

Representability of the Direct Sum of q -Matroids

Heide Gluesing-Luerssen¹ and Benjamin Jany¹

November 21, 2022

Abstract

q -Matroids are the q -analogue of matroids. In this short note we consider the direct sum of q -matroids, as introduced recently in the literature. We show that the direct sum of representable q -matroids may not be representable. It remains an open question whether representability of the direct sum can be characterized by the given q -matroids.

Keywords: q -matroid, direct sum, representability.

1 Introduction

A q -matroid is the q -analogue of a matroid. The ground space is a finite-dimensional vector space over some finite field and the rank function is defined on the subspace lattice of that ground space. It satisfies the natural analogues of the rank function of a matroid.

The notion of a q -matroid has only been introduced in 2018 in [8], and its theory is still in the beginnings. Fortunately, a long catalogue of cryptomorphisms has already been established in [2]. It tells us that q -matroids can be defined by any of its abundance of structures, such as independent spaces, bases, circuits, flats, etc, and provides us with q -analogues of the axioms that need to be satisfied.

Despite the extensive list of cryptomorphisms, it turns out that the notion of direct sum for q -matroids is far from obvious. None of the many ways of defining the direct sum of classical matroids has a well-defined q -analogue. Furthermore, in [4] it has been shown that there is no coproduct in the category of q -matroids with strong maps as morphisms. This stands in contrast to the matroid case and suggests that a direct sum of q -matroids will not behave well with respect to its flats. Nonetheless, just recently a notion of direct sum of q -matroids has been introduced in [3] by way of the rank function. In the same paper some essential properties of the direct sum have been established, and in [4] it has been shown that it is a coproduct in the category of q -matroids with linear weak maps as morphisms. The latter implies that the direct sum of q -matroids on ground

¹Department of Mathematics, University of Kentucky, Lexington KY 40506-0027, USA; heide.gl@uky.edu and benjamin.jany@uky.edu. HGL was partially supported by the grant #422479 from the Simons Foundation.

spaces E_1 and E_2 is the unique q -matroid with the most independent spaces among all q -matroids on $E_1 \oplus E_2$ whose restrictions to E_i are isomorphic to the given q -matroids. All these results suggest that the proposed notion of direct sum is the appropriate one, and it remains to investigate its properties.

In this short note we will discuss representability of the direct sum. For a q -matroid whose ground space is an \mathbb{F}_q -vector space, representability can be naturally defined over any field extension of \mathbb{F}_q ; see Theorem 2.3 below. Surprisingly, it turns out that the direct sum of two \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -representable q -matroids may not be \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -representable or, even worse, not be representable over any field extension of \mathbb{F}_q . In order to present examples we will derive the following results. Firstly, if the direct sum is representable then it is so by a block diagonal matrix whose blocks represent the summands (Theorem 3.4). Secondly, we introduce the notion of paving q -matroids and derive a condition on the representing matrices paving q -matroids of the same rank that prevents the block diagonal matrix to represent the direct sum (Theorem 3.6). This will allow us to construct the desired examples. It remains an open question whether representability of the direct sum can be characterized in terms of the summands.

Notation: Throughout, let $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_q$. Furthermore, for a finite-dimensional \mathbb{F} -vector space E denote by $\mathcal{L}(E)$ the subspace lattice of E . For a matrix $M \in \mathbb{F}_{q^a}^{k \times n}$ we denote by $\text{rs}(M) \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^a}^n$ the row space of M . The abbreviation RREF stands for reduced row echelon form.

2 The Direct Sum of q -Matroids

Definition 2.1. A q -matroid with ground space E is a pair (E, ρ) , where E is finite-dimensional \mathbb{F} -vector space and $\rho : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}$ is a map satisfying

- (R1) Dimension-Boundedness: $0 \leq \rho(V) \leq \dim V$ for all $V \in \mathcal{L}$;
- (R2) Monotonicity: $V \leq W \implies \rho(V) \leq \rho(W)$ for all $V, W \in \mathcal{L}$;
- (R3) Submodularity: $\rho(V + W) + \rho(V \cap W) \leq \rho(V) + \rho(W)$ for all $V, W \in \mathcal{L}$.

The value $\rho(V)$ is called the *rank of V* and $\rho(M) := \rho(E)$ the *rank of the q -matroid*. If ρ is the zero map, we call (E, ρ) the *trivial q -matroid on E* . A subspace $V \in \mathcal{L}$ is *independent* if $\rho(V) = \dim V$ and *dependent* otherwise. The dependent spaces all of whose proper subspaces are independent are called *circuits*. A space $V \in \mathcal{L}$ is a *flat* if it is inclusion-maximal in the set $\{W \in \mathcal{L} \mid \rho(W) = \rho(V)\}$.

Remark 2.2. It is well known (see [8, Thm. 8]) that the collection of independent spaces uniquely determines the q -matroid, and the same is true for the collections of dependent spaces and of circuits. For this and many more cryptomorphisms for q -matroids we refer to [2].

An abundance of q -matroids is obtained as follows.

