Linear Matroid Intersection is in quasi-NC*

Rohit Gurjar[1] and Thomas Thierauf[2]

[1]California Institute of Technology
[2]Aalen University

August 20, 2018

Abstract

Given two matroids on the same ground set, the matroid intersection problem asks to find a common independent set of maximum size. In case of linear matroids, the problem had a randomized parallel algorithm but no deterministic one. We give an almost complete derandomization of this algorithm, which implies that the linear matroid intersection problem is in quasi-NC^2. That is, it has uniform circuits of quasi-polynomial size $n^{O(\log n)}$ and $O(\log^2 n)$ depth. This generalizes a similar result for the bipartite perfect matching problem. Our main technical contribution is to derandomize the Isolation lemma for the family of common bases of two matroids.

We use our isolation result to give a quasi-polynomial time blackbox algorithm for a special case of *Edmonds' problem i.e., singularity testing of a symbolic matrix*, when the given matrix is of the form $A_0 + A_1x_1 + \cdots + A_mx_m$, for an arbitrary matrix A_0 and rank-1 matrices $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_m$. This can also be viewed as a blackbox polynomial identity testing algorithm for the corresponding determinant polynomial. Another consequence of this result is a deterministic solution to the maximum rank matrix completion problem.

Finally, we use our result to find a deterministic representation for the union of linear matroids in quasi-NC^2.

1 Introduction

Matroids are combinatorial structures that generalize the notion of *linear independence* in Linear Algebra. A matroid M is a pair $M = (E, \mathcal{I})$, where E is the finite ground set and $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(E)$ is a family of subsets of E that are said to be the *independent sets*. There are two axioms the independent sets must satisfy: (1) closure under subsets and (2) the *augmentation property* – for any two independent sets of different sizes, the smaller one can be augmented with an element from the bigger one to obtain a new independent set (See the Preliminary Section for exact definitions).

Matroids are motivated by Linear Algebra. For an $n \times m$ matrix V over some field, let $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_m$ be the column vectors of V, in this order. We define the ground set $E = \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$ as the set of indices of the columns of V. A set $I \subseteq E$ is defined to be independent, if the collection of vectors v_i, for $i \in I$, is linearly independent. Then $M = (E, \mathcal{I})$ is a matroid: Any subset of an independent set is again independent. The augmentation property is equivalent to the Steinitz

*Supported by DFG grant TH 472/4. A preliminary version appeared in the proceedings of 49th Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing (STOC) 2017. Email: rohitgurjar0@gmail.com, thomas.thierauf@uni-ulm.de

Exchange Lemma for two bases of the vector space spanned by the column vectors of V. A matroid is called *linear*, if it can be represented by a matrix in the above sense over some field.

Although we will formulate most of our results in terms of general matroids, our main result is for *linear* matroids. Hence, for a reader who is unfamiliar with matroid theory, it suffices to think of a matroid simply as a matrix as described above.

The augmentation property implies that all inclusion-wise maximal independent sets have the same size. A maximal independent set is called a *base* of the matroid. The *matroid problem* consists in computing a base of a given matroid. It can be solved efficiently by a simple *greedy algorithm*, provided that we can efficiently test whether a set is independent. There is also a parallel algorithm if we are given a rank oracle for the matroid: for each i, include the i-th element in the base if its inclusion to the set of first $i-1$ elements increases the rank of the set. See [KUW88] for parallel complexity of matroid problems under various oracles.

In the *matroid intersection problem*, we are given two matroids M_1 and M_2 over the same ground set. One has to find the largest set which is independent in both matroids. In the Linear Algebra example, we are given two matrices U and V of the same dimensions. We want to compute the largest set I of indices, such that the columns of U and the columns of V indexed by I are both independent sets. As another example, the bipartite matching problem can be expressed as a matroid intersection problem.

The matroid intersection problem can be solved in polynomial time by an algorithm due to Edmonds [Edm68, Edm79]. Edmonds' algorithm is a generalization of the famous augmenting path algorithm for bipartite matching. In the case of linear matroids, its parallel complexity is also similar to the matching problem. Narayanan, Saran, and Vazirani [NSV94] presented a randomized NC-algorithm based on the *Isolation Lemma*. Applied to matroid intersection, the Isolation Lemma states that randomly chosen weights for the elements of the ground sets isolate a common base, i.e., there is a unique minimum weight common base set, with high probability.

In order to obtain *deterministic* parallel algorithms, the derandomization of the Isolation Lemma is a major open problem. Recently, the authors together with Fenner [FGT16] (almost) achieved this in the case of bipartite perfect matching and presented a quasi-NC-algorithm for this problem. In the current paper, we generalize the matching algorithm to a quasi-NC-algorithm for linear matroid intersection. Our main result (Theorem 3.1) is:

Linear Matroid Intersection is in quasi-NC.

This puts a rich class of problems in quasi-NC. To give a few examples, besides perfect matching, the following combinatorial problems NC-reduce to linear matroid intersection (see [Sch03]), and thus, fall into the class quasi-NC.

- finding an r-arborescence in a directed graph,
- finding two edge-disjoint spanning trees in a graph,
- finding a rainbow spanning tree in an edge-colored graph,
- finding a shortest $R-S$ biconnector and a longest $R-S$ biforest of a graph.

See Section 4.4 for definitions and reductions to linear matroid intersection. To the best of our knowledge, there is no better bound known on the parallel complexity of the last three problems. In fact, the last two problems generalize the bipartite matching problem, for which quasi-NC is still the best known bound. On the other hand the r-arborescence problem already had an NC algorithm due to Lovász [Lov85].

Our main technique is to deterministically construct a weight assignment that isolates a common base of the two given matroids. Hence this can again be seen as a derandomization of the Isolation Lemma in this setting. Following the approach of the matching result [FGT16], we look at the isolation question in the corresponding polytope. However, since the matroid intersection polytope has a more complicated description than the bipartite matching polytope, we need more ideas. The novel part is to analyze the faces of the matroid intersection polytope (Section 3.2) and to come up with an appropriate definition of *cycles in the intersection of two matroids* (Section 3.3). As before, our weights have $O(\log^2 n)$ bits, and so we obtain circuits of quasi-polynomial size $n^{O(\log n)}$. Hence, we get linear matroid intersection in quasi-NC^2.

It remains open whether the problem is in NC. We would like to point out that our isolating weight assignment actually works for general matroid intersection and even for polymatroid intersection. However, we get the quasi-NC-bound only in the case of linear matroids, because only there do we have a connection to the determinant.

Subsequent to this work, our derandomization of the Isolation Lemma has been generalized to a larger class of families [GTV17].

1.1 Polynomial Identity Testing (PIT) and Singularity of Symbolic Matrices

Our derandomization of the Isolation Lemma in the above setting also gives a blackbox polynomial identity testing algorithm for an interesting class of polynomials. The *polynomial identity problem* asks whether a given multivariate polynomial is the zero-polynomial. The polynomial can be given, for example, as an arithmetic circuit, an arithmetic branching program, or a symbolic matrix. In the latter case, the polynomial is the defined as the determinant of the symbolic matrix. Given a polynomial in one of these representations, it might take exponential time to compute an explicit representation as a sum of monomials. However, evaluating the polynomial at a point is easy, and this suffices for an easy randomized polynomial identity test: just evaluate the polynomial at a random point. It is known that a nonzero polynomial will have a nonzero evaluation with high probability [DL78, Sch80, Zip79]. However, no nontrivial deterministic tests are known. Deterministic PIT is known to have connections with arithmetic circuit lower bounds [KI03, Agr05].

The *singularity problem of symbolic matrices*, also known as *Edmonds' problem* [Edm67], is a special case of PIT. Given a matrix A whose entries are linear forms in a set of formal variables, one has to determine whether A is singular, i.e., whether $\det(A)$ is the zero-polynomial. This problem captures PIT for small degree arithmetic circuits, with only a quasi-polynomial blow-up [Val79, VSBR83]. Efficient polynomial singularity tests are known only for very restricted cases. One such case which has received a lot of attention is when A is of the form $A = \sum_i z_i A_i$, where the A_i's are rank-1 matrices [Edm67, Lov89, Mur93]. Singularity testing for this case corresponds exactly to the linear matroid intersection question (see Sections 2.4 and 4.1), and thus has a polynomial-time algorithm [Edm79, Lov89]. However, no *blackbox* PIT algorithm was known for this case. A blackbox algorithm does not read its input, it only uses the input size. In our case, the algorithm does not use the entries of the given matrices, just the number of matrices and their dimension. The goal is to construct a *hitting set*, a set of points such that if the polynomial is nonzero, then it evaluates to nonzero at least at one of the points. With our derandomization of the Isolation Lemma we get a hitting set for $\det(\sum_i z_i A_i)$, when the A_i's are of rank 1.

As a generalization of the above, we add an arbitrary constant matrix A_0, i.e., we consider matrices of the form $A = A_0 + \sum_i z_i A_i$. There is a polynomial-time whitebox algorithm to determine the singularity of such A's [Mur93, Gee99, IKS10]. Using reductions from Anderson, Shpilka and Volk [ASV16] and Murota [Mur93], our hitting set from above also works for this case (Theorem 4.2).

In quasi-polynomial time we can construct a hitting set for polynomials of the form

$\det(A_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{m} z_i A_i)$, *where* A_0 *is an arbitrary matrix and* A_i *is a matrix of rank* 1, *for* $1 \leq i \leq m$.

This result can also be used for a blackbox solution to another version of *Edmonds' problem* [Edm67]: given set of matrices, find a matrix of maximum rank in the linear span these matrices. In the case when the given matrices are of rank 1, one of the points in our hitting set provides the linear combination of the given matrices which achieves maximum rank. To see this, suppose the given matrices are $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_m$ and consider the symbolic matrix $A = \sum_i z_i A_i$. Let $\sum_i \alpha_i A_i$ be a linear combination that achieves the maximum rank, say r. Then there are $r \times r$ sub-matrices B_i of A_i, for $i = 1, \ldots, m$ such that $\sum_i \alpha_i B_i$ is non-singular. Thus $B = \sum_i z_i B_i$ is non-singular as well. Note that matrices B_i have rank 1. Therefore, our hitting set for $\det(A)$ also works for $\det(B)$. That is, when the variables $z = (z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_m)$ are substituted with points in our hitting set, $\det(B(z = \alpha))$ will be nonzero for at least one of the points α. For such a point α, matrix $A(\alpha)$ has the maximum rank. That is, α is the desired linear combination that solves Edmonds' problem.

