

A graph-theoretic approach to a conjecture of Dixon and Pressman

Matthew Brassil and Zinovy Reichstein

ABSTRACT. Given $n \times n$ matrices, A_1, \dots, A_k , consider the linear operator

$$L(A_1, \dots, A_k): \text{Mat}_n \rightarrow \text{Mat}_n$$

given by $L(A_1, \dots, A_k)(A_{k+1}) = \sum_{\sigma \in S_{k+1}} \text{sgn}(\sigma) A_{\sigma(1)} A_{\sigma(2)} \cdots A_{\sigma(k+1)}$. The Amitsur-Levitzki theorem asserts that $L(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ is identically 0 for every $k \geq 2n - 1$. Dixon and Pressman conjectured that if k is an even number between 2 and $2n - 2$, then the kernel of $L(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ is of dimension k for $A_1, \dots, A_k \in \text{Mat}_n(\mathbb{R})$ in general position. We prove this conjecture using graph-theoretic techniques.

1. Introduction

Recall that the standard polynomial $[A_1, \dots, A_m]$ in m variables is defined as

$$[A_1, \dots, A_m] = \sum_{\sigma \in S_m} \text{sgn}(\sigma) A_{\sigma(1)} \cdots A_{\sigma(m)}.$$

The celebrated theorem of Amitsur and Levitzki [1] asserts that $[A_1, \dots, A_m] = 0$ for any $m \geq 2n$ and any $n \times n$ -matrices $A_1, \dots, A_m \in \text{Mat}_n(\Lambda)$ over a commutative ring Λ . The original proof in [1] is quite involved. Simpler proofs have since been given by Swan [7, 8], Razmyslov [5], Rosset [6] and, most recently, Procesi [4].

Let F be a field. For a k -tuple of matrices (A_1, \dots, A_k) with $A_i \in \text{Mat}_n(F)$, let

$$L(A_1, \dots, A_k): \text{Mat}_n(F) \rightarrow \text{Mat}_n(F)$$

be the linear operator given by

$$L(A_1, \dots, A_k)(X) := [A_1, \dots, A_k, X].$$

Dixon and Pressman investigated the kernel of this operator in [3]. When $k = 1$, the kernel of $L(A_1)$ is the centralizer of A_1 . When $k \geq 2n - 1$, $L(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ is identically zero, by the Amitsur-Levitzki theorem.

CONJECTURE 1.1 (Dixon, Pressman [3]). Suppose that $2 \leq k \leq 2n - 2$. Then for $A_1, \dots, A_k \in \text{Mat}_n(\mathbb{R})$ in general position, the nullity d of $L(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ is given by

- (i) $d = k$, if k is even,

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05C38, 15A24, 15A54.

Key words and phrases. Amitsur-Levitzki theorem, Dixon-Pressman conjecture, directed graph, Eulerian path, monomial order.

Matthew Brassil was partially supported by a Graduate Research Fellowship from the University of British Columbia. Zinovy Reichstein was partially supported by National Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada Discovery grant 253424-2017.

- (ii) $d = k + 1$, if k is odd and n is even, and
- (iii) $d = k + 2$, if both k and n are odd.

Here, as usual, \mathbb{R} is the field of real numbers and the nullity of a linear transformation is the dimension of its kernel. Dixon and Pressman showed that $d \geq k$, $k + 1$ and $k + 2$ in cases (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively, and verified computationally that equality holds for small values of n and k . Note that one may view Conjecture 1.1 and the Amitsur-Levitsky theorem as pointing in opposite directions: Conjecture 1.1 gives an upper bound on the generic nullity of $L(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ for $2 \leq k \leq 2n - 2$, whereas the Amitsur-Levitsky theorem gives a lower bound for $k \geq 2n - 1$.

The purpose of this paper is to prove Conjecture 1.1 in case (i). Our main result is the following.

THEOREM 1.2. *Let $k = 2r$ be a positive even integer and F be an infinite field whose characteristic does not divide $2(2r + 1)r!$. Assume that $n > r$. Then for $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k \in \text{Mat}_n(F)$ in general position, the nullity of $L(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k)$ is k .*

Our proof will rely on graph-theoretic techniques. To motivate it, let us briefly recall Swan's proof of the Amitsur-Levitsky theorem. Since the standard polynomial $[A_1, \dots, A_m]$ is multi-linear in A_1, \dots, A_m , it suffices to show that $[E_{a_1 b_1}, \dots, E_{a_m b_m}] = 0$ for any choice of $a_1, b_1, \dots, a_m, b_m \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, as long as $m \geq 2n$. Here E_{ab} denotes the elementary matrix with 1 in the (a, b) -position and 0s elsewhere. As we expand $[E_{a_1 b_1}, \dots, E_{a_m b_m}]$, the term $\text{sgn}(\sigma) E_{a_{\sigma(1)} b_{\sigma(1)}} \dots E_{a_{\sigma(m)} b_{\sigma(m)}}$ contributes $\text{sgn}(\sigma) E_{a_{\sigma(1)} b_{\sigma(m)}}$ to the sum if

$$(1.1) \quad b_{\sigma(1)} = a_{\sigma(2)}, \quad b_{\sigma(2)} = a_{\sigma(3)}, \quad \dots, \quad b_{\sigma(m-1)} = a_{\sigma(m)},$$

and 0 otherwise. Conditions (1.1) can be conveniently rephrased in graph-theoretic terms. Let G be the directed graph with n vertices, $1, \dots, n$ and m edges, $e_1 = (a_1, b_1), \dots, e_m = (a_m, b_m)$. Then conditions (1.1) hold if and only if $e_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, e_{\sigma(m)}$ form an Eulerian path on G . We will say that this Eulerian path is even if σ is an even permutation and odd otherwise. This way the Amitsur-Levitsky theorem reduces to the following graph-theoretic assertion.

THEOREM 1.3. (*Swan [7, 8]*) *Let G be a directed graph with n vertices and m edges. Let a and b be two of the vertices (not necessarily distinct). If $m \geq 2n$, then the number of even Eulerian paths from a to b equals the number of odd Eulerian paths from a to b .*

If one were to use a similar approach to prove Conjecture 1.1, one would set

$$(1.2) \quad A_\ell = \sum_{a,b=1}^n x_{ab}^{(\ell)} E_{ab},$$

for $\ell = 1, \dots, k$. Here $x_{ab}^{(\ell)}$ are kn^2 independent variables. Each entry of the $n^2 \times n^2$ matrix of $L = L(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ is then a multilinear polynomial of degree k in the groups of variables, $\{x_{ab}^{(1)}\}, \dots, \{x_{ab}^{(k)}\}$. (Here we identify the linear transformation $L(A_1, \dots, A_k): \text{Mat}_n \rightarrow \text{Mat}_n$ with its matrix in the standard basis E_{ab} of Mat_n .) The coefficient of the monomial $x_{a_1 b_1}^{(1)} \dots x_{a_k b_k}^{(k)}$ in a given position in L can again be computed as the signed sum of Eulerian paths on a certain graph. However, for $k \leq 2n - 2$, these signed sums will no longer be identically 0. To prove Conjecture 1.1(i) in this way, one would need to assemble these coefficients into the $n^2 \times n^2$ matrix L with polynomial entries, then show that the nullity of L over the field $F(x_{ab}^{(\ell)})$ is k (or equivalently, is $\leq k$). We are not able to carry

out the computations directly in this setting; the matrix L is too complicated. To prove Theorem 1.2 we will modify this approach in the following ways.

(1) We will specialize the matrices A_ℓ by setting some of the variables $x_{ab}^{(\ell)}$ equal to 0. For the purpose of showing that $\text{null}(L) \leq k$, this is sufficient. In fact, we will set $n^2 - n$ entries of each A_ℓ equal to 0; the other n entries will remain independent variables.


(2) We will choose A_1, \dots, A_k so that $L(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ decomposes as a direct sum

$$L(A_1, \dots, A_k) = L_0 \oplus L_1 \oplus \dots \oplus L_{n-1},$$

where each L_i is represented by an $n \times n$ matrix. This simplifies our analysis of L and reduces the problem to showing that $\text{null}(L_0) + \text{null}(L_1) + \dots + \text{null}(L_{n-1}) \leq k$. The specific matrices we will use are described in Sections 3 and 6.

(3) To get a better handle on the nullities of L_0, \dots, L_{n-1} , we will replace each L_j by its “matrix of initial coefficients” $\text{Ic}(L_j)$ with respect to a certain lexicographic monomial order on the variables $x_{\ell,\alpha}$; see Section 5. This will further simplify the computations in two ways. First, the entries of $\text{Ic}(L_j)$ will be integers, rather than polynomials. These integers will be obtained by counting Eulerian paths on certain graphs, as in Swan’s argument. Secondly, passing from L_j to $\text{Ic}(L_j)$ will allow us to focus only on the (rather special) graphs corresponding to leading monomials.

We will classify these “maximal graphs” in Sections 7 and 8 and complete the proof of Theorem 1.2 in Sections 9 and 10. The last part of the proof will rely on the computations of signed counts of Eulerian paths in Section 2. The overall structure of the paper is shown in the flowchart below.



2. Preliminaries on graphs and Eulerian paths

Throughout this paper our graphs will all be directed with labeled edges and vertices. An Eulerian path in a graph Γ is a path which visits every edge exactly once. We will denote by $\text{Eul}_a(\Gamma)$ the set of Eulerian paths on Γ which begin at a vertex a . It is easy to see that any two paths in $\text{Eul}_a(\Gamma)$ terminate at the same vertex.

For an edge $\begin{matrix} \bullet & \rightarrow & \bullet \\ a & e & b \end{matrix}$ appearing in a graph Γ we define $\text{src}_\Gamma(e) = a$ and $\text{tar}_\Gamma(e) = b$ to be the source and target vertices of the edge e respectively. We define the outdegree $\text{outdeg}_\Gamma(v)$ to be the number of edges in Γ whose source vertex is v , and the indegree $\text{indeg}_\Gamma(v)$ to be

the number of edges in Γ whose target vertex is v . When the graph Γ is clear from the context we will abbreviate these terms as $\text{src}(e)$, $\text{tar}(e)$, $\text{outdeg}(v)$, and $\text{indeg}(v)$.

An Eulerian path beginning and ending at the same vertex is known as an Eulerian circuit. The following fundamental theorem, due to Euler, is usually stated in terms of Eulerian circuits. In the sequel we will need a variant in terms of Eulerian paths.

THEOREM 2.1. *Let a, b be vertices of Γ , not necessarily distinct. There exists an Eulerian path from a to b on Γ , if and only if Γ is connected and*

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{outdeg}_\Gamma(v) &= \text{indeg}_\Gamma(v) \text{ , for all } v \neq a, b \text{ ,} \\ \text{outdeg}_\Gamma(a) &= \text{indeg}_\Gamma(a) + 1 \text{ , if } a \neq b \text{ ,} \\ \text{outdeg}_\Gamma(b) &= \text{indeg}_\Gamma(b) - 1 \text{ , if } a \neq b \text{ ,} \\ \text{outdeg}_\Gamma(a) &= \text{indeg}_\Gamma(a) \text{ , if } a = b \text{ .} \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. If $a = b$, then this is the usual form of Euler's Theorem; see, e.g., [2, Theorems 12, 13].

If $a \neq b$, let Γ' be the graph obtained from Γ by adding an edge from b to a . Eulerian paths w from a to b on Γ are in bijective correspondence with Eulerian circuits w' on Γ' . Indeed, given w , we obtain w' by appending e at the end. Conversely, given w' , after cyclically permuting the edges, we may assume that e is the last edge in w' . Now w is obtained from w' by removing e .

Finally, observe that conditions (2.1) are equivalent to $\text{outdeg}_{\Gamma'}(v) = \text{indeg}_{\Gamma'}(v)$ for every vertex v . Thus Theorem 2.1 reduces to Euler's theorem for Γ' . \square

Given a labeling of the edges e_1, e_2, \dots, e_m in Γ , we define the signature $\text{sgn}(w)$ of an Eulerian path $w = (e_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, e_{\sigma(m)})$ to be the signature of the permutation $\sigma \in S_m$. Note that changing the initial labeling e_1, e_2, \dots, e_m either leaves every $\text{sgn}(w)$ unchanged or multiplies $\text{sgn}(w)$ by -1 for every Eulerian path w . We will be particularly interested in the signed sum $\sum_{w \in \text{Eul}_a(\Gamma)} \text{sgn}(w)$; this sum is well-defined (i.e., is independent of the labeling of the edges) up to a factor of -1 .

We say that a graph has no repeated edges if there are no distinct edges which share both source and target vertices. The following lemma is remarked upon by Swan; [7, page 369].

LEMMA 2.2. *Let Γ be a graph with a repeated edge. Then $\sum_{w \in \text{Eul}_a(\Gamma)} \text{sgn}(w) = 0$ for any vertex a of Γ .*


PROOF. Let e_1 and e_2 be a pair of repeated edges. Let us partition the Eulerian paths in $\text{Eul}_a(\Gamma)$ into two groups, Eul_1 and Eul_2 , as follows: $w \in \text{Eul}_1$ if e_1 occurs before e_2 in w and $w \in \text{Eul}_2$ if e_2 occurs before e_1 . Given an Eulerian path w on Γ , we can form a new Eulerian path w' by interchanging e_1 and e_2 . This way we obtain a bijective correspondence between Eul_1 and Eul_2 . Since we have performed a transposition to get from w to w' , $\text{sgn}(w') = -\text{sgn}(w)$. This shows that

$$\sum_{w \in \text{Eul}_a(\Gamma)} \text{sgn}(w) = \sum_{w \in \text{Eul}_1} \text{sgn}(w) + \sum_{w' \in \text{Eul}_2} \text{sgn}(w') = 0,$$

as desired. \square

The remainder of this section will be devoted to computing $\sum_{w \in \text{Eul}_a(\Gamma)} \text{sgn}(w)$ for several families of graphs which will arise in the sequel.

