ROTA'S BASIS CONJECTURE FOR PAVING MATROIDS[*]

JIM GEELEN[†] AND PETER J. HUMPHRIES[‡]

Abstract. Rota conjectured that, given n disjoint bases of a rank-n matroid M, there are n disjoint transversals of these bases that are all bases of M. We prove a stronger statement for the class of paving matroids.

Key words. Rota's basis conjecture, paving matroids

AMS subject classification. 05B35

DOI. 10.1137/060655596

1. Introduction. We prove the following theorem.

THEOREM 1.1. *Let $B_1, \ldots, B_n$ be disjoint sets of size $n \geq 3$, and let $M_1, \ldots, M_n$ be rank-n paving matroids on $\bigcup_i B_i$ such that B_i is a basis of M_i for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. Then there exist n disjoint transversals $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ of $(B_1, \ldots, B_n)$ such that A_i is a basis of M_i for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$.*

A *paving matroid* M is a matroid in which each circuit has size $r(M)$ or $r(M)+1$, where $r(M)$ is the rank of M. Theorem 1.1 implies Rota's basis conjecture for paving matroids.

CONJECTURE 1.2 (Rota (see [6])). *Given n disjoint bases $B_1, \ldots, B_n$ in a rank-n matroid M, there exist n disjoint transversals $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ of $(B_1, \ldots, B_n)$ that are all bases of M.*

For $n = 2$, Conjecture 1.2 follows immediately from basis exchange in matroids. Chan [2] proved the conjecture for $n = 3$. Wild [9] proved a stronger conjecture for the class of strongly base-orderable matroids, while more recently a slightly weaker result was proved for a general matroid (Ponomarenko [8]). Further partial results may be found in [1], [3], [4], [5], and [9].

Theorem 1.1 fails for both $n = 2$ and matroids in general. When $n = 2$, if we take $\mathcal{B}(M_1) = \{\{e, f\}, \{e, g\}, \{f, h\}, \{g, h\}\}$ and $\mathcal{B}(M_2) = \{\{e, f\}, \{e, h\}, \{f, g\}, \{g, h\}\}$, then $\{e, f\}, \{g, h\}$ is the only pair of disjoint bases. In the second instance, if $r_{M_1}(E - B_1) = 0$, then there are no M_1-independent transversals of $(B_1, \ldots, B_n)$.

The remainder of this paper is taken up with the proof of the theorem. In section 2, we prove that Theorem 1.1 holds when $n = 3$. This result is used, in section 3, as the base case of an inductive proof of Theorem 1.1. The induction argument is surprisingly straightforward and can be read independently of section 2.

2. The case $n = 3$. For basic concepts in matroid theory, the reader is referred to Oxley [7]. We follow the same notation as Oxley throughout this paper.

A closed set in a matroid is commonly known as a flat. We will primarily be interested in rank-2 flats, or *lines*. In the proof of Theorem 2.1, we make frequent use

[†]Department of Combinatorics and Optimization, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON, Canada N2L 3G1.

[‡]Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand (pjh96@student.canterbury.ac.nz).

of the fact that if $r_M(X) = r_M(Y) = 2$ and $|X \cap Y| \geq 2$, then X and Y are contained in the same line in M.

THEOREM 2.1. *Theorem* 1.1 *holds for* $n = 3$.

Proof. Assume that the theorem is false. Then there exist bases $B_1 = \{a_1, a_2, a_3\}, B_2 = \{b_1, b_2, b_3\}, B_3 = \{c_1, c_2, c_3\}$ of rank-3 paving matroids M_1, M_2, M_3, respectively, with common ground set $E = B_1 \cup B_2 \cup B_3$, that provide a counterexample. The rank of a set X in M_i will be denoted by $r_i(X)$ and the closure by $\mathrm{cl}_i(X)$. A three-element subset of E will be called a *transversal* if it meets each of B_1, B_2, and B_3. Note that we may assume that every nontrivial line in each matroid contains a transversal, since all nontrivial lines not containing a transversal may be relaxed to provide an alternative counterexample (see [7, section 1.5, Exercise 3]).