1.2 Maximum Rank Matrix Completion

The above PIT result also provides a blackbox solution to the *maximum rank matrix completion problem*. Given a partially filled matrix, the objective is to fill in the blank entries so as to maximize the rank of the matrix. There is a simple randomized solution: filling in random values for the blank entries achieves the maximum rank with high probability [DL78, Sch80, Zip79]. The argument goes via a reduction to PIT (see Section 4.2). The problem also had a deterministic polynomial time algorithm (see [Mur93, Gee99, IKS10]). What is currently open is the question of finding a polynomial time blackbox solution, that is, filling in the blank entries without looking at the given matrix. We do this in quasi-polynomial time.

Given a partially filled matrix, we give a fixed substitution for the blank entries (with size quasi-polynomial in the input size) which maximizes the rank of the matrix for all choices of the already filled in entries.

1.3 A Representation for Matroid Union

For matroids $M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_k$ with ground sets $E_1, E_2, \ldots, E_k$, respectively, the *matroid union* $M = M_1 \vee M_2 \vee \cdots \vee M_k$ is a matroid with ground set $\bigcup_{i=1}^{k} E_i$. A set I is independent in M, if $I = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} I_i$, for independent sets $I_1, I_2, \ldots, I_k$ of $M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_k$, respectively. The problem of finding a maximum independent set in a matroid union reduces to matroid intersection (see Section 4.3). Thus, this problem is in quasi-NC for linear matroids.

When $M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_k$ are linear matroids, then their union M is also linear. An interesting question is to find a matrix that represents M. Narayanan, Saran, and Vazirani [NSV94] present a randomized parallel algorithm for this problem. Our PIT result from above gives a quasi-polynomial time solution for this question (Theorem 4.7).

Given matrices representing linear matroids $M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_k$, *we can deterministically construct a matrix representing the matroid union* $M_1 \vee M_2 \vee \cdots \vee M_k$ *whose entries have a quasi-polynomially bounded size.*

2 Preliminaries

For a set E, we denote the power set of E by $\mathcal{P}(E)$. For an integer m, we define $[m] = \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$.

2.1 Complexity Classes

Barrington [Bar92] generalized the class NC^k to define a class quasi-NC^k as the class of problems which have uniform circuits of quasi-polynomial size $2^{\log^{O(1)} n}$ and poly-logarithmic depth $O(\log^k n)$. The class quasi-NC is the union of classes quasi-NC^k, over all $k \geq 0$. Here, *uniformity* means quasi-polynomial time uniformity.

2.2 Matroids

Matroid theory originated in the middle of the 1930s. There is a huge literature on matroids by now. For an introduction, see for example the excellent textbooks of Oxley [Oxl06] or Schrijver [Sch03]. Below we give some basic definitions and facts about matroids.

A *matroid* M is a pair $M = (E, \mathcal{I})$, where E is the finite ground set and $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(E)$ is a nonempty family of subsets of E that satisfies the following two axioms.

1. *Closure under subsets.* For every $I \in \mathcal{I}$ and $J \subseteq I$ we have $J \in \mathcal{I}$.
2. *Augmentation property.* For every $I, J \in \mathcal{I}$ where $|I| < |J|$, there is an $j \in J$ such that $I \cup \{j\} \in \mathcal{I}$.

We denote $m = |E|$ throughout the paper. The sets in $\mathcal{I}$ are called the *independent sets of* M. An inclusion-wise maximal set $B \in \mathcal{I}$ is called a *base*. Note that by the augmentation property, all base sets have the same size. Let $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ denote the collection of base sets.

As an example, we already mentioned *linear matroids* in the Introduction which come from linear independence in Linear Algebra. A very simple subclass of linear matroids are *partition matroids*. Such a matroid is given by a partition $B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_k$ of the groundset E, and numbers $b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_k$. A set $I \subseteq E$ is independent, if $|I \cap B_i| \leq b_i$, for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k$.

Another well known example are *graphic matroids*. Given an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$, we take E as the ground set and the forests in G as the independent sets. It is not hard to see that forests fulfill the matroid axioms.

Matroid rank. Motivated by Linear Algebra, there is a *rank-function* of a matroid that is defined for every subset $A \subseteq E$ as the size of the largest independent set that is contained in A,

$$\text{rank}(A) = \max\{\, |I| \mid I \in \mathcal{I} \text{ and } I \subseteq A \,\}.$$

The size of every maximal independent set is $\text{rank}(E)$. This number is called the *rank of* M. The *matroid problem* is to compute a maximal independent set.

An important property of the rank-function is its submodularity. In general, a function $f\colon \mathcal{P}(E) \to \mathbb{R}$ is called *submodular*, if for any sets $S, T \subseteq E$, we have

$$f(S) + f(T) \geq f(S \cup T) + f(S \cap T).$$

Lemma 2.1 (See [Sch03])**.** *The rank-function of a matroid is submodular.*

Proof. Let $S, T \subseteq E$. Let $I, J \in \mathcal{I}$ be maximal such that $I \subseteq S \cap T$ and $I \subseteq J \subseteq S \cup T$. Hence $\text{rank}(S \cap T) = |I|$ and $\text{rank}(S \cup T) = |J|$.

Define $S' = J \cap S$ and $T' = J \cap T$. Note that $S', T' \in \mathcal{I}$ and $S' \cap T' = I$. Hence, we get

$$\begin{aligned} r(S) + r(T) \geq |S'| + |T'| &= |S' \cup T'| + |S' \cap T'| \\ &\geq |J| + |I| \\ &= r(S \cup T) + r(S \cap T). \end{aligned}$$

□

Dual Matroid. There is a concept of *duality* in matroid theory. Let $M = (E, \mathcal{I})$ be a matroid with base sets $\mathcal{B}$. Define $\mathcal{B}^*$ as the complements of the base sets, $\mathcal{B}^* = \{ \overline{B} \mid B \in \mathcal{B} \}$. Then $\mathcal{B}^*$ are the base sets of a matroid M^*, the *dual of* M. In terms of independent sets, we can write $M^* = (E, \mathcal{I}^*)$, where

$$\mathcal{I}^* = \{ I \mid \exists B \in \mathcal{B} \;\; B \cap I = \emptyset \}.$$

It is known that the dual of a linear matroid is again linear. Moreover, given the matrix that represents a linear matroid, the matrix that represents the dual matroid can be computed in NC^2 [NSV94].

Matroid intersection. Our main focus is the *matroid intersection problem*. Given two matroids $M_1 = (E, \mathcal{I}_1)$ and $M_2 = (E, \mathcal{I}_2)$ over the same ground set, compute a maximum size set in $\mathcal{I}_1 \cap \mathcal{I}_2$, the common independent sets. Let $\mathcal{B}_1$ and $\mathcal{B}_2$ be the collections of base sets of M_1 and M_2, respectively. In another variant of the problem, one has to decide whether the matroids have a common base, i.e., whether $\mathcal{B}_1 \cap \mathcal{B}_2$ is nonempty, and in this case, to construct such a base $B \in \mathcal{B}_1 \cap \mathcal{B}_2$. The two variants are equivalent for linear matroids. The reduction from former to the latter is implicit in Narayanan et al. [NSV94, Theorem 4.2]. Note that in general $(E, \mathcal{I}_1 \cap \mathcal{I}_2)$ is not a matroid anymore.

Matroid intersection captures many interesting combinatorial problems.

- We already mentioned the common linear independent columns of two matrices.
- A well known example is *bipartite maximum matching*. Let $G = (L \cup R, E)$ be a bipartite graph. We define two partition matroids M_L and M_R over the ground set E. In matroid M_L, for $v \in L$, define sets $B_v = \{ e \in E \mid v \in e \}$ that partition E. A set $I \subseteq E$ is independent, if $|I \cap B_v| \leq 1$, for all $v \in L$, i.e., if no two edges have a common end point in L. Matroid M_R is defined similarly with respect to vertex set R. Then any common independent set of M_L and M_R is a matching in the graph G. Note that M_L and M_R are linear matroids.

We provide more examples in Section 4.4.

2.3 Matroid Polytope

The polytopes we consider in this paper are *convex polytopes* defined as the convex hull of finitely many points in $\mathbb{R}^m$. Any convex polytope P can be described as the intersection of halfspaces, i.e., as $P = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid Ax \leq b \}$, for some matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times m}$ and vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^k$. A *face* of the polytope P is the set of points in P minimizing or maximizing a linear function. If the polytope P is described by $Ax \leq b$, then any face of P can be described as $\{ x \in P \mid A'x = b' \}$, where $\begin{pmatrix} A' & b' \end{pmatrix}$ is some subset of the rows of $\begin{pmatrix} A & b \end{pmatrix}$.

With every matroid, there is an associated *matroid polytope*. This polytope is crucial for our arguments.

For a set $I \subseteq E$, its *characteristic vector* $x^I \in \mathbb{R}^E$ is defined as

$$x^I_e = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } e \in I, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For any collection of sets $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(E)$, the polytope $P(\mathcal{A}) \subset \mathbb{R}^E$ is defined as the convex hull of the characteristic vectors of the sets in $\mathcal{A}$,

$$P(\mathcal{A}) = \operatorname{conv}\{ x^I \mid I \in \mathcal{A} \}.$$

For a matroid $M = (E, \mathcal{I})$, its *matroid polytope* is defined as $P(\mathcal{I}) \subset \mathbb{R}^E$, i.e., the convex hull of the characteristic vectors of the independent sets. The points $\{ x^I \mid I \in \mathcal{I} \}$ are the corners of the matroid polytope $P(\mathcal{I})$.