LEMMA 2.3. *If*



$$\text{then } \sum_{w \in \text{Eul}_{P_a}(\Gamma)} \text{sgn}(w) = \begin{cases} \pm\alpha! , & \text{if } a = 0, \text{ or} \\ \pm(\alpha - 1)! & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

PROOF. First assume $a = 0$. There are $\alpha!$ Eulerian paths from P_0 on Γ , determined by the order in which each of the vertices P_1, \dots, P_α are visited. Each is of the form

$$w_\tau = (S_{\tau(1)}, T_{\tau(1)}, S_{\tau(2)}, T_{\tau(2)}, \dots, S_{\tau(\alpha)}, T_{\tau(\alpha)})$$

for $\tau \in S_\alpha$. It thus suffices to show that these $\alpha!$ Eulerian paths all have the same signature. Indeed, the edges of w_τ come in groups of 2, being $(S_1, T_1), \dots, (S_\alpha, T_\alpha)$. Interchanging any two of these groups results in an even permutation of the edges. Thus


$$\sum_{w \in \text{Eul}_{P_0}(\Gamma)} \text{sgn}(w) = \sum_{\tau \in S_\alpha} \text{sgn}(w_\tau) = \pm\alpha! .$$

Now assume that $a \neq 0$. In this case the Eulerian paths on Γ from P_a are precisely those of the form $w = (T_a, w', S_a)$, where w' is an Eulerian path from P_0 on $\Gamma \setminus \{S_a, T_a\}$. As we showed above, there $(\alpha - 1)!$ possibilities for w' , and they all have the same signature; hence,

$$\sum_{w \in \text{Eul}_{P_a}(\Gamma)} \text{sgn}(w) = \pm(\alpha - 1)! .$$

□

LEMMA 2.4. *Let $\alpha \geq 2$ and*




$$\text{Then } \sum_{w \in \text{Eul}_{P_1}(\Gamma)} \text{sgn}(w) = \pm(\alpha - 1)! .$$

PROOF. Let us subdivide the Eulerian paths from P_1 on Γ into three groups, Λ_1 , Λ_2 and Λ_3 , depending on whether the edge e occurs at the beginning, the end or the middle of the path.

It follows from Lemma 2.3, that there are $(\alpha - 1)!$ paths in Λ_1 , all having the same signature, and there are $(\alpha - 1)!$ paths in Λ_2 , all having the same signature. Moreover, the signature of a path from Λ_1 is the same as the signature of a path from Λ_2 . This can be seen directly by comparing the signatures of, say $(e, T_2, S_1, T_1, \tau, S_2) \in \Lambda_1$ and $(T_1, \tau, S_2, T_2, S_1, e) \in \Lambda_2$, where $\tau = (S_3, T_3, \dots, S_\alpha, T_\alpha)$ is a path from P_0 to P_0 . A simple calculation shows that

$$\text{sgn}(e, T_2, S_1, T_1, \tau, S_2) = \text{sgn}(T_1, \tau, S_2, T_2, S_1, e),$$

as claimed. We now turn our attention to Λ_3 . Any path in Λ_3 begins with edge T_1 and ends with edge S_2 . These paths are determined by the order in which the $\alpha - 1$ circuits (S_1, e, T_2) , (S_3, T_3) , \dots , (S_α, T_α) from P_0 are traversed in the subgraph



Since interchanging any two of these circuits results in an even permutation of the edges, all paths in Λ_3 have the same signature. Moreover, a path in Λ_3 has the opposite signature to the paths in Λ_1 and Λ_2 , as illustrated by


$$\text{sgn}(T_1, S_2, T_2, \tau, S_1, e) = -\text{sgn}(T_1, S_1, e, T_2, \tau, S_2),$$

where $\tau = (T_3, S_3, \dots, T_\alpha, S_\alpha)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{w \in \text{Eul}_{P_1}(\Gamma)} \text{sgn}(w) &= \pm \left(\sum_{w_1 \in \Lambda_1} \text{sgn}(w_1) + \sum_{w_2 \in \Lambda_2} \text{sgn}(w_2) + \sum_{w_3 \in \Lambda_3} \text{sgn}(w_3) \right) \\ &= \pm(2(\alpha - 1)! - (\alpha - 1)!) = \pm(\alpha - 1)!. \end{aligned}$$

□

LEMMA 2.5. *Let $a, b \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, \alpha\}$ and*



Then

$$(2.2) \quad \sum_{w \in \text{Eul}_{P_a}(\Gamma)} \text{sgn}(w) = \begin{cases} \pm(\alpha + 1)!, & \text{if } a = b = 0, \\ \pm 2(\alpha - 1)!, & \text{if } a = b \neq 0, \\ \pm \alpha!, & \text{if } a = 0 \text{ and } b \neq 0, \text{ or } a \neq 0 \text{ and } b = 0, \\ \pm(\alpha - 1)!, & \text{in all other cases,} \end{cases}$$

where for fixed b , the sum $\sum_{w \in \text{Eul}_{P_a}(\Gamma)} \text{sgn}(w)$ is either positive for all a , or negative for all a .

PROOF. Any Eulerian path on Γ is a cyclic permutation of either

$$(e, S_{\tau(1)}, T_{\tau(1)}, S_{\tau(2)}, T_{\tau(2)}, \dots, S_{\tau(\alpha)}, T_{\tau(\alpha)})$$

if $b = 0$, or

$$(S_{\tau(1)}, e, T_{\tau(1)}, S_{\tau(2)}, T_{\tau(2)}, \dots, S_{\tau(\alpha)}, T_{\tau(\alpha)})$$

if $b \neq 0$, for some permutation $\tau \in S_\alpha$. Interchanging any two blocks of the form (S_{i_1}, T_{i_1}) and (S_{i_2}, T_{i_2}) induces an even permutation of the edges. Cyclically permuting a path of length $2\alpha + 1$ also induces an even permutation of the edges. Hence every Eulerian path has the same fixed signature when $b = 0$, and every Eulerian path has the same (opposite) fixed signature when $b \neq 0$.

If $a = b = 0$, the Eulerian paths from P_0 are determined by the order in which the $\alpha + 1$ circuits $e, (S_1, T_1), \dots, (S_\alpha, T_\alpha)$ are traversed. Thus there are $(\alpha + 1)!$ Eulerian paths in this case.


If $a = b \neq 0$, then e occurs either at the beginning or the end of each Eulerian path. Lemma 2.3 tells us that there are $(\alpha - 1)!$ Eulerian paths starting with e and $(\alpha - 1)!$ Eulerian paths ending with e . Thus the total number of Eulerian paths from P_a in this case is $2(\alpha - 1)!$.

If $a = 0$ and $b \neq 0$, then Eulerian paths from P_a are in bijective correspondence with permutations of the α circuits, (S_b, e, T_b) and (S_i, T_i) , where $i \neq b$.

If $a \neq 0$ and $b = 0$, then every path starts with T_a and ends with S_a , and the Eulerian paths from P_a are in bijective correspondence with permutations of the remaining α circuits e and (S_i, T_i) , where $i \neq a$.

Finally, if a, b are distinct and non-zero, then again every path starts with T_a and ends with S_a , so the count is the same as above, except that instead we only have $\alpha - 1$ circuits, (S_b, e, T_b) and (S_i, T_i) , $i \neq a, b$. \square

LEMMA 2.6. *If*



then $\sum_{w \in \text{Eul}_{P_{\alpha+\beta}}(\Gamma)} \text{sgn}(w) = \pm 2\alpha!$.

PROOF. Any Eulerian path from $P_{\alpha+\beta}$ on Γ is either of the form

$$(e, T_{\alpha+\beta}, \dots, T_{\alpha+1}, w, S_{\alpha+1}, \dots, S_{\alpha+\beta}), \quad \text{or} \quad (T_{\alpha+\beta}, \dots, T_{\alpha+1}, w, S_{\alpha+1}, \dots, S_{\alpha+\beta}, e),$$

where w is an Eulerian path from P_0 on the subgraph of Γ consisting of edges $S_1, T_1, S_2, T_2, \dots, S_\alpha, T_\alpha$. These two Eulerian paths on Γ for fixed w are related by the even permutation cyclically permuting the $2\alpha+2\beta+1$ edges, and all $\alpha!$ Eulerian paths from P_0 on the subgraph have the same signature, by Lemma 2.5. Thus the signed count of Eulerian paths on Γ from $P_{\alpha+\beta}$ is $\pm 2\alpha!$. \square

3. Proof of Theorem 1.2: First reductions

Fix integers $k, n \geq 1$. Recall from the Introduction that given a k -tuple of $n \times n$ matrices A_1, \dots, A_k , we defined the linear transformation $L(A_1, \dots, A_k): \text{Mat}_n \rightarrow \text{Mat}_n$ by $L(A_1, \dots, A_k)(A_{k+1}) = [A_1, \dots, A_k, A_{k+1}]$. We will identify $L(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ with its matrix relative to the standard basis $\{E_{ab} \mid a, b = 1, \dots, n\}$ of elementary matrices in Mat_n . Here E_{ab} is the elementary matrix with 1 in the (a, b) -position and 0s elsewhere; we will sometimes write $E_{a,b}$ in place of E_{ab} .

Let $W_{\text{null} > i} \subset (\text{Mat}_n)^k$ be the locus of k -tuples $(A_1, \dots, A_k) \in \text{Mat}_n$ such that

$$\text{null}(L(A_1, \dots, A_k)) > i \text{ or equivalently, } \text{rank}(L(A_1, \dots, A_k)) < n^2 - i.$$

Clearly $\emptyset = W_{\text{null} > n^2} \subseteq W_{\text{null} > n^2-1} \subseteq \dots \subseteq W_{\text{null} > 0} \subseteq W_{\text{null} > -1} = (\text{Mat}_n)^k$.

LEMMA 3.1. (a) $W_{\text{null} > i}$ is Zariski closed in $(\text{Mat}_n)^k$ for every integer i .

(b) Assume $k \leq n^2$. Then $W_{\text{null} > k-1} = (\text{Mat}_n)^k$ and hence,

$$\text{null}(L(A_1, \dots, A_k)) \geq k$$

for any $A_1, \dots, A_k \in \text{Mat}_n$.

(c) Assume that k is even and $2 \leq n \leq 2n-2$. In order to prove Theorem 1.2 it suffices to show that there exists a field K containing F and k matrices $A_1, \dots, A_k \in \text{Mat}_n(K)$ such that

$$\text{null}(L(A_1, \dots, A_k)) \leq k.$$

PROOF. (a) The entries of the $n^2 \times n^2$ matrix $L(A_1, \dots, A_k): \text{Mat}_n \rightarrow \text{Mat}_n$ are polynomials in the entries of A_1, \dots, A_k . By definition $W_{\text{null} > i} \subset (\text{Mat}_n)^k$ is the common zero locus of the determinants of the $(n^2 - i) \times (n^2 - i)$ -minors of this matrix. These determinants are again polynomials in the entries of A_1, \dots, A_k , and part (a) follows.

(b) Since the standard polynomial $[X_1, \dots, X_{k+1}]$ is alternating in X_1, \dots, X_{k+1} , we have

$$L(A_1, \dots, A_k)(A_j) = 0 \text{ for every } j = 1, \dots, k.$$

In other words, the kernel of $L(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k)$ contains the span of A_1, \dots, A_k . If A_1, \dots, A_k are linearly independent, this shows that $\text{null}(L(A_1, \dots, A_k)) \geq k$. In other words, $W_{\text{null} > k-1}$ contains the dense open subvariety of Mat_n^k consisting of linearly independent k -tuples of $n \times n$ matrices. Since $W_{\text{null} > k-1}$ is Zariski closed by part (a), we conclude that $W_{\text{null} > k-1} = \text{Mat}_n^k$.

(c) Note that under the assumptions of Theorem 1.2, $k = 2r < 2n$. Hence, $k \leq n^2$, and part (b) applies. In view of part (b), Theorem 1.2 is equivalent to the assertion that $W_{\text{null} > k} \neq (\text{Mat}_n)^k$. By part (a), $W_{\text{null} > k}$ is Zariski closed in Mat_n^k . To prove that $W_{\text{null} > k} \neq (\text{Mat}_n)^k$, it suffices to show that the complement $(\text{Mat}_n)^k \setminus W_{\text{null} > k}$ has a K -point for some field K containing F . In other words, it suffices to show that there exist matrices $A_1, \dots, A_k \in \text{Mat}_n(K)$ such that $\text{null}(L(A_1, \dots, A_k)) \leq k$. \square

Our proof of Theorem 1.2 will be based on Lemma 3.1(c). Note that it is not a priori clear how to choose the matrices A_1, \dots, A_k . Informally speaking, if they are chosen to be very general (e.g., if their entries are independent variables over F), it becomes difficult to compute $L(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ explicitly enough to determine its nullity. On the other hand, in multiple examples where we chose the k -tuple A_1, \dots, A_k in various special positions, the nullity of $L(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ turned out to be higher than k (and usually $\rightarrow \infty$ with n)¹. The remainder of this section will be devoted to defining a field K containing F and a k -tuple $A_1, \dots, A_k \in \text{Mat}_n(K)$ that will, in retrospect, turn out to be “just right”: “special enough” to make $\text{null}(L(A_1, \dots, A_k))$ computable, yet “general enough”, to ensure that

$$(3.1) \quad \text{null}(L(A_1, \dots, A_k)) \leq k.$$

The special property of A_1, \dots, A_k that will facilitate subsequent computations is that the $n^2 \times n^2$ matrix $L(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ naturally decomposes as a direct sum of $n \times n$ matrices. On the other hand, the inequality (3.1) will not be obvious at this stage; its proof will take up much of the remainder of this paper. Note also that the k -tuple A_1, \dots, A_k we will define in this section is really a family of k -tuples that depends on the integer parameters s_1, \dots, s_k . These integer parameters will remain unspecified until Section 6.