Theorem 2.3 ([8, Sec. 5]). Let \mathbb{F}_{q^m} be a field extension of $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_q$ and let $G \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{k \times n}$. Define the map $\rho : \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{F}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$ via

$$\rho(V) = \text{rk}_{\mathbb{F}_{q^m}}(GY^T), \quad \text{where } Y \in \mathbb{F}^{y \times n} \text{ is such that } V = \text{rs}(Y).$$

Then $\mathcal{M}_G := (\mathbb{F}^n, \rho)$ is a q -matroid. It is called the q -matroid *represented by* G . A q -matroid \mathcal{M} with ground space \mathbb{F}^n is called \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -*representable* if $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_G$ for some matrix G over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . In that case the rank of G equals the rank of \mathcal{M} . The q -matroid \mathcal{M} is called *representable* if it is \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -representable over some field extension \mathbb{F}_{q^m} .

Clearly, \mathcal{M}_G depends only on the row space of G ; in other word, $\mathcal{M}_G = \mathcal{M}_{UG}$ for all $U \in \text{GL}_k(\mathbb{F}_{q^m})$. In the context of the rank-metric on $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ the row space of G is known as the *rank-metric code generated by* G . Many invariants of the code (but not all) can be determined by the associated q -matroid. For further details we refer to [8, 1, 6] and Section 6 in the survey [7]. We will briefly touch on the relation to rank-metric codes in Definition 3.5 and Theorem 3.6.

Unsurprisingly, not every q -matroid is representable; see [6, Sec. 4] and [3, Sec. 3.3]. In the next section we will present examples showing that the direct sum of representable q -matroids need not be representable.

We now turn to the direct sum of q -matroids. Before doing so, we briefly summarize some properties of the direct sum of (classical) matroids. We refer to Section 4.2 in the monograph [9] by Oxley for further details.

Remark 2.4. Let $M_i = (S_i, r_i), i = 1, 2$, be two matroids on disjoint ground sets S_1 and S_2 . Then $M = (S, r)$, where $S = S_1 \cup S_2$ and $r(A) = r_1(A \cap S_1) + r_2(A \cap S_2)$ for all $A \subseteq S$, is a matroid and called the direct sum of M_1 and M_2 , denoted by $M_1 \oplus M_2$. We denote by $\mathcal{I}(M)$ and $\mathcal{I}(M_i)$ the collections of independent sets in M and M_i , respectively, and use similar notation for the collections of dependent sets, circuits, and flats. Then we have the following.

- (a) The independent sets satisfy $\mathcal{I}(M) = \{I_1 \cup I_2 \mid I_i \in \mathcal{I}(M_i)\}$.
- (b) The circuits satisfy $\mathcal{C}(M) = \mathcal{C}(M_1) \cup \mathcal{C}(M_2)$.
- (c) The flats satisfy $\mathcal{F}(M) = \{F_1 \cup F_2 \mid F_i \in \mathcal{F}(M_i)\}$.
- (d) If M_i is represented by the matrices G_i (over the same field \mathbb{F}) for $i = 1, 2$, then M is represented by the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} G_1 & 0 \\ 0 & G_2 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.1}$$

The above implies that the direct sum of matroids can also be defined by way of independent sets, circuits, flats (and many more). It is easy to see that the obvious q -analogue of the rank function above or of any of the properties (a) – (c) does not lead to a well-defined notion for a direct sum of q -matroids. In addition, (d) does not generalize. In fact, the q -matroid represented by G in (2.1) (in the sense of Theorem 2.3) depends on the choice of G_i . This is not surprising as the rank of

$$\begin{pmatrix} G_1 & 0 \\ 0 & G_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Y_1^\top \\ Y_2^\top \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} G_1 Y_1^\top \\ G_2 Y_2^\top \end{pmatrix}$$

depends on the relation between G_1 and G_2 . This has already been observed in [3, Rem. 22] and [4, Prop. 4.5]. The detailed example in the latter reference is used to establish the non-existence of a coproduct in the category of q -matroids with strong maps as morphisms.

In [3] the authors introduce the notion of a direct sum of q -matroids. Below we will present a concise, and slightly different, definition of the direct sum. The description will be needed for further computations.

Throughout the paper we will use the following notation. For any direct sum $E = E_1 \oplus E_2$ of \mathbb{F} -vector spaces E_1 and E_2 we denote by $\pi_i : E \rightarrow E_i$ the corresponding projections.

Theorem 2.5 ([3, Sec. 7]). Let $\mathcal{M}_i = (E_i, \rho_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, be q -matroids and set $E = E_1 \oplus E_2$. Define $\rho'_i : \mathcal{L}(E) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$, $V \mapsto \rho_i(\pi_i(V))$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then $\mathcal{M}'_i = (E, \rho'_i)$ is a q -matroid. Define

$$\sigma : \mathcal{L}(E) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}, \quad X \mapsto \rho'_1(X) + \rho'_2(X) - \dim X \quad (2.2)$$

and

$$\rho : \mathcal{L}(E) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0, \quad V \mapsto \dim V + \min_{X \leq V} \sigma(X) \quad \text{for } V \in \mathcal{L}(E). \quad (2.3)$$

Then $\mathcal{M} := (E, \rho)$ is a q -matroid, called the *direct sum of \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2* and denoted by $\mathcal{M}_1 \oplus \mathcal{M}_2$.

The fact that ρ is a rank function can be found in [3, Thm. 29] and also follows from [5, Thm. 3.9 and its proof].

Note that by the above, E_i is a loop space of \mathcal{M}'_j for $j \neq i$ (by definition a loop space is a space with rank 0). The process from \mathcal{M}_j to \mathcal{M}'_j in Theorem 2.5 is called *adding a loop space* in [3]. It is a special instance of the direct sum because $\mathcal{M}'_j \cong \mathcal{M}_j \oplus \mathcal{U}_0(E_i)$ for $i \neq j$, where $\mathcal{U}_0(E_i)$ is the trivial q -matroid on the ground space E_i . The process of adding a loop space can easily be described for representable q -matroids.