Edmonds [Edm70] gave a simple description of this polytope which uses the rank function of the matroid (see also [Sch03]). For convenience, we define for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^E$ and $S \subseteq E$,

$$x(S) = \sum_{e \in S} x_e.$$

Lemma 2.2 ([Edm70])**.** *For a matroid $(E, \mathcal{I})$ with rank function r, a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^E$ is in $P(\mathcal{I})$ iff*

$$\begin{aligned} x_e &\geq 0 \quad \forall\, e \in E && (1) \\ x(S) &\leq r(S) \quad \forall\, S \subseteq E. && (2) \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that any 0-1 corner of the polytope given by (1) and (2) corresponds to an independent set in $\mathcal{I}$. The nontrivial part is to show that the described polytope does not have a non-integral corner. Let $\mathcal{B}$ be the family of base sets of the matroid $(E, \mathcal{I})$. Let n be the rank of the matroid, i.e., the size of any base set. The matroid base polytope, defined as $P(\mathcal{B})$, is clearly a face of the matroid polytope $P(\mathcal{I})$. Putting the following equation together with (1) and (2) will give a description of $P(\mathcal{B})$,

$$x(E) = n. \tag{3}$$

Matroid Intersection Polytope. The intersection of two matroids also has an easy polytope description: Edmonds [Edm70] showed a surprising result that one can describe the matroid intersection polytope $P(\mathcal{I}_1 \cap \mathcal{I}_2)$ just by putting together the constraints of the two matroid polytopes $P(\mathcal{I}_1)$ and $P(\mathcal{I}_2)$ (see also [Sch03]).

Theorem 2.3 ([Edm70])**.** *For two matroids $(E, \mathcal{I}_1)$ and $(E, \mathcal{I}_2)$,*

$$P(\mathcal{I}_1 \cap \mathcal{I}_2) = P(\mathcal{I}_1) \cap P(\mathcal{I}_2).$$

That is, a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^E$ is in the polytope $P(\mathcal{I}_1 \cap \mathcal{I}_2)$ iff

$$\begin{aligned} x_e &\geq 0 \quad \forall\, e \in E, && (4) \\ x(S) &\leq r_1(S) \quad \forall\, S \subseteq E, && (5) \\ x(S) &\leq r_2(S) \quad \forall\, S \subseteq E, && (6) \end{aligned}$$

where r_1 and r_2 are the rank functions of the two matroids, respectively.

Let $\mathcal{B}_1$ and $\mathcal{B}_2$ be the families of base sets of the matroids $(E, \mathcal{I}_1)$ and $(E, \mathcal{I}_2)$, respectively. Note that there can be a common base set only if the two matroids have same rank, say n. To obtain the common base polytope $P(\mathcal{B}_1 \cap \mathcal{B}_2)$ one just needs to put the constraint (3) together with inequalities (4), (5) and (6).

2.4 An RNC-Algorithm for Linear Matroid Intersection

Narayanan, Saran, and Vazirani [NSV94] showed that the linear matroid intersection problem is in RNC. Their technique was to reduce the problem to a polynomial identity test (PIT), namely whether the determinant of a symbolic matrix is nonzero. Moreover, they show that to construct a maximum common independent set, it suffices to have an isolating weight function for a family of common bases of two matroids.

Let $w\colon E \to \mathbb{Z}$ be a weight function. The *weight of a set* $B \subseteq E$ is defined as $w(B) = \sum_{e\in B} w(e)$.

Definition 2.4. A weight function $w\colon E \to \mathbb{Z}$ is *isolating* for a family of sets $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(E)$, if there is a unique minimum weight set in $\mathcal{A}$.

We give some details on the argument, because we will use the same algorithm, except that we will *deterministically* compute the isolating weight function.

Let the linear matroids M_1 and M_2 be given by two matrices U and V. We want to find out whether M_1 and M_2 have a common base. Without loss of generality, we can assume that both matrices are $n \times m$ and have full row rank.

Lemma 2.5. *Let Z be an $m \times m$ diagonal matrix with variables on the diagonal, $Z_{e,e} = z_e$, for $e = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. Define the $n \times n$ symbolic matrix $D = UZV^{\mathsf{T}}$. Then M_1 and M_2 have a common base $\iff$ $\det(D) \not\equiv 0$.*

Proof. By the Binet-Cauchy formula, we can write

$$\det(D) = \sum_{\substack{B\subseteq[m]\\|B|=n}} \left(\prod_{e\in B} z_e\right) \det(U_B)\det(V_B),$$

where U_B and V_B are submatrices of U and V, respectively, with columns indexed by B. Let $\mathcal{B}_1$ and $\mathcal{B}_2$ be the collections of bases for M_1 and M_2, respectively. Clearly, $\det(U_B)\det(V_B) \neq 0$ if and only if $B \in \mathcal{B}_1 \cap \mathcal{B}_2$. Hence, the monomials of $\det(D)$ are coming precisely from the common bases,

$$\det(D) = \sum_{B\in\mathcal{B}_1\cap\mathcal{B}_2} \left(\prod_{e\in B} z_e\right) \det(U_B)\det(V_B). \tag{7}$$

This proves the lemma. □

Now, let w be an isolating weight assignment for $\mathcal{B}_1 \cap \mathcal{B}_2$. Replace each variable z_e in equation (7) by $z^{w(e)}$, for a new variable z. Then $\det(D)$ becomes a univariate polynomial $\det(D)(z)$. The monomial $\prod_{e\in B} z_e$ in equation (7) becomes $z^{w(B)}$ in $\det(D)(z)$.

If $\mathcal{B}_1 \cap \mathcal{B}_2 \neq \emptyset$, then the minimum degree term in $\det(D)(z)$ is unique, as w is isolating. Thus, $\det(D)(z) \neq 0 \iff \mathcal{B}_1 \cap \mathcal{B}_2 \neq \emptyset$.

The RNC-algorithm now simply uses random weights. The Isolation Lemma [MVV87] states that a random weight function w with polynomially bounded weights is isolating for any family $\mathcal{A}$ with high probability. Moreover, the determinant polynomial $\det(D)(z)$ can be computed in NC, when the entries are small degree univariate polynomials [BCP84].

Theorem 2.6 ([NSV94])**.** *Linear Matroid Intersection is in* RNC.

One can also compute the common base set B^* that is isolated. For each $e \in E$, in parallel, delete e and re-compute $\det(D)(z)$. If the minimum term disappears then $e \in B^*$.

3 Linear Matroid Intersection in quasi-NC

In this section, we show how to derandomize the algorithm from Theorem 2.6.

Theorem 3.1. *Linear Matroid Intersection is in* quasi-NC.

In the RNC-algorithm described in Section 2.4, random weights were used to isolate a base in the intersection of two matroids. We will construct an isolating weight assignment *deterministically.*

We build the isolating weight assignment in rounds. In every round, we slightly modify the current weight assignment to get a smaller set of *minimum* weight common bases. Our goal is to reduce their number in every round significantly. We stop when we have a unique minimum weight common base.

To get a picture of the set of minimum weight common bases with respect to a weight assignment w, we view w as a function on the common base polytope. That is, we define an extension of weight function $w : E \to \mathbb{Z}$ to $\mathbb{R}^E$. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^E$,

$$w(x) = w \cdot x = \sum_{e \in E} w(e)\, x_e.$$

Note that $w(x^B) = w(B)$, for any $B \subseteq E$. Now, consider the points minimizing the function $w(x)$ in the common base polytope. As $w(x)$ is linear, these points will form a face of the polytope. There will be a one to one correspondence between the corners of this face and the minimum weight common bases. Therefore we want to understand the properties of such faces. We start by considering the faces of a base polytope for a single matroid in Section 3.1, and then consider the intersection of two matroids in Section 3.2. The common base polytope and its faces will only be a part of the argument and not of the actual weight construction algorithm.

3.1 Faces of the Matroid Polytope

Let $(E, \mathcal{I})$ be a matroid with the family of base sets $\mathcal{B}$ and rank function r. From the description of the polytope $P(\mathcal{B})$ in Lemma 2.2, we know that any of its faces can be described by equations of the type $x_e = 0$ or $x(S) = r(S)$. The collection of sets S for which the second equation holds has some structure.

Lemma 3.2 ([Edm70])**.** *For any point $x \in P(\mathcal{B})$ and any sets $S, T \subseteq E$, if $x(S) = r(S)$ and $x(T) = r(T)$ then*

$$x(S \cap T) = r(S \cap T) \text{ and } x(S \cup T) = r(S \cup T).$$

Proof. From the lemma hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned} r(S) + r(T) = x(S) + x(T) &= x(S \cup T) + x(S \cap T) \\ &\leq r(S \cup T) + r(S \cap T) \\ &\leq r(S) + r(T). \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality is true since x satisfies (2). The second inequality is true by submodularity (Lemma 2.1). Thus, all the inequalities are in fact equalities. Hence, the claim follows. □

Lemma 3.2 allows us to partition the ground set E into a family of disjoint sets $\mathcal{S}$ that serve as a basis to write every set T that satisfies $x(T) = r(T)$ as a union of sets from $\mathcal{S}$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $(E, \mathcal{I})$ be a matroid with family of base sets $\mathcal{B}$ and rank function r. Let F be a face of the matroid base polytope $P(\mathcal{B})$. Then there exists a family of disjoint sets $\mathcal{S}$ that form a partition of E, such that for any $S \in \mathcal{S}$ there exists a number $n_S \geq 0$ such that for any $x \in F$,*

$$x(S) = n_S.$$

Moreover,

(i) if for some $T \subseteq E$, $x(T) = r(T)$ for all $x \in F$, then T is a disjoint union of sets from $\mathcal{S}$,

(ii) if for some $e \in E$, $x_e = 0$ for all $x \in F$, then there is an $S \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $S = \{e\}$ and $n_S = 0$.