From now on we will set $K = F(x_{\ell, \alpha})$, where $x_{\ell, \alpha}$ are independent variables, as ℓ ranges from 1 to k and α ranges over $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$. For notational convenience, we will label rows and columns of $n \times n$ matrices by $0, 1, \dots, n-1$ and view these labels as integers modulo n . Let

$$(3.2) \quad D_1 = \text{diag}(x_{1,0}, x_{1,1}, \dots, x_{1,n-1}), \dots, D_k = \text{diag}(x_{k,0}, x_{k,1}, \dots, x_{k,n-1})$$

be a k -tuple of diagonal matrices in $\text{Mat}_n(K)$. We will study $L(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ for

$$(3.3) \quad A_1 = D_1 \cdot C^{s_1}, A_2 = D_2 \cdot C^{s_2}, \dots, A_k = D_k \cdot C^{s_k}$$

¹As an extreme example of this phenomenon, $L(A_1, \dots, A_k) = 0$ and hence has nullity n^2 , if $k > 2$ and A_1, \dots, A_k are required to commute pairwise.

in $\text{Mat}_n(K)$. Here C denotes the cyclic permutation matrix

$$(3.4) \quad C = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}} E_{i,i+1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

and the exponents s_1, \dots, s_k are integers, to be specified later. Note that $C^n = I$, where I denotes the $n \times n$ identity matrix. Moreover,

$$CE_{ii} = E_{i-1,i-1}C \text{ and } E_{i,i+j} = E_{ii}C^j \text{ for every } i, j \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}.$$

Let V_j be the n -dimensional vector space spanned by the matrices

$$(3.5) \quad E_{0,j} = E_{0,0}C^j, E_{1,j+1} = E_{1,1}C^j, \dots, E_{n-1,n-1+j} = E_{n-1,n-1}C^j.$$

Equivalently, V_j is the space of matrices all of whose non-zero entries are concentrated on the main diagonal, shifted up by j units, i.e., in positions $(i, i+j)$, where j is fixed and i ranges over $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$.

Now observe that $\text{Mat}_n = V_0 \oplus V_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus V_{n-1}$. Moreover, every term in

$$L(A_1, \dots, A_k)(E_{ii}C^j) = [D_1C^{s_1}, \dots, D_kC^{s_k}, E_{ii}C^j]$$

is of the form $\tilde{D}C^{j+s}$ for some diagonal matrix \tilde{D} . Here $s = s_1 + \dots + s_k$. This matrix lies in V_{j+s} , where $j+s$ is viewed modulo n . In other words, the linear transformation $L = L(A_1, \dots, A_k): \text{Mat}_n(K) \rightarrow \text{Mat}_n(K)$ naturally decomposes as a direct sum of n linear maps $L_j: V_j \rightarrow V_{j+s}$, where j ranges over $0, 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ and $\dim(V_j) = n$ for each j . Consequently, $\text{Ker}(L)$ decomposes as a direct sum $\text{Ker}(L_0) \oplus \dots \oplus \text{Ker}(L_{n-1})$. In summary, we have reduced Theorem 1.2 to the following.

PROPOSITION 3.2. *Assume that $k = 2r$ is even, $n > r$, the base field F is infinite of characteristic not dividing $2(2r+1)r!$, and the matrices A_1, \dots, A_k are as in (3.3). Let $L_j: V_j \rightarrow V_{j+s_1+\dots+s_k}$ be the restriction of $L(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ to V_j . Then for some choice of the exponents $s_1, \dots, s_k \in \mathbb{Z}$,*

$$\text{null}(L_0) + \cdots + \text{null}(L_{n-1}) \leq k.$$

The remainder of this paper will be devoted to proving Proposition 3.2.

4. A graph-theoretic description of L_j

Throughout this section we fix positive integers k and n as well as s_1, \dots, s_k and j in $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$. We will continue using the following notations: D_1, \dots, D_k will be generic diagonal matrices, as in (3.2), and

$$A_\ell = D_\ell C^{s_\ell} = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{n-1} x_{\ell,\alpha} E_{\alpha,\alpha+s_\ell}$$

will be as in (3.3) for $\ell = 1, \dots, k$. As we saw in the previous section, for this choice of A_1, \dots, A_k , the linear transformation $L(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ decomposes as $L_0 \oplus L_1 \oplus \dots \oplus L_{n-1}$. We will identify the linear transformation $L_j: V_j \rightarrow V_{j+s}$, where $s = \sum_{\ell=1}^k s_\ell$, with the $n \times n$ matrix representing it in the bases (3.5) of V_j and V_{j+s} .

In order to find the matrix of L_j , we will want to calculate the generalized commutator

$$L(A_1, \dots, A_k)(A_{k+1}) = [A_1, \dots, A_k, A_{k+1}]$$

as A_{k+1} ranges over the basis $E_{\alpha, \alpha+j} = E_{\alpha\alpha}C^j$ of V_j . Expanding the generalized commutator $[A_1, \dots, A_{k+1}]$, we see that each entry is a multilinear polynomial in the groups of variables $\{x_{1,\alpha}\}, \{x_{2,\alpha}\}, \dots, \{x_{k,\alpha}\}$, i.e., a linear combination of monomials of the form $x_{1,\alpha_1}x_{2,\alpha_2} \cdots x_{k,\alpha_k}$ with integer coefficients. We will now give a graph-theoretic description of the coefficients of these monomials.

NOTATIONAL CONVENTIONS 4.1. (a) For the rest of this paper by a graph we will mean a directed graph with n vertices labeled P_v for $v \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ and at most $k+1$ edges, labeled e_ℓ with ℓ from $\{1, 2, \dots, k+1\}$. For $\ell = 1, \dots, k$, the labeled edge e_ℓ will be of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bullet & \xrightarrow{e_\ell} & \bullet \\ P_{\alpha_\ell} & & P_{\alpha_\ell + s_\ell} \end{array}$$

and the labeled edge e_{k+1} will be of the form $\begin{array}{ccc} \bullet & \xrightarrow{e_{k+1}} & \bullet \\ P_{\alpha_{k+1}} & & P_{\alpha_{k+1} + j} \end{array}$. Each edge e_ℓ will appear in a given graph at most once.

(b) We will say that a graph Γ is a disjoint union of Γ' and Γ'' and write

$$\Gamma = \Gamma' \amalg \Gamma''$$

if the edge set of Γ is the disjoint union of the edge sets of Γ' and Γ'' . Here by “disjoint” we mean that e_ℓ cannot be an edge in both Γ' and Γ'' for any $\ell = 1, \dots, k+1$. Note that the vertices of Γ, Γ' and Γ'' are assumed to be $P_v, v \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$, as in (a).

(c) Let G be a graph with vertex set $\{P_v \mid v \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}\}$ whose edge set is a subset of $\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}$. We define the graph G_b to be

$$G_b = G \amalg \begin{array}{ccc} \bullet & \xrightarrow{e_{k+1}} & \bullet \\ P_b & & P_{b+j} \end{array}.$$

In other words, G_b is the graph obtained from G by adding one extra edge e_{k+1} having source vertex P_b and target vertex P_{b+j} .

Let m be a monomial of the form

$$m = x_{1,\alpha_1}x_{2,\alpha_2} \cdots x_{k,\alpha_k}$$

where $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ are elements of $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$. We define $\text{gr}(m)$ to be the graph with k edges

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \bullet & \xrightarrow{e_1} & \bullet \\ P_{\alpha_1} & & P_{\alpha_1 + s_1} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \bullet & \xrightarrow{e_2} & \bullet \\ P_{\alpha_2} & & P_{\alpha_2 + s_2} \end{array} \quad \cdots \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \bullet & \xrightarrow{e_k} & \bullet \\ P_{\alpha_k} & & P_{\alpha_k + s_k} \end{array}.$$

Conversely, for a graph G with vertices of the form $P_v, v \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ whose edges have labels e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k , we define the monomial $\text{mon}(G)$ to be

$$(4.2) \quad \text{mon}(G) = x_{1,\text{src}_G(e_1)}x_{2,\text{src}_G(e_2)} \cdots x_{k,\text{src}_G(e_k)}.$$

Note that our definitions of $\text{mon}(G)$ and $\text{gr}(m)$ are inverse to each other: $\text{mon}(\text{gr}(m)) = m$ and $\text{gr}(\text{mon}(G)) = G$ for any monomial m and graph G of our required form. We will use this correspondence between graphs and monomials to study the entries of L_j in a graph-theoretic manner. Graphs of the form $\text{gr}(m)$ correspond to monomials m which may appear in the matrix L_j . The addition of the extra edge e_{k+1} in $\text{gr}(m)_b$ will help us keep track of the coefficient of m in the b^{th} column of L_j , as is explained in the lemma below.

LEMMA 4.2. *Fix $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ and b to be integers defined modulo n . Define m to be the monomial*

$$m = x_{1,\alpha_1}x_{2,\alpha_2} \cdots x_{k,\alpha_k}$$

and $G = \text{gr}(m)$. The coefficient of m appearing in the $(a, b)^{\text{th}}$ entry of L_j is

$$\sum_{w \in \text{Eul}_{P_a}(G_b)} \text{sgn}(w) .$$

Here, as usual, $\text{Eul}_{P_a}(G_b)$ denotes the set of Eulerian paths on G_b originating at P_a .

PROOF. Recall that V_j is spanned by the ordered basis $\{E_{0,0}C^j, E_{1,1}C^j, \dots, E_{n-1,n-1}C^j\}$. The matrix L_j is the restriction of L to V_j , mapping V_j to V_{j+s} where $s = s_1 + s_2 + \dots + s_k$. Thus the $(a, b)^{\text{th}}$ entry of L_j is the coefficient of $E_{a,a}C^{j+s}$ appearing in $L_j(E_{b,b}C^j) = L(E_{b,b}C^j)$. This is the $(a, a + j + s)^{\text{th}}$ entry of $L(E_{b,b}C^j)$.

Write $\alpha_{k+1} = b$ and $A_{k+1} = E_{b,b}C^j$. To calculate the coefficients of $x_{1,\alpha_1} \dots x_{k,\alpha_k}$ appearing in $A_{\sigma(1)} \dots A_{\sigma(k+1)}$ we set all indeterminants $x_{\ell,\alpha}$, other than $x_{1,\alpha_1}, \dots, x_{k,\alpha_k}$, to 0. Thus the coefficients of $x_{1,\alpha_1} \dots x_{k,\alpha_k}$ appearing in $A_{\sigma(1)} \dots A_{\sigma(k+1)}$ are the same as the coefficients of $x_{1,\alpha_1} \dots x_{k,\alpha_k}$ appearing in $B_{\sigma(1)} \dots B_{\sigma(k+1)}$, where for $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, k$,

$$B_\ell = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \dots & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & x_{\ell,\alpha_\ell} & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \dots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdot C^{s_\ell} = x_{\ell,\alpha_\ell} E_{\alpha_\ell, \alpha_\ell + s_\ell}$$

and $B_{k+1} = A_{k+1} = E_{b,b+j}$. Recall that by the definition of $\text{gr}(m)$,

$$(\alpha_\ell, \alpha_\ell + s_\ell) = (\text{src}(e_\ell), \text{tar}(e_\ell)) \text{ for } \ell = 1, \dots, k, \text{ and } (b, b + j) = (\text{src}(e_{k+1}), \text{tar}(e_{k+1})).$$

As in Swan's paper [7], $L_j(B_{k+1}) = [B_1, \dots, B_{k+1}]$ can be described by counting Eulerian paths. Using the product rule

$$E_{p,q} E_{p',q'} = \begin{cases} E_{p,q'} & \text{if } q = p', \text{ and} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

we see that

$$B_{\sigma(1)} \dots B_{\sigma(k+1)} = m E_{\text{src}(e_{\sigma(1)}), \text{tar}(e_{\sigma(1)})} \dots E_{\text{src}(e_{\sigma(k+1)}), \text{tar}(e_{\sigma(k+1)})}$$

has an $m = x_{1,\alpha_1} \dots x_{k,\alpha_k}$ in the $(\text{src}(e_{\sigma(1)}), \text{tar}(e_{\sigma(k+1)}))^{\text{th}}$ entry, if and only if $\text{tar}(e_{\sigma(\ell)}) = \text{src}(e_{\sigma(\ell+1)})$ for each $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, k$. This is precisely the requirement that $(e_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, e_{\sigma(k+1)})$ forms an Eulerian path from $P_{\text{src}(e_{\sigma(1)})}$ to $P_{\text{tar}(e_{\sigma(k+1)})}$ on G_b . All other entries of this product are zero.

