl_{M^+}(F - e)$ and therefore e would be in $cl_{M^+}(X)$, contradicting the fact that X is a flat that does not contain e .

Hence all cyclic flats in X are the same in both M and M^+ and all have the same nullities, as does X itself. Hence $\gamma_{M^+}(X) = \gamma_M(X)$. \square

To simplify notation we will use $\Delta\gamma(X)$ to mean $\gamma_M(X - e) - \gamma_{M^+}(X)$ for any $X \subseteq E(M^+)$. Also for a collection \mathcal{X} of sets $X \subset E(M^+)$ we will use $\text{down}(\mathcal{X})$ to mean the collection of cyclic flats of M^+ that are each contained in at least one of the sets $X \in \mathcal{X}$. Note that all cyclic flats $Z \in \mathcal{X}$ are contained in $\text{down}(\mathcal{X})$. If \mathcal{X} consists of a single set X we simplify notation by writing $\text{down}(X)$ instead of $\text{down}(\{X\})$. This allows us to rewrite the equation from Lemma 29 as

$$(9) \quad -\Delta\gamma(X) - 1 = \sum_{Z \in \text{down}(X) - X} \Delta\gamma(Z).$$

We use this notation for the next results:

Lemma 30. *Let X be a cyclic set in M^+ with $e \in X$. Let \mathcal{Y} be a non-empty collection of cyclic flats in M^+ , each properly contained in X such that $e \in \wedge \mathcal{Y}$. Then*

$$-\Delta\gamma(X) = \sum_{\substack{Z \in \text{down}(X) - X \\ Z \notin \text{down}(\mathcal{Y})}} \Delta\gamma(Z)$$

Proof. We prove this by contradiction. Assume that the result is false and that we have chosen M^+ , e , X , and \mathcal{Y} amongst all counterexamples so that $|\mathcal{Y}|$ is as small as possible. Since \mathcal{Y} is non-empty this means that we first examine what happens when $|\mathcal{Y}| = 1$. To do this we start with (9)

$$-\Delta\gamma(X) - 1 = \sum_{Z \in \text{down}(X) - X} \Delta\gamma(Z)$$

and then let \mathcal{Y} be just one cyclic flat $Y \in \mathcal{Z}(M^+)$. We can then take out the terms in the sum that are contained within Y .

$$-\Delta\gamma(X) - 1 = \sum_{\substack{Z \in \text{down}(X) - X \\ Z \notin \text{down}(Y)}} \Delta\gamma(Z) + \left(\sum_{Z \in \text{down}(Y) - Y} \Delta\gamma(Z) \right) + \Delta\gamma(Y)$$

but since $e \in Y$ we can use (9) again, replacing the second summation with a negative $\Delta\gamma(Y)$ term

$$-\Delta\gamma(X) - 1 = \left(\sum_{\substack{Z \in \text{down}(X) - X \\ Z \notin \text{down}(Y)}} \Delta\gamma(Z) \right) - \Delta\gamma(Y) - 1 + \Delta\gamma(Y)$$

we then cancel to obtain

$$-\Delta\gamma(X) = \sum_{\substack{Z \in \text{down}(X) - X \\ Z \notin \text{down}(Y)}} \Delta\gamma(Z)$$

which contradicts the fact that \mathcal{Y} provides a counterexample. We therefore let $|\mathcal{Y}| = k > 1$. Let Y_k be a maximal element of \mathcal{Y} and note that since $e \in \wedge \mathcal{Y}$ we must have that $e \in \wedge(\mathcal{Y} - Y_k)$ as well and therefore by our minimality assumption we have

$$-\Delta\gamma(X) = \sum_{\substack{Z \in \text{down}(X) - X \\ Z \notin \text{down}(\mathcal{Y} - Y_k)}} \Delta\gamma(Z)$$

but once again we can take out the terms in the sum that are in $\text{down}(Y_k)$ to get

$$-\Delta\gamma(X) = \sum_{\substack{Z \in \text{down}(X) - X \\ Z \notin \text{down}(\mathcal{Y})}} \Delta\gamma(Z) + \left(\sum_{\substack{Z \in \text{down}(X) - X \\ Z \notin \text{down}(\mathcal{Y} - Y_k) \\ Z \in \text{down}(Y_k) - Y_k}} \Delta\gamma(Z) \right) + \Delta\gamma(Y_k)$$

however there are various ways to rewrite the range of the second summation term. First note that since $Y_k \subset X$ we do not need the $Z \in \text{down}(X) - X$ condition. Next we construct the collection \mathcal{Y}' by adding $Y \wedge Y_k$ for each

$Y \in (\mathcal{Y} - Y_k)$. We may replace the $Z \notin \text{down}(\mathcal{Y} - Y_k)$ condition with $Z \notin \text{down}(\mathcal{Y}')$ instead as for each set $Y \in \mathcal{Y} - Y_k$ in order for an element to be excluded from the second sum by Y it would have to be in both $\text{down}(Y)$ and $\text{down}(Y_k)$, therefore meaning it would have to be in $\text{down}(Y \wedge Y_k)$ and therefore in $\text{down}(\mathcal{Y}')$. Hence for this particular sum $Z \notin \text{down}(\mathcal{Y}')$ provides the same restriction as $Z \notin \text{down}(\mathcal{Y} - Y_k)$ does. Hence we can rewrite our equation as

$$-\Delta\gamma(X) = \sum_{\substack{Z \in \text{down}(X) - X \\ Z \notin \text{down}(\mathcal{Y})}} \Delta\gamma(Z) + \left(\sum_{\substack{Z \in \text{down}(Y_k) - Y_k \\ Z \notin \text{down}(\mathcal{Y}')}} \Delta\gamma(Z) \right) + \Delta\gamma(Y_k)$$

but then we see that the \wedge operation is associative and commutative we have that $\wedge\mathcal{Y}' = \wedge\mathcal{Y}$ and therefore $e \in \wedge\mathcal{Y}'$ since $e \in \wedge\mathcal{Y}$. We also have that $e \in Y_k$. Also since Y_k is a maximal element of \mathcal{Y} each element $Y' \in \mathcal{Y}'$ is strictly contained in Y_k . We also have that \mathcal{Y}' is non-empty since $|\mathcal{Y}| > 1$. And finally we have that $|\mathcal{Y}'|$ is at most $k - 1$, hence Y_k and \mathcal{Y}' fulfill all of our conditions and therefore by our minimality assumption we have

$$-\Delta\gamma(X) = \left(\sum_{\substack{Z \in \text{down}(X) - X \\ Z \notin \text{down}(\mathcal{Y})}} \Delta\gamma(Z) \right) - \Delta\gamma(Y_k) + \Delta\gamma(Y_k)$$

which, of course, cancels to give us

$$-\Delta\gamma(X) = \sum_{\substack{Z \in \text{down}(X) - X \\ Z \notin \text{down}(\mathcal{Y})}} \Delta\gamma(Z)$$

contradicting our assumption and therefore proving the result for all k . \square