Remark 2.6. Let $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\mathcal{M}_1 = (\mathbb{F}^{n_1}, \rho_1)$ be a representable q -matroid, say $\mathcal{M}_1 = \mathcal{M}_G$ for some $G \in \mathbb{F}_q^{k \times n_1}$. Define $\mathcal{M}'_1 = (\mathbb{F}^{n_1+n_2}, \rho'_1)$, where $\rho'_1(V) = \rho_1(\pi_1(V))$ for all $V \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{F}^{n_1+n_2})$. Then $\mathcal{M}'_1 = \mathcal{M}_{G'}$, where $G' = (G \mid 0) \in \mathbb{F}^{k \times (n_1+n_2)}$.

The following is obvious since $\sigma(0) = 0$.

Remark 2.7. Consider Theorem 2.5. Define $\mathcal{X} = \{X \in \mathcal{L}(E) \mid \rho'_1(X) + \rho'_2(X) < \dim X\}$ and $\mathcal{X}_0 = \mathcal{X} \cup \{0\}$. Then

$$\rho(V) = \dim V + \min_{X \in \mathcal{X}_0 \cap \mathcal{L}(V)} \sigma(X) \quad \text{for all } V \in \mathcal{L}(E).$$

As a consequence, V is dependent iff $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{L}(V) \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, the collection of circuits of $\mathcal{M}_1 \oplus \mathcal{M}_2$ is given by

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M}_1 \oplus \mathcal{M}_2) = \{X \in \mathcal{X} \mid X \text{ is inclusion-minimal in } \mathcal{X}\}.$$

This follows immediately from the fact that a space V is dependent iff $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{L}(V) \neq \emptyset$. The last result can also be found in [4, Thm. 5.2].

The direct sum has some expected properties; see also [3, Thm. 47].

Theorem 2.8. Let $\mathcal{M}_i = (E_i, \rho_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, be q -matroids and $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1 \oplus \mathcal{M}_2$. Let $V_i \in \mathcal{L}(E_i)$. Then $\rho_i(V_i) = \rho'_i(V_i)$ and $\rho'_j(V_i) = 0$ if $j \neq i$. Furthermore, $\rho(V_1 \oplus V_2) = \rho_1(V_1) + \rho_2(V_2)$. As a consequence $\rho(\mathcal{M}) = \rho_1(\mathcal{M}_1) + \rho_2(\mathcal{M}_2)$.

Note that the above implies $\mathcal{M}_i \cong \mathcal{M}|_{E_i} \cong (\mathcal{M}'_i)|_{E_i}$, where the latter two are the restrictions of the respective q -matroids to the space E_i .

Proof. The first statement follows from $\rho'_i(V_i) = \rho_i(\pi_i(V_i)) = \rho_i(V_i)$. Let now $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$ and $X \leq V$. Note that $X \leq \hat{X} := \pi_1(X) \oplus \pi_2(X)$ and $\pi_i(\hat{X}) = \pi_i(X) \leq V_i$. This implies that $\sigma(X)$ from (2.2) satisfies $\sigma(X) \geq \sigma(\hat{X})$ and the minimum in (2.3) is attained by a subspace of the form $X_1 \oplus X_2$ with $X_i \leq V_i$. Let now $X = X_1 \oplus X_2$ for some $X_i \leq V_i$ be such that $\rho(V) = \dim V + \sigma(X)$. Write $V_i = X_i \oplus Z_i$ for some $Z_i \leq V_i$. Using the properties of the rank functions ρ'_i we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(V) &= \dim V + \sigma(X) = \rho'_1(X_1) + \rho'_2(X_2) + \dim Z_1 + \dim Z_2 \\ &\geq \rho'_1(X_1) + \rho'_2(X_2) + \rho'_1(Z_1) + \rho'_2(Z_2) \\ &\geq \rho'_1(X_1 \oplus Z_1) + \rho'_2(X_2 \oplus Z_2) = \rho'_1(V_1) + \rho'_2(V_2) = \dim V + \sigma(V) \geq \rho(V). \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have equality across and thus $\rho(V) = \rho'_1(V_1) + \rho'_2(V_2) = \rho_1(V_1) + \rho_2(V_2)$, as desired. The consequence is clear because $\rho(\mathcal{M}) = \rho(E) = \rho_1(E_1) + \rho_2(E_2)$. \square

3 Representability of the Direct Sum

In this section we turn to representability of the direct sum of representable q -matroids. We will provide an example of \mathbb{F}_4 -representable q -matroids over the ground space \mathbb{F}_2^4 for which the direct sum is not representable over any field extension \mathbb{F}_{2^m} . A crucial ingredient will be paving q -matroids defined below. We show that if $\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2$ are paving q -matroids of the same rank and represented by matrices G_i satisfying a certain condition, the direct sum $\mathcal{M}_1 \oplus \mathcal{M}_2$ is not represented by the block diagonal matrix $\text{diag}(G_1, G_2)$. This will be used to create the desired example. A second example will be provided where the direct sum is representable only over larger fields than the summands.

Definition 3.1. A q -matroid $\mathcal{M} = (\mathbb{F}^n, \rho)$ is *paving* if $\dim C \geq \rho(\mathcal{M})$ for all circuits C of \mathcal{M} .

A large class of paving q -matroids is given as follows.