Proof. We consider the equations of type $x(T) = r(T)$ in F,

$$\mathcal{T} = \{\, T \subseteq E \mid x(T) = r(T) \ \ \forall x \in F \,\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{T} = \{T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_p\}$. Consider the family of sets

$$\mathcal{S} = \{\, R_1 \cap R_2 \cap \cdots \cap R_p \mid R_i \in \{T_i, \overline{T}_i\} \ \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \ldots, p \,\}.$$

Clearly, the sets in $\mathcal{S}$ form a partition of E. We will show that for any $S \in \mathcal{S}$, there exists a number n_S such that $x(S) = n_S$, for all $x \in F$.

W.l.o.g. let $S = T_1 \cap \cdots \cap T_j \cap \overline{T}_{j+1} \cap \cdots \cap \overline{T}_p$. Let us denote $S' = T_1 \cap \cdots \cap T_j$ (for $j = 0$, let $S' = E$), and $S'' = T_{j+1} \cup \cdots \cup T_p$ (for $j = p$, let $S'' = \emptyset$). Then we have $S = S' - (S' \cap S'')$. As $x(T_i) = r(T_i)$, for each $1 \leq i \leq p$, we get from Lemma 3.2

$$x(S') = r(S') \ \text{ and } \ x(S'') = r(S'').$$

Again by Lemma 3.2, we have $x(S' \cap S'') = r(S' \cap S'')$. Now,

$$x(S) = x(S') - x(S' \cap S'') = r(S') - r(S' \cap S'').$$

Hence, for $n_S = r(S') - r(S' \cap S'')$, we have $x(S) = n_S$.

Claim (i) follows directly from the definition of $\mathcal{S}$. For claim (ii), consider an element $e \in E$ such that $x_e = 0$ for all $x \in F$. For any $x \in F$, we have $x(E - \{e\}) = x(E) - x_e = n = r(E - \{e\})$. Thus, $E - \{e\} \in \mathcal{T}$. We claim that $\{e\} \in \mathcal{S}$. To see this, define R_i to be T_i or $\overline{T}_i$, whichever contains e. Then clearly, $R_1 \cap R_2 \cap \cdots \cap R_p = \{e\}$. □

3.2 Faces of the Matroid Intersection Polytope

Let $(E, \mathcal{I}_1)$ and $(E, \mathcal{I}_2)$ be two matroids with family of base sets $\mathcal{B}_1$ and $\mathcal{B}_2$ and rank functions r_1 and r_2, respectively. By Theorem 2.3, the faces of polytope $P(\mathcal{B}_1 \cap \mathcal{B}_2)$ can be described by replacing some of the inequalities (4), (5), and (6) by equalities. This basically means that any face F of $P(\mathcal{B}_1 \cap \mathcal{B}_2)$ can be written as $F = F_1 \cap F_2$, for some faces F_1, F_2 of $P(\mathcal{B}_1)$ and $P(\mathcal{B}_2)$, respectively. Using this fact, we get the following extension of Lemma 3.3 that will be crucial for our weight assignment design.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $(E, \mathcal{I}_1)$ and $(E, \mathcal{I}_2)$ be two matroids with families of base sets $\mathcal{B}_1$ and $\mathcal{B}_2$ and rank functions r_1 and r_2, respectively. Let F be a face of the matroid intersection base polytope $P(\mathcal{B}_1 \cap \mathcal{B}_2)$. Then there exist two families of disjoint sets $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$, each forming a partition of E, such that for any $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and $T \in \mathcal{T}$ there exist numbers $n_S, m_T \geq 0$ such that for any $x \in F$,*

$$x(S) = n_S \ \ \textit{and} \ \ x(T) = m_T.$$

Moreover,

(i) if for some $R \subseteq E$, $x(R) = r_1(R)$ for all $x \in F$ or $x(R) = r_2(R)$ for all $x \in F$, then R is a disjoint union of sets from $\mathcal{S}$, respectively $\mathcal{T}$,

(ii) if for some $e \in E$, $x_e = 0$ for all $x \in F$, then there is a $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and a $T \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $S = T = \{e\}$ and $n_S = m_T = 0$.

Proof. We define sets for each type of equality of face F,

$$\begin{aligned} S_0 &= \{\, e \in E \mid x_e = 0 \ \ \forall x \in F \,\}, \\ \mathcal{T}_1 &= \{\, T \subseteq E \mid x(T) = r_1(T) \ \ \forall x \in F \,\}, \\ \mathcal{T}_2 &= \{\, T \subseteq E \mid x(T) = r_2(T) \ \ \forall x \in F \,\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, define faces F_1 and F_2 of polytopes $P(\mathcal{B}_1)$ and $P(\mathcal{B}_2)$ respectively, as

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 &= \{\, x \in P(\mathcal{B}_1) \mid x(S_0) = 0 \text{ and } x(T) = r_1(T) \ \ \forall\, T \in \mathcal{T}_1 \,\}, \\ F_2 &= \{\, x \in P(\mathcal{B}_2) \mid x(S_0) = 0 \text{ and } x(T) = r_2(T) \ \ \forall\, T \in \mathcal{T}_2 \,\}. \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 2.3, we have $F = F_1 \cap F_2$. Applying Lemma 3.3 to F_1 and F_2 proves the lemma. □

3.3 Cycles in Matroid Intersection

Let again $\mathcal{B}_1$ and $\mathcal{B}_2$ be the base sets of matroids $(E, \mathcal{I}_1)$ and $(E, \mathcal{I}_2)$, respectively. As mentioned earlier, we will construct the weight assignment in rounds. In each round, we want the dimension of the face of minimum weight common bases to become smaller. To measure this decrement, we define a *cycle* with respect to a face.

Definition 3.5 (Cycle)**.** Let F be a face of the polytope $P(\mathcal{B}_1 \cap \mathcal{B}_2)$ with the partitions $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ as in Lemma 3.4. A sequence $C = (e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_{2r})$ of distinct elements of E is called a *cycle* with respect to face F, if consecutive pairs are alternately in a set from $\mathcal{S}$ and a set from $\mathcal{T}$. That is, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, r$,

$$\begin{aligned} e_{2i-1}, e_{2i} &\in S_i, \quad \text{for some } S_i \in \mathcal{S}, \\ e_{2i}, e_{2i+1} &\in T_i, \quad \text{for some } T_i \in \mathcal{T}, \end{aligned}$$

where $e_{2r+1} = e_1$.

To motivate the definition, note that when we view bipartite matching as matroid intersection then the cycles defined here are exactly the cycles in the corresponding graph.

Note that if every point in face F satisfies equation $x_e = 0$ for some element $e \in E$, then e cannot appear in any cycle defined with respect to F. This is because $\{e\}$ appears as a singleton set in both the partitions constructed for F.

First we show that cycles always exist as long as there are at least two bases in the face.

Lemma 3.6. *Let B_1, B_2 be two bases in the face F of polytope $P(\mathcal{B}_1 \cap \mathcal{B}_2)$. Then $B_1 \triangle B_2$ is a set of disjoint cycles.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ be the two partitions of E as in Lemma 3.4. Then we have

$$|B_1 \cap S| = |B_2 \cap S| = n_S, \text{ for every } S \in \mathcal{S} \tag{8}$$

$$|B_1 \cap T| = |B_2 \cap T| = m_T, \text{ for every } T \in \mathcal{T}. \tag{9}$$

We construct the first cycle. Since $B_1 \neq B_2$, there is an element $e_1 \in B_1 - B_2$. Let $e_1 \in S_1 \cap T_1$, for some $S_1 \in \mathcal{S}$ and $T_1 \in \mathcal{T}$. As $|B_1 \cap S_1| = |B_2 \cap S_1|$, there must be another element $e_2 \in S_1$ such

that $e_2 \in B_2 - B_1$. Now, let $e_2 \in T_2$. By a similar argument, there must be another element $e_3 \in T_2$ such that $e_3 \in B_1 - B_2$. We keep finding such elements, alternatively from $B_1 - B_2$ and $B_2 - B_1$, until we get back to an element already seen. These elements define the first cycle C.

For the next cycle, we iterate the above procedure, but switch to $B_1' = B_1 \triangle C$ instead of B_1. Note that B_1' might not be a base anymore. But by the construction of C, equations (8) and (9) still hold for B_1' and B_2. This suffices for our purpose. The construction halts when $B_1' = B_2$. □

Note that there can be cycles which do not come from a symmetric difference of two bases. Let $\mathcal{C}_F$ denote the family of all cycles with respect to face F. By Lemma 3.6, we have $\mathcal{C}_F \neq \emptyset$, for any face F of dimension ≥ 1.

Corollary 3.7. *If $\mathcal{C}_F = \emptyset$, then F has dimension 0, i.e., F is just a point.*

Consider a face $F' \subseteq F$. All equations that hold for F also hold for F'. Therefore the partitions of E that we get from F' will be refinements of those from F. Hence, when we go to a sub-face, cycles are only destroyed; no new cycles are created.

Lemma 3.8. *Let F, F' be two faces of $P(\mathcal{B}_1 \cap \mathcal{B}_2)$ such that $F' \subseteq F$. Then $\mathcal{C}_{F'} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_F$.*

Thus, the strategy is to successively eliminate cycles to reach smaller and smaller faces, until we reach a face F where $\mathcal{C}_F = \emptyset$. For this purpose, we define the *circulation* of a cycle.

Definition 3.9. For a weight assignment $w\colon E \to \mathbb{Z}$, the *circulation* $c_w(C)$ of a cycle $C = (e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_k)$ is defined as the alternating sum

$$c_w(C) = |w(e_1) - w(e_2) + w(e_3) - \ \cdots \ - w(e_k)|.$$

Let B_1, B_2 be two common bases with $w(B_1) = w(B_2)$ such that $C = B_1 \triangle B_2$ is a cycle. Then we have $c_w(C) = |w(B_1) - w(B_2)| = 0$. Our next lemma generalizes this observation to *all* cycles in a minimum weight face F.