Lemma 31. *Let X be a cyclic set in M^+ with $e \in X$. Let there be some cyclic flat Z_X of M^+ such that $Z_X \subset X$ and $\Delta\gamma(Z_X)$ is positive. Let $Z_0 \vee Z_1 \subset X$ for cyclic flats Z_0 and Z_1 of M^+ , whenever $Z_0 \subset X$ and $Z_1 \subset X$ and, both $\Delta\gamma(Z_0)$ and $\Delta\gamma(Z_1)$ are positive. Then $\Delta\gamma(X) \geq 0$.*

Similarly let W be a cyclic set in M^+ with $e \in W$. Let $Z_0 \vee Z_1 \subset W$ for cyclic flats Z_0 and Z_1 of M^+ , whenever $Z_0 \subset W$ and $Z_1 \subset W$ and, both $\Delta\gamma(Z_0)$ and $\Delta\gamma(Z_1)$ are negative. Then $\Delta\gamma(W) \leq 0$.

Proof. We first examine X . Note that our hypothesis is non-trivial as if X is not a flat it is possible for $Z_0 \vee Z_1$ to not be contained in X and even if X is a cyclic flat we could still have $Z_0 \vee Z_1 = X$ in which case $Z_0 \vee Z_1$ would not be properly contained in X as we require.

Let \mathcal{Y} be the collection of cyclic flats Y in M^+ such that $Y \subset X$ and $\Delta\gamma(Y) > 0$. Since $\Delta\gamma(Y) \neq 0$ we have from Lemma 29 that $e \in Y$ for all $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$. Note that since there exists some cyclic flat Z_X of M^+ such that $Z_X \subset X$ and $\Delta\gamma(Z_X) > 0$ we have that \mathcal{Y} is non-empty.

Let Y' be some cyclic flat of \mathcal{Y} and let \mathcal{Y}' be the set $\{Y' \vee Y, \forall Y \in \mathcal{Y} - Y'\}$ if $|\mathcal{Y}| > 1$, otherwise let $\mathcal{Y}' = \{Y'\}$. Either way note that since \mathcal{Y} is non-empty we have that \mathcal{Y}' is non-empty as well. We also have that since every cyclic flat of \mathcal{Y} contains e every cyclic flat of \mathcal{Y}' contains e as they all contain at least one cyclic flat of \mathcal{Y} . Note also that by hypothesis every cyclic flat of \mathcal{Y}' is strictly contained in X as they are all either joins of cyclic flats strictly contained in X with positive $\Delta\gamma$ values, or simply cyclic flats that are already strictly contained in X . Finally we have that $Y' \subseteq \wedge \mathcal{Y}'$ and therefore $e \in \wedge \mathcal{Y}'$ and so by Lemma 30 we have

$$-\Delta\gamma(X) = \sum_{\substack{Z \in \text{down}(X) - X \\ Z \notin \text{down}(\mathcal{Y}')}} \Delta\gamma(Z)$$

However, since every cyclic flat of \mathcal{Y} is contained within one or more cyclic flats of \mathcal{Y}' we have that this sum contains no cyclic flats of \mathcal{Y} , nor any cyclic flats contained within them. Hence for any Z in this sum $\Delta\gamma(Z)$ must be nonpositive. Hence all terms in the sum are nonpositive and so

$$-\Delta\gamma(X) \leq 0$$

which of course means

$$\Delta\gamma(X) \geq 0$$

as required.

The second result is similar except we do not require the Z_X condition. This is because of the -1 term from (9) which makes $\Delta\gamma(W) \leq 0$ when there are no cyclic flats strictly contained in W with negative $\Delta\gamma$ values. Let \mathcal{Y} be the collection of cyclic flats Y in M^+ such that $Y \subset W$ and $\Delta\gamma(Y) < 0$. Since $\Delta\gamma(Y) \neq 0$ we have from Lemma 29 that $e \in Y$ for all $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$. We have two cases to consider, the first case is when \mathcal{Y} is non-empty.

Let Y' be some cyclic flat of \mathcal{Y} and let \mathcal{Y}' be the set $\{Y' \vee Y, \forall Y \in \mathcal{Y} - Y'\}$ if $|\mathcal{Y}| > 1$, otherwise let $\mathcal{Y}' = \{Y'\}$. Either way note that since \mathcal{Y} is non-empty we have that \mathcal{Y}' is non-empty as well. We also have that since every cyclic flat of \mathcal{Y} contains e every cyclic flat of \mathcal{Y}' contains e as they all contain at least one cyclic flat of \mathcal{Y} . Note also that by hypothesis every cyclic flat of \mathcal{Y}' is strictly contained in W as they are all either joins of cyclic flats strictly contained in W with negative $\Delta\gamma$ values, or simply cyclic flats that are already strictly contained in W . Finally we have that $Y' \subseteq \wedge \mathcal{Y}'$ and therefore $e \in \wedge \mathcal{Y}'$ and so by Lemma 30 we have

$$-\Delta\gamma(W) = \sum_{\substack{Z \in \text{down}(X) - X \\ Z \notin \text{down}(\mathcal{Y}')}} \Delta\gamma(Z)$$

However, since every cyclic flat of \mathcal{Y} is contained within one or more cyclic flats of \mathcal{Y}' we have that this sum contains no cyclic flats of \mathcal{Y} , nor any cyclic flats contained within them. Hence for any Z in this sum $\Delta\gamma(Z)$ must be

nonnegative. Hence all terms in the sum are nonnegative and so

$$-\Delta\gamma(X) \geq 0$$

which of course means

$$\Delta\gamma(X) \leq 0$$

as required. On the other hand if \mathcal{Y} is empty then we have from Lemma 29

$$-\Delta\gamma(W) - 1 = \sum_{Z \in \text{down}(W) - W} \Delta\gamma(Z)$$

however once again every term in the sum is nonnegative and so

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta\gamma(W) - 1 &\geq 0 \\ \Delta\gamma(W) &\leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

as required. \square

It will be more useful to view Corollary 31 via its contrapositive.

