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#### Abstract

Let $B=\cup_{i=1}^{n} B_{i}$ be a partition of base $B$ in the union (or sum) of $n$ matroids into independent sets $B_{i}$ of $M_{i}$. We prove that every other base $B^{\prime}$ has such a partition where $B_{i}$ and $B_{i}^{\prime}$ span the same set in $M_{i}$ for $i=1,2, \ldots, n$.
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## 1 Introduction

For the definitions and notations in matroid theory the reader is referred to [5] or [6]. In particular, let $E$ denote the common underlying set of every matroid and let $r_{1}, r_{2}, \ldots, r_{n}$ denote the rank functions of the matroids $M_{1}, M_{2}, \ldots, M_{n}$, respectively. Throughout $M$ will denote the union (or sum) $\vee_{i=1}^{n} M_{i}$ of these matroids, and $R$ will denote the rank function of $M$. A subset $X \subseteq E$ is independent in $M$ if and only if it arises as $X=\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} X_{i}$ with $X_{i}$ independent in $M_{i}$ for each $i$. Recall that

$$
R(X)=\min _{Y \subseteq X}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} r_{i}(Y)+|X-Y|\right]
$$

by the fundamental results of [1] and [4].
An element of the underlying set $E$ of a matroid is a loop if it is dependent as a single element subset, and it is a coloop if it is contained in every base. We shall need the following observation ([3], independently rediscovered in [2]):

Proposition 1 If $M$ has no coloops, then $R(E)=\sum_{i=1}^{n} r_{i}(E)$.
The weak map relation is defined as follows: the matroid $B$ is freer than $A$ (denoted by $A \preceq B)$ if every independent set of $A$ is independent in $B$ as well. Clearly $M_{j} \preceq \vee_{i=1}^{n} M_{i}$ for every $j=1,2, \ldots, n$ and $A \preceq B$ implies $A \vee C \preceq B \vee C$ for every $C$.
Let $\sigma_{i}(X)$ denote the closure of a set $X \subseteq E$ in $M_{i}$, that is, $\sigma_{i}(X)=\left\{e \mid r_{i}(X \cup\{e\})=\right.$
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Fig. 1.
$\left.r_{i}(X)\right\}$. Let $\sigma(X)$ denote the closure of $X$ in $M$. A set $X \subseteq E$ is closed if $\sigma(X)=X$. The closed sets are also called flats. In particular, the set of loops, that is $\sigma(\emptyset)$ is the smallest and $E$ is the largest flat. We shall need the following easy property of the closure function:

Proposition 2 Let $S_{1}, S_{2} \subseteq E$ be independent subsets with $\sigma\left(S_{1}\right)=\sigma\left(S_{2}\right)=S$. Let, furthermore, $S_{0} \subseteq E$ so that $S \cap S_{0}=\emptyset$ and $S_{1} \cup S_{0}$ is independent. Then $S_{2} \cup S_{0}$ is also independent.

Proof: Observe that $\left|S_{1}\right|=\left|S_{2}\right|$ since both are independent and span the same subset $S$. Indirectly suppose that $r\left(S_{2} \cup S_{0}\right)<\left|S_{2}\right|+\left|S_{0}\right|=\left|S_{1}\right|+\left|S_{0}\right|=\left|S_{1} \cup S_{0}\right|$. Since $S_{1} \cup S_{0}$ is independent, there exists an element $x \in S_{1}-S_{2}$ so that $r\left(S_{2} \cup S_{0} \cup\{x\}\right)>r\left(S_{2} \cup S_{0}\right)$. However, $x \in S_{1} \subseteq S=\sigma\left(S_{2}\right)$ implies that $r\left(S_{2} \cup\{x\}\right)=r\left(S_{2}\right)$, a contradiction.

## 2 Partitioning the bases

Let $B$ be a base of $M$. The partition $B_{1}, B_{2}, \ldots, B_{n}$ of $B$ is a good partition if $B_{i}$ is independent in $M_{i}$ for $i=1,2, \ldots, n$.
Let $F_{i}=\sigma_{i}\left(B_{i}\right)$ for every $i$. This collection of flats $F_{1}, F_{2}, \ldots, F_{n}$ depends on the actual good partition of $B$, as illustrated by the following example.

Example 3 If $M_{1}$ and $M_{2}$ are the cycle matroids of the graphs $G_{1}$ and $G_{2}$ of Figure 1, respectively, then $M$ will be the cycle matroid of the graph of Figure 2. The base $B=$ $\{1,2,4,5,6,7\}$ of $M$ has 54 good partitions, see the first two columns of Table 1, where each row represents six good partitions (put $a, b \in\{1,2,3\}, a \neq b$ in every possible way). These good partitions lead to 9 different collections of flats, see columns 3 and 4 of Table 1.

Table 1

|  | $B_{1}$ | $B_{2}$ | $F_{1}$ | $F_{2}$ |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $\{a, 4,6,7\}$ | $\{b, 5\}$ | $E$ | $\{1,2,3,5\}$ |
| 2 | $\{a, 5,6,7\}$ | $\{b, 4\}$ | $E$ | $\{1,2,3,4\}$ |
| 3 | $\{a, 4,6\}$ | $\{b, 5,7\}$ | $E-\{7\}$ | $E-\{4\}$ |
| 4 | $\{a, 4,7\}$ | $\{b, 5,6\}$ | $E-\{6\}$ | $E-\{4\}$ |
| 5 | $\{a, 5,6\}$ | $\{b, 4,7\}$ | $E-\{7\}$ | $E-\{5\}$ |
| 6 | $\{a, 5,7\}$ | $\{b, 4,6\}$ | $E-\{6\}$ | $E-\{5\}$ |
| 7 | $\{a, 6,7\}$ | $\{b, 4,5\}$ | $E-\{4,5\}$ | $E-\{6,7\}$ |
| 8 | $\{a, 6\}$ | $\{b, 4,5,7\}$ | $\{1,2,3,6\}$ | $E$ |
| 9 | $\{a, 7\}$ | $\{b, 4,5,6\}$ | $\{1,2,3,7\}$ | $E$ |



Fig. 2.
Surprisingly if we consider any other base of the union, the list of the possible collections of flats will always be the same.

