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A short proof is given of a recent theorem of M. Feinberg on representable matroids. The result is shown not to hold for nonrepresentable matroids of rank 3.

Following Feinberg [1], we call a matroid $\mathbf{M}$ on a set $S$-independent in degrees if there is an ordering $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}$ of the elements of $S$ such that, for each $i(i=1, \ldots, m)$, there exist $k$ not necessarily distinct hyperplanes of $\mathbf{M}$ whose union contains $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{i-1}$ but not $x_{i}$. This implies that $\mathbf{M}$ has no loops or parallel elements (the effect of the hypothesis when $i=1$ being solely to ensure that $x_{1}$ is not a loop).
$\mathbf{M}$ is $k$-independent if the above statement is true for every ordering of the elements of $S$; that is, if, for each element $x$ of $S$, there exist $k$ not necessarily distinct hyperplanes of $\mathbf{M}$ whose union is exactly $S \backslash\{x\}$. So " 1 independent" and " 1 -independent in degrees" both mean exactly the same as "independent"; and, in general, " $k$-independent" implies " $k$-independent in degrees," but not vice versa.

The following theorem was proved by Feinberg in [1].
Theorem 1. Let $\mathbf{M}$ be a representable matroid of rank $r$ on a set $S$. If $\mathbf{M}$ is $k$-independent in degrees (and hence, a fortiori, if $\mathbf{M}$ is $k$-independent), then $|S| \leqslant\left({ }_{k}^{r+k-1}\right)$.

Proof. Choose a representation for $M$ as a set of $|S|$ distinct vectors in a vector space $V$ of dimension $r$ over some field $K$, so that independence in $\mathbf{M}$ corresponds to linear independence in $V$. Let $V^{(k)}$ be a vector space of

[^0]dimension $\left({ }^{r+k-1}{ }_{k}\right)$ over $K$, fix bases for $V$ and $V^{(k)}$, and define a map $f: V \rightarrow V^{(k)}$ as follows: if $\mathbf{x}=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{r}\right) \in V$, then the coordinates of $f(\mathbf{x})$ are all the distinct products of $k$ not necessarily distinct $x_{i}$ 's arranged in lexicographic order of suffixes. (For example, if $r=k=3$, then $\binom{r+k-1}{k}=10$ and
$$
\left.f(\mathrm{x})=\left(x_{1}^{3}, x_{1}^{2} x_{2}, x_{1}^{2} x_{3}, x_{1} x_{2}^{2}, x_{1} x_{2} x_{3}, x_{1} x_{3}^{2}, x_{2}^{3}, x_{2}^{2} x_{3}, x_{2} x_{3}^{2}, x_{3}^{3}\right) .\right)
$$

To prove the theorem, it suffices to prove that, if a subset $X$ of $V$ is $k$ independent in degrees, then $\{f(\mathbf{x}): \mathbf{x} \in X\}$ is linearly independent in $V^{(k)}$.

To do this, let $\mathbf{y} \in Y \subseteq X$ and suppose that $Y \backslash\{\mathbf{y}\}$ is covered by $k$ not necessarily distinct hyperplanes none of which contains $y$. Let the equations 'of these hyperplanes be $h_{1}=0, \ldots, h_{k}=0$, where each $h_{i}$ is a linear function of coordinates, $h_{i}=a_{i 1} x_{1}+\cdots+a_{i r} x_{r}$. Then $h_{1} \cdots h_{k}=0$ is a homogeneous equation of degree $k$ that is satisfied by all the points of $Y \backslash\{\mathbf{y}\}$ but not by $\mathbf{y}$. It can thus be reinterpreted as a linear equation that is satisfied by all the points of $\{f(\mathbf{x}): \mathbf{x} \in Y \backslash\{\mathbf{y}\}\}$ but not by $f(\mathbf{y})$.

Now, if $X$ is $k$-independent in degrees, then there is an ordering $\mathbf{x}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{m}$ of its elements such that, for each $i(i=1, \ldots, m)$, there are $k$ hyperplanes of $V$ whose union contains $\mathbf{x}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{i-1}$ but not $\mathbf{x}_{i}$. It follows from the previous paragraph that, for each $i(i=1, \ldots, m)$, there is a hyperplane of $V^{(k)}$ that contains $f\left(\mathbf{x}_{1}\right), \ldots, f\left(\mathbf{x}_{i-1}\right)$ but not $f\left(\mathbf{x}_{i}\right)$. Thus $\{f(\mathbf{x}): \mathbf{x} \in X\}$ is linearly independent in $V^{(k)}$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

This result clearly holds for non-representable matroids of ranks 1 and 2, but not (as we shall see in Example 2) for those of rank 3. For arbitrary matroids we have the following rather trivial upper bound.