Corollary 32. *Let X be a cyclic set in M^+ for which $\Delta\gamma(X) < 0$ and there is some cyclic flat Z_X of M^+ strictly contained in X for which $\Delta\gamma(Z_X) > 0$. Then there exists cyclic flats, Z_0 and Z_1 of M^+ , both strictly contained in X for which $\Delta\gamma(Z_0) > 0$ and $\Delta\gamma(Z_1) > 0$ and $Z_0 \vee Z_1$ is not strictly contained in X .*

Similarly let W be a cyclic set in M^+ for which $\Delta\gamma(X) > 0$. Then there exists cyclic flats, Z_0 and Z_1 of M^+ , both strictly contained in W for which $\Delta\gamma(Z_0) < 0$ and $\Delta\gamma(Z_1) < 0$ and $Z_0 \vee Z_1$ is not strictly contained in W .

Of course when X and W are cyclic flats any join of two cyclic flats that are both strictly contained within them is contained within them and so we obtain another more specific corollary for this case.

Corollary 33. *Let X be a cyclic flat of M^+ for which $\Delta\gamma(X) < 0$ and there is some cyclic flat Z_X of M^+ strictly contained in X for which $\Delta\gamma(Z_X) < 0$. Then there exists cyclic flats, Z_0 and Z_1 of M^+ , both strictly contained in X for which $\Delta\gamma(Z_0) > 0$ and $\Delta\gamma(Z_1) > 0$ and $Z_0 \vee Z_1 = X$.*

Similarly let W be a cyclic flat of M^+ for which $\Delta\gamma(X) > 0$. Then there exists cyclic flats, Z_0 and Z_1 of M^+ , both strictly contained in W for which $\Delta\gamma(Z_0) < 0$ and $\Delta\gamma(Z_1) < 0$ and $Z_0 \vee Z_1 = W$.

4.3. Constructing the Algorithm. We now assume that M^+ is a strict gammoid and describe a polynomial time algorithm that determines whether M is also a strict gammoid. Recall that $M = M^+ \setminus e$. We will do this by first checking whether there are any cyclic flats of M with negative γ_M values and if there aren't we will check the γ_M values of all other sets in M by examining a few important sets. To check the γ_M values of cyclic flats in M we let first let \mathcal{F} be the set of all cyclic flats, F , of M^+ for which $\gamma_{M^+}(F) \neq 0$. Note these values must be positive since M^+ is a strict gammoid and also note that by Theorem 23 we can simply examine the closed forward neighbourhoods of our graphical representation to obtain

these in polynomial time. Recall that $|\mathcal{F}|$ is bounded by $n = |E(M^+)|$ by (4).

Next we let \mathcal{F}' be the collection of joins of any two cyclic flats in \mathcal{F} . Note that there are at most $n(n-1)/2$ cyclic flats in \mathcal{F}' and so there are $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ cyclic flats in $\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{F}'$. Finally we let \mathcal{F}'' be the collection of joins of any two cyclic flats in \mathcal{F}' . Note that for similar reasons there are $\mathcal{O}(n^4)$ cyclic flats in $\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{F}' \cup \mathcal{F}''$. Let \mathcal{E} be the collection of cyclic flats Z of M for which there is some $F \in \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{F}' \cup \mathcal{F}''$ such that $Z = F - e$. This means that $|\mathcal{E}| \leq |\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{F}' \cup \mathcal{F}''|$ and so $|\mathcal{E}|$ is also of order $\mathcal{O}(n^4)$. The cyclic flats in \mathcal{E} are the only cyclic flats that we will be examining, which will allow our algorithm to run in polynomial time. We define a new function η on M , which works the same as the γ_M function, except it only counts cyclic flats in \mathcal{E} . Formally, this is

$$\eta(X) = n_M(X) - \sum_{\substack{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M) \\ Z \subset X \\ Z \in \mathcal{E}}} \eta(Z)$$

where sets that contain no such Z have η value equal to their nullity.

Our algorithm will work as follows:

- For each $Z \in \mathcal{E}$ check that $\eta(Z) \geq 0$.
- If there exists a $Z \in \mathcal{E}$ with $\eta(Z) < 0$ then M is not a strict gammoid.
- Otherwise; let \mathcal{F}_M be the set of cyclic flats of M with positive γ_M values (which we have obtained at this point by Theorem 34).
- Check whether there is a strict gammoid M' such that \mathcal{F}_M is the set of cyclic flats of M' with positive γ values.
- If M' does not exist then M is not a strict gammoid.
- Otherwise; check that $r_M(Z_0 \cup Z_1) = r_{M'}(Z_0 \cup Z_1)$ and $cl_M(Z_0 \cup Z_1) = cl_{M'}(Z_0 \cup Z_1)$ for all $Z_0, Z_1 \in \mathcal{F}_M$.
- If there exists Z_0 and Z_1 in \mathcal{F}_M such that either $r_M(Z_0 \cup Z_1) \neq r_{M'}(Z_0 \cup Z_1)$ or $cl_M(Z_0 \cup Z_1) \neq cl_{M'}(Z_0 \cup Z_1)$ then M is not a strict gammoid.
- Otherwise; M is a strict gammoid and $M = M'$.

Since \mathcal{E} has order $\mathcal{O}(n^4)$ and checking the η value of any cyclic flat in \mathcal{E} only requires checking the η value of at most every other cyclic flat in \mathcal{E} we have that the first step of the this algorithm takes at most order $\mathcal{O}(n^8)$ time. While this is admittedly not very fast this is still polynomial time and is the slowest part of the algorithm.

If we find all the cyclic flats of M with positive η value, then we have found all cyclic flats of M with positive γ value as we show in Theorem 34. We can then use these cyclic flats to attempt to construct a strict gammoid M' as described in Corollary 12. By Corollary 12 if M' does not exist then M is not a strict gammoid and if M is a strict gammoid then $M = M'$. If we construct a strict gammoid using Corollary 12 we will need to check that the cyclic flats we used to construct M' are actually cyclic flats of M' . That

is, we must check that the representation we have constructed is a maximal representation. We can do this in polynomial time as described in Section 3.3 and if our representation is not maximal then one of the cyclic flats used to construct M' is actually not a cyclic flat in M' meaning $M \neq M'$. Therefore by Corollary 12 we have that M is not a strict gammoid in this case.

