

THE CRITICAL THEOREM FOR q -POLYMATROIDS

GIANIRA N. ALFARANO¹ AND EIMEAR BYRNE²

ABSTRACT. The Critical Theorem, due to Henry Crapo and Gian-Carlo Rota, has been extended and generalised in many ways. In this paper, we describe properties of the characteristic polynomial of a weighted lattice and show that it has a recursive description, which we use to obtain results on the critical exponent of q -polymatroids. We prove a Critical Theorem for representable q -polymatroids and we provide a lower bound on the critical exponent. We show that q -polymatroids arising from certain families of rank-metric codes attain this lower bound.

1. INTRODUCTION

The critical exponent of a collection \mathcal{S} of n points in the projective space $\text{PG}(k-1, q)$ is defined to be the minimum number of hyperplanes whose intersection with \mathcal{S} is empty. A reformulation of this definition from the point of view of coding theory can be read in [Gre76]: the critical exponent of the matroid arising from a code $C \leq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ is the minimum dimension of a subcode of C whose support is $\{1, \dots, n\}$. The critical problem for a representable matroid is the determination of its critical exponent and is strongly related to the celebrated MDS conjecture; see [Seg55]. If S is a $(d-1)$ -anticode in \mathbb{F}_q^n then its critical exponent is the codimension c of a linear code of minimum distance at least d , which is MDS if and only if $d = c + 1$; see [Dow71]. In [CR70], Crapo and Rota proved that the critical exponent of a collection of vectors or projective points is actually equal to an evaluation of the characteristic polynomial of the matroid represented by those points, which is a result known as the Critical Theorem. This theorem provides a more general setting for many results in extremal combinatorics and has been the subject of numerous applications and generalisations; see [AAB14, Bri05, BO92, Tut54, Zas87, KMS18, IS21, GRSZ23, IS23].

In this paper, we consider an extension of this topic. The codes we are interested in are vector spaces of matrices over the finite field \mathbb{F}_q endowed with the rank metric (matrix codes), while in exchanging the role of the Boolean lattice for an arbitrary lower semimodular lattice \mathcal{L} in the theory of polymatroids we arrive at \mathcal{L} -polymatroids. In the special case that \mathcal{L} is the lattice of subspaces of a vector space over \mathbb{F}_q , we have a q -polymatroid; such objects have many connections to rank-metric codes. We establish properties of the characteristic polynomial of an \mathcal{L} -polymatroid and derive recursive expressions of it in terms of the characteristic polynomials of its minors. Such expressions can be used to obtain results on the critical exponent of a representable q -polymatroid, which is one that arises from a matrix code. In specialising these results to the Boolean lattice, one recovers familiar identities for matroids and polymatroids; see e.g. [ANSO84, BO92]. We provide a lower bound on the critical exponent of a representable q -polymatroid and identify some classes of matrix codes that meet this lower bound.

This paper is organised as follows. In Section 2, we provide the necessary background material on lattices, weighted lattices, q -polymatroids and rank-metric codes. In Section 3 we derive expressions of the characteristic polynomial $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}; z)$ of a weighted lattice \mathcal{W} in terms of characteristic polynomials of the minors of \mathcal{W} . We furthermore establish criteria for the positivity of evaluations of the characteristic polynomials of some of the minors of \mathcal{W} in terms of evaluations of $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}; z)$. In Section 4, we give a q -analogue of the Critical Theorem and hence define the

¹EINDHOVEN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, THE NETHERLANDS.

²UNIVERSITY COLLEGE DUBLIN, IRELAND.

E-mail addresses: g.n.alfarano@tue.nl, ebyrne@ucd.ie.

G. N. A. is supported by the Swiss National Foundation through grant no. 210966.

critical exponent of a representable q -polymatroid. We describe a geometric interpretation of the critical exponent for vector rank-metric codes. We apply the results of Section 3 to obtain q -analogue results on critical exponents such as those found in [ANSO84]. In Section 5 we give a lower bound on the critical exponent of a representable q -polymatroid and we give sufficient conditions that ensure this bound is met with equality for certain families of codes. In Section 6, we consider the q -analogue of several generalisations of the classical Critical Theorem, such as those given in [Bri05].

Notation. Throughout this paper, q is either 1 or a prime power, while n and m are integers satisfying $n, m \geq 2$. For $q > 1$, we denote by \mathbb{F}_q the finite field with q elements and by \mathbb{F}_{q^m} its field extension of degree m . If $q > 1$, we let E denote an n -dimensional vector space over \mathbb{F}_q and we let $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ denote the standard basis of E . We let $\mathbb{F}_q^{n \times m}$ denote the space of $n \times m$ matrices with entries in \mathbb{F}_q . For a matrix $M \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n \times m}$ we denote by $\text{colsp}(M)$ the column-space of M over \mathbb{F}_q . If $q = 1$, then E denotes a finite set of cardinality n . For any positive integer s , we define $[s] := \{1, \dots, s\}$.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we introduce q -polymatroids, rank-metric code and we collect some well-known facts about lattices.

2.1. Lattices. In this short subsection we recall some preliminary results on lattices. We refer the reader to [Bir40, Rom08, Sta11] for further reading on ordered lattices.

Definition 2.1. Let (\mathcal{L}, \leq) be a partially ordered set (poset). Let $a, b, v \in \mathcal{L}$. We say that v is an **upper bound** of a and b if $a \leq v$ and $b \leq v$ and furthermore, we say that v is a **least upper bound** of a and b if $v \leq u$ for any $u \in \mathcal{L}$ that is also an upper bound of a and b . If a least upper bound of a and b exists, then it is unique, is denoted by $a \vee b$, which is called the **join** of a and b . We analogously define a **lower bound** and the **greatest lower bound** of a and b and denote the unique greatest lower bound of a and b by $a \wedge b$, which is called the **meet** of a and b . The poset \mathcal{L} is called a **lattice** if each pair of elements has a least upper bound and a greatest lower bound and it is denoted by $(\mathcal{L}, \leq, \vee, \wedge)$. An element in \mathcal{L} that is not smaller than any other element is called **maximal** element of \mathcal{L} and it is denoted by $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{L}}$ and an element that is not bigger than any other element is called **minimal** element of \mathcal{L} and it is denoted by $\mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{L}}$. If there is no confusion, we simply write $\mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{0}$.