Lemma 3.10. *Let F be a face of the polytope $P(\mathcal{B}_1 \cap \mathcal{B}_2)$. Let $w\colon E \to \mathbb{Z}$ be a weight function such that $w \cdot x$ is constant on F. Then $c_w(C) = 0$, for any $C \in \mathcal{C}_F$.*

Proof. Let $C = (e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_{2r}) \in \mathcal{C}_F$. We split C into two sets, $C_1 = \{e_1, e_3, \ldots, e_{2r-1}\}$ and $C_2 = \{e_2, e_4, \ldots, e_{2r}\}$. Now, define the *circulation vector* $\delta_C \in \mathbb{R}^E$ for cycle C as

$$\delta_C = x^{C_1} - x^{C_2}.$$

Vector δ_C has alternating entries $+1$ and -1 on the cycle elements, and zeros elsewhere. Note that $c_w(C) = |w \cdot \delta_C|$. We will show that $w \cdot \delta_C = 0$.

Let $\{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p\}$ be the set of corners of F. Consider their average $a = (a_1 + a_2 + \cdots + a_p)/p$. Clearly, $a \in F$. Now we move from point a along the vector δ_C and go to a new point $b = a + \epsilon\, \delta_C$, for some $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$. We claim that $b \in F$, for small enough $\epsilon > 0$. If this is true then $w \cdot a = w \cdot b$. By the definition of b, we get

$$w \cdot a = w \cdot (a + \epsilon\, \delta_C).$$

We conclude that $w \cdot \delta_C = 0$, which proves the lemma.

It remains to argue that $b \in F$. Consider an inequality which is not tight for F. Then, it will not be tight for a too, because a is the centroid of F. One can choose $\epsilon > 0$ to be small enough

so that the inequality remains non-tight for b. So, we only need to care about the tight equalities for F,

$$\begin{aligned} S_0 &= \{\, e \in E \mid x_e = 0 \ \ \forall x \in F \,\}, \\ \mathcal{T}_1 &= \{\, T \subseteq E \mid x(T) = r_1(T) \ \ \forall x \in F \,\}, \\ \mathcal{T}_2 &= \{\, T \subseteq E \mid x(T) = r_2(T) \ \ \forall x \in F \,\}. \end{aligned}$$

We will show that b satisfies all these constraints. Consider an element $e \in S_0$. By definition of a, we have $a_e = 0$. We already remarked above, that e cannot be a part of a cycle. Therefore, we have $b_e = a_e$, and hence $b_e = 0$.

Let $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ be the two partitions of E as in Lemma 3.4. From the definition of a cycle we know that $|C_1 \cap S| = |C_2 \cap S|$, for any $S \in \mathcal{S}$. Thus,

$$\delta_C(S) = 0, \quad \text{for all } S \in \mathcal{S}.$$

Let $R \in \mathcal{T}_1$. By Lemma 3.4, R is the disjoint union of sets from $\mathcal{S}$, Hence, we conclude that $\delta_C(R) = 0$. Therefore

$$b(R) = a(R) + \epsilon\, \delta_C(R) = a(R) = r_1(R).$$

This shows the second constraint. Similarly, one can show the third constraint. □

Let C be a cycle, say in $P(\mathcal{B}_1 \cap \mathcal{B}_2)$, and let w be a weight function such that $c_w(C) \neq 0$. Let F be the face we get by minimizing w over $P(\mathcal{B}_1 \cap \mathcal{B}_2)$. It follows from Lemma 3.10 that $C \notin \mathcal{C}_F$. This means that if w ensures nonzero circulation for *all* cycles in $P(\mathcal{B}_1 \cap \mathcal{B}_2)$, then all cycles will be eliminated, i.e., $\mathcal{C}_F = \emptyset$ and F will be a corner. Thus, w would be isolating. However, we cannot achieve nonzero circulation for all cycles at once, as there are exponentially many possible cycles.

We get around this problem by constructing the weight function in rounds. In each round, we double the length of the eliminated cycles and reach a face of smaller dimension. Thus, in $\log m$ rounds, we eliminate all cycles and reach a corner. The following lemma shows that the number of cycles we handle in each round remains small. A similar lemma for the number of cycles in a graph was proved by Fenner et al. [FGT16].

Lemma 3.11. *Let F be a face of $P(\mathcal{B}_1 \cap \mathcal{B}_2)$. If $\mathcal{C}_F$ has no cycles of length $\leq r$, for some even number $r \geq 2$, then $\mathcal{C}_F$ has $\leq m^4$ cycles of length $\leq 2r$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ be the two partitions of E as in Lemma 3.4. Let $C = (e_0, e_1, \ldots, e_{s-1})$ be a cycle of length $s \leq 2r$. We choose four elements from the cycle C which divide it into four almost equal parts: Let $(a, b, c, d) = (0, \lceil s/4 \rceil, \lceil 2s/4 \rceil, \lceil 3s/4 \rceil)$. We associate the tuple (e_a, e_b, e_c, e_d) with cycle C. Since we could choose cycle C with any of its element as a starting point, the ordered tuple associated with C is not uniquely defined. However, we claim that the tuple uniquely describes C.

Claim 1. *Cycle C is the only cycle in $\mathcal{C}_F$ of length $\leq 2r$ that is associated with (e_a, e_b, e_c, e_d).*

Proof. Suppose $C' = (f_0, f_1, \ldots, f_{t-1})$ is another such cycle of length $t \leq 2r$. We will show that there exists a cycle of length $\leq r$, which will be a contradiction.

Let $(a', b', c', d') = (0, \lceil t/4 \rceil, \lceil 2t/4 \rceil, \lceil 3t/4 \rceil)$. From the assumption, $e_0 = f_0$, $e_b = f_{b'}$, $e_c = f_{c'}$ and $e_d = f_{d'}$. Without loss of generality, let C and C' differ in their first segment. Let $0 < p < b, b'$ be the first index such that $e_p \neq f_p$. Let $p < q \leq b$ be the first index such that $e_q = f_h$ for some $p < h \leq b'$. As $e_{p-1} = f_{p-1}$, e_p and f_p both belong to some common $S \in \mathcal{S}$ or $T \in \mathcal{T}$.

We consider two cases:

(i) q and h have the same parity: because $e_q = f_h$, e_{q-1} and f_{h-1} belong to some common S or T. Hence,
$(e_p, e_{p+1}, \ldots, e_{q-1}, f_{h-1}, f_{h-2} \ldots, f_p)$ forms a valid cycle.

(ii) q and h have a different parity: then the sequence
$(e_p, e_{p+1}, \ldots, e_{q-1}, f_h, f_{h-1} \ldots, f_p)$ forms a valid cycle as e_{q-1} and f_h both belong to some common S or T.

The cycles we get in both cases have length $\leq q - p + h - p + 1 \leq b - 1 + b' \leq r$. □

There are at most m^4 ways to choose the tuple (e_a, e_b, e_c, e_d). By Claim 1, this gives a bound on the number of cycles of length $\leq 2r$. □

There are standard techniques to give nonzero weights to a small number of sets (see, for example [FKS84]).

Lemma 3.12. *For any number s, one can construct a set of $O(m^2 s)$ integer weight functions on the set $[m]$ with weights bounded by $O(m^2 s)$ in* NC *such that for any set of s cycles, one of the weight functions will give nonzero circulation to each of the s cycles.*

For a proof see [FGT16, Lemma 2.3]. We apply Lemma 3.12 to a set of $s = m^4$ cycles. Then, in each round, we get a set of $O(m^6)$ weight functions, each bounded by $O(m^6)$.

3.4 Isolating Weight Construction

Now, we are ready to describe the construction of the isolating weight assignment. Let the two given matroids be $(E, \mathcal{I}_1)$ and $(E, \mathcal{I}_2)$ with family of base sets $\mathcal{B}_1$ and $\mathcal{B}_2$, respectively. Let $m = |E|$ and $t = \lceil \log m \rceil$. We will define a sequence of weight functions and faces of $P(\mathcal{B}_1 \cap \mathcal{B}_2)$. Let $F_0 = P(\mathcal{B}_1 \cap \mathcal{B}_2)$. For $i = 0, 1, \ldots, t-1$, define

w_i: a weight assignment such that $c_{w_i}(C) \neq 0$, for any cycle $C \in \mathcal{C}_{F_i}$ of length $\leq 2^{i+1}$,

F_{i+1}: the set of points in F_i minimizing the weight function w_i.

We combine the weight functions $w_0, w_1, \ldots, w_{t-1}$ with decreasing precedence. Let N be a number that is larger than the weight of any point in $P(\mathcal{B}_1 \cap \mathcal{B}_2)$ with respect to any of these weight functions. We will see later that choosing $N = O(m^7)$ suffices. For $i = 0, 1, \ldots, t-1$, define

$$W_i = w_0 N^i + w_1 N^{i-1} + \cdots + w_i N^0.$$

Our final weight assignment will be W_{t-1}.