The last step requires checking ranks and closures of unions of the cyclic flats in \mathcal{F}_M but since \mathcal{F}_M is bounded by n the order of sets to check is $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ and so once again we can perform this step in polynomial time. We now verify that the algorithm will produce the correct answer.

Theorem 34. *If there exists a cyclic flat Z of M with $\gamma_M(Z) < 0$ then there exists a cyclic flat $Z' \in \mathcal{E}$ with $\eta(Z') < 0$. If every cyclic flat Z of M has $\gamma_M(Z) \geq 0$ then for all $Z' \in \mathcal{E}$ we have $\gamma_M(Z') = \eta(Z')$ and for all cyclic flats Z'' of M with $Z'' \notin \mathcal{E}$ we have $\gamma_M(Z'') = 0$.*

Proof. If Z is a cyclic flat of M then note that by Lemma 28.1 there is a unique cyclic flat of M^+ , which we will denote as Z^+ such that $Z^+ - e = Z$. If $Z \in \mathcal{E}$ then $Z^+ \in \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{F}' \cup \mathcal{F}''$.

Claim 34.1. Let X be a cyclic flat of M in \mathcal{E} . Then either $\eta(X) = \gamma_M(X)$ or there exists some cyclic flat Y of M with $Y \subset X$ such that $\gamma_M(Y) < 0$.

Proof. To see this let X be a minimal cyclic flat of \mathcal{E} such that $\eta(X) \neq \gamma_M(X)$ and such that there does not exist any cyclic flat Y of M with $Y \subset X$ such that $\gamma_M(Y) < 0$. First we examine the two equations for $\gamma_M(X)$ and $\eta(X)$. These are

$$\gamma_M(X) = n_M(X) - \sum_{\substack{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M) \\ Z \subset X}} \gamma_M(Z)$$

and

$$\eta(X) = n_M(X) - \sum_{\substack{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M) \\ Z \subset X \\ Z \in \mathcal{E}}} \eta(Z).$$

There are two ways that γ and η could differ. The first is that there is some $X' \in \mathcal{E}$ with $\gamma_M(X') \neq \eta(X')$, however, this would contradict the minimality of X . The second is that there is some $Z \notin \mathcal{E}$ with $\gamma_M(Z) \neq 0$. If neither of these occur then all the terms in both sums must be equal and there are no terms that are in one sum and not the other. Hence there must be some $Z \notin \mathcal{E}$ with $\gamma_M(Z) \neq 0$.

Firstly if $\gamma_M(Z) < 0$ then we simply set $Y = Z$ and we are done. Otherwise assume that $\gamma_M(Z) > 0$. Since $Z \notin \mathcal{E}$ we must have that $Z^+ \notin \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{F}' \cup \mathcal{F}''$. This means $Z^+ \notin \mathcal{F}$ and so $\gamma_{M^+}(Z^+) = 0$. Hence $\Delta\gamma(Z^+) > 0$. Therefore, by Corollary 33 there exist cyclic flats Z_0 and Z_1 in M^+ , both strictly contained in Z^+ , such that $\Delta\gamma(Z_0) < 0$ and $\Delta\gamma(Z_1) < 0$ and $Z^+ = Z_0 \vee Z_1$. Then, since Z^+ is not in \mathcal{F}' either, one of Z_0 or Z_1 is not in

\mathcal{F} . Assume, without loss of generality, that $Z_0 \notin \mathcal{F}$. Then $\gamma_{M^+}(Z_0) = 0$ and so since $\gamma_M(Z_0 - e) - \gamma_{M^+}(Z_0) = \Delta\gamma(Z_0) < 0$ we have that $\gamma_M(Z_0 - e) < 0$. By Lemma 28.5 this means that $Z_0 - e$ is a cyclic flat of M and so we set $Y = Z_0 - e$ and we are done since $Z_0 - e \subset Z^+ - e = Z \subset X$. \square

Next we prove the first statement of the theorem. To see this assume first that all η values are nonnegative and let Y be a cyclic flat of M such that $\gamma_M(Y) < 0$. We may assume Y is minimal with the property that $\gamma_M(Y) < 0$. If $Y \in \mathcal{E}$ then by Claim 34.1 and the minimality of Y we have that $\eta(Y) = \gamma_M(Y)$, a contradiction since all η values are nonnegative. Hence we assume that $Y \notin \mathcal{E}$. In this case note that $Y^+ \notin \mathcal{F}$ and therefore $\gamma_{M^+}(Y^+) = 0$ meaning that $\Delta\gamma(Y^+) < 0$, that is $\Delta\gamma(Y^+) \neq 0$. Therefore by Lemma 29 we have that $e \in Y^+$ and so by Lemma 27 since $\gamma_{M^+}(Y^+) = 0$ there is some cyclic flat $F_Y \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $F_Y \subset Y^+$ and $e \in F_Y$ (where we have strict containment because we know that $F_Y \neq Y^+$ since $Y^+ \notin \mathcal{F}$ and $F_Y \in \mathcal{F}$). We use Lemma 30 to get

$$-\Delta\gamma(Y^+) = \sum_{\substack{Z \in \text{down}(Y^+) - Y^+ \\ Z \notin \text{down}(F_Y)}} \Delta\gamma(Z)$$

where since $\Delta\gamma(Y^+) < 0$ there must be at least one Z in this sum for which $\Delta\gamma(Z) > 0$. Hence by Corollary 33 again, there exist cyclic flats Z_0 and Z_1 in M^+ , both strictly contained in Y^+ such that $\Delta\gamma(Z_0) > 0$ and $\Delta\gamma(Z_1) > 0$ and $Z_0 \vee Z_1 = Y^+$. We claim that both Z_0 and Z_1 are in \mathcal{F}' .

Assume, without loss of generality, that $Z_0 \notin \mathcal{F}'$. Since $\Delta\gamma(Z_0) > 0$ we have by Corollary 33 that there exist cyclic flats Z_2 and Z_3 of M^+ both strictly contained in Z_0 such that $\Delta\gamma(Z_2) < 0$ and $\Delta\gamma(Z_3) < 0$ and $Z_2 \vee Z_3 = Z_0$. However, since $Z_0 \notin \mathcal{F}'$ it cannot be the join of two elements of \mathcal{F} and so one of Z_2 or Z_3 is not in \mathcal{F} . We can assume, without loss of generality, that $Z_2 \notin \mathcal{F}$, and hence $\gamma_{M^+}(Z_2) = 0$. However, since $\Delta\gamma(Z_2) < 0$ this means that $\gamma_M(Z_2 - e) < 0$. Since $Z_2 - e \subset Z_0 - e \subset Y^+ - e = Y$ this contradicts the minimality of Y . Hence we see that both Z_0 and Z_1 must be in \mathcal{F}' .