When $(e_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, e_{\sigma(k+1)})$ does form an Eulerian path on G_b , this path terminates at $\text{tar}(e_{\sigma(k+1)}) = \text{src}(e_{\sigma(1)}) + s_1 + s_2 + \dots + s_k + j = \text{src}(e_{\sigma(1)}) + j + s$, as s_1, \dots, s_k and j are the differences between the source and target vertices of each edge in the path. Thus the $(a, a + j + s)^{\text{th}}$ entry of $B_{\sigma(1)} \dots B_{\sigma(k+1)}$ is $m = x_{1,\alpha_1} \dots x_{k,\alpha_k}$ if and only if $\text{src}(e_{\sigma(1)}) = P_a$ and $(e_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, e_{\sigma(k+1)})$ is an Eulerian path on G_b , that is, if and only if $(e_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, e_{\sigma(k+1)})$ is an Eulerian path from P_a on G_b .

Summing over all permutations $\sigma \in S_{k+1}$ we obtain that the coefficient of $x_{1,\alpha_1}, \dots, x_{k,\alpha_k}$ appearing in the $(a, a + j + s)^{\text{th}}$ entry of $L(E_{b,b}C^j) = [A_1, \dots, A_{k+1}]$ is $\sum_{w \in \text{Eul}_{P_a}(G_b)} \text{sgn}(w)$, and therefore the $(a, b)^{\text{th}}$ entry of L_j is $\sum_{w \in \text{Eul}_{P_a}(G_b)} \text{sgn}(w)$. \square

With this lemma we can study L_j by considering only graphs of the form $\text{gr}(m)_b$ which admit Eulerian paths. We define a set of graphs which could possibly give rise to a nonzero coefficient in the a^{th} row of L_j .

DEFINITION 4.3. Fix a, j and s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k to be elements of $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ and let $I \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. Define $U(a, j, I)$ to be the set of directed graphs G , as in Notational Conventions 4.1(a), satisfying the following additional conditions.

- (i) The edges of G are precisely e_ℓ for $\ell \in I$.
- (ii) Each edge e_ℓ for $\ell \in I$ is of the form $\bullet \xrightarrow{e_\ell} \bullet$ for some α_ℓ .
- (iii) G has no repeated edges.
- (iv) There is some $b \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ such that G_b has an Eulerian path from P_a in G_b .

We abbreviate

$$U(a, j) = U(a, j, \{1, 2, \dots, k\}).$$

and

$$U_{nz}(a, j) = \left\{ G \in U(a, j) \mid \text{There exists } b \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} \text{ such that } \sum_{w \in \text{Eul}_{P_a}(G_b)} \text{sgn}(w) \neq 0 \right\}.$$

REMARK 4.4. We will be primarily interested in the case where $I = \{1, \dots, k\}$. We allow I to be a proper subset of $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ to facilitate induction arguments later on.

In the case where $I = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, conditions (i) and (ii) are equivalent to the requirement that G is of the form $\text{gr}(m)$ for some monomial $m = x_{1,\alpha_1} x_{2,\alpha_2} \dots x_{k,\alpha_k}$. The reason for conditions (iii) and (iv) is that if they fail, then $\sum_{w \in \text{Eul}_{P_a}(G_b)} \text{sgn}(w) = 0$ for each $b \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$; see Lemma 2.2. Thus by Lemma 4.2 the monomial m never appears in the a th row of L_j , and the graph G does not contribute anything to the a th row of L_j .

For the same reason we are only really interested in graphs from $U_{nz}(a, j)$. However, it is not always transparent which graphs lie in $U_{nz}(a, j)$, so as a preliminary step, it will be convenient for us to work with all graphs from $U(a, j)$.

Here is a brief example illustrating Definition 4.3.

EXAMPLE 4.5. Let $k = 2$, $n = 3$, $j = 1$ and $s_1 = 1$, $s_2 = -1$. For fixed a , $U(a, j)$ consists of 4 graphs, being

$$\begin{aligned} G^1 &= \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_a \end{array} \xrightarrow{e_1} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_{a+1} \end{array} \xrightarrow{e_2} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_{a+2} \end{array}, & G^2 &= \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_a \end{array} \xrightarrow{e_1} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_{a+1} \end{array} \xrightarrow{e_2} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_{a+2} \end{array}, \\ G^3 &= \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_{a-1} \end{array} \xrightarrow{e_1} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_a \end{array} \xrightarrow{e_2} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_{a+1} \end{array} & \text{and} & G^4 &= \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_{a-1} \end{array} \xrightarrow{e_2} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_a \end{array} \xrightarrow{e_1} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_{a+1} \end{array}. \end{aligned}$$

The only graphs of the form G_b which admit Eulerian paths from P_a , for $G \in U(a, j)$, are

$$\begin{aligned} G_{a+1}^1 &= \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_a \end{array} \xrightarrow{e_1} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_{a+1} \end{array} \xrightarrow{e_3} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_{a+2} \end{array}, & G_a^2 &= \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_a \end{array} \xrightarrow{e_3} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_{a+1} \end{array} \xrightarrow{e_1} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_{a+2} \end{array}, \\ G_a^3 &= \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_{a-1} \end{array} \xrightarrow{e_1} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_a \end{array} \xrightarrow{e_3} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_{a+1} \end{array} & \text{and} & G_{a-1}^4 &= \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_{a-1} \end{array} \xrightarrow{e_3} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_a \end{array} \xrightarrow{e_1} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_{a+1} \end{array}. \end{aligned}$$

Each of the above graphs has a unique Eulerian path from P_a and so $U_{nz}(a, j) = U(a, j)$. For fixed $a \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, by Lemma 4.2, the only monomials appearing in the a th row of L_1 are the following.

- (1) $x_{1,a} x_{2,a+2}$ appears with coefficient -1 in the $(a, a+1)$ th entry, corresponding to path (e_1, e_3, e_2) .

- (2) $x_{1,a+1}x_{2,a+2}$ appears with coefficient 1 in the $(a, a)^{\text{th}}$ entry, corresponding to path (e_3, e_1, e_2) .
- (3) $x_{1,a-1}x_{2,a}$ appears with coefficient -1 in the $(a, a)^{\text{th}}$ entry, corresponding to path (e_2, e_1, e_3) .
- (4) $x_{1,a}x_{2,a}$ appears with coefficient 1 in the $(a, a - 1)^{\text{th}}$ entry, corresponding to path (e_2, e_3, e_1) .

We obtain

$$L_1 = \begin{pmatrix} x_{1,1}x_{2,2} - x_{1,2}x_{2,0} & -x_{1,0}x_{2,2} & x_{1,0}x_{2,0} \\ x_{1,1}x_{2,1} & x_{1,2}x_{2,0} - x_{1,0}x_{2,1} & -x_{1,1}x_{2,0} \\ -x_{1,2}x_{2,1} & x_{1,2}x_{2,2} & x_{1,0}x_{2,1} - x_{1,1}x_{2,2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

5. The matrix of initial coefficients

In order to prove Proposition 3.2 (and thus Theorem 1.2), we need to bound the nullities of L_0, L_1, \dots, L_{n-1} from above. We will not be able to work with the matrices L_j directly; their entries are too complicated (recall that these entries are polynomials in the variables $x_{\ell, \alpha}$). Our approach will be to consider the matrices $\text{Ic}(L_j)$ arising from the initial coefficients of L_j with respect to a suitably defined lexicographic monomial order on the variables $x_{\ell, \alpha}$. The matrix $\text{Ic}(L_j)$ will turn out to be more manageable than L_j and as we shall soon see, its nullity will give us an upper bound on the nullity of L_j .

DEFINITION 5.1. Let $R = F[x_1, \dots, x_t]$ be a polynomial ring.

(a) We define a lexicographic order \succ on R to be a total order on monomials from R induced by an order on the variables x_1, \dots, x_t .

(b) Let $f \in R$ and write $f = \sum_{i \in I} c_i m_i$ for nonzero coefficients $c_i \in F$ and distinct monomials $m_i \in R$. If m is the maximal monomial from $\{m_i \mid i \in I\}$ with respect to \succ , then we define the initial monomial of f to be $\text{In}(f) = m$. The leading coefficient of f is defined to be the coefficient of $\text{In}(f)$ in f .

(c) We define the matrix $\text{Ic}(M) \in \text{Mat}_n(F)$ of initial coefficients of an $n \times n$ matrix $M \in \text{Mat}_n(R)$ as follows. For each a let m_a be the largest monomial occurring in the a^{th} row of M , that is, $m_a = \max(\text{In}(M_{a,0}), \dots, \text{In}(M_{a,n-1}))$. Then the entry $\text{Ic}(M)_{a,b}$ of $\text{Ic}(M)$ in position (a, b) is defined to be the coefficient of m_a in $M_{a,b}$.

LEMMA 5.2. *Let R be a polynomial ring as above, and M be an $n \times n$ matrix with coefficients in R . Then $\text{null}(M) \leq \text{null}(\text{Ic}(M))$.*

PROOF. Suppose $r = \text{rank}(\text{Ic}(M))$. Then there exists a non-singular $r \times r$ submatrix N_0 of $\text{Ic}(M)$. Let us say that N_0 is obtained from $\text{Ic}(M)$ by removing rows a_1, \dots, a_{n-r} and columns b_1, \dots, b_{n-r} . Let N be the $r \times r$ submatrix of M obtained by removing the same rows a_1, \dots, a_{n-r} and columns b_1, \dots, b_{n-r} . Clearly, $\det(N_0)$ is the leading coefficient of $\det(N)$. Hence, $\det(N) \neq 0$ and consequently, $\text{rank}(M) \geq r = \text{rank}(\text{Ic}(M))$. Equivalently, $\text{null}(M) \leq \text{null}(\text{Ic}(M)) = n - r$. \square

Recall that a graph $G \in U(a, j)$ determines a monomial $\text{mon}(G)$ by the source vertices of its edges, as in (4.2). To determine the a^{th} row of $\text{Ic}(L_j)$ we need only consider the maximal graph from $U_{nz}(a, j)$, where we define $G_1 \succ G_2$ if $\text{mon}(G_1) \succ \text{mon}(G_2)$.

LEMMA 5.3. *Assume $U_{nz}(a, j)$ is nonempty, and let G be the maximal graph from $U_{nz}(a, j)$. Then the $(a, b)^{\text{th}}$ entry of $\text{Ic}(L_j)$ is*

$$(\text{Ic}(L_j))_{a,b} = \sum_{w \in \text{Eul}_{P_a}(G_b)} \text{sgn}(w).$$

PROOF. Let m be the maximal monomial appearing in the a^{th} row of L_j with nonzero coefficient. Then $\text{gr}(m)$ is the maximal graph in $U_{nz}(a, j)$. Thus $\text{mon}(G) = m$, and the $(a, b)^{\text{th}}$ -entry of $\text{Ic}(L_j)$ is the coefficient of $\text{mon}(G)$ appearing in the $(a, b)^{\text{th}}$ -entry of L_j . By Lemma 4.2, this coefficient is

$$(\text{Ic}(L_j))_{a,b} = \sum_{w \in \text{Eul}_{P_a}(G_b)} \text{sgn}(w) .$$

□

EXAMPLE 5.4. Let $k = 2$, $n = 3$, $j = 1$ and $s_1 = 1$, $s_2 = -1$, as in Example 4.5. Define an order on graphs from $U(a, j)$ to be the lexicographic order induced by the order on edges

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{e_1} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_0 \end{array} & \succ & \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_2 \end{array} \xleftarrow{e_2} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_0 \end{array} & \succ & \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_0 \end{array} \xrightarrow{e_1} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_1 \end{array} & \succ & \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_0 \end{array} \xleftarrow{e_2} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_1 \end{array} & \succ & \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_2 \end{array} \xleftarrow{e_1} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_1 \end{array} & \succ & \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{e_2} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_1 \end{array} . \\ x_{1,2} & & x_{2,0} & & x_{1,0} & & x_{2,1} & & x_{1,1} & & x_{2,2} \end{array}$$

The correspondence between variables $x_{\ell, \alpha}$ and pairs (e_ℓ, P_α) of labeled edges with source vertices determines a monomial order. The graph order defined here corresponds to the lexicographic monomial order on the polynomial ring $F[x_{1,0}, x_{1,1}, x_{1,2}, x_{2,0}, x_{2,1}, x_{2,2}]$ induced by $x_{1,2} \succ x_{2,0} \succ x_{1,0} \succ x_{2,1} \succ x_{1,1} \succ x_{2,2}$. Our maximal graph from $U(a, 1)$ is then

$$G = \begin{array}{ccc} & e_1 & \\ \bullet & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \bullet \\ P_2 & \xleftarrow{e_2} & P_0 \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_1 \end{array}$$

for any choice of $a = 0, 1, 2$. This graph G does lie in $U_{nz}(a, 1)$ when $a = 0, 1$, however when $a = 2$, the only graph of the form G_b admitting Eulerian paths is G_2 . But G_2 has a repeated edge from P_2 to P_0 . By Lemma 2.2 we have $\sum_{w \in \text{Eul}_{P_2}(G_2)} \text{sgn}(w) = 0$ and hence $G \notin U_{nz}(2, 1)$. We consider the next largest graph from $U(2, 1)$ and see that the maximal graphs from $U_{nz}(a, 1)$ are

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{e_1} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_0 \end{array} \xleftarrow{e_2} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_0 \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_1 \end{array} & , \quad \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{e_1} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_0 \end{array} \xleftarrow{e_2} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_0 \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_1 \end{array} & \text{ and } & \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{e_1} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_0 \end{array} \xleftarrow{e_2} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_1 \end{array} . \\ a = 0 & & a = 1 & & & a = 2 \end{array}$$

For each of the above 3 graphs, there is precisely one placement of the edge e_3 such that the graph $G_b = G \amalg \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_b \end{array} \xrightarrow{e_3} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_{b+1} \end{array}$ admits an Eulerian path from P_a . These are

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{e_1} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_0 \end{array} \xleftarrow{e_2} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_0 \end{array} \xrightarrow{e_3} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_1 \end{array} & , & \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{e_1} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_0 \end{array} \xleftarrow{e_2} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_0 \end{array} \xrightarrow{e_3} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_1 \end{array} & \text{ and } & \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{e_1} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_0 \end{array} \xleftarrow{e_2} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_1 \end{array} \xrightarrow{e_3} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ P_1 \end{array} . \\ a = 0, b = 0 & & a = 1, b = 1 & & a = 2, b = 0 \end{array}$$

By Lemma 5.3 we obtain

$$\text{Ic}(L_1) = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

from which we see that $\text{null}(\text{Ic}(L_1)) = 1$ and hence $\text{null}(L_1) \leq 1$ by Lemma 5.2.