Example 3.2. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 \leq k < n$. Let \mathcal{S} be a collection of k -dimensional subspaces of \mathbb{F}^n with the property that $\dim(X \cap Y) \leq k - 2$ for all distinct $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}$. For $V \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{F}^n)$ define

$$\rho(V) = \begin{cases} k - 1 & \text{if } V \in \mathcal{S}, \\ \min\{k, \dim V\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then $\mathcal{M} = (\mathbb{F}^n, \rho)$ is q -matroid of rank k ; see [6, Prop. 4.6]. The circuits are the spaces in \mathcal{S} and all $(k + 1)$ -dimensional spaces not containing a space in \mathcal{S} . Thus \mathcal{M} is paving. We will make use of this construction later in Proposition 3.7. Further examples can be found in [6, Sec. 4].

Proposition 3.3. Let $\mathcal{M}_i = (\mathbb{F}^{n_i}, \rho_i), i = 1, 2$, be paving q -matroids with $\rho_1(\mathcal{M}_1) = \rho_2(\mathcal{M}_2) = k$. Let $n = n_1 + n_2$ and $\mathcal{M} = (\mathbb{F}^n, \rho) = \mathcal{M}_1 \oplus \mathcal{M}_2$. Denote by $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2$ and \mathcal{C} the collections of circuits of $\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2$, and \mathcal{M} , respectively. Then every $C \in \mathcal{C}$ has dimension at least k and

$$\{C \in \mathcal{C} \mid \dim C = k\} = \{C_1 \oplus 0 \mid C_1 \in \mathcal{C}_1, \dim C_1 = k\} \cup \{0 \oplus C_2 \mid C_2 \in \mathcal{C}_2, \dim C_2 = k\}.$$

Proof. We start with the stated identity. Denote the set on the right hand side by \mathcal{V} .

“ \supseteq ” Let $C_1 \oplus 0 \in \mathcal{V}$. From Theorem 2.8 we obtain $\rho(C_1 \oplus 0) = \rho_1(C_1) = k - 1$, and thus $C_1 \oplus 0$ is dependent. Clearly, every subspace of $C_1 \oplus 0$ is of the form $I_1 \oplus 0$ where I_1 is independent in \mathcal{M}_1 . Using again Theorem 2.8 we conclude that $I_1 \oplus 0$ is independent in \mathcal{M} and thus $C_1 \oplus 0$ is a circuit of \mathcal{M} of dimension k . The same reasoning holds for $0 \oplus C_2 \in \mathcal{V}$.

“ \subseteq ” By Remark 2.7 a subspace $C \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{F}^n)$ is a circuit of \mathcal{M} if and only if it is inclusion-minimal subject to

$$\rho_1(\pi_1(C)) + \rho_2(\pi_2(C)) \leq \dim C - 1, \quad (3.1)$$

where π_1, π_2 are the projections from \mathbb{F}^n to the first n_1 and last n_2 coordinates, respectively. Let $C \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\dim C \leq k$.

1) Let $\dim \pi_1(C) = k$ (which implies $\dim C = k$). Then (3.1) implies that $\pi_1(C)$ is a dependent space of \mathcal{M}_1 , and thus a circuit thanks to the paving property. Hence $\rho_1(\pi_1(C)) = k - 1$ and thus $\rho_2(\pi_2(C)) = 0$ again by (3.1). But then $\pi_2(C) = 0$ by the paving property of \mathcal{M}_2 , and thus $C = \pi_1(C) \oplus 0$, as stated. In the same way we have $C = 0 \oplus \pi_2(C)$ if $\dim \pi_2(C) = k$.

2) Let $\dim \pi_i(C) = \ell_i < k$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then $\pi_i(C)$ is independent in \mathcal{M}_i and $\rho_i(\pi_i(C)) = \ell_i$. Now we obtain $\dim C \leq \dim \pi_1(C) + \dim \pi_2(C) = \ell_1 + \ell_2 = \rho_1(\pi_1(C)) + \rho_2(\pi_2(C))$ in contradiction to (3.1). Hence this case does not arise. This also shows that all circuits have dimension at least k , and the proof is complete. \square

We now turn to representability of the direct sum and start with the following unsurprising result.

Theorem 3.4. Let $\mathcal{M}_i = (\mathbb{F}^{n_i}, \rho_i), i = 1, 2$, be q -matroids of rank k_i . Let $n = n_1 + n_2$ and $\mathcal{M} := \mathcal{M}_1 \oplus \mathcal{M}_2$. Suppose \mathcal{M} is representable over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Then \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 are representable over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} and $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_G$ for a matrix G of the form

$$G = \begin{pmatrix} G_1 & 0 \\ 0 & G_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $G_i \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{k_i \times n_i}$ are such that $\mathcal{M}_{G_i} = \mathcal{M}_i$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{M} = (\mathbb{F}^n, \rho)$ and suppose $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_G$ for some matrix G over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Since $\rho(\mathcal{M}) = k := k_1 + k_2$ by Theorem 2.8, we may assume that G is in $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{k \times n}$ and has rank k . Furthermore, without loss of generality let G be in RREF. Then we can write G as

$$G = \begin{pmatrix} G_1 & G' \\ 0 & G_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

for some matrices $G_1 \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{t_1 \times n_1}, G_2 \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{t_2 \times n_2}$ of full row rank and some matrix $G' \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{t_1 \times n_2}$. Hence $t_1 + t_2 = k_1 + k_2$. Let $V = \text{rs}(Y) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{F}^{n_1})$ for some $Y \in \mathbb{F}^{y \times n_1}$ and set $\hat{Y} = (Y \mid 0) \in \mathbb{F}^{y \times n}$. With the aid of Theorem 2.8 we compute

$$\text{rk}(G_1 Y^\top) = \text{rk}(G \hat{Y}^\top) = \rho(\text{rs}(\hat{Y})) = \rho(V \oplus 0) = \rho_1(V).$$