This means that $Y^+ \in \mathcal{F}''$ which means $Y \in \mathcal{E}$ contradicting the fact that $Y \notin \mathcal{E}$. Hence we see that the algorithm will find negative η values if any exist, otherwise it produces accurate γ_M values for all the sets calculated by Claim 34.1. All that is left to show is that $\gamma_M(Z) = 0$ for all cyclic flats $Z \notin \mathcal{E}$.

To see this let Y be a minimal cyclic flat of M such that $\gamma_M(Y) > 0$ but $Y \notin \mathcal{E}$. Then $Y^+ \notin \mathcal{F}$ and so $\gamma_{M^+}(Y^+) = 0$ meaning $\Delta\gamma(Y) > 0$ which means that, once again by Corollary 33, there exist cyclic flats Z_0 and Z_1 in M^+ such that both $\Delta\gamma(Z_0) < 0$ and $\Delta\gamma(Z_1) < 0$ and $Z_0 \vee Z_1 = Y^+$. Since all γ_M values are nonnegative we know that for any cyclic flat Z of M^+ if $\Delta\gamma(Z) < 0$ we must have $\gamma_{M^+}(Z) > 0$. Hence both Z_0 and Z_1 are in \mathcal{F} and therefore $Y \in \mathcal{F}'$, a contradiction. Hence we obtain the result. \square

Theorem 34 verifies that checking the η values of sets in \mathcal{E} is enough to tell us either that M is not a strict gammoid, or what the γ values of all cyclic flats in M are. Since we only checked \mathcal{E} there are at most $\mathcal{O}(n^4)$ cyclic flats of M with positive γ_M values. We first check these against Corollary 13 to ensure that there aren't too many. Then we can use Proposition 10 and Lemma 11 to construct M' from \mathcal{F}_M . In order to perform this construction we need a transversal of the set system consisting of $E(M)$ and the cyclic flats of M with positive γ_M values. However, if no such transversal exists then M is not a strict gammoid by Corollary 12 and if a transversal does exist it is easy to find one in polynomial time since finding transversals is polynomial time solvable.

If the transversal does exist then let M' be the strict gammoid that we construct using this process, otherwise we may halt the algorithm and conclude that M is not a strict gammoid. If M is a strict gammoid then by Corollary 12 we have that $M = M'$ so all that remains to check is whether or not $M = M'$.

We can quickly check that all cyclic flats of M with positive γ_M values are in fact cyclic flats of M' . If D is the directed graph we have constructed that represents M' then each of these sets will be a closed forward neighbourhood of D by construction and so will be cyclic by Proposition 21 hence we need only check these sets are closed which we can do in polynomial time since we have a directed graph representation of M' . If any such set is not a flat of M' then $M' \neq M$ and so M is not a strict gammoid. Therefore we may assume that the cyclic flats of M with positive γ_M values are cyclic flats of M' and therefore that D is a maximal representation of M by Lemma 18. However, it is still possible that M may not be equal to M' .

Let the set of cyclic flats in M with positive γ_M values be \mathcal{F} . Since M' is a strict gammoid the set of cyclic flats with positive $\gamma_{M'}$ values is precisely the set of closed forward neighbourhoods of D which is precisely \mathcal{F} by construction. What's more, each of these neighbourhoods has multiplicity exactly equal to its γ_M value and therefore also equal to its $\gamma_{M'}$ value by Theorem 23. Therefore for every F in \mathcal{F} we have that F is a cyclic flat of both M and M' and $\gamma_M(F) = \gamma_{M'}(F) > 0$. Since all other cyclic flats of M have γ_M value of 0 by the definition of \mathcal{F} and all other cyclic flats of M' have $\gamma_{M'}$ value of 0 by Theorem 23 and the fact that M' has no sets with $\gamma_{M'}$ value less than 0 means that for all sets X we have

$$(10) \quad \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset X} \gamma_M(Z) = \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M'): Z \subset X} \gamma_{M'}(Z).$$

So if there exists some $X_M \subseteq E(M)$ for which $\gamma_M(X_M) \neq \gamma_{M'}(X_M)$ we must have that $n_M(X_M) \neq n_{M'}(X_M)$. We could then, of course, naively check the nullities of every set in both M and M' but this would, of course, be impossible to do in polynomial time. Instead we will locate a special set X of M with special properties.

Lemma 35. *If M is not a strict gammoid but every cyclic flat of M has nonnegative γ_M value then there exists a set X of M with negative γ_M value such that X contains two cyclic flats Z_0 and Z_1 of M , both with positive γ_M values such that $X \subseteq (Z_0 \vee Z_1)$.*

Proof. We begin by examining the set X_M which is a set of M with negative γ_M value. If X_M is not cyclic then by Lemma 25 since $\gamma_M(X_M) \neq 0$ there exists a cyclic set contained in X_M that also has negative γ value. Therefore we may assume that X_M is cyclic. We may therefore assume that X_M is a maximal cyclic set of M with a negative γ_M value.

Claim 35.1. There exists a cyclic flat Z_e^+ of M^+ such that $Z_e^+ \subset X_M + e$ and $e \in Z_e^+$.