In our description of L_1 in Example 4.5, the largest monomials in each row are $x_{1,2}x_{2,0}$, $x_{1,2}x_{2,0}$ and $x_{1,2}x_{2,1}$ respectively. Lemma 5.3 allows us to extract the coefficients of these monomials by considering the associated order on graphs from $U(a, j)$.

6. Specialization of the lexicographic order and the exponents s_i

From now on we will assume that $k = 2r$ is even and $1 \leq r \leq n-1$. We will now choose our exponents s_1, \dots, s_k . These exponents will be fixed for the remainder of the proof of Theorem 1.2. The matrices $A_\ell = D_\ell C^{s_\ell}$, $\ell = 1, \dots, k$ and the linear transformations $L(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ and L_j , $j = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$ defined in Section 3, will also be fixed. We define

$$s_i = \lceil \frac{i}{2} \rceil, \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, r, \text{ and}$$

$$s_{r+i} = s_{-i} = -s_i = -\lceil \frac{i}{2} \rceil, \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, r .$$

In other words,

$$\begin{aligned} (s_1, s_2, s_3, \dots, s_k) &= (s_1, s_2, s_3, \dots, s_r, s_{-1}, s_{-2}, \dots, s_{-r}) \\ &= \left(\lceil \frac{1}{2} \rceil, \lceil \frac{2}{2} \rceil, \lceil \frac{3}{2} \rceil, \dots, \lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil, -\lceil \frac{1}{2} \rceil, -\lceil \frac{2}{2} \rceil, \dots, -\lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil \right) \\ &= (1, 1, 2, \dots, \lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil, -1, -1, \dots, -\lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil) \end{aligned}$$

and our matrices A_1, \dots, A_k specialize to

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= D_1 C, & A_2 &= D_2 C, & A_3 &= D_3 C^2, & \dots &, & A_r &= D_r C^{\lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil}, \\ A_{r+1} &= D_{r+1} C^{-1}, & A_{r+2} &= D_{r+2} C^{-1}, & \dots &, & A_k &= D_k C^{-\lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil} . \end{aligned}$$

NOTATIONAL CONVENTIONS 6.1. In the sequel $[a \longleftrightarrow b]$ will denote an ‘interval’ in $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$, i.e., the set of successive integers $a, a+1, \dots$ in $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ up to the first integer congruent to b modulo n .

DEFINITION 6.2. For $v \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ we let $|v|$ denote the absolute value of the representative of v in $[-\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil \longleftrightarrow \lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor]$. For two vertices P_{v_1}, P_{v_2} , $v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ we define

$$P_{v_1} \succ P_{v_2}, \text{ if } |v_1| < |v_2|, \text{ or if } v_1 = -v_2 \text{ and } v_2 \in [1 \longleftrightarrow \lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor].$$

Our order on vertices becomes

$$(6.1) \quad P_0 \succ P_{-1} \succ P_1 \succ P_{-2} \succ P_2 \succ \dots .$$

This defines a lexicographic order on unordered pairs of vertices. If $\max(P_{v_1}, P_{v_2}) \succ \max(P_{v'_1}, P_{v'_2})$, or $\max(P_{v_1}, P_{v_2}) = \max(P_{v'_1}, P_{v'_2})$ and $\min(P_{v_1}, P_{v_2}) \succ \min(P_{v'_1}, P_{v'_2})$, then we define $(P_{v_1}, P_{v_2}) \succ (P_{v'_1}, P_{v'_2})$.

Next we define an order on pairs of labeled edges with their source vertices. For $\ell_1, \ell_2 \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ and $v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ we define


$$(6.2) \quad \begin{aligned} (e_{\ell_1}, P_{v_1}) \succ (e_{\ell_2}, P_{v_2}), & \text{ if } (P_{v_1}, P_{v_1+s_{\ell_1}}) \succ (P_{v_2}, P_{v_2+s_{\ell_2}}), \\ (e_{\ell_1}, P_{v_1}) \succ (e_{\ell_2}, P_{v_2}), & \text{ if } (P_{v_1}, P_{v_1+s_{\ell_1}}) = (P_{v_2}, P_{v_2+s_{\ell_2}}), \text{ and } \ell_1 < \ell_2. \end{aligned}$$

The equality in the second line of this definition is of unordered pairs. Note that for $n > r$, the equality $(P_{v_1}, P_{v_1+s_{\ell_1}}) = (P_{v_2}, P_{v_2+s_{\ell_2}})$ can only hold if $s_{\ell_1} = \pm s_{\ell_2}$.

This order on pairs of labeled edges and vertices determines an order on graphs from $U(a, j, I)$. A graph $G \in U(a, j, I)$ is determined by the pairs $(e_\ell, \text{src}_G(e_\ell))$ for $\ell \in I$. Our order on $U(a, j, I)$ is the lexicographic order induced by the order on these pairs in (6.2).

In a graph of the form $G = G(m)$, an edge e_ℓ will satisfy $\text{tar}_G(e_\ell) = \text{src}_G(e_\ell) + s_\ell$. Thus when comparing edges $e \in G$ and $e' \in G'$, the order given in (6.2) first compares the unordered pairs $(\text{src}_G(e), \text{tar}_G(e))$ and $(\text{src}_{G'}(e'), \text{tar}_{G'}(e'))$, with ties broken by comparing edge labels.

Our global pictures of the n vertices used in the graphs of $U(a, j)$, when n is even and odd respectively, are



In these pictures, the lower vertices have larger weight, corresponding to our order on vertices $P_0 \succ P_{-1} \succ P_1 \succ P_{-2} \succ \dots$. The largest edges will be those incident on P_0 and, more generally, the lower an edge appears in the above picture, the larger weight it has.

The graphs $G \in U(a, j)$ are defined so that there exists an Eulerian path from P_a on G_b for some b . Conversely, a graph in $U(a, j)$ can be defined by a path $(e_{\sigma(1)}, e_{\sigma(2)}, \dots, e_{\sigma(k+1)})$ on the n vertices. In the largest graph from $U(a, j)$, this path will reach the lowest possible vertex in (6.3).

Intuitively, if P_a is to the left of P_0 in (6.3), we would suspect an Eulerian path on G_b from P_a on a maximal graph $G \in U(a, j)$ to traverse down the left side of the picture as low as possible. If such a path can reach P_0 , then the remaining edges will be filled in to be incident to P_0 . This intuition will be formalized in the next section.

The order given in Example 5.4 is equivalent to the order defined above when $k = 2$ and $n = 3$. The unordered pairs of vertices satisfy

$$(P_0, P_{-1}) \succ (P_0, P_1) \succ (P_{-1}, P_1) ,$$

and if the two edges share both source and target vertices we break ties by declaring $e_1 \succ e_2$.

Our proof of Proposition 3.2 will be based on the following.

PROPOSITION 6.3. *Assume that $n > r$ and that the base field F is infinite of characteristic not dividing $r!$.*

(a) *If $j \neq 0$ then*

$$\text{null}(\text{Ic}(L_j)) \leq \delta_j,$$

where

$$\delta_j = \begin{cases} 2, & \text{if both } j \text{ and } -j \text{ lie in } [[r/2] \leftrightarrow [r/2]], \\ 1, & \text{if exactly one of } j, -j \text{ lies in } [[r/2] \leftrightarrow [r/2]], \\ 0, & \text{if neither } j \text{ nor } -j \text{ lie in } [[r/2] \leftrightarrow [r/2]]. \end{cases}$$

(b) *Assume further that the characteristic of F does not divide $2(2r + 1)r!$. Then the $n \times n$ matrix $\text{Ic}(L_0)$ is non-singular.*

Here $\text{Ic}(L_j)$ is the matrix of initial coefficients of L_j with respect to the order on graphs described in Definition 6.2.

To see that Proposition 6.3 implies Proposition 3.2 (and thus Theorem 1.2), assume for a moment that Proposition 6.3 is established. Then by Lemma 5.2,

$$\text{null}(L_0) + \text{null}(L_1) + \dots + \text{null}(L_{n-1}) \leq \text{null}(\text{Ic}(L_0)) + \text{null}(\text{Ic}(L_1)) + \dots + \text{null}(\text{Ic}(L_{n-1})) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \delta_j.$$

Each $0 \neq a \in [\lceil r/2 \rceil \longleftrightarrow \lfloor r/2 \rfloor]$ contributes exactly 2 to the sum $\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \delta_j$, one when $j = a$ and one when $-j = a$. (Note that a contributes 2 to this sum even if $a = -a$ in $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$.) Since there are exactly r non-zero elements a in the interval $[\lceil r/2 \rceil \longleftrightarrow \lfloor r/2 \rfloor]$, we conclude that $\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \delta_j = 2r = k$. Substituting k for $\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \delta_j$ into the above inequality, we obtain

$$\text{null}(L_0) + \text{null}(L_1) + \dots + \text{null}(L_{n-1}) \leq k,$$

and Proposition 3.2 follows. \square

7. Maximal graphs

As a first step towards proving Proposition 6.3, we will now describe the maximal graph of $U(a, j)$ for fixed a and j under the ordering defined in Section 6. This is a purely graph-theoretic problem. The answer is given by Proposition 7.2, whose proof will be completed in the next section.

In the definition of $U(a, j)$ our k edges were given labels e_1, \dots, e_k . In the sequence it will be convenient for us to use the following alternative labels with negative indices:

$$e_{-1} = e_{r+1}, e_{-2} = e_{r+2}, \dots, e_{-r} = e_k.$$

The graphs of $U(a, j)$ will then be defined by the source vertices v_i of the $2r$ edges of the form


$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bullet & \xrightarrow{e_i} & \bullet \\ P_{v_i} & & P_{v_i+s_i} \end{array}$$

as i ranges over $\{\pm 1, \pm 2, \dots, \pm r\}$, where $s_i = \lceil \frac{i}{2} \rceil$ and $s_{-i} = -\lceil \frac{i}{2} \rceil$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, r$.

For each $t \geq 0$ let H_t be the graph consisting of the t pairs of edges of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bullet & \xleftrightarrow{e_{1-2i}} & \bullet \\ & \xleftarrow{e_{2i-1}} & \\ P_i & & P_0 \end{array} \quad \text{if } i < 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \bullet & \xleftarrow{e_{-2i}} & \bullet \\ & \xrightarrow{e_{2i}} & \\ P_0 & & P_i \end{array} \quad \text{if } i > 0,$$

as i ranges over $[-\lceil t/2 \rceil \longleftrightarrow \lfloor t/2 \rfloor] \setminus \{0\}$. When $t = 0$, H_0 is the empty graph with no edges, and for each t , H_{t+1} is the disjoint union of H_t with a pair of edges connecting P_0 to the next largest vertex. For example, H_5 is the graph



The following lemma shows that the maximal graph from $U(a, j)$ will contain H_t for the largest possible t .

LEMMA 7.1. *Let $G, G' \in U(a, j)$. If there exists t such that $G \supset H_t$ and $G' \not\supset H_t$, then $G \succ G'$.*

PROOF. Our order on edges follows the lexicographic order on pairs of vertices, with

$$(P_0, P_{-1}) \succ (P_0, P_1) \succ (P_0, P_{-2}) \succ (P_0, P_2) \succ \dots$$

being the maximal pairs. There are at most 2 edges connecting any pair of vertices in a graph with no repeated edges, and if two edges connect the same pair of vertices, ties are broken using the following order on the edge labels:


$$e_{2\alpha+1} \succ e_{2\alpha+2} \succ e_{-2\alpha-1} \succ e_{-2\alpha-2} \text{ for any } \alpha \geq 0.$$

We conclude that the largest $2t$ edges that could possibly appear in a graph $G \in U(a, j)$ are those in H_t , and the lemma follows. \square


Our next goal is to prove the following proposition, which describes the maximal graph of $U(a, j)$.

PROPOSITION 7.2. *Let t be the largest integer such that there exists $G \in U(a, j)$ containing H_t . Let $P_{a'} = \max(P_a, P_{a+j})$.*


(a) *If $a' \in [-\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil \leftrightarrow 0]$, then define \hat{G} to be the graph*




In other words, $\hat{G} = H_t \amalg \hat{G}'$ where



(b) *If $a' \in [1 \leftrightarrow \lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor]$, then define \hat{G} to be the graph*



In other words, $\hat{G} = H_t \amalg \hat{G}'$ where




Then \hat{G} is the maximal graph from $U(a, j)$.