Definition 2.2. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let $(\mathcal{L}_i, \leq_i, \vee_i, \wedge_i)$ be a lattice. A bijection $\phi : \mathcal{L}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_2$ is called

- (1) a **lattice isomorphism** if $\phi(a \vee_1 b) = \phi(a) \vee_2 \phi(b)$ and $\phi(a \wedge_1 b) = \phi(a) \wedge_2 \phi(b)$ for all $a, b \in \mathcal{L}_1$;
- (2) a **lattice anti-isomorphism** if $\phi(a \vee_1 b) = \phi(a) \wedge_2 \phi(b)$ and $\phi(a \wedge_1 b) = \phi(a) \vee_2 \phi(b)$ for all $a, b \in \mathcal{L}_1$.

Definition 2.3. Let \mathcal{L} be a lattice with meet \wedge and join \vee . Let $a, b \in \mathcal{L}$ be such that $a \leq b$.

- (1) An **interval** $[a, b] \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ is the set of all $x \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $a \leq x \leq b$. It defines the **interval sublattice** $([a, b], \leq, \vee, \wedge)$.
- (2) Let $c \in [a, b]$. We say that d is a **complement** of c in $[a, b]$ if $c \wedge d = a$ and $c \vee d = b$.
- (3) \mathcal{L} is called **relatively complemented** if every $c \in [a, b]$ has a complement in $[a, b]$ and is called **complemented** if every $c \in \mathcal{L}$ has a complement in \mathcal{L} .
- (4) If $[a, b] \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ is such that for any $x \in \mathcal{L}$, $x \in [a, b]$ implies that $x = a$ or $x = b$, then b is called a **cover** of a and we write $a \lessdot b$.
- (5) An **atom** or **point** of \mathcal{L} is any element that is a cover of $\mathbf{0}$. A **coatom** or **copoint** of \mathcal{L} is any element that is covered by $\mathbf{1}$. We define $\mathcal{A}([a, b]) := \{x \in [a, b] : a \lessdot x\}$ and $\mathcal{H}([a, b]) := \{x \in [a, b] : x \lessdot b\}$. We also define $\mathcal{A}(b) := \{x \in [\mathbf{0}, b] : \mathbf{0} \lessdot x\}$ and $\mathcal{H}(b) := \{x \in [\mathbf{0}, b] : x \lessdot b\}$.

- (6) A **chain** from a to b is a totally ordered subset of $[a, b]$ with respect to \leq . A chain from a to b is called a **maximal** chain in $[a, b]$ if it is not properly contained in any other chain from a to b . A finite **chain** from a to b is a sequence of the form $a = x_1 < \cdots < x_{k+1} = b$ with $x_j \in \mathcal{L}$ for $j \in [k]$, in which case we say that the chain has length k . If a chain in \mathcal{L} is not finite then it is called an infinite chain.
- (7) If \mathcal{L} has no infinite chains, we define the **height** of b , which we denote by $h(b)$, to be the maximum length of all maximal chains from $\mathbf{0}$ to b . The **length** of $[a, b]$ is defined to be $h(b) - h(a)$.
- (8) \mathcal{L} is called **lower** (resp. **upper**) **semimodular** if $a \triangleleft a \vee b$ implies $a \wedge b \triangleleft b$ (resp. $a \wedge b \triangleleft b$ implies $a \triangleleft a \vee b$).
- (9) \mathcal{L} is called **modular** if for all $a, b, c \in \mathcal{L}$, we have that $a \geq c$ implies $(a \wedge b) \vee c = a \wedge (b \vee c)$.

Every modular lattice is both upper and lower semimodular, while the converse holds for lattices of finite length.

Notation 2.4. Throughout this paper, unless explicitly stated otherwise, \mathcal{L} will denote a lattice of finite length n , ordered under \leq with meet \wedge and join \vee . We will denote atoms of \mathcal{L} in lowercase, while if the height of an element is not specified to be 1, we will use uppercase. We write \mathcal{H} to denote the coatoms of \mathcal{L} and we write \mathcal{A} to denote the set of atoms of \mathcal{L} .

With respect to the connections with coding theory discussed in this paper, we are particularly interested in the subspace lattice $(\mathcal{L}(E), \leq, \vee, \wedge)$, which is the lattice of \mathbb{F}_q -subspaces of E , ordered with respect to inclusion and for which the join of a pair of subspaces is their vector space sum and the meet of a pair of subspaces is their intersection. That is, for all subspaces $A, B \leq E$ we have: $A \vee B = A + B$, $A \wedge B = A \cap B$. The minimal element of $\mathcal{L}(E)$ is $\mathbf{0} = \langle 0 \rangle$ and its maximal element is $\mathbf{1} = E$. $\mathcal{L}(E)$ is a modular, complemented lattice. For each $U \in \mathcal{L}(E)$, we write U^\perp to denote the orthogonal complement of U with respect to a fixed non-degenerate bilinear form on E . The map $U \mapsto U^\perp$ is an involutory anti-automorphism of $\mathcal{L}(E)$. We let $\mathcal{A}(E)$ and $\mathcal{H}(E)$ denote the atoms and coatoms, respectively, of $\mathcal{L}(E)$.

We may think of $\mathcal{L}(E)$ as a q -analogue of the Boolean lattice $\mathcal{L}(S)$, where S is a set of cardinality n . In $\mathcal{L}(S)$, the meet operation is again intersection while the join operation is set-theoretic union. Several formulae and invariants related to the objects associated with $\mathcal{L}(E)$ can be obtained in the Boolean case by setting $q = 1$.