Proof. Since $e \notin X_M$, for every cyclic flat, Z^+ of M , that is contained in X_M we have that $\Delta\gamma(Z^+) = 0$ by Lemma 29. Similarly since $e \notin X_M$ we have that $n_{M^+}(X_M) = n_M(X_M)$. Therefore

$$n_{M^+}(X_M) - \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M^+): Z \subset X_M} \gamma_{M^+}(Z) = n_M(X_M) - \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M^+): Z \subset X_M} \gamma_M(Z - e).$$

However, since $\gamma_M(X_M) < 0$ and $\gamma_{M^+}(X_M) \geq 0$ we have that

$$n_{M^+}(X_M) - \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M^+): Z \subset X_M} \gamma_{M^+}(Z) \neq n_M(X_M) - \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset X_M} \gamma_M(Z).$$

So there must be some cyclic flat, $Z_e \in \mathcal{Z}(M)$ that is strictly contained in X_M in M but is not in M^+ . This means that $Z + e = Z_e^+$ must be a cyclic flat of M^+ and therefore we obtain the result. \square

Since $\gamma_{M^+}(X_M + e) \geq 0$ we have that $\Delta\gamma(X_M + e) < 0$. By Claim 35.1 we have that there exists a cyclic flat, $Z_e^+ \subset X_M + e$ that contains e which also means that $X_M + e$ is cyclic since X_M is cyclic. Therefore by Lemma 30 we have

$$-\Delta\gamma(X_M + e) = \sum_{\substack{Z \in \text{down}(X_M + e) - (X_M + e) \\ Z \notin \text{down}(Z_e^+)}} \Delta\gamma(Z).$$

If all the terms in the sum are nonpositive then we contradict $\Delta\gamma(X_M + e) < 0$. Hence there exists some cyclic flat Z_X^+ of M^+ contained in $X_M + e$ such that $\Delta\gamma(Z_X^+) > 0$. But then by Corollary 32 there must exist cyclic flats Z_0^+ and Z_1^+ of M^+ , both contained in $X_M + e$ with $\Delta\gamma(Z_0^+) > 0$ and $\Delta\gamma(Z_1^+) > 0$ such that $Z_0^+ \vee Z_1^+$ is not strictly contained in $X_M + e$.

Since both $\Delta\gamma(Z_0^+)$ and $\Delta\gamma(Z_1^+)$ are non zero we have that $e \in Z_0^+$ and $e \in Z_1^+$ by Lemma 29 and so we let $Z_0 = Z_0^+ - e$ and $Z_1 = Z_1^+ - e$. Also, since both $\Delta\gamma(Z_0^+)$ and $\Delta\gamma(Z_1^+)$ are positive and $\gamma_{M^+}(Z_0^+)$ and $\gamma_{M^+}(Z_1^+)$ are nonnegative (since M^+ is a strict gammoid) we see that $\gamma_M(Z_0)$ and $\gamma_M(Z_1)$ are positive and hence nonzero, meaning they are cyclic flats of M by Lemma 28.5. Also by Lemma 28.2 we have that $(Z_0^+ \vee Z_1^+) - e = Z_0 \vee Z_1$. If $X_M \subseteq (Z_0 \vee Z_1)$ then we set $X_M = X$ and we are done so we assume that

$X_M \not\subseteq (Z_0 \vee Z_1)$. Note that since $(Z_0 \vee Z_1) \not\subseteq X_M$ there exists some element in $Z_0 \vee Z_1$ that is not in X_M .

For ease of notation we set $Y = Z_0 \vee Z_1$. We have that Y is a cyclic flat of M . Since both Z_0 and Z_1 are contained in X_M we clearly have $Z_0 \cup Z_1 \subseteq X_M$ and therefore since $r_M(Y) = r_M(Z_0 \cup Z_1)$ we have that $r_M(Y) = r_M(Y \cap X_M)$. This gives us

$$n_M(Y) - n_M(X_M \cap Y) = |Y| - r_M(Y) - |Y \cap X_M| + r_M(Y \cap X_M)$$

which implies

$$(11) \quad n_M(Y) - n_M(X_M \cap Y) = |Y - X_M|.$$

Then since $r_M(Y) = r_M(Y \cap X_M)$ this means that $Y \in cl_M(X_M)$ and therefore $r_M(Y \cup X_M) = r_M(X_M)$ and so we have

$$(12) \quad n_M(X_M \cup Y) - n_M(X_M) = |X_M \cup Y| - r_M(X_M \cup Y) - |X_M| + r_M(X_M)$$

$$n_M(X_M \cup Y) = |Y - X_M| + n_M(X_M).$$

We now examine $\gamma_M(Y) - \gamma_M(X_M \cap Y)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_M(Y) - \gamma_M(X_M \cap Y) &= n_M(Y) - \left(\sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subseteq Y} \gamma_M(Z) \right) \\ &\quad - n_M(X_M \cap Y) + \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subseteq (X_M \cap Y)} \gamma_M(Z). \end{aligned}$$

We then split the first sum into those terms that are properly contained in $X_M \cap Y$ and those that are not.

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_M(Y) - \gamma_M(X_M \cap Y) &= n_M(Y) - \sum_{\substack{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subseteq Y \\ Z \not\subseteq (X_M \cap Y)}} \gamma_M(Z) \\ &\quad - \left(\sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subseteq (X_M \cap Y)} \gamma_M(Z) \right) - n_M(X_M \cap Y) + \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subseteq (X_M \cap Y)} \gamma_M(Z). \end{aligned}$$

This allows us to cancel and obtain

$$\gamma_M(Y) - \gamma_M(X_M \cap Y) = n_M(Y) - \left(\sum_{\substack{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subseteq Y \\ Z \not\subseteq (X_M \cap Y)}} \gamma_M(Z) \right) - n_M(X_M \cap Y).$$

This rearranges to

$$\sum_{\substack{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subseteq Y \\ Z \not\subseteq (X_M \cap Y)}} \gamma_M(Z) = \gamma_M(X_M \cap Y) + n_M(Y) - n_M(X_M \cap Y)$$

where we have added the $\gamma_M(Y)$ term to the sum by increasing the range from $Z \subset Y$ to $Z \subseteq Y$. We now use (11) to obtain

$$\sum_{\substack{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subseteq Y \\ Z \not\subset (X_M \cap Y)}} \gamma_M(Z) = \gamma_M(X_M \cap Y) + |Y - X_M|.$$

If $\gamma_M(X_M \cap Y) < 0$ then since Z_0 and Z_1 are both contained in $X_M \cap Y$ and Y contains $X_M \cap Y$ we may set $X = X_M \cap Y$ and be done. Hence we may assume that $\gamma_M(X_M \cap Y) \geq 0$ and so we have

$$(13) \quad \sum_{\substack{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subseteq Y \\ Z \not\subset (X_M \cap Y)}} \gamma_M(Z) \geq |Y - X_M|.$$

We now examine $\gamma_M(X_M \cup Y)$.

$$\gamma_M(X_M \cup Y) = n_M(X_M \cup Y) - \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset (X_M \cup Y)} \gamma_M(Z).$$

We split up the sum into terms that are strictly contained in X_M , the terms that are contained in Y but not in X_M and all the other terms, to get