This shows that \mathcal{M}_1 is representable and $\mathcal{M}_1 = \mathcal{M}_{G_1}$. As a consequence, $t_1 = k_1$ and thus $t_2 = k_2$. Next, $k_2 = \rho_2(\mathbb{F}^{n_2}) = \rho(0 \oplus \mathbb{F}^{n_2}) = \text{rk} \begin{pmatrix} G' \\ G_2 \end{pmatrix}$. Since $\text{rk} G_2 = k_2$ this implies $\text{rs}(G') \subseteq \text{rs}(G_2)$. Using that G is in RREF, we conclude $G' = 0$. Hence G is block diagonal as stated, and as above we obtain $\mathcal{M}_2 = \mathcal{M}_{G_2}$. This concludes the proof. \square

We will now make use of some notions that are standard in the theory of rank-metric codes. The proof of Theorem 3.6 below illustrates the well known fact that for a representable q -matroid \mathcal{M}_G the dimension of a dependent space equals the rank-weight of a suitable codeword in the dual code $\text{rs}(G)^\perp = \ker G$ (where the dual is defined with respect to the standard inner product).

Definition 3.5. As before, let $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_q$. For a vector $v = (v_1, \dots, v_n) \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ we define the \mathbb{F} -support of v as the subspace

$$\text{supp}(v) = \langle v_1, \dots, v_n \rangle_{\mathbb{F}} \leq \mathbb{F}_q^m.$$

The rank-weight of v is $\text{wt}_{\text{rk}}(v) := \dim \text{supp}(v)$.

Theorem 3.6. For $i = 1, 2$ let $G_i \in \mathbb{F}_q^{k \times n}$ be of rank k and \mathcal{M}_i be the associated q -matroids. Suppose \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 are both paving. Suppose furthermore that there exist vectors $v_i \in \ker G_i$ such that $\text{wt}_{\text{rk}}(v_1) = \text{wt}_{\text{rk}}(v_2) = k$ and $\text{supp}(v_1) = \text{supp}(v_2)$. Then $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1 \oplus \mathcal{M}_2$ is not represented by

$$G = \begin{pmatrix} G_1 & 0 \\ 0 & G_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.2)$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{M}_G$, that is, \mathcal{N} is the q -matroid generated by G . We will show that $\mathcal{N} \neq \mathcal{M}$ with the aid of their circuits. Proposition 3.3 implies that the k -dimensional circuits of \mathcal{M} are circuits of \mathcal{N} . We will show the existence of a circuit of \mathcal{N} that is not a circuit of \mathcal{M} . To do so, let $\text{supp}(v_1) = \langle \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k \rangle$ for some (\mathbb{F} -linearly independent) $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{F}_q^m$. Set $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{km}$. Then there exist matrices $Y_i \in \mathbb{F}^{k \times n_i}$ of rank k such that $\alpha Y_i = v_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. Hence $0 = G_i Y_i^\top \alpha^\top$, and thus $\text{rk}(G_i Y_i^\top) < k$. This shows that $V_i := \text{rs}(Y_i) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{F}^{n_i})$ is a dependent space of \mathcal{M}_i . Since $\dim V_i = k$, the paving property implies that V_i is a circuit of \mathcal{M}_i . Now we have

$$G \begin{pmatrix} Y_1^\top \\ Y_2^\top \end{pmatrix} \alpha^\top = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and therefore $W := \text{rs}(Y_1 \mid Y_2) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{F}^{n_1+n_2})$ is a k -dimensional dependent space of \mathcal{N} . Since Y_1 and Y_2 are both nonzero, W is not a circuit of the direct sum \mathcal{M} thanks to Proposition 3.3 and neither does the latter contain any circuits of dimension less than k . All of this shows that W contains a circuit of \mathcal{N} that is not a circuit of \mathcal{M} , and thus $\mathcal{N} \neq \mathcal{M}$ thanks to Remark 2.2. Hence G does not represent \mathcal{M} . \square

Now we are ready to provide an example of a direct sum of representable q -matroids that is not representable over any field extension.

Proposition 3.7. Let $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_2$ and $\mathbb{F}_4 = \{0, 1, \omega, \omega + 1\}$. Consider the matrix

$$G_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \omega & 0 & \omega + 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \omega \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{F}_4^{2 \times 4}$$

and set $\mathcal{M}_1 = \mathcal{M}_{G_1}$, which is a q -matroid over the ground space \mathbb{F}_4^4 . Then $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1 \oplus \mathcal{M}_1$ is not representable over any field extension \mathbb{F}_{2^m} .