Claim 2. *F_{i+1} is the set of minimum points in $P(\mathcal{B}_1 \cap \mathcal{B}_2)$ with respect to W_i, for $i = 0, 1, \ldots t-1$.*

Proof. We prove this by induction. The claim is clearly true for $i = 0$. Now, assume that F_i is the set of points in $P(\mathcal{B}_1 \cap \mathcal{B}_2)$ that minimizes W_{i-1}. Then F_i is also the set of points that minimizes $N W_{i-1}$. As $N W_{i-1}$ always dominates w_i, the set of points that minimizes $W_i = N W_{i-1} + w_i$ will be a subset of F_i. This subset is exactly those points in F_i where w_i is minimized, that is F_{i+1}. □

Claim 3. *$\mathcal{C}_{F_i}$ has no cycles of length $\leq 2^i$, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots t$.*

Proof. By the definition of w_{i-1}, $c_{w_{i-1}}(C) \neq 0$ for any cycle $C \in \mathcal{C}_{F_{i-1}}$ of length $\leq 2^i$. As w_{i-1} is constant over the face F_i, we have $c_{w_{i-1}}(C) = 0$, for all cycles $C \in \mathcal{C}_{F_i}$, by Lemma 3.10. Recall Lemma 3.8 that $\mathcal{C}_{F_i} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{F_{i-1}}$. Thus, $\mathcal{C}_{F_i}$ has no cycles of length 2^i. □

Lemma 3.13. *Weight function W_{t-1} is isolating.*

Proof. By Claim 2, the face minimized by W_{t-1} is F_t. By Claim 3, $\mathcal{C}_{F_t}$ has no cycles of length $\leq 2^t = m$. That is, $\mathcal{C}_{F_t} = \emptyset$. By Corollary 3.7, F_t has only one corner, i.e., W_{t-1} is isolating. □

Since $\mathcal{C}_{F_i}$ has no cycles of length $\leq 2^i$ (Claim 3), the number of cycles in $\mathcal{C}_{F_i}$ of length $\leq 2^{i+1}$ is at most m^4 (Lemma 3.11). Thus, w_i needs to give nonzero circulations to at most m^4 cycles. By Lemma 3.12, each w_i has weights bounded by $O(m^6)$. Hence, it is sufficient to choose N to be $O(m^7)$. It follows that W_{t-1} will have weights bounded by $O(m^{7 \log m})$. By Lemma 3.12, we get $O(m^6)$ possible weight functions for each w_i, and therefore $O(m^{6 \log m})$ combinations for W_{t-1}. We need to try all of them in parallel.

Lemma 3.14. *For a given number m, we can construct $O(m^{6 \log m})$ weight functions on $[m]$ with weights bounded by $O(m^{7 \log m})$ such that for any matroid intersection on the ground set $[m]$, one of the weight functions isolates a common base.*

As mentioned in Section 2, by plugging-in a isolating weight assignment in the determinant polynomial we can decide whether there exists a common base. As our weights are quasi-polynomially bounded, the determinant entries will have quasi-polynomial bits. Thus, the determinant can be computed in quasi-NC^2 [Ber84, BCP84]. This proves Theorem 3.1.

4 Applications

We already mentioned the connection of our isolating weight construction to *Polynomial Identity Testing* in Section 2.4. In this section, we extend the class of polynomials even further where our technique applies. Then we show that this extended class of polynomials can be used to solve the *matroid union problem* in quasi-NC.

4.1 Polynomial Identity Testing (PIT)

The weight assignment constructed in Lemma 3.14 yields a quasi-polynomial time blackbox identity test, i.e., a hitting set, for polynomials of the form $D = UZV^{\mathsf{T}}$, where U, V are $n \times m$ matrices over some field $\mathbb{F}$, and Z is a $m \times m$ diagonal matrix with $Z_{i,i} = z_i$, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. To see this, recall from Section 2.4 that if w is isolating for the common bases of U and V, then the univariate polynomial $\det(D)(z)$, obtained after substituting $z_e = z^{w(e)}$, for each $e \in [m]$, is nonzero. Since w has weights bounded by $m^{O(\log m)}$, the degree of the polynomial $\det(D)(z)$ is bounded by $m^{O(\log m)}$. Thus, any set of $m^{O(\log m)}$ field elements constitutes a hitting set for $\det(D)(z)$.

Let u_i and v_i be the i-th columns of U and V, respectively. Then we can rewrite D as $D = \sum_{i=1}^{m} z_i u_i v_i^{\mathsf{T}}$. Note that any rank-1 matrix is of the form uv^{T} for some $u, v \in \mathbb{F}^n$. Thus we get the following corollary.

Corollary 4.1. *In quasi-polynomial time, one can compute a hitting set for polynomials of the form $\det(\sum_{i=1}^{m} z_i A_i)$, where A_i is an $n \times n$ matrix of rank at most 1 over some field $\mathbb{F}$, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m$.*

We can further generalize the class of polynomials we can handle and add an arbitrary constant matrix A_0, i.e., with no rank restriction.

Theorem 4.2. *There is an $(m+n)^{O(\log(m+n))}$-size hitting set for polynomials of form $\det(A_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{m} z_i A_i)$, where A_i is an $n \times n$ matrix over some field $\mathbb{F}$, for $i \geq 0$, and is of rank at most 1, for $i \geq 1$.*

Let U and V be the matrices from above such that

$$A_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{m} z_i A_i = A_0 + UZV^{\mathsf{T}}.$$

Observe that the entries of this matrix are linear forms in the variables $z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_m$. The following lemma constructs a matrix M such that $\det(A_0 + UZV^{\mathsf{T}}) = \det(M)$ and the entries of M are either constant or a single variable z_i. Moreover, every variable z_i occurs only once in M. This *rank-one to read-once* reduction is due to Matthew Anderson, Amir Shpilka and Ben Lee Volk [ASV16].

Lemma 4.3 ([ASV16])**.**

$$\det(A_0 + UZV^{\mathsf{T}}) = \det \begin{pmatrix} I & Z & 0 \\ 0 & I & V^{\mathsf{T}} \\ U & 0 & A_0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{10}$$

Proof. Let A, B, C, D be matrices where A and D are square matrices and A is invertible. Then we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ C & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I & A^{-1}B \\ 0 & D - CA^{-1}B \end{pmatrix}$$

and hence,

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} = \det(A) \det(D - CA^{-1}B). \tag{11}$$

We split the matrix on the right hand side of (10) into

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} I & Z \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ V^{\mathsf{T}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad C = \begin{pmatrix} U & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad D = A_0$$

and apply Equation (11). We have $\det(A) = 1$. Note that $A^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} I & -Z \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}$, and therefore we get $D - CA^{-1}B = A_0 + UZV^{\mathsf{T}}$. This proves the lemma. □

Murota [Mur93] has shown that PIT for read-once matrices reduces to the matroid intersection problem. We present the reduction in a way that is suitable for blackbox identity testing. Let $Q(\boldsymbol{z}) = \det\left(A_0 + UZV^{\mathsf{T}}\right)$. By Lemma 4.3, polynomial $Q(\boldsymbol{z})$ is multilinear.

The first step is to *homogenize* $Q(\boldsymbol{z})$. Consider the polynomial

$$\begin{aligned} &Q'(z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_{2m}) \\ &= z_{m+1} z_{m+2} \cdots z_{2m} \cdot Q(z_1/z_{m+1}, z_2/z_{m+2}, \ldots, z_m/z_{2m}), \end{aligned}$$

where $z_{m+1}, z_{m+2}, \ldots, z_{2m}$ are new variables. Observe that Q' is homogeneous, every monomial in Q' has degree m. Note also that $Q' \neq 0$ if and only if $Q \neq 0$. Moreover, if Q' is nonzero at a point $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_{2m})$, where $\alpha_{m+1}, \ldots, \alpha_{2m} \neq 0$, then Q is nonzero at the point $(\alpha_1/\alpha_{m+1}, \alpha_2/\alpha_{m+2}, \ldots, \alpha_m/\alpha_{2m})$. Thus, it suffices to find a hitting set for Q'.

Let Z' be the $m \times m$ diagonal matrix with $Z'_{i,i} = z_{m+i}$. Then we can write

$$Q'(\boldsymbol{z}) = \det \begin{pmatrix} Z' & Z & 0 \\ 0 & I & V^{\mathsf{T}} \\ U & 0 & A_0 \end{pmatrix},$$

Compared with the representation of Q in (10), the matrix here has Z' in the left upper corner instead of I. That is, there are only variable entries in the first m rows, and zeros, but no other constants. We will take advantage of this representation.

Define matrices

$$Y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I & V^{\mathsf{T}} \\ U & 0 & A_0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad L = \begin{pmatrix} Z' & Z & 0 \\ & Y & \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence $Q'(\boldsymbol{z}) = \det(L)$. Let Y_i be the i-th column of Y, for $1 \leq i \leq 2m+n$. Since variables z_i and z_{m+i} are in the same row of L, exactly one of them will appear in any monomial of $Q'(\boldsymbol{z})$, for each $1 \leq i \leq m$. For any such monomial $\prod_{i \in S} z_i$ with $S \subseteq [2m]$, its coefficient is nonzero if and only if the columns $\{Y_i\}_{i \in [2m+n]-S}$ are linearly independent. With these observations, we can show that the monomials of $Q'(\boldsymbol{z})$ exactly correspond to the common bases of two matroids: Let $E = [2m+n]$.

- The first matroid $M_1 = (E, \mathcal{I}_1)$ is defined by the $m \times (2m+n)$ matrix $\begin{pmatrix} I & I & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. The matrix has two ones in every row, at position i and $i+m$. Therefore any base set of matroid M_1 has exactly one of the two elements $i, m+i$, for each $1 \leq i \leq m$, and no elements $> 2m$. Let the collection of all its base sets be $\mathcal{B}_1$.
- Let matroid $M_2 = (E, \mathcal{I}_2)$ be defined by the $(m+n) \times (2m+n)$ matrix Y. Our second matroid is its *dual matroid* $M_2^* = (E, \mathcal{I}_2^*)$. Let the collection of all base sets of M_2^* be $\mathcal{B}_2^*$.

Now the monomials in $Q'(\boldsymbol{z})$ exactly correspond to the sets in $\mathcal{B}_1 \cap \mathcal{B}_2^*$. Thus, we can construct an isolating weight assignment for the monomials of $Q'(\boldsymbol{z})$, which gives us a hitting set. As we have to try quasi-polynomially many weight assignments, our hitting set size is quasi-polynomial. This proves Theorem 4.2.

4.2 Maximum Rank Matrix Completion

In the maximum rank matrix completion problem, we are given a partially filled matrix and the goal is to complete the matrix so as to get the maximum possible rank. The problem reduces to PIT as follows. Consider the matrix A obtained by filling in a distinct variable z_i for each blank entry in the given matrix. Note that A can be written in the form $A_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{m} z_i A_i$, where A_0 is the matrix with the already filled in entries, and 0 at all the blank positions. Here $m = n^2$, that is, for $1 \leq i \leq n^2$, each A_i represents an entry of the matrix A. If A_i corresponds to a blank position then it has one entry 1 at the blank position and 0 at all other entries. Otherwise A_i is the zero matrix. Note that $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_m$ have rank at most 1. We need to find a substitution for the variables which maximizes the rank of A.

