

Reduction of Rota's basis conjecture to a problem on three bases

Timothy Y. Chow

Center for Communications Research, 805 Bunn Drive, Princeton, NJ 08540

Abstract

It is shown that Rota's basis conjecture follows from a similar conjecture that involves just three bases instead of n bases.

Key words: common independent sets, non-base-orderable matroid, odd wheel

1 Introduction

In 1989, Rota formulated the following conjecture, which remains open.

Conjecture 1 (Rota's basis conjecture) *Let M be a matroid of rank n on n^2 elements that is a disjoint union of n bases B_1, B_2, \dots, B_n . Then there exists an $n \times n$ grid G containing each element of M exactly once, such that for every i , the elements of B_i appear in the i th row of G , and such that every column of G is a basis of M .*

Partial results towards this conjecture may be found in [1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,12,14,15]. Now consider the following conjecture.

Conjecture 2 *Let M be a matroid of rank n on $3n$ elements that is a disjoint union of 3 bases. Let I_1, I_2, \dots, I_n be disjoint independent sets of M , with $0 \leq |I_i| \leq 3$ for all i . Then there exists an $n \times 3$ grid G containing each element of M exactly once, such that for every i , the elements of I_i appear in the i th row of G , and such that every column of G is a basis of M .*

The main purpose of the present note is to make the following observation.

Theorem 3 *Conjecture 2 implies Conjecture 1.*

Our proof is inspired by the proof of Theorem 4 in [10].

PROOF. Since Conjecture 1 is known if $n \leq 2$, we may assume that $n \geq 3$. Let M be given as in the hypothesis of Conjecture 1. Define a *transversal* to be a subset $\tau \subseteq M$ that contains exactly one element from each B_i . Define a *double partition* of M to be a pair (β, τ) where $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_n)$ is a partition of M into n pairwise disjoint bases β_i and $\tau = (\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_n)$ is a partition of M into n pairwise disjoint transversals. Given a double partition (β, τ) , define

$$\mu(\beta, \tau) = \sum_{i \neq j} |\beta_i \cap \tau_j|.$$

Observe that if $\mu(\beta, \tau) = 0$ then necessarily $\beta_i = \tau_i$ for all i , and then Rota's basis conjecture follows—just let the (i, j) entry of G be $B_i \cap \tau_j$.

So let (β, τ) be an arbitrary double partition with $\mu(\beta, \tau) > 0$. We show how to construct a double partition (β', τ') with $\mu(\beta', \tau') < \mu(\beta, \tau)$; the proof is then complete, by infinite descent, since by hypothesis there exists at least one double partition. Since $\mu(\beta, \tau) > 0$, there exist β_i and τ_j with $i \neq j$ such that $\beta_i \cap \tau_j \neq \emptyset$. Since $n \geq 3$, there also exists k such that i, j , and k are all distinct. It will simplify notation to assume that $i = 1$, $j = 2$, and $k = 3$; no generality is lost, and it will be convenient to be able to reuse the index variables i and j below. Let $S = \beta_1 \cup \beta_2 \cup \beta_3$, let $T = \tau_1 \cup \tau_2 \cup \tau_3$, and let $M' = M|S$ (i.e., M restricted to the ground set S).

For each i , let $I_i = B_i \cap T \cap S$. Then I_i is an independent subset of the matroid M' , and $|I_i| \leq |B_i \cap T| \leq 3$. The I_i are pairwise disjoint because the B_i are pairwise disjoint. Therefore we may apply Conjecture 2 to obtain an $n \times 3$ grid G' whose columns β'_1 , β'_2 , and β'_3 are disjoint bases of M' (and therefore are bases of M) and whose i th row contains the elements of I_i .

To construct the desired double partition (β', τ') , let $\beta' = \beta$ except with β_1 , β_2 , and β_3 replaced with β'_1 , β'_2 , and β'_3 respectively. Similarly, let $\tau' = \tau$ except with τ_1 , τ_2 , and τ_3 replaced with τ'_1 , τ'_2 , and τ'_3 , which are defined as follows. Let G'' be any $n \times 3$ grid whose i th row contains the elements of $B_i \cap T$ in some order, and whose (i, j) entry agrees with that of G' whenever that entry is in I_i . Clearly G'' exists (though it may not be unique). Let τ'_j be the j th column of G'' , for $j = 1, 2, 3$.

It is easily verified that what we have done is to regroup the elements of M' into three new bases and to regroup the elements of T into three new transversals in such a way that the contribution to $\mu(\beta', \tau')$ from intersections of the new bases with the new transversals is reduced to zero, and such that the total of the other contributions to μ is unchanged. Thus the overall value of μ is reduced, as required. \square

Careful inspection of the above proof shows that it is easily adapted to prove a stronger statement than Theorem 3. Let $C(k)$ denote the statement obtained by replacing '3' with ' k ' throughout Conjecture 2. Then the above argument,

mutatis mutandis, yields the following result.