Proof. Denote the rank function of \mathcal{M}_1 by ρ_1 . Recall that $\rho_1(\text{rs}(Y)) = \text{rk}(G_1 Y^\top)$ for all matrices $Y \in \mathbb{F}^{y \times 4}$. Set $\mathcal{V} = \{\text{rs}(Y_1), \text{rs}(Y_2), \text{rs}(Y_3), \text{rs}(Y_4), \text{rs}(Y_5)\}$, where

$$Y_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, Y_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, Y_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, Y_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, Y_5 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.3)$$

Using, for instance, SageMath one obtains

$$\rho_1(V) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{for } V \in \mathcal{V}, \\ \min\{2, \dim V\}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

In particular, \mathcal{M}_1 is of the form as in Example 3.2 and thus paving of rank 2. The above can also be verified by hand. For instance, $\rho(V) = 1$ for all 1-dimensional subspaces simply reflects that the columns of G_1 are linearly independent over \mathbb{F}_2 . Furthermore, $G_1 Y_2^\top = \begin{pmatrix} \omega & 1 \\ \omega+1 & \omega \end{pmatrix}$, which has rank 1. Similarly, the rank of all 2-dimensional subspaces can easily be verified. Clearly, the matrix

$$\hat{G}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \omega+1 & 0 & \omega \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \omega+1 \end{pmatrix}$$

also represents \mathcal{M}_1 .

1) We show that G_1 and \hat{G}_1 are the only matrices over any field extension \mathbb{F}_{2^m} , $m \geq 1$, that represent \mathcal{M}_1 . To do so, let $m \geq 1$ and $H = (h_1, h_2, h_3, h_4) \in \mathbb{F}_{2^m}^{2 \times 4}$ be such that $\mathcal{M}_H = \mathcal{M}_1$. Thus $\text{rk}(HY^\top) = \text{rk}(G_1 Y^\top)$ for all matrices $Y \in \mathbb{F}^{y \times 4}$. Without loss of generality we may assume that H is in RREF. Clearly $\text{rk}(H) = 2$. Moreover, h_1, \dots, h_4 are linearly independent over \mathbb{F}_2 because \mathcal{M}_1 has no loops (a loop is a 1-dimensional space of rank 0). Next, $\text{rk}(HY_1^\top) = 1 = \text{rk}(HY_4^\top)$ shows that $h_2 \in \langle h_1 \rangle_{\mathbb{F}_{2^m}}$ and $h_4 \in \langle h_2 + h_3 \rangle_{\mathbb{F}_{2^m}}$. Hence h_2 and h_4 are not pivot columns of H . All of this implies that H must be of the form

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \alpha & 0 & \alpha\beta \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \beta \end{pmatrix} \text{ for some } \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F}_{2^m}.$$

The \mathbb{F}_2 -linear independence of the columns of H implies that $\alpha, \beta \notin \mathbb{F}_2$. Next,

$$1 = \text{rk}(HY_3^\top) = \text{rk} \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \alpha\beta & \alpha\beta \\ \beta & 1 + \beta \end{pmatrix} = \text{rk} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \alpha\beta \\ 1 & 1 + \beta \end{pmatrix},$$

and this results in $\alpha\beta = 1 + \beta$. Using this, we continue with

$$1 = \text{rk}(HY_2^\top) = \text{rk} \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \alpha\beta & \alpha + \alpha\beta \\ 1 + \beta & \beta \end{pmatrix} = \text{rk} \begin{pmatrix} \beta & \alpha + 1 + \beta \\ 1 + \beta & \beta \end{pmatrix} = \text{rk} \begin{pmatrix} \beta & \alpha + 1 \\ 1 + \beta & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Using the determinant and $\alpha\beta = 1 + \beta$ we conclude that $\alpha + \beta = 0$, hence $\alpha = \beta$, and with $\alpha\beta = 1 + \beta$ we arrive at $\beta^2 + \beta + 1 = 0$. Thus $\beta \in \mathbb{F}_4 \setminus \mathbb{F}_2$ (and m is even), and the two choices $\beta \in \{\omega, \omega + 1\}$ lead to $H \in \{G_1, \hat{G}_1\}$.

2) Consider now $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1 \oplus \mathcal{M}_1$. From Theorem 3.4 we know that if \mathcal{M} is \mathbb{F}_{2^m} -representable for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$, then any representing matrix is of the form

$$G = \begin{pmatrix} G'_1 & 0 \\ 0 & G'_2 \end{pmatrix}, \text{ where } G'_i \in \{G_1, \hat{G}_1\}.$$

Since $v = (1, 1, \omega, 1) \in \ker G_1$, $\hat{v} = (1, 1, \omega + 1, 1) \in \ker \hat{G}_1$ satisfy $\text{supp}(v) = \text{supp}(\hat{v}) = \langle 1, \omega \rangle$ we may apply Theorem 3.6 and conclude that \mathcal{M} is not representable over any field extension \mathbb{F}_{2^m} . \square

In the following case, representability of the direct sum depends on the field size. More precisely, the direct sum is not representable over the same field as the summands, but is representable over a field extension. We present an entire family of such instances.

Proposition 3.8. Let $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_q$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} \setminus \mathbb{F}$, thus $1, \alpha$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{F} . Set

$$G_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \alpha \end{pmatrix}$$

and $\mathcal{M}_1 = \mathcal{M}_G$, which is a q -matroid over the ground space \mathbb{F}^2 . Let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1 \oplus \mathcal{M}_1$. Then \mathcal{M} is representable over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} iff $m \geq 4$.