Let $\boldsymbol{z} = (z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_m)$ and $\boldsymbol{z} = \boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_m) \in \mathbb{F}^r$ be a substitution that achieves the maximum rank, say r. Then there is an $r \times r$ sub-matrix B of A such that $\det(B(\boldsymbol{z} = \alpha))$ is nonzero. Thus, the polynomial $\det(B(\boldsymbol{z}))$ must be nonzero as well. Note that the matrix B has the same form as A, that is, $B = B_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{m} z_i B_i$, where $B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_m$ are rank≤ 1 matrices.

Therefore, our hitting set constructed in Theorem 4.2 works for $\det(B)$. That is, when the variables $\boldsymbol{z}$ are substituted with points $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ from our hitting set, $\det(B(z = \boldsymbol{\alpha}))$ will be nonzero for at least one of the points $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$. For such a point $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, matrix $A(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ has the maximum rank.

Note however that we do not know which point in the hitting set will achieve the maximum rank. It turns out that we can combine all the points in the hitting set to construct one fixed substitution which achieves the maximum rank for all possible choices of the already filled in entries, i.e., A_0. For this purpose, one can use the well-known technique of Lagrange interpolation (see, for example [For14, Lemma 3.2.22]).

Lemma 4.4 (Lagrange Interpolation)**.** *Let $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathbb{F}^r$ be a hitting set for a family of polynomials $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{F}[z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_r]$. Let $\{\alpha_h\}_{h\in\mathcal{H}}$ be distinct field elements and t be a variable. Then each polynomial p in $\mathcal{P}$ has a nonzero evaluation over the field $\mathbb{F}(t)$ at*

$$L(t) = \sum_{h\in\mathcal{H}} h \frac{\prod_{h'\in\mathcal{H}-\{h\}}(t-\alpha_{h'})}{\prod_{h'\in\mathcal{H}-\{h\}}(\alpha_h-\alpha_{h'})}.$$

Proof. Let $p \in \mathcal{P}$. Since $\mathcal{H}$ is a hitting set, there exists an $h \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $p(h) \neq 0$. Note that $L(\alpha_h) = h$. Thus, $p(L(\alpha_h)) \neq 0$ and hence $p(L(t)) \neq 0$. □

We apply Lemma 4.4 with $r = m$. After substituting $\boldsymbol{z} = L(t)$ in A, the entries in the resulting matrix $A(t)$ are univariate polynomials in t of quasi-polynomial degree, since our hitting set has quasi-polynomial size. The polynomial $\det(B(\boldsymbol{z} = L(t)))$ will be nonzero as a univariate polynomial.

If our field are real or rational numbers, we can choose t to be larger than the absolute values of the coefficients of the poynomials in $L(t)$. Then the univariate polynomial $\det(B(\boldsymbol{z} = L(t)))$ remains nonzero. The size of these coefficients are bounded by $\mathsf{poly}(n)$, if the matrix A and its entries have sizes bounded by n. Thus, t can be replaced with a number of size $\mathsf{poly}(n)$. After this replacement, the entries of A have size $n^{O(\log n)}$, since the entries of $A(t)$ are univariates of degree $n^{O(\log n)}$.

Theorem 4.5. *Given a partially filled matrix of size $n \times n$ and with entries having bit-size n, there is a* quasi-NC *algorithm to find a fixed substitution (of size $n^{O(\log n)}$) for the blank entries which maximizes the rank of the matrix, irrespective of where and what the given entries in the matrix are.*

4.3 Matroid Union

For matroids $M_1 = (E_1, \mathcal{I}_1), M_2 = (E_2, \mathcal{I}_2), \ldots, M_k = (E_k, \mathcal{I}_k)$, their union $M = M_1 \vee M_2 \vee \cdots \vee M_k$ is defined as $(E, \mathcal{I})$, where $E = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} E_i$ and

$$\mathcal{I} = \{ \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} I_i \mid I_i \in \mathcal{I}_i, \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq k \}.$$

It is known that M is again a matroid, and M is linear when $M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_k$ are linear, see [Sch03].

The *matroid union problem* is to compute a base of the matroid union M i.e., to compute independent sets $I_i \in \mathcal{I}_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ which maximize $|I_1 \cup I_2 \cup \cdots \cup I_k|$. The simple greedy algorithm for matroids does not work, because it is not immediately clear how to test if a set is independent in M. The problem thereby is that the groundsets E_i may overlap each other. In case that the sets E_i are pairwise disjoint, one can simply put the matrices A_i representing M_i as blocks in a block-diagonal matrix A. Then A is a linear representation of M and we can easily solve the matroid union problem.

In general, the groundsets E_i overlap each other. Inspired by the disjoint case, the idea now is to work with a *disjoint union* of the ground sets as one matroid and then define a second matroid that allows to take only one copy of an element in the disjoint union. The intersection of the two matroids describes M. In more detail, the reduction from union to intersection is as follows. We define two matroids M' and M''.

1. Matroid $M' = (E', \mathcal{I}')$ is defined by the *disjoint union* of $M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_k$. That is,

$$E' = E_1 \sqcup E_2 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup E_k = \{ (e, i) \mid e \in E_i \}.$$

A set I' is independent in M' if $I' = I_1 \sqcup I_2 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_k$, for k independent sets $I_1, I_2, \ldots, I_k$ of $M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_k$, respectively.

2. Matroid $M'' = (E', \mathcal{I}'')$ is a partition matroid on the same ground set E'. The sets that partition E' are the copies of e in E'. That is, for $e \in E$, define $B_e = \{ (e, i) \mid e \in E_i \} \subseteq E'$. A set I'' is independent in M'' if $|I'' \cap B_e| \leq 1$, for all $e \in E$.

Now observe that for a common independent set $\widehat{I}$ of M' and M'', the projection

$$I = \{ e \in E \mid (e, i) \in \widehat{I} \text{ for some } i \in [k] \}$$

is independent in $\mathcal{I}$. Conversely, every independent set I of M corresponds to a common independent set $\widehat{I}$ of M' and M''. Note that $|I| = |\widehat{I}|$ in both directions. Note also that M' and M'' are linear when $M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_k$ are linear.

Hence, the matroid union problem reduces to matroid intersection, and thus has a polynomial-time algorithm [Edm68, Sch03]. Also, our quasi-NC algorithm for matroid intersection implies a quasi-NC algorithm for matroid union.

Theorem 4.6. *Linear Matroid Union is in* quasi-NC.

In case of linear matroids, another interesting question is to compute a linear representation for the matroid union. Narayanan, Saran, and Vazirani [NSV94] gave a randomized NC-algorithm for computing such a linear representation. It turns out that we can derandomize their algorithm with our PIT result.

The construction of the linear representation is as follows. Suppose the matroids $M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_k$ are given by matrices $U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_k$, respectively. Without loss of generality, one can assume that all the matroids have the same ground set, i.e., each U_i and U_j have a one-to-one correspondence between their columns. If not, then one can add extra zero columns to the matrices. We want to find a representation of $M = M_1 \vee M_2 \vee \cdots \vee M_k$.

Let the dimensions of U_i be $n_i \times m$, for $1 \leq i \leq k$. For each $1 \leq i \leq k$, define U_i' to be an $n_i \times m$ matrix such that its j-th column is the j-th column of U_i, multiplied by a variable $z_{i,j}$. Define the $(n_1 + n_2 + \cdots + n_k) \times m$ matrix V by stacking the matrices $U_1', U_2', \ldots, U_k'$ one below another,

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} U_1' \\ U_2' \\ \vdots \\ U_k' \end{pmatrix}$$

Then a set I is independent in M if and only if the corresponding columns V_I in V are linearly independent (over the field $\mathbb{F}(z_{i,j})_{i,j}$) [NSV94, Lemma 3.1]. To get a matrix over the base field, one can plug-in random values for the variables $z_{i,j}$. This works because a random substitution preserves the nonzeroness of minors with high probability [DL78, Sch80, Zip79].

Note that in the matrix V, any variable $z_{i,j}$ appears only in the j-th column. Thus, any minor of V will be a polynomial of the form $\det(\sum_{i,j} A_{i,j} z_{i,j})$, where matrix $A_{i,j}$ has rank 1, for $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $1 \leq j \leq m$. This is precisely the form for which we have given a hitting set in Theorem 4.2. Thus, any nonzero minor of V will have a nonzero evaluation at least at one point of the hitting set.

However, this does not yet solve our problem because we need to find one substitution which works simultaneously for *all* nonzero minors. For this, one can again use the technique of Lagrange interpolation, as in the previous subsection (Lemma 4.4).

We apply Lemma 4.4 (with $r = km$) to combine the hitting-set into one substitution. After substituting the variables $(z_{i,j})_{i,j}$ in V by $L(t)$ (from Lemma 4.4), the entries in the resulting matrix $V(t)$ are univariate polynomials in t of quasi-polynomial degree, since our hitting set has quasi-polynomial size. As argued in the previous subsection, t can be replaced with a field value of size $\mathsf{poly}(m)$ while preserving the nonzeroness of each minor, where the matrices $M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_k$ have their entry sizes bounded by $\mathsf{poly}(m)$. Finally, after substituting t with such a large enough value, the entries in V have quasi-polynomial size since the univariate polynomials in $V(t)$ have quasi-polynomial degree.

Theorem 4.7. *Given linear matroids $M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_k$ each with ground set size m, there is a* quasi-NC *algorithm to compute a linear representation V of $M = M_1 \vee M_2 \vee \cdots \vee M_k$, where the entries of matrix V are of size $2^{O(\log^2(mk))}$.*

4.4 Some More Combinatorial Problems

To illustrate the wide range of matroid intersection, we give a few more examples of combinatorial problems which are known to reduce to linear matroid intersection (see [Sch03]).