Theorem 4 Let $M_{1}, M_{2}, \ldots, M_{n}$ be matroids and let $M$ be their union. Let $B$ be a base of $M$ with a good partition $B_{1}, B_{2}, \ldots, B_{n}$. For any base $B^{\prime}$ of $M$ there is a good partition $\cup_{i=1}^{n} B_{i}^{\prime}$ so that $\sigma_{i}\left(B_{i}\right)=\sigma_{i}\left(B_{i}^{\prime}\right)$ for $i=1,2, \ldots, n$.

Proof: Suppose that $B^{\prime}$ is a base of the union with a good partition $X_{1}, X_{2}, \ldots, X_{n}$.
Let $A$ denote the set of the non-coloop elements of the union. $B^{\prime}$ is independent in the union so $\left|B^{\prime} \cap A\right|=R\left(B^{\prime} \cap A\right)$. Clearly $R\left(B^{\prime} \cap A\right)=R(A)$ since $B^{\prime}$ is a base in the union, and $\sigma(A)=A$. According to Proposition $1 \sum_{i=1}^{n} r_{i}(A)=R(A)$. Now $r_{i}(A) \geq r_{i}\left(X_{i} \cap A\right)$ since $X_{i} \cap A \subseteq A$, and $r_{i}\left(X_{i} \cap A\right)=\left|X_{i} \cap A\right|$ since $X_{i}$ is independent in $M_{i}$. These together give the following:

$$
\left|B^{\prime} \cap A\right|=R\left(B^{\prime} \cap A\right)=R(A)=\sum_{i=1}^{n} r_{i}(A) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n} r_{i}\left(X_{i} \cap A\right)=\left|B^{\prime} \cap A\right|
$$

Since the two sides are equal, the inequality must be satisfied as equality, so $r_{i}(A)=$
$r_{i}\left(X_{i} \cap A\right)$. This means that every good partition $X_{1}, X_{2}, \ldots, X_{n}$ of a base $B^{\prime}$ of the union will satisfy $\sigma_{i}\left(A \cap X_{i}\right)=A$, that is, $X_{i} \cap A$ spans $A$ in $M_{i}$ for $i=1,2, \ldots, n$.
These results are true for $B$, too, so $B_{i} \cap A$ spans $A$ in $M_{i}$ for $i=1,2, \ldots, n$. All the coloops of $M$ are in $B \cap B^{\prime}$, this way we can get a good partition of $B^{\prime}$, namely $B_{i}^{\prime}=\left(X_{i} \cap A\right) \cup\left(B_{i} \backslash A\right)$ according to Proposition 2. This partition satisfies the requirements of Theorem 4.

## 3 Weak maps with the same union

Let $B$ be an arbitrary base of $M$ with an arbitrary good partition $\cup_{i=1}^{n} B_{i}$. Let $F_{i}=\sigma_{i}\left(B_{i}\right)$ for every $i$ and let $M_{i}^{\prime}$ be obtained from $M_{i}$ by replacing all the elements of $E-F_{i}$ by loops. (That is, $M_{i}^{\prime}$ has ground set $E$ and $X \subseteq E$ is independent in $M_{i}^{\prime}$ if and only if $X \subseteq F_{i}$ and $X$ is independent in $M_{i}$.)

Proposition 5 If $M^{\prime}=\vee_{i=1}^{n} M_{i}^{\prime}$ then $M^{\prime}=M$.

Proof: Clearly $M_{i}^{\prime} \preceq M_{i}$, and therefore $M^{\prime}=\vee_{i=1}^{n} M_{i}^{\prime} \preceq \vee_{i=1}^{n} M_{i}=M$.
On the other hand we have to prove that any independent set $X$ of $M$ is independent in $M^{\prime}$ as well.
Let $B^{\prime}$ be a base of $M$, containing $X$. By Theorem 4, there exists a good partition $\cup_{i=1}^{n} B_{i}^{\prime}$ of $B^{\prime}$ so that $\sigma_{i}\left(B_{i}^{\prime}\right)=F_{i}$ for every $i$. Since $B_{i}^{\prime}$ is independent in $M_{i}^{\prime}$, so is $B_{i}^{\prime} \cap X$. Hence $X=\cup_{i=1}^{n}\left(B_{i}^{\prime} \cap X\right)$ is independent in $M^{\prime}$, as requested.

Example 6 illustrates Proposition 5.

Example 6 Let $M_{1}$ and $M_{2}$ be the cycle matroids of the graphs $G_{1}$ and $G_{2}$ of Figure 1, as in Example 3. Consider the pair of flats $E,\{1,2,3,5\}$ as in the first row of Table 1. The corresponding restricted matroids $M_{1}^{\prime}, M_{2}^{\prime}$ are represented by the graphs of the first row of Figure 3. One can easily see that $M_{1}^{\prime} \vee M_{2}^{\prime}$ is still the cycle matroid of the graph of Figure 2. Similarly, the pairs of flats, given by rows 3 and 9 of Table 1 lead to the second and third rows of Figure 3, respectively.
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