We recall the definition of a closure operator on a lattice; see [Cra69, Whi93].

Definition 2.5. A **closure operator** on the lattice \mathcal{L} is a function $\text{cl} : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ such that

- (1) $\text{cl}(X) \geq X$, for all $X \in \mathcal{L}$;
- (2) $\text{cl}(X) \leq \text{cl}(Y)$ for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $X \leq Y$;
- (3) $\text{cl}(\text{cl}(X)) = \text{cl}(X)$ for all $X \in \mathcal{L}$.

Let cl be a closure operator on \mathcal{L} . An element $X \in \mathcal{L}$ is called **closed** with respect to cl if $X = \text{cl}(X)$. The quotient lattice of \mathcal{L} with respect to cl is the lattice of closed elements of \mathcal{L} .

Definition 2.6 ([Whi93]). Let $f : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $f(\mathbf{0}) = 0$ and for all $A, B \in \mathcal{L}$, $f(A) \leq f(B)$ whenever $A \leq B$. We say that the pair (\mathcal{L}, f) is an (integer) **weighted lattice**.

Definition 2.7. Let $\mathcal{W} = (\mathcal{L}, f)$ be a weighted lattice and let $X, Y \in \mathcal{L}$. Define the map $f_{[X, Y]} : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$ by $f_{[X, Y]}(T) = f(T) - f(X)$ for every $T \in [X, Y]$. Then $\mathcal{W}([X, Y])$ is the weighted lattice defined by the pair $([X, Y], f_{[X, Y]})$. The weighted lattice $\mathcal{W}([X, Y])$ is called a **minor** of \mathcal{W} .

Definition 2.8. We say that two weighted lattices $\mathcal{W}_1 = (\mathcal{L}_1, f_1)$ and $\mathcal{W}_2 = (\mathcal{L}_2, f_2)$ are **scaling-lattice-equivalent** if there exists a lattice isomorphism $\phi : \mathcal{L}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_2$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $f_1(A) = \lambda f_2(\phi(A))$ for all $A \in \mathcal{L}_1$. If $\lambda = 1$, we say that \mathcal{W}_1 and \mathcal{W}_2 are lattice-equivalent.

We mention some other well-known facts on weighted lattices; see [Whi93] for a more detailed treatment. The element $F \in \mathcal{L}$ is called a **flat** of the weighted lattice (\mathcal{L}, f) if $f(A) > f(F)$

whenever $A > F$. A closure operator cl on \mathcal{L} is called **respectful** on (\mathcal{L}, f) if $f(A) = f(\text{cl}(A))$ for all $A \in \mathcal{L}$. A closure operator is respectful on (\mathcal{L}, f) if and only if every flat F of (\mathcal{L}, f) satisfies $\text{cl}(F) = F$, i.e. is closed. The collection of flats of (\mathcal{L}, f) forms a lattice called the **lattice of flats** of (\mathcal{L}, f) . We define the **principal closure** of $A \in \mathcal{L}$ to be meet of all the flats of (\mathcal{L}, f) that contain A . Thus the quotient lattice with respect to the principal closure operator on (\mathcal{L}, f) coincides with the lattice of flats of (\mathcal{L}, f) . We say that an atom $x \in \mathcal{L}$ is a **loop** of the weighted lattice (\mathcal{L}, f) if $f(x) = 0$.

The Möbius function (see, e.g. [vLW92, Chapter 25]) is necessary for the definition of a characteristic polynomial.

Definition 2.9. Let (\mathcal{P}, \leq) be a partially ordered set. The Möbius function for \mathcal{P} is defined via the recursive formula for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{P}$:

$$\mu(X, Y) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } X = Y, \\ -\sum_{X \leq Z < Y} \mu(X, Z) & \text{if } X < Y, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

An equivalent definition of μ is given by the recursion

$$\sum_{X \leq Z \leq Y} \mu(Z, Y) = 0 \quad \forall X, Y \in \mathcal{P}, X < Y. \quad (1)$$

Lemma 2.10 (The Möbius Inversion Formula). Let $f, g : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be functions on a poset \mathcal{P} . The following hold.

- (1) $f(X) = \sum_{X \leq Y} g(Y) \quad \forall X \in \mathcal{P}$ if and only if $g(X) = \sum_{X \leq Y} \mu(X, Y) f(Y) \quad \forall X \in \mathcal{P}$.
- (2) $f(X) = \sum_{X \geq Y} g(Y) \quad \forall X \in \mathcal{P}$ if and only if $g(X) = \sum_{X \geq Y} \mu(Y, X) f(Y) \quad \forall X \in \mathcal{P}$.

We recall the following result of Crapo [Cra69, Theorem 1].

Lemma 2.11 ([Cra69]). Let \mathcal{L}' be the quotient lattice of \mathcal{L} with respect to a closure operator cl of \mathcal{L} and let μ' be its corresponding Möbius function. Let $X, Y \in \mathcal{L}$. Then

$$\sum_{Z \in \mathcal{L} : \text{cl}(Z) = \text{cl}(Y)} \mu(X, Z) = \begin{cases} \mu'(\text{cl}(X), \text{cl}(Y)) & \text{if } \text{cl}(X) = X, \\ 0 & \text{if } \text{cl}(X) > X. \end{cases}$$

Given $U, V \in \mathcal{L}(E)$ of heights u and v , respectively, we have that

$$\mu(U, V) = \begin{cases} (-1)^{v-u} q^{\binom{v-u}{2}} & \text{if } U \leq V, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

2.2. Basic Notions of \mathcal{L} -Polymatroids and q -Polymatroids. We outline basic facts and definitions of \mathcal{L} -Polymatroids and q -polymatroids. In all of the following, the definitions are extensions of those found in the literature on matroids and polymatroids; we simply consider these structures to be defined on more general lattices than the Boolean lattice.