2.1.1. *Let* $X \subseteq E$ *be a set that meets each of* B_1, B_2, B_3. *If* $r_i(X) = 3$, *then* X *contains an* M_i-*independent transversal.*

Subproof. Let $T \subseteq X$ be a transversal, and suppose that T is M_i-dependent. Then since $r_i(X) = 3$, there is some $e \in X$ such that $e \notin \mathrm{cl}_i(T)$. Without loss of generality, $e \in B_1$, so let f be the unique element in $T \cap B_1$. Then $r_i((T-f) \cup e) = 3$, and we are done. □

2.1.2. *If no* M_1-*dependent transversal contains both* a_1 *and* b_1, *then there exists* $e \in B_3$ *such that* $r_2(E - \{a_1, b_1, e\}) = 2$.

Subproof. For each $a \in B_1$ and $b \in B_2$, there exists $c \in B_3$ such that $\{a, b, c\}$ is M_3-independent (since $r_3(B_3) = 3$). In particular, there exist $e, f, g \in B_3$ such that $\{a_2, b_3, e\}$, $\{a_3, b_3, f\}$, and $\{a_2, b_2, g\}$ are M_3-independent. Then, by 2.1.1, $\{a_3, b_2\} \cup (B_3 - \{e\})$, $\{a_2, b_2\} \cup (B_3 - \{f\})$, and $\{a_3, b_3\} \cup (B_3 - \{g\})$ all have rank 2 in M_2 (since otherwise we would find the required partition into transversals). The second and third of these sets both have two points in common with the first, and so they are all contained in a common line in M_2. □

Suppose that M_1 has a line L containing at least seven elements. Since $r_1(B_1) = 3$, $|L - B_1| \geq 5$. Up to symmetry, we may assume that $b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2, c_3 \in L$ and that $a_1 \notin \mathrm{cl}_1(L)$. Now neither $\{a_1, b_1\}$ nor $\{a_1, b_2\}$ is in an M_1-dependent transversal. So by 2.1.2, $r_2(\{a_2, a_3, b_2, b_3\}) = r_2(\{a_2, a_3, b_1, b_3\}) = 2$, contradicting the fact that $r_2(B_2) = 3$. Thus none of M_1, M_2, and M_3 contains a line on seven or more elements.

2.1.3. *Every pair* $e \in B_i, f \notin B_i$ *is contained in some* M_i-*dependent transversal.*

Subproof. Suppose that no M_1-dependent transversal contains both a_1 and b_1. Then, by 2.1.2 and symmetry, we may assume that $r_2(E - \{a_1, b_1, c_1\}) = 2$. Let $X = E - \{a_1, b_1, c_1\}$ and $Y = X - B_1$. Each transversal in $\{a_2, a_3, b_2, b_3, c_1\}$ is M_2-independent, for otherwise $E - \{a_1, b_1\}$ is a seven-point line in M_2. Since each transversal in $\{a_1, b_1, c_2, c_3\}$ is M_1-independent, there is no M_3-independent transversal in X; thus $r_3(X) = 2$. Similarly, since each transversal in $\{a_2, a_3, b_1, c_2, c_3\}$ is M_2-independent and each transversal in $\{a_2, a_3, b_2, b_3, c_1\}$ is M_3-independent, we conclude that $r_1(Y \cup \{a_1\}) = 2$. Without loss of generality, $a_2 \notin \mathrm{cl}_1(Y)$, and so both $\{a_2, b_2, c_2\}$ and $\{a_2, b_3, c_3\}$ are M_1-independent. This means that $\{a_1, b_1, c_2\}$ and $\{a_1, b_1, c_3\}$ are M_2-dependent, for otherwise we again have three disjoint transversals that are independent in their respective matroids. Thus $r_2(\{a_1, b_1, c_2, c_3\}) = 2$, and $E - \{c_1\}$ is an eight-point line in M_2, which is a contradiction. □

Assume that B_2 is dependent in M_1. Thus, some line L in M_1 contains B_2; we may assume that L also contains a_1 and c_1, since any nontrivial line contains a transversal. There must be some element a_3, say, of B_1 that is not in $\mathrm{cl}_1(L)$, but then no transversal containing both a_3 and c_1 is dependent in M_1, leading to a contradiction by 2.1.3. Thus each of B_1, B_2, and B_3 is independent in all three matroids. This provides

additional symmetry, since we may now permute (B_1, B_2, B_3).