This result is a key step in our proof of Proposition 6.3 and thus of Theorem 1.2. The remainder of this section will be devoted to proving a preparatory lemma, Lemma 7.3. It describes the maximal graphs in $U(a, j, I)$, where I is a subset of $\{1, 2, \dots, r\} \cup \{-1, -2, \dots, -r\}$, under certain conditions on a, j and I . In the subsequent application $\{e_i \mid i \in I\}$ will be the set of edges that are not used in H_t . We will use Lemma 7.3 to complete the proof of Proposition 7.2 in Section 8.

LEMMA 7.3. Let $I = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_\alpha, -i_1, -i_2, \dots, -i_\alpha\} \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, r\} \cup \{-1, -2, \dots, -r\}$ have corresponding edges labeled $e_{i_1}, e_{i_2}, \dots, e_{i_\alpha}, e_{-i_1}, e_{-i_2}, \dots, e_{-i_\alpha}$ for some $i_\alpha > \dots > i_1 > 0$. Assume that $s_{i_1} + s_{i_2} + \dots + s_{i_\alpha} \leq |a|, |a + j|$, $P_{a'} = \max(P_a, P_{a+j})$, and G is the maximal graph in $U(a, j, I)$.


(a) If $a' \in [-\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil \longleftrightarrow 0]$, then G is the graph




(b) If $a' \in [1 \longleftrightarrow \lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor]$, then G is the graph



PROOF. Let $P_v = \max(P_{a'+s}, P_{a'-s})$, where $s = s_{i_1} + s_{i_2} + \dots + s_{i_\alpha}$. We claim that the edges e_{i_1} and e_{-i_1} appear in G , incident on P_v , as in the picture above. That is, if $a' \in [-\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil \longleftrightarrow 0]$, then $v = a' + s$ and



appears in G , and if $a' \in [1 \longleftrightarrow \lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor]$, then $v = a' - s$ and




appears in G .

Let $b \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ be such that $G_b = G \amalg \begin{matrix} \bullet & \rightarrow & \bullet \\ P_b & e_{k+1} & P_{b+j} \end{matrix}$ has an Eulerian path from P_a . Such a b exists, by the definition of $U(a, j, I)$. Our order on edges is determined by our order on vertices. The largest edge which appears in some graph from $U(a, j, I)$ is incident on the largest vertex reachable from P_a using edges of the form e_i for $i \in I$ and e_{k+1} . We will show that P_v is the largest such vertex. The vertices reachable from P_a in G_b using edges of the form e_i for $i \in I$ and e_{k+1} are necessarily of the form P_λ for some

$$\lambda \in [a - s_{i_1} - \dots - s_{i_\alpha} \longleftrightarrow a + s_{i_1} + \dots + s_{i_\alpha}] \cup [a + j - s_{i_1} - \dots - s_{i_\alpha} \longleftrightarrow a + j + s_{i_1} + \dots + s_{i_\alpha}].$$

By our assumption of $s \leq |a|, |a + j|$, where $s = s_{i_1} + s_{i_2} + \dots + s_{i_\alpha}$, the intervals $[a - s \longleftrightarrow a + s]$ and $[a + j - s \longleftrightarrow a + j + s]$ are of the form



for $\tilde{a} = a$ or $a + j$. In particular, 0 does not lie in the interior of either interval. The maximal vertex of this form is P_{v_0} , where

$$|v_0| = \min(|a| - s_{i_1} - s_{i_2} - \dots - s_{i_\alpha}, |a + j| - s_{i_1} - s_{i_2} - \dots - s_{i_\alpha}).$$

For P_{v_0} to be reachable from P_a in G_b , $v_0 - a$ must be expressible as a partial sum of the integers $\pm s_{i_1}, \pm s_{i_2}, \dots, \pm s_{i_\alpha}$ and j . The only way this can happen is if


$$v_0 = a \pm (s_{i_1} + s_{i_2} + \dots + s_{i_\alpha}), \text{ or } v_0 = a + j \pm (s_{i_1} + s_{i_2} + \dots + s_{i_\alpha}).$$

If $a' \in [-\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil \longleftrightarrow 0]$, then $v_0 = a' + s_{i_1} + s_{i_2} + \dots + s_{i_\alpha}$. Otherwise $v_0 = a' - s_{i_1} - s_{i_2} - \dots - s_{i_\alpha}$. That is, we have $v = v_0$, and P_v is the largest vertex which may appear in a graph from $U(a, j, I)$ with nonzero degree.


As G is maximal, $v_0 \neq a, a + j$, and there exists an Eulerian path from P_a to P_{a+j} on G_b , there must be at least 2 edges incident on P_{v_0} in G_b . The maximal edges which can be incident on P_{v_0} are $e_{\pm i_1}$. Hence, in a maximal graph these edges must be incident on P_{v_0} . This proves the claim.

We will now complete the proof of Lemma 7.3 by induction on α . Let us assume $a' \in [-\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil \longleftrightarrow 0]$; when $a' \in [1 \longleftrightarrow \lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor]$ the proof is symmetric. In this case, the

maximal graph $G \in U(a, j, I)$ must include the edges



By induction, the maximal graph in $U(a, j, I \setminus \{i_1, -i_1\})$ is



We see that $G' \amalg \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \xrightarrow{e_{i_1}} \\ \bullet \\ \xleftarrow{e_{-i_1}} \\ \bullet \end{array}$ lies in $U(a, j, I)$, and as no graph from $U(a, j, I)$ can be larger than this graph, it must be maximal. \square

8. Conclusion of the proof of Proposition 7.2

Let $G = G' \amalg H_t$ be the maximal graph from $U(a, j)$. By Lemma 7.1 no $\tilde{G} \in U(a, j)$ can contain $H_{t'}$ for $t' > t$. As $G \in U(a, j)$, there exists $b \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$G_b = G \amalg \begin{array}{c} \bullet \rightarrow \bullet \\ P_b \quad e_{k+1} \quad P_{b+j} \end{array}$$

admits an Eulerian path from P_a to P_{a+j} . For $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, r\}$ define

$$\begin{aligned} I_t^+ &= \{t+1, t+2, \dots, r\}, \\ I_t^- &= \{-t-1, -t-2, \dots, -r\}, \\ I_t &= I_t^+ \cup I_t^-. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, let

$$R_t(a) = \{a + \bar{p} \mid \bar{p} \text{ is a partial sum of } s_i, i \in I_t \text{ and } j\}$$

be the set of indices v such that P_v is reachable from P_a using only edges from G' , i.e., a subset of $\{e_i \mid i \in I_t\} \cup \{e_{k+1}\}$. Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} (s_1, s_2, s_3, \dots, s_k) &= (s_1, s_2, s_3, \dots, s_r, s_{-1}, s_{-2}, \dots, s_{-r}) \\ &= \left(\lceil \frac{1}{2} \rceil, \lceil \frac{2}{2} \rceil, \lceil \frac{3}{2} \rceil, \dots, \lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil, -\lceil \frac{1}{2} \rceil, -\lceil \frac{2}{2} \rceil, \dots, -\lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil \right) \\ &= (1, 1, 2, \dots, \lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil, -1, -1, \dots, -\lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil). \end{aligned}$$

If we set $s_{k+1} = j$, then $R_t(a) = \{a + \sum_{\lambda \in Q} s_\lambda \mid Q \text{ is a subset of } I_t \cup \{k+1\}\}$.

LEMMA 8.1. *Assume $n > r$. There exists $G \in U(a, j)$ containing H_t (for $t > 0$) if and only if $R_t(a) \cap \text{supp}(H_t) \neq \emptyset$.*

Here

$$\text{supp}(H_t) = \begin{cases} \{-\lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil, -\lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil + 1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor\} = [-\lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil \longleftrightarrow \lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor], & \text{if } t > 0 \\ \emptyset, & \text{if } t = 0. \end{cases}$$


denotes the support of H_t , i.e., the set of subscripts i such that P_i is adjacent to at least one edge from H_t . For example, $\text{supp}(H_0) = \emptyset$, $\text{supp}(H_1) = \{-1, 0\}$, $\text{supp}(H_2) = \{-1, 0, 1\}$, $\text{supp}(H_3) = \{-2, -1, 0, 1\}$, etc. Note also that $I_t = \{\pm 1, \pm 2, \dots, \pm r\} \setminus \text{supp}(H_t)$.

PROOF. Suppose that there exists $G \in U(a, j)$ containing H_t with $t > 0$. Then there is an Eulerian path $(e_{i_1}, e_{i_2}, \dots, e_{i_{k+1}})$ from P_a in G_b for some $b \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$. As this path traverses G_b , it must traverse H_t . Let P_v be the first vertex on this path with $v \in \text{supp}(H_t)$ and m be the first integer with $\text{tar}(e_{i_m}) = P_v$ (with $m = 0$ if $P_a = P_v$). Then, setting $s_{k+1} = j$, we have $v = a + \sum_{h=1}^m s_{i_h}$. Each e_{i_h} with $1 \leq h \leq m$ has $\text{src}(e_{i_h}) \notin H_t$ and so $i_h \in I_t \cup \{k+1\}$ by the definition of H_t . Thus $v \in R_t(a)$ as required.

Conversely, suppose that $R_t(a) \cap \text{supp}(H_t) \neq \emptyset$ and let I' be a minimal subset of $I_t \cup \{k+1\}$ such that $v = a + \sum_{i \in I'} s_i$ lies in $\text{supp}(H_t)$. Note that at most one of i and $-i$ can lie in $I' \setminus \{k+1\}$ for any i by the minimality of I' (otherwise we can remove both from I'). Now consider two cases.

Case 1. $k+1 \notin I'$. We claim that there exists a graph G with edges $e_{\pm 1}, \dots, e_{\pm r}$ containing H_t such that G has no repeated edges and G has an Eulerian path starting at P_a . If we can prove this claim, then appending e_{k+1} to this Eulerian path at the end, we obtain an Eulerian path for G_a starting at P_a . Thus $G \in U(a, j)$, and the proof in Case 1 will be complete.

To prove the claim, set $G' = H_t \amalg G''$ where G'' is a path from P_a to P_v with edge labels e_i , $i \in I'$ and back to P_a with edge labels e_{-i} , $i \in I'$. Since H_t is an Euler circuit, G' admits an Eulerian path. Note that by our construction, edges in G' come in pairs e_ℓ and $e_{-\ell}$ so that $\text{src}(e_\ell) = \text{tar}(e_{-\ell})$ for each ℓ . If G' has edges for all the labels $e_{\pm 1}, \dots, e_{\pm r}$, then we can set $G = G'$ and our proof is complete. If not, then we can construct a G from G' recursively, by attaching missing edges in pairs, e_ℓ and $e_{-\ell}$, as follows



Here $c \in \text{supp}(G')$. Note that for a given $d \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$, there are at most two $\ell \in \{\pm 1, \dots, \pm r\}$ such that $s_\ell = d$. If we want to add e_ℓ and $e_{-\ell}$ to G' , and $e_{\ell'}$ and $e_{-\ell'}$ with $s_\ell = s_{\ell'}$ are not present in G' , then we can place e_ℓ and $e_{-\ell}$ at any P_c , where $c \in \text{supp}(G')$, as above. This way the extended graph will have no repeated edges and will retain an Eulerian circuit. If $e_{\ell'}$ and $e_{-\ell'}$ with $s_{\ell'} = s_\ell$ are present in G' , then the same will be true if we choose $c \in \text{supp}(G')$ so that $P_c \neq \text{src}(e_{\ell'})$. This completes the proof of the claim and thus of Lemma 8.1 in Case 1.

Case 2. $k+1 \in I'$. Applying the claim in Case 1 with a replaced by $a+j$, we see that there exists a graph G with edges $e_{\pm 1}, \dots, e_{\pm r}$ containing H_t such that G has no repeated edges and G has an Eulerian path starting at P_{a+j} . Appending e_{k+1} to this Eulerian path at the beginning, we obtain an Eulerian path for G_a starting at P_a . Thus $G \in U(a, j)$ and H_t is contained in G . This completes the proof in Case 2. \square

LEMMA 8.2. *Let $0 \leq t \leq r$ be the largest integer such that there exists $G \in U(a, j)$ containing H_t . Set $s = \sum_{i \in I_t^+} s_i$. Then*

(a) $s \leq |a|, |a+j|$.

(b) *If $t > 0$ and $v \in R_t(a) \cap \text{supp}(H_t)$ then either every s_i for $i \in I_t^+$ or every s_i for $i \in I_t^-$ must appear as a summand of v .*

PROOF. Throughout the proof, a' will denote either a or $a + j$.

(a) We will assume that $0 < a' \leq \lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor$; the case where $-\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil \leq a' \leq 0$ is symmetrical. We argue by contradiction. Suppose $s_r + \dots + s_{t+1} > a'$. Let $t + 1 \leq \lambda \leq r$ be the smallest integer such that

$$(8.1) \quad s_r + s_{r-1} + \dots + s_{\lambda+1} + s_\lambda > a'.$$

We may assume without loss of generality that $\lambda \leq r - 1$. Indeed, suppose $\lambda = r$. Then $0 \leq a' < s_r = \lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor$ and consequently, $a' \in \text{supp}(H_r)$. In this case $t = r$, the sum $s_r + \dots + s_{t+1}$ is empty, and there is nothing to prove.

From now on we will assume that $\lambda \leq r - 1$. By our choice of λ , $a' \geq s_r + \dots + s_{\lambda+1}$ and thus

$$0 \leq a' - (s_r + s_{r-1} + \dots + s_{\lambda+1}) = a' - (s_r + s_{r-1} + \dots + s_{\lambda+1} + s_\lambda) + s_\lambda < 0 + s_\lambda = \lfloor \frac{\lambda}{2} \rfloor.$$

This shows that $a' - (s_r + \dots + s_{\lambda+1}) \in R_\lambda(a) \cap \text{supp}(H_\lambda)$. Lemma 8.1 now tells us that there exists a $G \in U(a, j)$ containing H_λ . Since $\lambda \geq t + 1$, this contradicts our choice of t .