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_M(X_M \cup Y) &= n_M(X_M \cup Y) - \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset X_M} \gamma_M(Z) \\ &\quad - \sum_{\substack{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subseteq Y \\ Z \not\subset X_M}} \gamma_M(Z) - \sum_{\substack{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset (X_M \cup Y) \\ Z \not\subset X_M: Z \not\subseteq Y}} \gamma_M(Z) \end{aligned}$$

where we are including Y in the second sum since Y is a cyclic flat of M . We now substitute in (12) to get

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_M(X_M \cup Y) &= |Y - X_M| + n_M(X_M) - \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset X_M} \gamma_M(Z) - \\ &\quad \sum_{\substack{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subseteq Y \\ Z \not\subset X_M}} \gamma_M(Z) - \sum_{\substack{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset (X_M \cup Y) \\ Z \not\subset X_M: Z \not\subseteq Y}} \gamma_M(Z). \end{aligned}$$

But then the second and third terms on the right hand side simply add to make $\gamma_M(X_M)$ and so we have

$$\gamma_M(X_M \cup Y) = \gamma_M(X_M) + |Y - X_M| - \sum_{\substack{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subseteq Y \\ Z \not\subset X_M}} \gamma_M(Z) - \sum_{\substack{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset (X_M \cup Y) \\ Z \not\subset X_M: Z \not\subseteq Y}} \gamma_M(Z).$$

However, since the range of the first sum is all the cyclic flats that are in Y but not in X_M we could equally write it as all the cyclic flats that are in Y but not in $X_M \cap Y$ since this would exclude the same cyclic flats. This gives us

$$\gamma_M(X_M \cup Y) = \gamma_M(X_M) + |Y - X_M| - \sum_{\substack{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subseteq Y \\ Z \not\subset (X_M \cap Y)}} \gamma_M(Z) - \sum_{\substack{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset (X_M \cup Y) \\ Z \not\subset X_M: Z \not\subseteq Y}} \gamma_M(Z).$$

We then use (13) to swap out the first sum for $|Y - X_M|$

$$\gamma_M(X_M \cup Y) \leq \gamma_M(X_M) + |Y - X_M| - |Y - X_M| - \sum_{\substack{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset (X_M \cup Y) \\ Z \not\subset X_M: Z \not\subset Y}} \gamma_M(Z)$$

which cancels to give

$$\gamma_M(X_M \cup Y) \leq \gamma_M(X_M) - \sum_{\substack{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M): Z \subset (X_M \cup Y) \\ Z \not\subset X_M: Z \not\subset Y}} \gamma_M(Z)$$

but every term on the right hand side is negative since all cyclic flats of M have nonnegative γ_M values and $\gamma_M(X_M)$ is negative by definition. Hence $\gamma_M(X_M \cup Y) < 0$ but since $X_M \cup Y$ is the union of a cyclic set and a cyclic flat it is a cyclic set of M with a negative γ_M value, contradicting the maximality of X_M and therefore we obtain the result. \square

We can verify in polynomial time whether or not a set such as the one described in Lemma 35 exists or not. To do this we examine every pair of cyclic flats in M with positive γ_M values and compute the rank of their union and the closure of their union in both M and M' . If either of these disagree then clearly $M \neq M'$. Otherwise those two cyclic flats cannot be the two cyclic flats contained in X .

To see this let the two cyclic flats be Z_0 and Z_1 . If X is contained in $cl_M(Z_0 \cup Z_1)$ then since $(Z_0 \cup Z_1) \subseteq X$ we have that $r_M(X) = r_M(Z_0 \cup Z_1)$ and so if

$$r_{M'}(Z_0 \cup Z_1) = r_M(Z_0 \cup Z_1)$$

and

$$cl_{M'}(Z_0 \cup Z_1) = cl_M(Z_0 \cup Z_1)$$

then

$$r_{M'}(X) = r_{M'}(cl_{M'}(Z_0 \cup Z_1)) = r_M(cl_M(Z_0 \cup Z_1)) = r_M(X)$$

and so $n'_M(X) = n_M(X)$. But then by (10) we would have $\gamma_M(X) = \gamma_{M'}(X)$ but of course since M' is a strict gammoid $\gamma_{M'}(X) \geq 0$ and so X cannot be the set described by Lemma 35.

Fortunately there are only polynomially many such pairs to check as Z_0 and Z_1 are both in \mathcal{F} and the size of \mathcal{F} is bounded by $n_M(M)$ which is bounded by $n = E(M)$, so there are at most $n(n-1)/2$ pairs to check which can be done in polynomial time. Hence we have constructed an algorithm which will verify in polynomial time in the size of M^+ whether or not M is a strict gammoid. Therefore we provide a proof of Theorem 2 and therefore a proof of Theorem 1.

5. FUTURE WORK

Having put SINGLE ELEMENT STRICT GAMMOID DELETION into P we naturally examine the clear extension of the problem, namely

STRICT GAMMOID DELETION

INSTANCE: A directed graph, $D = (V, A)$ with sink set $S \subseteq V$ and subset X , of V .

QUESTION: If M is the strict gammoid represented by (D, V, S) ; is $M \setminus X$ a strict gammoid?

This problem is clearly the dual problem of TRANSVERSAL CONTRACTION. We may also examine the dual problem of TRANSVERSAL DUAL, which is

STRICT GAMMOID DUAL

INSTANCE: A directed graph, $D = (V, A)$ with sink set $S \subseteq V$.

QUESTION: If M is the strict gammoid represented by (D, V, S) ; is M^* a strict gammoid?

A polynomial time algorithm to solve STRICT GAMMOID DUAL would provide a solution to the conjectures mentioned in the introduction and so is of great interest. We examine how one might use similar methods to ours to obtain such a solution.

Let $M = M(V, D, S)$ be a strict gammoid. As we have seen we may obtain a transversal matroid, M^* , as the dual of M . We may represent M^* as a bipartite graph, G with vertex sets $V = E(M^*)$ and A , whose partial transversals correspond to the independent sets of M^* . We can turn G into a representation of a gammoid, M_G , by directing edges from V into A and letting A be the target set [12]. Now, sets of paths that link sets from V into A correspond to matchings in G . Everything we have done so far can be done in polynomial time, all that remains is to determine, hopefully in polynomial time, if M_G is a strict gammoid.