Suppose next that M_1 contains a five- (or six-) point line L. By the conclusion of the last paragraph, we may assume that $a_1, b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2 \in L$ and that $a_3 \notin \mathrm{cl}_1(L)$. Now, since there is an M_1-dependent transversal containing a_3, b_1, we have that $\{a_3, b_1, c_3\}$ must be M_1-dependent. Likewise $\{a_3, b_2, c_3\}$ is M_1-dependent, and thus $r_1(\{a_3, b_1, b_2, c_3\}) = 2$, contradicting the fact that $a_3 \notin \mathrm{cl}_1(L)$. Hence, none of M_1, M_2, and M_3 have lines containing more than four points.

We suppose now that the transversal $\{a_3, b_3, c_3\}$ is M_2-independent and M_3-dependent. Since $r_1(E - \{a_3, b_3, c_3\}) = 3$, we may assume that $\{a_1, b_1, c_1\}$ is M_1-independent, and also that $r_3(\{a_2, b_2, c_2\}) = 2$, for otherwise we have the required disjoint bases. Now, at most one of a_3, b_3, and c_3 may be contained in $\mathrm{cl}_3(\{a_2, b_2, c_2\})$, so without loss of generality both $\{a_2, b_3, c_2\}$ and $\{a_3, b_2, c_2\}$ are M_3-independent. Then $\{a_3, b_2, c_3\}$ and $\{a_2, b_3, c_3\}$ are both M_2-dependent. The transversal $\{a_2, b_2, c_3\}$ must now be M_2-independent, for otherwise we get a line in M_2 containing $\{a_3, b_3, c_3\}$. Thus $r_3(\{a_3, b_3, c_2\}) = 2$, and further $r_3(\{a_3, b_3, c_2, c_3\}) = 2$. Then both of $\{a_2, b_2, c_3\}$ and $\{a_3, b_2, c_3\}$ are M_3-independent, for otherwise there is a line in M_3 that contains $E - \{a_1, b_1, c_1\}$. So we have $r_2(\{a_3, b_3, c_2\}) = r_2(\{a_2, b_3, c_2\}) = 2$. This, together with the dependence of $\{a_3, b_2, c_3\}$ and $\{a_2, b_3, c_3\}$ in M_2, further implies that $\{a_3, b_3, c_3\}$ is M_2-dependent, which is a contradiction.

From now on, we may assume that M_1, M_2, and M_3 are the same matroid M, since they share the same set of independent transversals. Suppose that M contains the four-point line $\{a_3, b_3, c_2, c_3\}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\{a_1, b_1, c_1\}$ is independent in M, but then both $\{a_2, b_3, c_3\}$ and $\{a_3, b_2, c_2\}$ are also independent in M, so we are done.

Thus, the rank-2 flats in M each contain at most three points. Let $\{a_3, b_3, c_3\}$ be a dependent transversal of M. By 2.1.1, the set $\{a_3, b_2, c_1, c_2\}$ contains a transversal that is independent in M. Suppose without loss of generality that $\{a_3, b_2, c_2\}$ is such a transversal. Then, again by 2.1.1, the set $\{a_1, a_2, b_1, c_1\}$ contains an M-independent transversal, $\{a_1, b_1, c_1\}$ say. Finally, $\{a_2, b_3, c_3\}$ is also independent, for otherwise we get a four-point line, and we have the three required transversals. $\square$

3. Proof of Theorem 1.1. Before proving Theorem 1.1, we require two further lemmas. These allow us to apply induction with Theorem 2.1 as the base case. Let $\mathcal{B}(M)$ denote the set of bases of a matroid M.

LEMMA 3.1. *Let $B_1 \in \mathcal{B}(M_1), B_2 \in \mathcal{B}(M_2)$ be disjoint bases of rank-n paving matroids on the same ground set, where $n \geq 3$. Let X be a two-element subset of B_1. Then there is some $x \in X, y \in B_2$ such that $(B_1 - x) \cup y \in \mathcal{B}(M_1)$ and $(B_2 - y) \cup x \in \mathcal{B}(M_2)$.*

Proof. Since M_1, M_2 are paving matroids, $(B_1 - X) \cup y$ is M_1-independent for all $y \in B_2$. Suppose that both $(B_1 - x) \cup y$ and $(B_1 - x') \cup y$ are circuits in M_1, where x, x' are distinct elements of X. Then by circuit elimination, B_1 is also a circuit of M_1. Hence for each $y \in B_2$, at least one of $(B_1 - x) \cup y$ and $(B_1 - x') \cup y$ must be a basis of M_1.