In the instance of the subspace lattice $\mathcal{L}(E)$, the main difference between the case $q = 1$ and $q > 1$ is that in the former case we have the Boolean lattice, which is distributive, while the subspace lattice is not. Furthermore, while both lattices are relatively complemented, the complement of an element of the subspace lattice is not unique. Finally, over a finite field, an orthogonal complement of an element is not in general one of its complements in the subspace lattice. The first results on q -polymatroids and codes can be read in [Shi19] and [GJLR20].

Definition 2.12. An (\mathcal{L}, r) -**(integer) polymatroid** is a pair $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{L}, \rho)$ for which $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and ρ is a function $\rho : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$ satisfying the following axioms.

- (R1) Boundedness: $0 \leq \rho(A) \leq r \cdot h(A)$, for all $A \in \mathcal{L}$.
- (R2) Monotonicity: $A \leq B \Rightarrow \rho(A) \leq \rho(B)$, for all $A, B \in \mathcal{L}$.

(R3) Submodularity: $\rho(A \vee B) + \rho(A \wedge B) \leq \rho(A) \vee \rho(B)$, for all $A, B \in \mathcal{L}$.

If $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(E)$, we say that \mathcal{M} is a (q, r) -polymatroid.

If it is not necessary to specify r , we will simply refer to such an object as an \mathcal{L} -polymatroid, in the case of arbitrary \mathcal{L} , or as a q -polymatroid for $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(E)$. We define a q -**matroid** to be a $(q, 1)$ -polymatroid. A $(1, r)$ -polymatroid is an integer polymatroid and a $(1, 1)$ -polymatroid is simply a matroid. Clearly, an \mathcal{L} -polymatroid (\mathcal{L}, ρ) is a weighted lattice whose underlying function ρ is bounded and submodular. We say that an atom $x \in \mathcal{L}$ is a **loop** of the \mathcal{L} -polymatroid $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{L}, \rho)$ if $\rho(x) = 0$. A coatom $H \in \mathcal{L}$ is called a **coloop** of \mathcal{M} if $\rho(H) = \rho(\mathbf{1}) - r$.

Definition 2.13. Let $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{L}, \rho)$ be an (\mathcal{L}, r) -polymatroid and let \mathcal{L}^* be a lattice of finite length n . Let φ be a lattice anti-isomorphism $\varphi : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^*$. For every $A \in \mathcal{L}$, define $\rho^*(\varphi(A)) := r \cdot h(\varphi(A)) - \rho(\mathbf{1}) + \rho(A)$. Then $\mathcal{M}^* = (\mathcal{L}^*, \rho^*)$ is an (\mathcal{L}^*, r) -polymatroid called the **dual** of \mathcal{M} .

Different choices of anti-isomorphism φ may lead to different dual matroids, but all duals of an (\mathcal{L}, r) -polymatroid \mathcal{M} are lattice-equivalent.

Definition 2.14. Let $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{L}, \rho)$ be a (\mathcal{L}, r) -polymatroid and let $[X, Y]$ be an interval of \mathcal{L} . Then $\mathcal{M}([X, Y])$ is the (\mathcal{L}, r) -polymatroid defined by the pair $([X, Y], \rho_{[X, Y]})$. We say that $\mathcal{M}([X, Y])$ is a **minor** of \mathcal{M} . Let φ be an anti-automorphism of \mathcal{L} .

- (1) We write $\mathcal{M}|_Y := \mathcal{M}([\mathbf{0}, Y])$, which is called the **restriction** of \mathcal{M} to Y .
- (2) We write $\mathcal{M}/X := \mathcal{M}([X, \mathbf{1}])$, which is called the **contraction** of \mathcal{M} by X .
- (3) For $T \in \mathcal{L}$, we write $\mathcal{M}.T := \mathcal{M}/\varphi(T)$, which is called the **contraction** of \mathcal{M} to T .

In the more general context of a weighted lattice $\mathcal{W} = (\mathcal{L}, f)$, we similarly write $\mathcal{W}|_Y := \mathcal{W}([\mathbf{0}, Y])$ and $\mathcal{W}/X := \mathcal{W}([X, \mathbf{1}])$ for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{L}$.

We define the *weight enumerator* of an (\mathcal{L}, r) -polymatroid; see [BRS09] for the matroid case.

Definition 2.15. Let φ be an anti-automorphism of \mathcal{L} . We define the **weight enumerator** of the (\mathcal{L}, r) -polymatroid \mathcal{M} to be the list $[A_{\mathcal{M}}(i; z) : 0 \leq i \leq n]$, where for each i we define

$$A_{\mathcal{M}}(i; z) := \sum_{\substack{X \in \mathcal{L}: \\ h(X)=i}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}.X; z) = \sum_{\substack{X \in \mathcal{L}: \\ h(X)=i}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}/\varphi(X); z).$$

Definition 2.16. Let $\mathcal{W} = (\mathcal{L}, f)$ be a weighted lattice and let $X, Y \in \mathcal{L}$. Let μ be the Möbius function of \mathcal{L} . The **characteristic polynomial** of $\mathcal{W}([X, Y])$ is the polynomial in $\mathbb{Z}[z]$ defined by

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}([X, Y]); z) := \sum_{A \in [X, Y]} \mu(X, A) z^{f(Y) - f(A)}.$$

In particular, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}; z) := \sum_{X \in \mathcal{L}} \mu(\mathbf{0}, X) z^{f(\mathbf{1}) - f(X)}.$$

It is straightforward to check that the characteristic polynomial is an invariant of the lattice-equivalence class of a weighted lattice. Indeed, if $\phi : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}'$ is a lattice isomorphism, such that $\mathcal{W} = (\mathcal{L}, f)$ and $\mathcal{W}' = (\mathcal{L}', f')$ are lattice-equivalent via $f(X) = f'(\phi(X))$ for all $X \in \mathcal{L}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}'; z) &= \sum_{X \in \mathcal{L}'} \mu(\mathbf{0}, X) z^{f'(\mathbf{1}') - f'(X)} \\ &= \sum_{X \in \mathcal{L}} \mu(\mathbf{0}, \phi(X)) z^{f'(\phi(\mathbf{1})) - f'(\phi(X))} \\ &= \sum_{X \in \mathcal{L}} \mu(\mathbf{0}, X) z^{f(\mathbf{1}) - f(X)} \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}; z). \end{aligned}$$

If $\mathcal{W} = (\mathcal{L}, f)$ and $\mathcal{W}' = (\mathcal{L}', f')$ are scaling-lattice-equivalent via $f(X) = \lambda f'(\phi(X))$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}$, then $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}'; z^\lambda) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}; z)$.