Two edge-disjoint spanning trees in a graph. This problem can be reduced to the intersection of a graphic matroid and a cographic matroid. Recall that for an undirected connected graph $G = (V, E)$, the graphic matroid has ground set E and any forest in G is an independent set. Thus, any spanning tree in G is a base set. In the cographic matroid of G, a set of edges is independent if its removal keeps the graph connected. Both the matroids are known to be linear (see, e.g. [Oxl06]). Now, to find two edge-disjoint spanning trees in G, we find the maximum edge set which is independent in both, the graphic and the cographic matroid. This will be a spanning tree whose removal keeps the graph connected. Thus, after removing this tree, we can find another spanning tree in the resulting graph.

Rainbow spanning tree in an edge-colored graph. Given a graph with colored edges, the problem asks if there is a spanning tree with all its edges having distinct colors. To capture this by matroid intersection, define the first matroid to be the graphic matroid of G. The second matroid is a partition matroid, where each set of the partition consists of the edges of one color. A set is independent if it contains at most one edge of a color.

Arborescence in a directed graph. An *arborescence* is a directed acyclic graph, that has a vertex r, called the *root*, such that for any vertex v, there is exactly one path from r to v. In the r-arborescence problem we have given a directed graph G and a vertex r. The task is to find an arborescence in G with root r.

Note that an r-arborescence is any set of edges which form a spanning tree in the underlying undirected graph and for each vertex v other than the root, it has exactly one edge incoming to v. Hence, we can express the problem as the intersection of two matroids: The first matroid is the graphic matroid of the underlying undirected graph. The second matroid is a partition matroid with the partition $\cup_v E_v$, where E_v is the sets of edges incoming to the vertex v. (We may assume that there are no edges incoming to the root r).

Shortest R-S biconnector and a longest R-S biforest of a graph. For a graph $G = (V, E)$ and a partition of V into R and S, an R-S *biconnector* is a set $F \subseteq E$, such that each component

of (V, F) intersects both R and S [Sch03, Chapter 54]. If F has minimum size, it is a *shortest biconnector*.

A *spanning set* in a matroid is a set which contains a base set. In case of graphic matroids, a spanning set is any subset of edges which forms a connected graph. The shortest R-S biconnector problem reduces to the shortest common spanning set of two matroids.

The reduction goes as follows. Define graph G_R from G by contracting the set R to one vertex. The edges within R are kept as self-loops. Define graph G_S similarly for S. Let M_R and M_S be the graphic matroid for G_R and G_S, respectively. Now observe that a set is a R-S biconnector if and only if it is a spanning set in M_R and M_S.

To reduce the problem of shortest common spanning set to maximum common independent set, recall that the complement of a spanning set is an independent set of the dual matroid. Thus, the problem reduces to maximum common independent set of the two dual matroids.

An R-S *biforest* is a forest F such that each component of (V, F) has at most one edge in the cut $\delta(R)$. The reduction to linear matroid intersection is similar as above. Let u be a vertex in R and v be a vertex in S. Define the graph G_u from G as follows: for any edge e which has one endpoint in R and the other in S, change the endpoint in R to u. Define graph G_v similarly with respect to S and v. Then a common independent set of the two graphic matroids corresponding to G_u and G_v is precisely an R-S biforest.

5 Discussion

One of the main open questions is to do isolation with polynomially bounded weights, or to come up with a different NC-algorithm for linear matroid intersection. It would be interesting to find out for what polytopes our isolation technique works. For general matroids, the parallel complexity of matroid intersection is not clear. Can we find an NC algorithm (randomized or deterministic) for the general case.

A generalization of matroids are *polymatroids*. These are polytopes similar to the matroid polytope, where instead of the rank function one can use any submodular function that is nonnegative and nondecreasing. The key argument in our construction is the structure of the faces of the matroid intersection polytope, which basically comes from Lemma 3.2. Note that for the proof of this lemma, the only property used was submodularity of the rank function. Thus, one can verify that the whole argument generalizes to polymatroid intersection. That is, our weight function isolates a corner in a polymatroid intersection polytope.

Another generalization of matroid intersection is matroid matching, which also captures perfect matchings in general graphs (not necessarily bipartite).

6 Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Stephen Fenner, Ankit Gupta, Jacobo Tóran, Ben Lee Volk, and Magnus Wahlström for helpful discussions. We are thankful to Matthew Anderson, Amir Shpilka and Ben Lee Volk for letting us use their reduction (Lemma 4.3). Part of the work was done during Dagstuhl Seminar 16411 on Algebraic Methods in Computational Complexity 2016. We thank the anonymous referees for many useful suggestions.

References

[Agr05] Manindra Agrawal. Proving lower bounds via pseudo-random generators. In *FSTTCS*, volume 3821 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 92–105, 2005.

[ASV16] Matthew Anderson, Amir Shpilka, and Ben Lee Volk. Personal communication, 2016.

[Bar92] David A. Mix Barrington. Quasipolynomial size circuit classes. In *Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Structure in Complexity Theory Conference*, pages 86–93, 1992.

[BCP84] Allan Borodin, Stephen Cook, and Nicholas Pippenger. Parallel computation for well-endowed rings and space-bounded probabilistic machines. *Information and Control*, 58(1-3):113–136, July 1984.

[Ber84] Stuart J. Berkowitz. On computing the determinant in small parallel time using a small number of processors. *Information Processing Letters*, 18(3):147 – 150, 1984.

[DL78] Richard A. Demillo and Richard J. Lipton. A probabilistic remark on algebraic program testing. *Information Processing Letters*, 7(4):193 – 195, 1978.

[Edm67] Jack Edmonds. Systems of distinct representatives and linear algebra. *Journal of research of the National Bureau of Standards*, 71:241–245, 1967.

[Edm68] Jack Edmonds. Matroid partition. *Mathematics of the Decision Sciences*, 11:335–345, 1968.

[Edm70] Jack Edmonds. Submodular functions, matroids, and certain polyhedra. In *Combinatorial Structures and Their Applications, Gordon and Breach, New York*, pages 69–87, 1970.

[Edm79] Jack Edmonds. Matroid intersection. In E.L. Johnson P.L. Hammer and B.H. Korte, editors, *Discrete Optimization I (Proceedings of the Advanced Research Institute on Discrete Optimization and Systems Applications of the Systems Science Panel of NATO and of the Discrete Optimization Symposium)*, volume 4, pages 39 – 49. Elsevier, 1979.

[FGT16] Stephen A. Fenner, Rohit Gurjar, and Thomas Thierauf. Bipartite perfect matching is in quasi-nc. In *Proceedings of the 48th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2016, Cambridge, MA, USA*, pages 754–763, 2016.

[FKS84] Michael L. Fredman, János Komlós, and Endre Szemerédi. Storing a sparse table with $O(1)$ worst case access time. *J. ACM*, 31(3):538–544, June 1984.

[For14] Michael A. Forbes. *Polynomial Identity Testing of Read-Once Oblivious Algebraic Branching Programs*. PhD thesis, MIT, 2014.

[Gee99] James F. Geelen. Maximum rank matrix completion. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 288:211 – 217, 1999.

[GTV17] Rohit Gurjar, Thomas Thierauf, and Nisheeth K. Vishnoi. Isolating a vertex via lattices: Polytopes with totally unimodular faces. *CoRR*, abs/1708.02222, 2017.

[IKS10] Gbor Ivanyos, Marek Karpinski, and Nitin Saxena. Deterministic polynomial time algorithms for matrix completion problems. *SIAM Journal of computing*, 39(8):2010, 2010.

[KI03] Valentine Kabanets and Russell Impagliazzo. Derandomizing polynomial identity tests means proving circuit lower bounds. *STOC*, pages 355–364, 2003.

[KUW88] Richard M. Karp, Eli Upfal, and Avi Wigderson. The complexity of parallel search. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 36(2):225 – 253, 1988.

[Lov85] László Lovász. Computing ears and branchings in parallel. *26th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (SFCS 1985)*, pages 464–467, 1985.

[Lov89] László Lovász. Singular spaces of matrices and their application in combinatorics. *Boletim da Sociedade Brasileira de Matemática - Bulletin/Brazilian Mathematical Society*, 20(1):87–99, 1989.

[Mur93] Kazuo Murota. Mixed matrices: Irreducibility and decomposition. In Richard A. Brualdi, Shmuel Friedland, and Victor Klee, editors, *Combinatorial and Graph-Theoretical Problems in Linear Algebra*, pages 39–71. Springer New York, New York, NY, 1993.

[MVV87] Ketan Mulmuley, Umesh V. Vazirani, and Vijay V. Vazirani. Matching is as easy as matrix inversion. *Combinatorica*, 7:105–113, 1987.

[NSV94] H. Narayanan, Huzur Saran, and Vijay V. Vazirani. Randomized parallel algorithms for matroid union and intersection, with applications to arboresences and edge-disjoint spanning trees. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 23(2):387–397, 1994.

[Oxl06] James G. Oxley. *Matroid Theory (Oxford Graduate Texts in Mathematics)*. Oxford University Press, Inc., New York, NY, USA, 2006.

[Sch80] Jacob T. Schwartz. Fast probabilistic algorithms for verification of polynomial identities. *Journal of the ACM*, 27(4):701–717, October 1980.

[Sch03] Alexander Schrijver. *Combinatorial optimization : polyhedra and efficiency. Vol. B. , Matroids, trees, stable sets. chapters 39-69.* Algorithms and combinatorics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, N.Y., et al., 2003.

[Val79] L. G. Valiant. Completeness classes in algebra. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '79, pages 249–261, New York, NY, USA, 1979. ACM.

[VSBR83] L. G. Valiant, S. Skyum, S. Berkowitz, and C. Rackoff. Fast parallel computation of polynomials using few processors. *SIAM journal of computing*, 12(4):641–644, November 1983.

[Zip79] Richard Zippel. Probabilistic algorithms for sparse polynomials. In *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation (EUROSAM)*, pages 216–226. Springer-Verlag, 1979.