Theorem 2. Let $\mathbf{M}$ be a matroid of rank $r$ on a set $S$. If $\mathbf{M}$ is $k$ independent in degrees (and hence, a fortiori, if $\mathbf{M}$ is $k$-independent), then $|S| \leqslant\left(k^{r}-1\right) /(k-1)$.

Proof. The proof is performed by induction on $r$. The result is clearly true if $r=1$ or 2 ; so suppose $r \geqslant 3$. Let $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}$ be the elements of $S$ ordered in such a way that, for each $i(i=1, \ldots, m)$, there are $k$ hyperplanes of $\mathbf{M}$ whose union contains $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{i-1}$ but not $x_{i}$. Let $H_{1}, \ldots, H_{k}$ be these $k$ hyperplanes in the case $i=m$. It is easy to see that, for each such hyperplane $H_{j}, \mathbf{M} \mid H_{j}$ is a matroid of rank $r-1$ that is $k$-independent in degrees. So, by the induction hypothesis, $\left|H_{j}\right| \leqslant\left(k^{r-1}-1\right) /(k-1)$ for each $j$, whence

$$
|S| \leqslant k \cdot \frac{k^{r-1}-1}{k-1}+1=\frac{k^{r}-1}{k-1}
$$

as required. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.
We now give two constructions, the first of which is used in the second
and also shows that Theorem 1 is best possible. (This example appears in [1].)

Example 1. Let $V$ be a vector space of dimension $r$ over any sufficiently large field. Choose $r+k-1$ hyperplanes in "general position" in $V$ (that is, such that only the zero vector belongs to $r$ or more of them). Each subset of $r-1$ of these hyperplanes then determines (intersects in) a onedimensional subspace. If $X$ is any set of $\binom{r+k-1}{r-1}=\binom{r+k-1}{k}$ non-zero vectors, one chosen from each of these one-dimensional subspaces, then it is clear that, for each $\mathbf{x}$ in $X, X \backslash\{\mathbf{x}\}$ can be covered by $k$ hyperplanes that do not contain x . Thus $X$ is $k$-independent (hence, $k$-independent in degrees).

For use in Example 2, consider the configuration of Example 1 in the case $r=3, k=t$ (say). The analogous affine or projective configuration consists of the $\binom{t+2}{2}$ points of intersection of $t+2$ lines in "general position" in a plane (meaning that no three lines are concurrent). If $n$ is a positive integer, let $S(n)$ denote any matroid obtained from such a configuration by deleting any $\binom{t+2}{2}-n$ points, where $t$ is as small as possible subject to $\binom{t+2}{2} \geqslant n$.

Example 2. Consider an affine plane $\Pi$ with $n^{2}$ points and $n^{2}+n$ lines. Let the $n$ lines in one particular parallel class be $L_{1}, \ldots, L_{n}$, and replace each of these by a configuration of type $S(n)$. Then the resulting configuration $\Pi^{\prime}$ is ( $n+t$ )-independent. For, let $P$ and $Q$ be two points of $L_{1}$ (say). The $n$ other lines of $\Pi$ through $Q$ cover all the points of $\Pi^{\prime}$ not in $L_{1}$ (and do not cover $P$ ); and, from the definition of the $S(n)$ that replaced $L_{1}$, there are $t$ lines in this $S(n)$ whose union is $L_{1} \backslash\{P\}$. Thus there are $n+t$ lines in $\Pi^{\prime}$ whose union is $\Pi^{\prime} \backslash\{P\}$. This holds for each point $P$ in $\Pi^{\prime}$, and so $\Pi^{\prime}$ is $(n+t)$-independent, as stated.

To show that the result of Theorem 1 does not apply to non-representable matroids, we can take $n=19, t=5$ in Example 2, and we get a 24independent matroid of rank 3 on $19^{2}=361$ points, whereas $\binom{24+2}{24}=\binom{26}{2}=325$. By combining the results of Example 2 and Theorem 2, one can show that the largest number of elements in a $k$-independent matroid of rank 3 is $k^{2}+o\left(k^{2}\right)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. It would be nice to reduce the error term in this expression.

It would also be nice to generalize this construction to larger values of $r$. It is still possible that Theorem 1 holds without the word "representable" if $r \geqslant 4$.
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