By the definition of the Möbius function, for a weighted lattice $\mathcal{W} = (\mathcal{L}, f)$, we have $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}; 1) = 0$ and so, unless $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}; z)$ is identically zero, $z - 1$ is a factor in $\mathbb{Z}[z]$. There are some instances for which it is known that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}; z)$ is identically zero, for example, this is the case if $f(a) = 0$ for some atom of $a \in \mathcal{L}$. More generally, as a direct consequence of Lemma 2.11 ([Cra69, Theorem 1]), we have the following.

Proposition 2.17. Let $\mathcal{W} = (\mathcal{L}, f)$ be a weighted lattice and let $A \in \mathcal{L}$. If A is not a flat of \mathcal{W} then $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/A; z)$ is identically zero.

Lemma 2.18. Let $\mathcal{W} = (\mathcal{L}, f)$ be a weighted lattice. Then $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}; z) = z^{f(\mathbf{1})} - \sum_{B \in \mathcal{L}: B > \mathbf{0}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/B; z)$.

Proof. By the definition of the characteristic polynomial, for every $B \in \mathcal{L}$ we have:

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/B; z) = \sum_{A \in [B, \mathbf{1}]} \mu(B, A) z^{f(\mathbf{1}) - f(A)}.$$

By Möbius inversion, for every $B \in \mathcal{L}$ we have:

$$z^{f(\mathbf{1}) - f(B)} = \sum_{A \in [B, \mathbf{1}]} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/A; z),$$

and so the result follows by setting $B = \mathbf{0}$. \square

2.3. Rank-Metric Codes. Rank-metric codes have a natural connection with q -polymatroids, as the *supports* of their codewords are subspaces. We start by briefly recalling some basic notions on rank-metric codes; see [Del78, Gab85, Gor21]. For this purpose, we endow the space $\mathbb{F}_q^{n \times m}$ with the **rank distance**, defined by $d(A, B) := \text{rk}(A - B)$, for all $A, B \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n \times m}$.

Notation 2.19. We write $A \leq B$ if A is a subspace of B . By abuse of notation, we write C^\perp to denote the following.

- (1) $C \leq \mathbb{F}_q^{n \times m}$ with respect to the inner product $b_{\mathbb{F}_q^{n \times m}}$ defined by $b_{\mathbb{F}_q^{n \times m}}(X, Y) = \text{Tr}(XY^T)$ for all $X, Y \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n \times m}$, where $\text{Tr}(\cdot)$ denotes the trace of a given matrix.
- (2) $C \leq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ with respect to the dot product defined by $x \cdot y = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i$ for all $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$.

Definition 2.20. We say that $C \leq \mathbb{F}_q^{n \times m}$ is an \mathbb{F}_q -**linear (rank-metric) code** or a **matrix code** if C is an \mathbb{F}_q -subspace of $\mathbb{F}_q^{n \times m}$. Its **minimum distance** is:

$$d(C) := \min\{\text{rk}(M) : M \in C, M \neq 0\}.$$

We say that C is an \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, k, d]$ rank-metric code if it has \mathbb{F}_q -dimension k and minimum distance d . The **dual code** of C is defined to be $C^\perp = \{M \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n \times m} : \text{Tr}(MN^T) = 0 \text{ for all } N \in C\}$. For each $i \in [\min(n, m)]$, we define $W_i(C) := |\{A \in C : \text{rk}(A) = i\}|$. The list $[W_i(C) : i \in [\min(n, m)]]$ is called the **weight distribution** of C .

Let $X \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n \times m}$ and let $U \leq \mathbb{F}_q^n$. We say that U is the **support** of X if $\text{colsp}(X) = U$. Let C be an \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, k]$ rank-metric code. We say that U is a **support** of C if there exists some $X \in C$ with support U . We also define the notion of support for a code. The **support** of C is defined to be the \mathbb{F}_q -subspace of \mathbb{F}_q^n given by

$$\text{supp}(C) = \sum_{M \in C} \text{colsp}(M),$$

where the sum denotes the sum of vector subspaces. The code C is said to be **non-degenerate** if $\text{supp}(C) = \mathbb{F}_q^n$.

In the same way one can define the supports of a matrix or of a code in terms of the row-space, however this is not necessary for the scope of the paper. See [Gor21] for a detailed analysis of the various definitions of rank-support proposed in the literature.

Definition 2.21. Let Γ be a basis of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} over \mathbb{F}_q . For each $x \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$, we write $\Gamma(x)$ to denote the $n \times m$ matrix over \mathbb{F}_q whose i th row is the coordinate vector of the i th coefficient of x with respect to the basis Γ . The **rank** of x , denoted by $\text{rk}(x)$, is the rank of the matrix $\Gamma(x)$.

It is easy to see that the rank of x is independent of the choice of the basis Γ .

Definition 2.22. An \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -**linear (rank-metric) code** or a **vector code** C is an \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -subspace of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$. Its **minimum rank distance** is

$$d(C) = \min\{\text{rk}(x) : x \in C, x \neq 0\}.$$

We say that C is an \mathbb{F}_{q^m} - $[n, k, d]$ rank-metric code if it has \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -dimension k and minimum rank distance d . If d is not known we simply write that C is an \mathbb{F}_{q^m} - $[n, k]$ rank-metric code. A **generator matrix** of C is a matrix $G \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{k \times n}$ whose rows generate C as an \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -linear space. The code C^\perp denotes the **dual code** of C with respect to the standard dot product on $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$. Let $U \leq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ and let $x \in C$. We say that U is a **support** of x if U is the column space of $\Gamma(x)$, where Γ is a basis for the field extension $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}/\mathbb{F}_q$ and we write $\text{supp}(x) = U$. In fact, the support does not depend on the choice of Γ . The **support** of C is defined to be

$$\text{supp}(C) = \sum_{x \in C} \text{supp}(x).$$

We say that C is **non-degenerate** if $\text{supp}(C) = \mathbb{F}_q^n$.