(b) Suppose $v = a' + s'$ lies in $\text{supp}(H_t)$ for some $s' = \epsilon_r s_r + \epsilon_{r-1} s_{r-1} + \dots + \epsilon_{t+1} s_{t+1}$, where $\epsilon_i \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$. We want to show that either all ϵ_i are 1, or all ϵ_i are -1 , for $i = t + 1, \dots, r$. First note that $\epsilon_{t+1} \neq 0$. Indeed, otherwise we would have

$$v \in R_{t+1}(a) \cap \text{supp}(H_t) \subset R_{t+1}(a) \cap \text{supp}(H_{t+1}).$$

By Lemma 8.1, this contradicts the maximality of t .

It remains to show that if $\epsilon_{t+1} \neq 0$ and $\epsilon_i \neq \epsilon_{t+1}$ for some $t + 1 < i \leq r$, then

$$(8.2) \quad |s'| < s - \lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor.$$

If we can prove this inequality, then v cannot lie in $\text{supp}(H_t)$ because

$$|a' + s'| \geq |a'| - |s'| \geq |s| - |s'| > \lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor,$$

and part (b) will follow. We will prove the inequality (8.2) in two steps.

Step 1. First we will show that (8.2) holds if $\epsilon_\lambda = 0$ for any $\lambda = t + 2, \dots, r$. (Recall that we know that $\epsilon_{t+1} \neq 0$.) Indeed,

$$|s'| \leq \sum_{i \neq \lambda} |\epsilon_i| s_i \leq s - s_\lambda = s - \lfloor \frac{\lambda}{2} \rfloor < s - \lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor,$$

where the last inequality follows from $\lambda \geq t + 2$.

Step 2. We are now ready to complete the proof of (8.2). By Step 1 we may assume that $\epsilon_\lambda = \pm 1$ for every $\lambda = t + 1, t + 2, \dots, r$. In this case

$$|s'| = \sum_{\lambda \in A} s_\lambda - \sum_{\mu \notin A} s_\mu$$

for some proper subset $\emptyset \neq A \subsetneq \{t + 1, t + 2, \dots, r\}$. Here $A = \{\lambda \mid s_\lambda = 1\}$ or $A = \{\lambda \mid s_\lambda = -1\}$. Note that A is a proper subset of $\{t + 1, t + 2, \dots, r\}$ because we are assuming that $\epsilon_i \neq \epsilon_{t+1}$ for some $t + 1 < i \leq r$. Thus $|s'| < \sum_{\lambda \in A} s_\lambda$. Now for any $\mu \in \{t + 1, t + 2, \dots, r\} \setminus A$,

we have

$$|s'| < \sum_{\lambda \in A} s_\lambda \leq s - s_\mu = s - \lfloor \frac{\mu}{2} \rfloor \leq s - \lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor.$$

This completes the proof of (8.2) and thus of part (b). \square

LEMMA 8.3. *Let $0 \leq t \leq r$ be the largest integer such that there exists a graph in $U(a, j)$ containing H_t . Denote the maximal graph in $(U(a, j))$ by G . (Recall that by Lemma 7.1, G contains H_t .) Let G' be the graph with vertices $P_v, v \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ obtained from G by removing the edges $e_{\pm 1}, \dots, e_{\pm t}$, i.e., by removing the edges which occur in H_t . Then $G' \in U(a, j, I_t)$.*

PROOF. If $t = 0$ then $G = G' \in U(a, j) = U(a, j, I_0)$. So we may assume $t > 0$. As $G \in U(a, j)$ there exists $b \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$G_b = G \amalg \begin{matrix} \bullet & \rightarrow & \bullet \\ P_b & e_{k+1} & P_{b+j} \end{matrix}$$

admits an Eulerian path from P_a to P_{a+j} . Let G'_b be the graph obtained from G' by adding the edge e_{k+1} originating at P_b . Equivalently, G'_b is the graph obtained by removing $e_{\pm 1}, \dots, e_{\pm t}$ from G_b . It suffices to show that there exists an Eulerian path from P_a to P_{a+j} in G'_b .

As there exists an Eulerian path on G_b from P_a to P_{a+j} , by Theorem 2.1(a), the degree of the vertices in G_b must satisfy

$$(8.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{outdeg}(P_v) &= \text{indeg}(P_v), \text{ for all } v \neq a, a+j, \\ \text{outdeg}(P_a) &= \text{indeg}(P_a) + 1, \text{ if } j \neq 0, \\ \text{outdeg}(P_{a+j}) &= \text{indeg}(P_{a+j}) - 1, \text{ if } j \neq 0, \\ \text{outdeg}(P_a) &= \text{indeg}(P_a), \text{ if } j = 0. \end{aligned}$$

As every vertex has its indegree equal to its outdegree in H_t , the equation (8.3) also holds in G'_b . We claim that G'_b is connected. If we can prove this claim, then Theorem 2.1(a) will tell us that G'_b admits an Eulerian path from P_a to P_{a+j} and consequently, $G' \in U(a, j, I_t)$, as desired.

To prove the claim, we will argue by contradiction. Assume G'_b is not connected. Then there exists a decomposition of G'_b as $G'_b = \Gamma^1 \amalg \Gamma^2$ for two non-empty graphs Γ^1 and Γ^2 , such that P_a has nonzero degree in Γ^1 , Γ^1 is connected, and there is no vertex having nonzero degree in both Γ^1 and Γ^2 . Thus for any vertex P_v , either all edges incident on P_v in G'_b are present in Γ^1 or none of them are (and similarly for Γ^2).

The sum of the indegrees of the vertices in Γ^1 equals the sum of the outdegrees. By (8.3) we must then have P_{a+j} lies in Γ^1 and so every vertex having nonzero degree in Γ^2 has its indegree equal to its outdegree. There is a path from P_a to some $P_v \in H_t$ in G_b . By Lemma 8.2 (b), this path necessarily uses all edges of the form e_λ for $\lambda \in I_t^+$, or all edges of the form e_λ for $\lambda \in I_t^-$. Thus Γ^1 contains either every edge e_λ for $\lambda \in I_t^+$, or every edge e_λ for $\lambda \in I_t^-$. We assume that Γ^1 contains every edge e_λ for $\lambda \in I_t^+$, the proof in the other case is symmetric.

The set of edges of Γ^2 is a subset of $\{e_{-t-1}, e_{-t-2}, \dots, e_{-r}\} \cup \{e_{k+1}\}$. Let $P_{v'}$ be a vertex having nonzero degree in Γ^2 . As every vertex has its indegree equal to its outdegree in Γ^2 , there exists a closed circuit in Γ^2 originating (and terminating) at $P_{v'}$. This implies that a nonempty partial sum of $\{s_{-t-1}, s_{-t-2}, \dots, s_{-r}\} \cup \{j\}$ is zero modulo n . By Lemma 8.2(a), $|s_{-t-1} + s_{-t-2} + \dots + s_{-r}| \leq |a| < n$. Thus our partial sum must be $0 = j - (s_{\lambda_1} + s_{\lambda_2} + \dots + s_{\lambda_\alpha})$ for some $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_\alpha \in \{t+1, t+2, \dots, r\}$.

As j appears in this partial sum corresponding to a closed circuit in Γ^2 we know that e_{k+1} is an edge in Γ^2 and therefore not in Γ^1 . Thus the path from P_a to P_v in Γ^1 does not use the edge e_{k+1} and hence by Lemma 8.2(b) we have $v = a + (s_{t+1} + s_{t+2} + \dots + s_r)$.

Using the equality $0 = j - (s_{\lambda_1} + s_{\lambda_2} + \cdots + s_{\lambda_\alpha})$ we can write v as

$$\begin{aligned} v &= a + (s_{t+1} + s_{t+2} + \cdots + s_r) + j - (s_{\lambda_1} + s_{\lambda_2} + \cdots + s_{\lambda_\alpha}) \\ &= a + j + \sum_{i \in I_t^+ \setminus \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\alpha\}} s_i. \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts Lemma 8.2 (b), as $v \in R_t(a) \cap \text{supp}(H_t)$ and we have written v as a sum that does not include s_i for every $i \in I_t^+$. The proof of the claim (and thus of Lemma 8.3) is now complete. \square

We are now ready to finish the proof of Proposition 7.2.

CONCLUSION OF THE PROOF OF PROPOSITION 7.2. Let t be the largest integer such that there exists a graph $G \in U(a, j)$ containing H_t , and G be the maximal graph in $U(a, j)$. By Lemma 7.1, G must contain H_t . Write $G = G' \amalg H_t$. By Lemma 8.3, $G' \in U(a, j, I_t)$. By Lemma 7.3 (whose assumptions are met by Lemma 8.2 (a)), the largest graph in $U(a, j, I_t)$ is the conjectured subgraph \hat{G}' in the proposition. We want to show that $G' = \hat{G}'$. As \hat{G}' is maximal in $U(a, j, I_t)$, it suffices to show that $\hat{G} = \hat{G}' \amalg H_t$ lies in $U(a, j)$.

Clearly \hat{G}_a has an Eulerian circuit. Thus we only need to check that \hat{G} has no repeated edges. As $s_{t+1} + s_{t+2} + \cdots + s_r \leq |a'| \leq \lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil$, n is sufficiently large so that the vertices of the graph \hat{G} are all distinct. Thus the edges of \hat{G}' are all distinct, and the edges of H_t are all distinct. If a repeated edge were present, we would have more than one vertex having nonzero degree in both subgraphs \hat{G}' and H_t . On the other hand, \hat{G}' and H_t have exactly one vertex in common, namely $P_{a'+s_r+\dots+s_{t+1}}$ in part (a) and $P_{a'-s_r+\dots-s_{t+1}}$ in part (b). Any other vertex is reachable from a' using the edges from I_{t+1} and hence, cannot lie in H_t (or even in H_{t+1} by the minimality of t ; see Lemma 8.1). This shows that the edges of \hat{G} are distinct and hence, $\hat{G} \in U(a, j)$, completing the proof. \square

9. Proof of Proposition 6.3(a)

In this section we will prove the following.

PROPOSITION 9.1. *Let $1 \leq r < n$, $a, j \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ and $j \neq 0$. Assume that F is an infinite field of characteristic not dividing $r!$. If both a and $a + j$ lie in $\text{supp}(H_r) = [-\lceil r/2 \rceil \leftrightarrow \lfloor r/2 \rfloor]$, assume further that $a, a + j \neq 0$. Then*

$$(\text{Ic}(L_j))_{a,b} = 0 \text{ for any } b \neq a \text{ and } (\text{Ic}(L_j))_{a,a} \neq 0$$

in F .

Note that Proposition 6.3(a) readily follows from Proposition 9.1. Indeed, fix $0 \neq j \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$. By the definition of δ_j (see the statement of Proposition 6.3), there are exactly δ_j values of $a \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ such that (a, j) does not satisfy the conditions of Proposition 9.1. (Note that this can only happen if $a \in \{0, -j\}$, so in each case $\delta_j = 0, 1$ or 2 .) If we remove the a^{th} row and the a^{th} column from $\text{Ic}(L_j)$ for every such a , we will be left with a diagonal matrix with non-zero diagonal entries. In other words, if we remove δ_j rows and δ_j columns from $\text{In}(L_j)$, the remaining $(n - \delta_j) \times (n - \delta_j)$ matrix is non-singular. This shows that $\text{null}(\text{In}(L_j)) \leq \delta_j$, as desired.

The remainder of this section will be devoted to proving Proposition 9.1.

LEMMA 9.2. *Let $j \neq 0$ and G be the maximal graph in $U(a, j)$. Suppose that there exists an Eulerian path from P_a on G_b . Then $b = a$.*

PROOF. The maximal graph G in $U(a, j)$ is described in Proposition 7.2. It is clear from this description that the indegree matches the outdegree for each vertex of G . Thus in the graph


$$G_b = G \coprod_{P_b \xrightarrow{e_{k+1}} P_{b+j}} \bullet \rightarrow \bullet$$

the outdegree of P_b is 1 larger than its indegree and the outdegree of P_{b+j} is 1 smaller than its indegree. Since $j \neq 0$ in $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$, we have $P_b \neq P_{b+j}$. Thus every Eulerian path on G_b starts at P_b and ends at P_{b+j} ; see Theorem 2.1. Since we assumed there exists an Eulerian path from P_a on G_b we conclude that $b = a$. \square

LEMMA 9.3. *Let $a, j \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ be as in the statement of Proposition 9.1 and G be the maximal graph in $U(a, j)$. Then the sum of the signatures of Eulerian paths on G_a from P_a to P_{a+j} is $\pm\alpha!$ for some $\alpha \leq r$.*

PROOF. Let $0 \leq t \leq r$ be the largest integer such that a graph from $U(a, j)$ contains H_t . Recall that $H_0 = \emptyset$, so t is well defined. We will consider three cases.

Case 1. $P_{a+j} \succ P_a$ and a does not lie in $\text{supp}(H_t)$. (Note that if a lies in $\text{supp}(H_t)$, then so does $a+j$; hence $r = t$ and we are in Case 3 below.) By Proposition 7.2, $G_a = H_t \amalg G'_a$, for G'_a of the form




where $s = s_{t+1} + \cdots + s_r$. Since a does not lie in $\text{supp}(H_t)$, any Eulerian path from P_a on G_a is of the form

$$(e_{k+1}, e_{\pm r}, \dots, e_{\pm(t+1)}, w, e_{\mp(t+1)}, \dots, e_{\mp r}),$$

where w is an Eulerian path on H_t . By Lemma 2.3, the sum of the signatures of these Eulerian paths is $\pm(t-1)!$ or $\pm t!$, depending on whether $P_{a+j \pm s_{t+1} + \cdots + s_r} = P_0$ or not.