Let y_1, y_2, y_3 be distinct elements of B_2. Then without loss of generality $(B_1 - x) \cup y_1, (B_1 - x) \cup y_2 \in \mathcal{B}(M_1)$. Also, one of $(B_2 - y_1) \cup x$ and $(B_2 - y_2) \cup x$ is a basis of M_2, so we are done. $\square$

LEMMA 3.2. *Let $B_1, \dots, B_n$ be disjoint sets of size $n \geq 3$, and let $M_1, \dots, M_n$ be rank-n paving matroids on $\bigcup_i B_i$ such that B_i is a basis of M_i for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Then there is an ordering of the elements of B_1 as $a_1, \dots, a_n$ and a transversal $\{b_2, \dots, b_n\}$ of $(B_2, \dots, B_n)$ such that for all $j \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ the set*

$(B_1 - \{a_2, \ldots, a_j\}) \cup \{b_2, \ldots, b_j\}$ *is a basis of* M_1, *and* $(B_j - b_j) \cup a_j$ *is a basis of* M_j.

Proof. For $j = 2$, the lemma follows immediately from Lemma 3.1. Suppose now that the lemma holds for some $j \in \{2, \ldots, n-1\}$, so that $B' = (B_1 - \{a_2, \ldots, a_j\}) \cup \{b_2, \ldots, b_j\} \in \mathcal{B}(M_1)$. Then $|B_1 \cap B'| \geq 2$, and so by Lemma 3.1 there is some element $a_{j+1} \in B_1 \cap B'$ and some $b_{j+1} \in B_{j+1}$ such that $(B' - a_{j+1}) \cup b_{j+1} \in \mathcal{B}(M_1)$ and $(B_{j+1} - b_{j+1}) \cup a_{j+1} \in \mathcal{B}(M_{j+1})$, thus proving the lemma. $\quad\square$

Lemma 3.2 is stated for $j \in \{2, \ldots, n\}$ to simplify the induction process. We need the result only for $j = n$ to prove main theorem of this paper.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Assume that the theorem is true for some $m \geq 3$, and take $n = m + 1$. Let $B_1 = \{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}$ and $b_i \in B_i$ for each $i \in \{2, \ldots, n\}$. By Lemma 3.2 we may assume that $A_1 = \{a_1, b_2, \ldots, b_n\}$ is a basis of M_1 and that $B_i' = (B_i - b_i) \cup a_i$ is a basis of M_i for each $i \in \{2, \ldots, n\}$.

Now let $X = E - (B_1 \cup A_1)$ and $M_i' = (M_i/a_i)|X$ for each $i \in \{2, \ldots, n\}$. Then each M_i' is a rank-m paving matroid having $B_i - b_i$ as a basis. By our induction hypothesis, there are disjoint transversals $A_2', \ldots, A_n'$ of these m bases such that A_i' is a basis of M_i'. Hence $A_i = A_i' \cup a_i$ is a basis of M_i for each $i \in \{2, \ldots, n\}$. Moreover, the bases $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ are disjoint transversals of $(B_1, \ldots, B_n)$, as required. $\quad\square$

REFERENCES

[1] R. AHARONI AND E. BERGER, *The intersection of a matroid and a simplicial complex*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 358 (2006), pp. 4895–4917.

[2] W. CHAN, *An exchange property of matroid*, Discrete Math., 146 (1995), pp. 299–302.

[3] T. CHOW, *On the Dinitz conjecture and related conjectures*, Discrete Math., 145 (1995), pp. 73–82.

[4] A. A. DRISKO, *On the number of even and odd Latin squares of order $p+1$*, Adv. Math., 128 (1997), pp. 20–35.

[5] A. A. DRISKO, *Proof of the Alon-Tarsi conjecture for $n = 2^r p$*, Electron. J. Combin., 5 (1998), paper R28.

[6] R. HUANG AND G.-C. ROTA, *On the relations of various conjectures on Latin squares and straightening coefficients*, Discrete Math., 128 (1994), pp. 225–236.

[7] J. G. OXLEY, *Matroid Theory*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1992.

[8] V. PONOMARENKO, *Reduction of jump systems*, Houston J. Math., 30 (2004), pp. 27–33.

[9] M. WILD, *On Rota's problem about n bases in a rank n matroid*, Adv. Math., 108 (1994), pp. 336–345.