In [ABNR22] the following characterization of the non-degeneracy property of vector codes has been provided, which we recall in order to use it in Sections 4 and 5.

Proposition 2.23. [ABNR22, Proposition 3.2] Let C be an \mathbb{F}_{q^m} - $[n, k]$ rank-metric code. C is non-degenerate if and only if the \mathbb{F}_q -span of the columns of any generator matrix of C has \mathbb{F}_q -dimension n .

We recall the notion of equivalence and the puncturing operation for both matrix and vector rank-metric codes. For a rank-metric code $C \leq \mathbb{F}_q^{n \times m}$ and matrices $A \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{F}_q^{m \times m}$ we define:

$$ACB := \{AMB : M \in C\} \text{ and } C^T := \{M^T : M \in C\}.$$

If $B = I$ we simply write AC in the above and if $A = I$ we write CB . If $n \neq m$, then a pair of rank-metric codes C_1 and C_2 are called **equivalent** if there exist $A \in \text{GL}(n, \mathbb{F}_q)$ and $B \in \text{GL}(m, \mathbb{F}_q)$ such that $C_2 = AC_1B$. If $n = m$, then the transpose operation for matrices also preserves rank. For this reason it is often included in the definition of equivalence. That is, if $n = m$ then C_2 and C_1 are called equivalent if $C_2 = AC_1B$ or $C_2^T = AC_1B$ for some invertible matrices A, B . If C_1, C_2 are two \mathbb{F}_{q^m} - $[n, k]$ codes, then they are said to be equivalent if there is a matrix $A \in \text{GL}(n, \mathbb{F}_q)$ such that $C_2 = C_1A$.

Let $M \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n \times m}$. For any $J \subseteq [n]$, satisfying $0 < |J| < n$, we denote by $M_J \in \mathbb{F}_q^{(n-|J|) \times m}$ the submatrix obtained from M by deleting the rows indexed by J .

Definition 2.24. Let $A \in \text{GL}_n(q)$ and $J \subseteq [n]$ be such that $0 < |J| < n$. We define the **punctured code** of C with respect to A and J as

$$\Pi(C, A, J) = \{(AM)_J : M \in C\} \leq \mathbb{F}_q^{(n-|J|) \times m}.$$

Definition 2.25. Let C be an \mathbb{F}_{q^m} - $[n, k]$ rank-metric code and $A \in \text{GL}(n, \mathbb{F}_q)$. Let $J \subseteq [n]$, satisfying $0 < |J| < n$. We define the **punctured code** of C with respect to A and J by

$$\Pi(C, A, J) := \{(cA)_J : c \in C\} \leq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{n-|J|}.$$

Remark 2.26. The punctured code of a non-degenerate \mathbb{F}_{q^m} - $[n, k]$ code is always non-degenerate, by Proposition 2.23 (2). More generally, it is easy to see that the punctured code of a non-degenerate \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, k]$ rank-metric code is also non-degenerate, for if $\text{supp}(C) = \mathbb{F}_q^n$ then $\text{supp}(AC) = \mathbb{F}_q^n$ for any $A \in \text{GL}_n(q)$, so that $\text{supp}(\Pi(C, A, J)) = \mathbb{F}_q^{n-|J|}$ for any $J \subseteq [n]$.

We conclude this subsection by recalling the relation between the parameters of a rank-metric code. Indeed, a code cannot have large dimension and minimum distance at the same time. The following result by Delsarte expresses a trade-off between these quantities.

Theorem 2.27 (The rank-metric Singleton bound; see [Del78]). Let C be an \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, k]$ rank-metric code with $d(C) \geq d$. We have

$$k \leq \max(m, n)(\min(m, n) - d + 1).$$

The best-known rank-metric codes are those having the maximum possible dimension for a given minimum distance.

Definition 2.28. Let C be \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, k, d]$ rank-metric code. C is called a **maximum rank distance (MRD)** code if its parameters attain the bound of Theorem 2.27 with equality, i.e.

$$d = \min(n, m) - \frac{k}{\max(n, m)} + 1.$$

C is called a quasi-MRD (QMRD) code if $\max(n, m)$ does not divide k and

$$d = \min(n, m) - \left\lceil \frac{k}{\max(n, m)} \right\rceil + 1.$$

If C is QMRD and C^\perp is QMRD then C is called a **dually-QMRD (DQMRD)** code.

MRD codes have several notable properties. Delsarte showed that MRD codes exist for all values of q, n, m , and all d ; see [Del78]. In the following lemma we summarize other relevant properties of these codes; see [Del78, dICGLR18, Gor21].

Lemma 2.29. Let C be an \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, k, d]$ MRD code or a DQMRD code. Then the following properties hold.

- (1) C is non-degenerate. Indeed, a degenerate code can be isometrically embedded into $\mathbb{F}_q^{(n-1) \times m}$, in which case the Singleton bound would be violated.
- (2) The weight distribution of C is known and determined by q, n, m, k .
- (3) If C is MRD then C^\perp is an MRD code with rank distance equal to $\min(m, n) - d + 2$.
- (4) If C is DQMRD then C^\perp has rank distance $d^\perp = \min(m, n) - d + 1$.

2.4. Representable q -Polymatroids. It is known that an \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, k]$ rank-metric code induces a (q, m) -polymatroid; see [GJLR20, Shi19]. One way to describe this correspondence is as follows.