Case 2. $P_a \succ P_{a+j}$ and $a+j$ does not lie in $\text{supp}(H_t)$. (Once again, if $a+j$ lies in $\text{supp}(H_t)$, then we are in Case 3.) By Proposition 7.2, $G_a = H_t \amalg G'_a$, where G'_a is of the form



where $s = s_{t+1} + \cdots + s_r$. Again, since $a+j$ does not lie in $\text{supp}(H_t)$, the sum of the signatures of the Eulerian paths will be determined by the sum of the signatures of the Eulerian paths on H_t , being either $\pm(t-1)!$ or $\pm t!$.

Case 3. Both a and $a+j$ lie in $\text{supp}(H_t)$. By the definition of t , this forces $t = r$. By our assumptions on a and j we have $a \neq 0$, $j \neq 0$ and $a+j \neq 0$. Thus G_a is of the same form as the graph considered in Lemma 2.4, where we showed there that $\sum_{w \in \text{Eul}_{P_a}(G_a)} \text{sgn}(w) = \pm(r-1)!$. \square

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 9.1. Let G be the maximal graph in $U(a, j)$. The key point is that since $\text{char}(F)$ does not divide $r!$, Lemma 9.3 tells us under our assumptions on a and j , $G \in U_{nz}(a, j)$. In other words, G is the maximal graph in $U_{nz}(a, j)$. Thus by Lemma 5.3, $(\text{Ic}(L_j))_{a,b}$ is the sum of the signatures of the Eulerian paths on G_b from P_a to P_{a+j} . If

$b \neq a$, then Lemma 9.2 tells us that there are no such paths, so $(\text{Ic}(L_j))_{a,b} = 0$. On the other hand, $(\text{Ic}(L_j))_{a,a} \neq 0$ in F by Lemma 9.3. \square

REMARK 9.4. In those cases where the pair (a, j) does not satisfy the conditions of Proposition 9.1, the maximal graph G of $U(a, j)$ does not lie in $U_{nz}(a, j)$. If it did, the nullity of $\text{In}(L_j)$ would be lower than the value given by Proposition 6.3 for at least one j . In view of Lemma 5.2, the nullity of $L = L_0 \oplus L_1 \oplus \dots \oplus L_{n-1}$ would be lower than k , contradicting Lemma 3.1(b).

To illustrate this point more concretely, let us revisit Example 5.4. Here $k = 2$ (so, $r = 1$), $n = 3$, and $j = 1$. The maximal graph from $U(a, 1)$ does not lie in $U_{nz}(a, 1)$ when $a = 2$, though it does when $a = 0$ or 1 . After removing the row and column corresponding to $a = 2$ (i.e., the last row and the last column) from the 3×3 matrix $\text{Ic}(L_1)$ we are left with a nonsingular diagonal 2×2 matrix, showing that $\text{null}(\text{Ic}(L_1)) = 1$.

10. Proof of Proposition 6.3(b)

As we showed in the previous section, for $j \neq 0$ in $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ the matrix $\text{Ic}(L_j)$ is close to being diagonal. In this section we will see that $\text{Ic}(L_0)$ has a more complicated structure. For ease of visualizing the matrix $\text{Ic}(L_0)$, we will reorder the rows and columns. In the matrix $\text{Ic}(L_0)$, our rows and columns corresponding to a and b respectively range from 0 to $n - 1$. We define the $n \times n$ matrix $\text{Ic}(L_0)'$ to be the matrix $\text{Ic}(L_0)$ but with the rows and columns corresponding to a and b ranging from $-\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil$ to $\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor$. Since permuting rows and columns does not effect the nullity of a matrix, we have

$$\text{null}(\text{Ic}(L_0)') = \text{null}(\text{Ic}(L_0)).$$

Thus our goal is to show that $\text{Ic}(L_0)'$ is a non-singular matrix. We will do this by proving that $\text{Ic}(L_0)'$ is of the form

$$(10.1) \quad \text{Ic}(L_0)' = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{U} & * & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & N & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & * & \mathcal{L} \end{pmatrix},$$

where

- \mathcal{U} , N and \mathcal{L} are square matrices,
- \mathcal{U} is upper triangular with non-zero diagonal matrices,
- \mathcal{L} is lower triangular with non-zero diagonal entries, and
- N is the $(r + 1) \times (r + 1)$ submatrix corresponding to rows and columns labeled by elements of $\text{supp}(H_r) = \{-\lceil r/2 \rceil, -\lceil r/2 \rceil + 1, \dots, \lfloor r/2 \rfloor\}$,
- N is non-singular.

This will imply that $\text{Ic}(L_0)'$ is a non-singular matrix and hence, so is $\text{Ic}(L_0)$, thus completing the proof of Proposition 6.3(b). Proofs of these assertions will be carried out in Lemmas 10.1, 10.2, 10.3 and 10.4. The idea is to read off the entries of $\text{Ic}(L_0)'$ from Proposition 7.2 using their graph-theoretic interpretation given by Lemma 5.3.

LEMMA 10.1. *The matrix consisting of the first $\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil - \lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil$ rows of $\text{Ic}(L_0)'$ has the structure*

$$(U \ * \ \mathbf{0}) = \begin{pmatrix} * & * & * & \dots & * & * & * & * & \dots & * & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & * & * & \dots & * & * & * & * & \dots & * & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & * & \dots & * & * & * & * & \dots & * & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & * & * & * & * & \dots & * & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & * & * & * & \dots & * & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The first $\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil - \lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil$ columns form an upper triangular block U , where the terms on the diagonal are $\pm 2\alpha!$ for some $\alpha \leq r$. The last $\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor - \lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor$ columns are zero.


PROOF. By Lemma 5.3, it suffices to prove the following.

Fix $-\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil \leq a \leq -\lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil - 1$. Let G be the maximal graph in $U(a, 0)$ and $b \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ be such that there exists an Eulerian path from P_a to P_a on $G_b = G \amalg \begin{matrix} \bullet & \rightarrow & \bullet \\ P_b & e_{k+1} & P_b \end{matrix}$. Then

(a) $b \in \{a, a + 1, \dots, -1, 0, 1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor - 1, \lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor\}$.


(b) the sum of the signatures of the Eulerian paths on G_a from P_a to P_a is $\pm 2\alpha!$ for some $\alpha \leq r$.

Recall that by Proposition 7.2(a), $G = H_t \amalg G'$ for some $0 \leq t \leq r$, where G' is of the form



and $s_r + s_{r-1} + \dots + s_{t+1} \leq |a|$. The graph G_b is obtained from G by appending the extra edge e_{k+1} at P_b . Since $j = 0$, e_{k+1} is a loop. If G_b has an Eulerian path, it has to be connected. In other words, the loop e_{k+1} has to be appended at one of the vertices that has non-zero degree in G , i.e., at $P_a, P_{a+s_r}, \dots, P_{a+s_r+\dots+s_{t+1}}$ or at one of the vertices from H_t . This shows that $b \in [a \leftrightarrow \lfloor r/2 \rfloor]$, thus proving (a).

To prove (b), note that the graph G_a is of the form



where the (possibly empty) flower on the right corresponds to H_t . Here the vertices $P_{a+s_r+\dots+s_{t+1}}$ and P_0 may be distinct (as in the above diagram) or not (in which case the two edges connecting them should be removed), depending on whether G' intersects H_t

at P_0 . In either case, G_a will have the shape of the graph in Lemma 2.6. By Lemma 2.6,

$$\sum_{w \in \text{Eul}_{P_a}(G_a)} \text{sgn}(w) = \pm 2\alpha!,$$

where α is the number of vertices to the right of P_0 . As G_a has $2r + 1$ edges, there are at most r vertices to the right of P_0 in the picture and hence $\alpha \leq r$. \square

LEMMA 10.2. *The matrix consisting of the last $\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor - \lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor$ rows of $\text{Ic}(L_0)'$ has the structure*

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & * & \mathcal{L} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & * & * & \dots & * & * & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & * & * & \dots & * & * & * & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & * & * & \dots & * & * & * & * & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & * & * & \dots & * & * & * & * & \dots & * & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & * & * & \dots & * & * & * & * & \dots & * & * \end{pmatrix}.$$

The last $\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor - \lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor$ columns form a lower triangular block \mathcal{L} where the terms on the diagonal are $\pm 2\alpha!$ for some $\alpha \leq r$. The first $\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil - \lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil$ columns are zero.

PROOF. The proof mirrors that of Lemma 10.1, except that here we appeal to Proposition 7.2(b) for the structure of the maximal graph G instead of Proposition 7.2(a). \square

Lemmas 10.1 and 10.2 show that the upper and lower portions of $\text{Ic}(L_0)'$ have the structure as in (10.1), and that \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{L} are nonsingular under our characteristic assumption. It remains to consider the rows corresponding to $a \in [-\lceil r/2 \rceil, \lfloor r/2 \rfloor]$. By Proposition 7.2 the maximal graph in $U(a, 0)$ for a in this range is H_r .

LEMMA 10.3. *The middle rows of $\text{Ic}(L_0)'$ corresponding to $a \in [-\lceil r/2 \rceil, \lfloor r/2 \rfloor]$ are*

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & N & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix},$$

up to multiplication of each column by ± 1 , where N is the $(r+1) \times (r+1)$ matrix

$$(10.2) \quad N = (r-1)! \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 & r & 1 & \dots & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 & 1 & \dots & 1 & r & 1 & \dots & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 2 & \dots & 1 & r & 1 & \dots & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \dots & 2 & r & 1 & \dots & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ r & r & r & \dots & r & r(r+1) & r & \dots & r & r & r \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 & r & 2 & \dots & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 & r & 1 & \dots & 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 & r & 1 & \dots & 1 & 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 & r & 1 & \dots & 1 & 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

PROOF. Let $a \in [-\lceil r/2 \rceil, \lfloor r/2 \rfloor]$. The (a, b) th entry of $\text{Ic}(L_0)'$ is $\sum_{w \in \text{Eul}_{P_a}(G_b)} \text{sgn}(w)$, where G_b is H_r with an additional edge e_{k+1} , being a loop, placed at P_b . For the graph G_b to be connected, we require $b \in [-\lceil r/2 \rceil, \lfloor r/2 \rfloor]$. This shows that the (a, b) th entry of $\text{Ic}(L_0)'$ is zero when $b \notin [-\lceil r/2 \rceil, \lfloor r/2 \rfloor]$.

Assume $b \in [-\lceil r/2 \rceil, \lfloor r/2 \rfloor]$. Lemma 2.5 with $\alpha = r$ gives us

$$N_{(a,b)} = \sum_{w \in \text{Eul}_{F_a}(G_b)} \text{sgn}(w) = \begin{cases} \pm(r+1)!, & \text{if } a = 0 \text{ and } b = 0 \\ \pm 2(r-1)!, & \text{if } a = b \text{ and } a, b \neq 0 \\ \pm r!, & \text{if } a = 0 \text{ and } b \neq 0, \text{ or } a \neq 0 \text{ and } b = 0 \\ \pm(r-1)!, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where for fixed b , either all entries $N_{(a,b)}$ are positive, or all entries $N_{(a,b)}$ are negative. This shows that N has the required form. \square

LEMMA 10.4. *Suppose the characteristic of F does not divide $(2r+1)r!$. Then $\det(N) \neq 0$ in F .*

PROOF. We perform elementary row operations on the matrix N . After dividing N by $(r-1)!$ and dividing the row corresponding to 0 by r , we obtain

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & r & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & r & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 2 & \cdots & 1 & r & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 2 & r & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & r+1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & r & 2 & \cdots & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & r & 1 & \cdots & 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & r & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & r & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Next we subtract the row corresponding to 0 from every other row. Our matrix is transformed to

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & r+1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Finally, we subtract every other row from the row corresponding to 0. Our matrix becomes

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 2r+1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

which has determinant $2r+1 \neq 0$. Thus N is nonsingular under our assumption on the characteristic. \square

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to Omer Angel, John Dixon, Irwin Pressman and Bruce Shepherd for helpful comments.

References

- [1] A. S. Amitsur and J. Levitzki. Minimal identities for algebras. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 1:449–463, 1950.
- [2] B. Bollobás. *Modern graph theory*, volume 184 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.
- [3] J. D. Dixon and I. S. Pressman. Generalized commutators and a problem related to the Amitsur-Levitzki theorem. *Linear Multilinear Algebra*, 66(11):2199–2207, 2018.
- [4] C. Procesi. On the theorem of Amitsur-Levitzki. *Israel J. Math.*, 207(1):151–154, 2015.
- [5] J. P. Razmyslov. Identities with trace in full matrix algebras over a field of characteristic zero. *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.*, 38:723–756, 1974.
- [6] S. Rosset. A new proof of the Amitsur-Levitzki identity. *Israel J. Math.*, 23(2):187–188, 1976.
- [7] R. G. Swan. An application of graph theory to algebra. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 14:367–373, 1963.
- [8] R. G. Swan. Correction to “An application of graph theory to algebra”. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 21:379–380, 1969.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, VANCOUVER, CANADA
 Email address: mbrassil@math.ubc.ca, reichst@math.ubc.ca