Proof. Note that $\mathcal{M}_1 = (\mathbb{F}^2, \rho_1)$ is the uniform q -matroid of rank 1, that is, $\rho_1(V) = \min\{1, \dim V\}$ for all $V \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{F}^2)$. In particular, \mathcal{M}_1 is paving of rank 1. Let $\mathcal{M} = (\mathbb{F}^4, \rho)$. With the aid of the very definition of the direct sum one easily verifies that $\rho(V) = 1$ for all 1-dimensional spaces $V \leq \mathbb{F}^4$, while for $\dim V = 2$

$$\rho(V) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } V = \langle e_1, e_2 \rangle \text{ or } V = \langle e_3, e_4 \rangle, \\ 2, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (3.5)$$

where e_1, \dots, e_4 are the standard basis vectors of \mathbb{F}^4 . Suppose \mathcal{M} is representable over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Then Theorem 3.4 tells us that any representing matrix of \mathcal{M} over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} is of the form

$$G = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \beta & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \gamma \end{pmatrix} \text{ for some } \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} \setminus \mathbb{F}.$$

1) Let $m = 2$. Then $\langle 1, \alpha \rangle = \mathbb{F}_{q^2} = \langle 1, \beta \rangle$. Let $\gamma = a + b\beta$, where $a, b \in \mathbb{F}$, and

$$V = \text{rs}(Y), \text{ where } Y = \begin{pmatrix} a & b & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Then $\dim V = 2$ and $\text{rk}(GY^\top) = 1$. This contradicts (3.5), and thus G does not represent \mathcal{M} .

2) Let $m = 3$. Then $\mathbb{F}_{q^3} = \langle 1, \beta, \beta^2 \rangle$ and

$$\gamma = c_0 + c_1\beta + c_2\beta^2, \quad \beta^3 = b_0 + b_1\beta + b_2\beta^2 \text{ for some } b_i, c_i \in \mathbb{F}.$$

This implies $\beta\gamma = c_2b_0 + (c_0 + c_2b_1)\beta + (c_1 + c_2b_2)\beta^2$. Now we have the following cases:

i) If $c_2 = 0$, then $\text{rk}(GY^\top) = 1$ for

$$Y = \begin{pmatrix} c_0 & c_1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

ii) If $c_2 \neq 0 = c_1 + c_2b_2$, then $\text{rk}(GY^\top) = 1$ for

$$Y = \begin{pmatrix} c_2b_0 & c_0 + c_2b_1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

iii) If $c_2 \neq 0 \neq c_1 + c_2b_2$, we have $(c_1 + c_2b_2)\gamma - c_2\beta\gamma = f_0 + f_1\beta$ for some $f_i \in \mathbb{F}$ and thus $\text{rk}(GY^\top) = 1$ for

$$Y = \begin{pmatrix} f_0 & f_1 & 0 & 1 \\ c_1 + c_2b_2 & -c_2 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In all cases we obtain a contradiction to (3.5) and conclude that \mathcal{M} is not representable over \mathbb{F}_{q^3} .
3) Let $m \geq 4$. We show that \mathcal{M} is represented by the matrix

$$G = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & z & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & z^2 \end{pmatrix} \text{ for any } z \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} \text{ of degree at least 4.}$$

Consider the q -matroid $\mathcal{M}_G = (\mathbb{F}^4, \hat{\rho})$. By definition $\hat{\rho}(\text{rs}(Y)) = \text{rk}(GY^\top)$ for any matrix $Y \in \mathbb{F}^{y \times 4}$. Denote by $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M}_G)$ the collections of dependent spaces of \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{M}_G , respectively. We will show that

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M}_G) = \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M}). \quad (3.6)$$

To do so, we first determine the set $\mathcal{X} = \{X \leq \mathbb{F}^4 \mid \rho_1(\pi_1(X)) + \rho_1(\pi_2(X)) < \dim X\}$ from Remark 2.7. Since $\mathcal{M}_1 = (\mathbb{F}^2, \rho_1)$ is the uniform q -matroid of rank 1, one easily observes that

$$\mathcal{X} = \{X \leq \mathbb{F}^4 \mid \dim X \geq 3\} \cup \{\langle e_1, e_2 \rangle, \langle e_3, e_4 \rangle\}.$$

This also follows from (3.5) along with Remark 2.7. The form of \mathcal{X} implies that every subspace of \mathbb{F}^4 containing a space in \mathcal{X} is itself in \mathcal{X} . Now it follows from Remark 2.7 that $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M})$. We turn to \mathcal{M}_G . Denote the diagonal blocks of G by G'_1 and G'_2 , thus

$$G = \begin{pmatrix} G'_1 & 0 \\ 0 & G'_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since both G'_1 and G'_2 represent the q -matroid \mathcal{M}_1 , any matrix $Y = (Y_1 \mid Y_2) \in \mathbb{F}^{t \times 4}$ satisfies

$$\text{rk}(G'_i Y_i^\top) = \rho_1(\pi_i(\text{rs}(Y))).$$

Let now $Y = (Y_1 \mid Y_2) \in \mathbb{F}^{t \times 4}$ be such that $\text{rs}(Y) \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{X}$. Then

$$\hat{\rho}(\text{rs}(Y)) = \text{rk}(GY^\top) \leq \text{rk}(G'_1 Y_1^\top) + \text{rk}(G'_2 Y_2^\top) = \rho_1(\pi_1(\text{rs}(Y))) + \rho_1(\pi_2(\text{rs}(Y))) < \text{rk } Y.$$