Definition 2.30. Let m be a positive integer and let C be an \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, k]$ rank-metric code. For each subspace $U \leq E$, we define

$$C_U := \{A \in C : \text{colsp}(A) \leq U^\perp\} \text{ and } C_{=U} := \{A \in C : \text{colsp}(A) = U^\perp\}.$$

Let $\rho : \mathcal{L}(E) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}$ be defined by $\rho(U) := k - \dim(C_U)$. Then (E, ρ) is a (q, m) -polymatroid [GJLR20, Theorem 5.3] and we denote it by $\mathcal{M}[C]$.

Each vector rank-metric code determines a q -matroid (a $(q, 1)$ -polymatroid), as follows.

Definition 2.31. Let C be an \mathbb{F}_{q^m} - $[n, k]$ rank-metric code. For every $W \leq \mathbb{F}_q^n$, we define

$$C_W := \{x \in C : \text{supp}(x) \leq W^\perp\} \text{ and } C_{=W} := \{x \in C : \text{supp}(x) = W^\perp\}.$$

Let $\rho : \mathcal{L}(E) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}$ be defined by $\rho(W) := k - \dim_{\mathbb{F}_{q^m}}(C_W)$. Then (E, ρ) is a q -matroid [JP18, Theorem 24] and we also denote it by $\mathcal{M}[C]$.

Note that if Definition 2.30 is applied to a vector rank-metric code to obtain a (q, m) -polymatroid, then this (q, m) -polymatroid is a scaling (by a factor of m) of the q -matroid constructed from the same code using Definition 2.31.

It is also common to construct a q -matroid starting from the generator matrix of an \mathbb{F}_{q^m} - $[n, k]$ rank-metric code C ; see for instance [JP18, GJLR20]. Let G be a $k \times n$ generator matrix for C

and for every $U \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$, let A^U be a matrix whose columns form a basis of U . Then the map

$$\rho_G : \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{F}_q^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}, U \mapsto \text{rk}(GA^U)$$

is the rank function of a q -matroid. However, it is easy to see that ρ_G and the rank function ρ from Definition 2.31 are the same; see for instance [JP18, Corollary 23].

We make some final remarks on code equivalence. If C is a matrix rank-metric code, then $\mathcal{M}[ACB]$ and $\mathcal{M}[C]$ are lattice-equivalent for any $A \in \text{GL}(n, \mathbb{F}_q)$ and $B \in \text{GL}(m, \mathbb{F}_q)$. This means, in particular, that the characteristic polynomials of $\mathcal{M}[AC]$ and $\mathcal{M}[C]$ are identical. If C is a vector rank-metric code, then the multiplication by $A \in \text{GL}(n, \mathbb{F}_q)$ is on the right, but the result stays the same, i.e. the characteristic polynomials of $\mathcal{M}[CA]$ and $\mathcal{M}[C]$ are identical; see [BCIJ24, Lemma 25].

3. PROPERTIES OF THE CHARACTERISTIC POLYNOMIAL

In this section we examine expressions of the characteristic polynomial of a weighted lattice in terms of the characteristic polynomials of its minors. Theorem 3.2 is a generalisation to weighted lattices of a well-known recursive description of the characteristic polynomial of a matroid in terms of contractions and deletions. The interested reader is referred to [Kun96, Whi93, BO92] for further reading.

We first give a preliminary result on the characteristic polynomial of a weighted lattice of height 2.

Lemma 3.1. Let \mathcal{L} have length equal to 2 and let $e \in \mathcal{A}$. Let $\mathcal{W} = (\mathcal{L}, f)$ be a weighted lattice. Then

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}; z) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}|_e; z)(\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/e; z) + 1) - \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{A}: \\ a \neq e}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/a; z).$$

Proof. Let μ be the Möbius function of \mathcal{L} . Since $\mu(\mathbf{0}, a) = -1$ for each atom a of \mathcal{L} , $\mu(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}) = 1$, and $\mu(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}) = |\mathcal{A}| - 1$, we see that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}; z) = z^{f(\mathbf{1})} - \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} z^{f(\mathbf{1})-f(a)} + |\mathcal{A}| - 1$. Furthermore, for every atom a of \mathcal{L} we have: $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}|_a; z) = z^{f(a)} - 1$ and $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/a; z) = z^{f(\mathbf{1})-f(a)} - 1$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}; z) - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}|_e; z) + \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{A}: \\ a \neq e}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/a; z) &= z^{f(\mathbf{1})} - z^{f(e)} - z^{f(\mathbf{1})-f(e)} + 1 \\ &= (z^{f(\mathbf{1})-f(e)} - 1)(z^{f(e)} - 1) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/e; z)\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}|_e). \end{aligned}$$

The result now follows. □

We now show that Lemma 3.1 holds for weighted lattices of any height. We will then use this theorem to deduce several other results on the characteristic polynomial.

Theorem 3.2. Let \mathcal{L} be a lower semimodular lattice. Let $\mathcal{W} = (\mathcal{L}, f)$ be a weighted lattice and let $H \in \mathcal{H}$. Then

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}; z) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}|_H; z)(\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/H; z) + 1) - \sum_{b \in \mathcal{A}: b \not\leq H} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/b; z).$$

Proof. We prove the result by induction on the length of \mathcal{L} , noting that the first step holds by Lemma 3.1. Now suppose that the result holds whenever \mathcal{L} has length at most $n - 1$. Applying

Lemma 2.18 and using the fact that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/H; z) = z^{f(E)-f(H)} - 1$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}; z) - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}|_H; z) &= z^{f(E)} - \sum_{\substack{B \in \mathcal{L}: \\ B > \mathbf{0}}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/B; z) - z^{f(H)} + \sum_{\substack{Y \in \mathcal{L}: \\ \mathbf{0} < Y \leq H}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}([Y, H]); z) \\ &= z^{f(H)} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/H; z) + \sum_{\substack{Y \in \mathcal{L}: \\ \mathbf{0} < Y \leq H}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}([Y, H]); z) - \sum_{\substack{B \in \mathcal{L}: \\ \mathbf{0} < B \leq H}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/B; z) \\ &\quad - \sum_{\substack{B \in \mathcal{L}: \\ \mathbf{0} < B \leq H}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/B; z). \end{aligned}$$