If we add all vertices in A to $E(M_G)$ we will certainly obtain a strict gammoid, M_S . Then all that remains is to determine whether $M_S \setminus A$ is a strict gammoid. That is, we have reduced our instance of STRICT GAMMOID DUAL to an instance of STRICT GAMMOID DELETION. Furthermore this instance of STRICT GAMMOID DELETION has the property that X , the set we are deleting, is a basis of M_S . In fact X is a *fundamental basis* of M_S . That is, a basis whose intersection with any cyclic flat spans the cyclic flat. To see this note that since M_S is a strict gammoid every cyclic flat must be a union of closed forward neighbourhoods by Corollary 20. However, the only neighbourhoods in M_S consist of a single vertex in V with all other vertices in A . A basis for any union of such neighbourhoods can clearly be found by taking the intersection of the union with A .

Therefore in order to obtain a polynomial time algorithm for STRICT GAMMOID DUAL and therefore for TRANSVERSAL DUAL it suffices to find a polynomial time algorithm for STRICT GAMMOID DELETION in the case when X is a fundamental basis. This problem shares certain similarities with the problem we have just solved as we outline below.

Let M^B be a strict gammoid with fundamental basis B . Now let $M = M^B \setminus B$. We once more define $f : \mathcal{Z}(M^B) \rightarrow 2^{E(M)}$ as $f(Z) = Z - B$. We examine the new version of Lemma 28

Lemma 36. *The function f has the following properties for all $Z_0, Z_1 \in \mathcal{Z}(M^B)$ and $Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M)$:*

- 36.1. *If $f(Z_0) = f(Z_1)$ then $Z_0 = Z_1$.*
- 36.2. *$cl_M(f(Z_0) \cup f(Z_1)) \subseteq f(cl_{M^B}(Z_0 \cup Z_1))$.*
- 36.3. *There exists some $Z' \in \mathcal{Z}(M^B)$ such that $f(Z') = Z$.*
- 36.4. *Either $f(Z_0) \in \mathcal{Z}(M)$ or $\gamma_M(f(Z_0)) = 0$.*

We also have a new version of Lemma 29

Lemma 37. *Let X be a cyclic flat in M^B . Then*

$$\gamma_{M^B}(X) - \gamma_M(f(X)) - r_M(f(X)) = \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}(M^B) : Z \subset X} (\gamma_M(f(Z)) - \gamma_{M^B}(Z)).$$

As before we can rewrite this as

$$-\Delta\gamma(X) - r_M(f(X)) = \sum_{Z \in \text{down}(X) - X} \Delta\gamma(Z).$$

Unfortunately the next step, where we take elements out of $\text{down}(X) - X$ and cancel things out does not appear to work in this case. What seems to happen is that terms regarding the ranks of cyclic flats and their intersections appear which cannot be cancelled out so easily. However, we are still hopeful that a solution to this problem may exist, or another algorithm may exist.

6. CONCLUSION

In this paper we have collated some of the knowledge about transversal matroids and proved it in the dual setting of strict gammoids as well as providing a few new results in this area. We have then used this work to demonstrate that a polynomial time algorithm exists to determine whether a strict gammoid remains strict after deleting a single element. This can also be applied to the dual case of contracting a single element from a transversal matroid.

It is difficult to be sure whether or not these techniques can be extended to the multiple element case. Unfortunately they do not extend directly and if the wrong elements are deleted even Lemma 28 ceases to work which means that different cyclic flats of the original matroid can map to the same cyclic flat in the new matroid. This would likely be a problem for any technique similar to ours as then having the sums of $\Delta\gamma$ terms line up would be more difficult.

In the case of simply deleting a fundamental basis things seem slightly more hopeful, however, as in this case Lemma 28 mostly holds in the form of Lemma 36 and Lemma 29 similarly holds in a slightly different form, that of Lemma 37. While the other results do not hold we are nevertheless

optimistic that either different versions of these results exist or that the problem will prove to be tractable using some other technique. Therefore we make the following conjecture:

Conjecture 38. *There exists a polynomial time algorithm that solves STRICT GAMMOID DELETION in the case when X is a fundamental basis. If this algorithm obtains a positive answer then it also provides a strict gammoid representation of $M \setminus X$.*

As explained in Section 5 this means that we are also making the following conjecture:

Conjecture 39. *There exists a polynomial time algorithm that solves TRANSVERSAL DUAL. If this algorithm obtains a positive answer then it also provides a transversal representation of M^* .*

REFERENCES

- [1] J. A. Bondy and U. S. R. Murty. *Graph theory*. Springer London, 1st ed., 2008.
- [2] J.E. Bonin. *Notes on transversal matroids*, 2010. Last accessed 8 December 2023.
- [3] J.E. Bonin and A. de Mier. The lattice of cyclic flats of a matroid. *Annals of combinatorics* 12 (2):155–170, 2008.
- [4] R.A. Brualdi. Transversal matroids. In *Combinatorial geometries*, pages 72–97. 1987. N White, editor.
- [5] C.P. Bruter and J.H. Mason. A characterization of transversal independence spaces. In *Théorie des matroïdes: Rencontre franco-britannique actes 14–15 mai 1970*, pages 86–94. 1971.
- [6] M. Garey and D. Johnson. *Computers and intractability: A guide to the theory of np-completeness*. Bell Telephone Laboratories, Incorporated, 1979.
- [7] P. Hall. On representatives of subsets. *Classic Papers in Combinatorics*:58–62, 1987.
- [8] A.W. Ingleton. Transversal matroids and related structures. *Higher Combinatorics: Proceedings of the NATO Advanced Study Institute held in Berlin (West Germany), September 1–10, 1976*:117–131, 1977.
- [9] A.W. Ingleton and M.J. Piff. Gammoids and transversal matroids. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 15 (1):51–68, 1973.
- [10] S. Kratsch and M. Wahlström. Representative sets and irrelevant vertices: New tools for kernelization. In *2012 IEEE 53rd annual symposium on foundations of computer science*, pages 450–459. 2012.
- [11] J. H. Mason. On a class of matroids arising from paths in graphs. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society* s3-25 (1):55–74, 1972.
- [12] J. Oxley. *Matroid theory*. Oxford University Press, 2nd ed., 2011.
- [13] D.J.A. Welsh. Combinatorial problems in matroid theory. In *Combinatorial mathematics and its applications*, pages 291–306. 1971.
- [14] D.J.A. Welsh. *Matroid theory*. New York: Academic Press, 1976.