Theorem 4 *For any $\ell \geq k \geq 2$, $C(k)$ implies $C(\ell)$.*

In particular, proving $C(k)$ for any fixed k would prove Rota’s basis conjecture (in fact a stronger statement, namely $C(n)$) for all n greater than or equal to that fixed k .

It is therefore natural to ask why we have formulated Conjecture 2 as $C(3)$ rather than as $C(2)$. The reason is that $C(2)$ is false. The simplest counterexample is a well-known stumbling block that is partly responsible for the fact that there is no known general “matroid union intersection theorem,” i.e., a criterion for determining the minimum number of common independent sets that a set with two matroid structures on it can be partitioned into. Namely, take $M(K_4)$, the graphic matroid of the complete graph on four vertices, and let the I_i be the three pairs of non-incident edges of K_4 . Another counterexample arises from a matroid that Oxley [11] calls J . Representing J by vectors in Euclidean 4-space, we can for example let

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \{(-2, 3, 0, 1), (0, 0, 1, 1)\} \\ I_2 &= \{(0, 2, 0, 1), (1, 0, 3, 1)\} \\ I_3 &= \{(1, 0, 0, 1), (0, 1, 2, 1)\} \\ I_4 &= \{(0, 1, 0, 1), (4, 0, 0, 1)\} \end{aligned}$$

It may be possible to construct other examples from non-base-orderable matroids such as those in [9].

Despite these counterexamples to $C(2)$, we believe that Conjecture 2 is plausible. Using a database of matroids with nine elements kindly supplied by Gordon Royle [13], we have computationally verified Conjecture 2 for the case $n = 3$.

In an earlier version of this paper, the formulation of Conjecture 2 did not require the I_i to be independent. A counterexample to that version of the conjecture was found by Colin McDiarmid. Take the complete graph on the vertex set $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, and create an extra copy of the three edges incident to vertex 4. Call the edges 12, 13, 14, 23, 24, 34, 14', 24', 34', and let $I_1 = \{14, 14', 23\}$, $I_2 = \{24, 24', 13\}$, and $I_3 = \{34, 34', 12\}$. More generally, as pointed out by an anonymous referee, if k is odd, then a wheel with $k - 1$ copies of each of its k spokes yields a counterexample to $C(k)$ if the I_i are not required to be independent.

In closing, we speculate that Conjecture 2 might be provable using the following strategy. First, develop a modified version of $C(2)$ that says that the conclusion holds provided certain “obstructions” (such as $M(K_4)$ and J) are absent. Then use Rado’s theorem (12.2.2 of [11]), or a suitable strengthening

of it, to construct a first column of G in such a way that the remaining $2n$ elements are obstruction-free. Applying the modified version of $C(2)$ would then yield the desired result. The analysis of obstructions should hopefully be tractable since there are only 3 columns to consider.

2 Acknowledgments

I wish to thank Jonathan Farley, Patrick Brosnan, and James Oxley for useful discussions, and a referee for correcting an error in my counterexample based on J .

References

- [1] R. Aharoni and E. Berger, The intersection of a matroid and a simplicial complex, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **358** (2006), 4895–4917.
- [2] W. Chan, An exchange property of matroid, *Discrete Math.* **146** (1995), 299–302.
- [3] T. Chow, On the Dinitz conjecture and related conjectures, *Discrete Math.* **145** (1995), 73–82.
- [4] A. A. Drisko, On the number of even and odd Latin squares of order $p + 1$, *Advances in Math.* **128** (1997), 20–35.
- [5] A. A. Drisko, Proof of the Alon-Tarsi conjecture for $n = 2^r p$, *Electron. J. Combin.* **5** (1998), R28.
- [6] J. Geelen and P. J. Humphries, Rota’s basis conjecture for paving matroids, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* **20** (2006), 1042–1045.
- [7] J. Geelen and K. Webb, On Rota’s basis conjecture, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* **21** (2007), 802–804.
- [8] R. Huang and G.-C. Rota, On the relations of various conjectures on Latin squares and straightening coefficients, *Discrete Math.* **128** (1994), 225–236.
- [9] A. W. Ingleton, Non-base-orderable matroids, *Proc. 5th British Combin. Conf.* (1975), 355–359.
- [10] J. Keijsper, An algorithm for packing connectors, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **74** (1998), 397–404.
- [11] J. G. Oxley, *Matroid Theory*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1992.
- [12] V. Ponomarenko, Reduction of jump systems, *Houston J. Math.* **30** (2004), 27–33.

- [13] D. Mayhew and G. F. Royle, Matroids with nine elements, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **98** (2008), 415–431.
- [14] M. Wild, On Rota’s problem about n bases in a rank n matroid, *Advances in Math.* **108** (1994), 336–345.
- [15] P. Zappa, The Cayley determinant of the determinant tensor and the Alon-Tarsi conjecture, *Advances in Appl. Math.* **19** (1997), 31–44.