This shows that $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M}) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M}_G)$. This can also be concluded from the coproduct property of $\mathcal{M} \oplus \mathcal{M}$; see [4, Thm. 5.5]. It remains to show the converse containment. Let now $Y \in \mathbb{F}^{t \times 4}$ be a matrix of rank t such that $\text{rs}(Y) \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M}_G)$. Thus

$$\text{rk}(GY^\top) < t. \quad (3.7)$$

We will show that $\text{rs}(Y)$ is in \mathcal{X} . For $t \geq 3$ every Y satisfies (3.7) and $\text{rs}(Y)$ is contained in \mathcal{X} , while for $t = 1$ no matrix Y satisfies (3.7). It remains to consider the case $t = 2$. Let

$$Y = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & b_1 & c_1 & d_1 \\ a_2 & b_2 & c_2 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

be of rank 2 satisfying (3.7). Without loss of generality let Y be in RREF. We compute

$$GY^\top = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 + b_1 z & a_2 + b_2 z \\ c_1 + d_1 z^2 & c_2 + d_2 z^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\det(GY^\top) = (a_1 c_2 - a_2 c_1) + (b_1 c_2 - b_2 c_1)z + (a_1 d_2 - a_2 d_1)z^2 + (b_1 d_2 - b_2 d_1)z^3.$$

Recall that $1, z, z^2, z^3$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{F}_q by choice of G . Thanks to the RREF of Y we only have to consider the following cases.

- i) If $a_1 = b_1 = a_2 = b_2 = 0$, then $\text{rs}(Y) = \langle e_3, e_4 \rangle$ is in \mathcal{X} .
- ii) Let $a_1 = 1, a_2 = 0, b_1 = 0, b_2 = 1$. Then $\det(GY^\top) = c_2 - c_1z + d_2z^2 - d_1z^3$ and (3.7) implies $c_1 = c_2 = d_1 = d_2 = 0$. Thus $\text{rs}(Y) = \langle e_1, e_2 \rangle$, which is in \mathcal{X} .
- iii) Let $a_1 = 1$ and $a_2 = b_2 = 0$. Then $\det(GY^\top) = c_2 + b_1c_2z + d_2z^2 + b_1d_2z^3$ and (3.7) implies $c_2 = d_2 = 0$. But this contradicts that Y has rank 2 and thus this case does not occur.
- iv) Let $a_1 = a_2 = 0 = b_2$ and $b_1 = 1$. Then $\det(GY^\top) = c_2z + d_2z^3$ and (3.7) implies $c_2 = d_2 = 0$, which contradicts $\text{rk } Y = 2$. Hence this case does not occur either.

All of this shows that $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M}_G)$. Thanks to Remark 2.2 we arrive at $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_G$, and this shows the \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -representability of \mathcal{M} . \square

So far the only examples of q -matroids for which the direct sum is representable (over some field extension) are of rank 1 over a 2-dimensional ground space. We add a slightly larger example.

Example 3.9. Let $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_2$ and consider \mathbb{F}_{16} with primitive element ω satisfying $\omega^4 + \omega + 1 = 0$. Let $\alpha = \omega^5$, thus $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_4$. Set

$$G_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \alpha \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad G_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \alpha^2 \\ 0 & 1 & \alpha \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{F}_4^{2 \times 3}.$$

Let $\mathcal{M}_i = \mathcal{M}_{G_i}$ for $i = 1, 2$ (as q -matroids over the ground space \mathbb{F}^3) and $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1 \oplus \mathcal{M}_2$. Using SageMath one checks that \mathcal{M} is not $\hat{\mathbb{F}}$ -representable for $\hat{\mathbb{F}} \in \{\mathbb{F}_4, \mathbb{F}_8\}$, but \mathcal{M} is \mathbb{F}_{16} -represented by the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \alpha & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & w \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & w^4 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We close the paper with the following comment. Due to the definition of the rank function of the direct sum it is cumbersome to produce more insightful and larger examples. One needs to compute the rank value of all subspaces of $\mathbb{F}^{n_1+n_2}$ (or at least check them for independence). The examples that we were able to compute suggest that \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -representability of the direct sum is quite rare – at least if \mathbb{F}_{q^m} is the smallest field over which the summands are representable.

References

- [1] E. Byrne, M. Ceria, S. Ionica, and R. Jurrius. Weighted subspace design from q -polymatroids. Preprint 2021. arXiv: 2104.12463.
- [2] E. Byrne, M. Ceria, and R. Jurrius. Constructions of new q -cryptomorphisms. *J. Comb. Theory. Ser. B*, 153:149–194, 2022.
- [3] M. Ceria and R. Jurrius. The direct sum of q -matroids. Preprint 2021. arXiv: 2109.13637v3.

- [4] H. Gluesing-Luerssen and B. Jany. Coproducts in categories of q -matroids. arXiv: 2111.09723v2, 2021.
- [5] H. Gluesing-Luerssen and B. Jany. Independent spaces of q -polymatroids. *Algebr. Comb.*, 5:727–744, 2022.
- [6] H. Gluesing-Luerssen and B. Jany. q -Polymatroids and their relation to rank-metric codes. *J. Algebr. Comb.*, 56:725–753, 2022.
- [7] E. Gorla. Rank-metric codes. In W. C. Huffman, J.-L. Kim, and P. Solé, editors, *A Concise Encyclopedia of Coding Theory*, pages 227–250. CRC, 2021. See also arXiv 1902.02650.
- [8] R. Jurrius and R. Pellikaan. Defining the q -analogue of a matroid. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 25:P3.2, 2018.
- [9] J. Oxley. *Matroid Theory*. Oxford Graduate Text in Mathematics. Oxford University Press, 2nd edition, 2011.