For $B \leq H$, since $[\mathbf{0}, B]$ is lower semimodular we may apply the induction hypothesis to $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/B; z)$ and H and obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/B; z) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}([B, H]); z)(\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/H; z) + 1) - \sum_{\substack{Y \in \mathcal{L}: \\ B < Y \not\leq H}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/Y; z).$$

Consider the right-most term in the above as we sum over the non-zero elements of $[\mathbf{0}, H]$. If $Y \not\leq H$, then since \mathcal{L} is lower semimodular we have that $Y \wedge H < Y$, from which it follows that $\{B \in \mathcal{L} : B < Y, B \leq H\} = \{Y \wedge H\}$. Therefore, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{B \in \mathcal{L}: \\ \mathbf{0} < B \leq H}} \sum_{\substack{Y \in \mathcal{L}: \\ B < Y \not\leq H}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/Y; z) &= \sum_{B \in [\mathbf{0}, H]} \sum_{\substack{Y \in \mathcal{L}: \\ B < Y \not\leq H}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/Y; z) - \sum_{\substack{Y \in \mathcal{L}: \\ \mathbf{0} < Y \not\leq H}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/Y; z) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{Y \in \mathcal{L}: \\ \mathbf{0} < Y \not\leq H}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/Y; z) \sum_{\substack{B \in \mathcal{L}: \\ B < Y, B \leq H}} 1 - \sum_{\substack{Y \in \mathcal{L}: \\ \mathbf{0} < Y \not\leq H}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/Y; z) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{Y \in \mathcal{L}: \\ \mathbf{0} < Y \not\leq H}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/Y; z) - \sum_{\substack{Y \in \mathcal{L}: \\ \mathbf{0} < Y \not\leq H}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/Y; z). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{B \in \mathcal{L}: \\ \mathbf{0} < B \leq H}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/B; z) &= \sum_{\substack{B \in \mathcal{L}: \\ \mathbf{0} < B \leq H}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}([B, H]); z) + \sum_{\substack{B \in \mathcal{L}: \\ \mathbf{0} < B \leq H}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}([B, H]); z)(\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/H; z)) \\ &\quad - \sum_{\substack{Y \in \mathcal{L}: \\ \mathbf{0} < Y \not\leq H}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/Y; z) + \sum_{\substack{Y \in \mathcal{L}: \\ \mathbf{0} < Y \not\leq H}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/Y; z). \end{aligned}$$

We hence obtain the following identity, using Lemma 2.18.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}; z) - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}|_H; z) &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/H; z) \left(z^{f(H)} - \sum_{\substack{B \in \mathcal{L}: \\ \mathbf{0} < B \leq H}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}([B, H]); z) \right) - \sum_{\substack{Y \in \mathcal{L}: \\ \mathbf{0} < Y \not\leq H}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/Y; z) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/H; z) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}|_H; z) - \sum_{\substack{Y \in \mathcal{L}: \\ \mathbf{0} < Y \not\leq H}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/Y; z). \end{aligned}$$

□

The following are immediate consequences of Theorem 3.2 (with (2) following with the addition of Proposition 2.17).

Corollary 3.3. Let \mathcal{L} be a lower semimodular lattice. Let $\mathcal{W} = (\mathcal{L}, f)$ be a weighted lattice and let $H \in \mathcal{H}$. The following hold.

$$(1) \quad \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}; z) = z^{f(\mathbf{1})-f(H)} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}|_H; z) - \sum_{\substack{y \in \mathcal{A}: \\ y \not\leq H}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/y; z).$$

$$(2) \text{ If } H \text{ is not a flat then } \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}; z) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}|_H; z) - \sum_{\substack{y \in \mathcal{A}: \\ y \not\leq H}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/y; z).$$

In the case of an \mathcal{L} -polymatroid $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{L}, \rho)$, by the submodularity of ρ we have the following result. Note that if $A \in \mathcal{L}$ is a complement of $H \in \mathcal{H}$, then by the lower semimodularity of \mathcal{L} we must have $h(A) = 1$.

Corollary 3.4. Let $H \in \mathcal{H}$. Suppose that H has a complement in \mathcal{L} .

$$(1) \text{ If a complement of } H \text{ is a loop of } \mathcal{M}, \text{ then } \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|_H; z) = \sum_{\substack{y \in \mathcal{A}: \\ y \not\leq H}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}/y; z).$$

(2) Let \mathcal{L} be modular. If H is a coloop of \mathcal{M} and e is a complement of H in \mathcal{L} , then

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}; z) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|_e; z)\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}/e; z) - \sum_{\substack{y \in \mathcal{A}: \\ y \not\leq H, y \neq e}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}/y; z).$$

Proof. If a complement of H is a loop then $\rho(\mathbf{1}) - \rho(H) = 0$, by the submodularity of ρ . Moreover, $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}; z) = 0$ by Crapo's result (Proposition 2.17). This yields (1). Suppose H is a coloop of \mathcal{M} and that e is a complement of H in \mathcal{L} . By the submodularity of ρ , we have that $\rho(e) = r$ and so $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|_e; z) = z^r - 1$. Since \mathcal{L} is modular, we have that $H \wedge (e \vee A) = A$. Therefore, by the submodularity of ρ , for every $A \in [\mathbf{0}, H]$ we have that $\rho(A \vee e) - \rho(A) = \rho(A \vee e) - \rho(H \wedge (e \vee A)) \geq \rho(H \vee (A \vee e)) - \rho(H) = \rho(\mathbf{1}) - \rho(H) = r = \rho(e)$. On the other hand, again by the submodularity of ρ , we have that $\rho(A \vee e) - \rho(e) \leq \rho(A)$ for each $A \in [\mathbf{0}, H]$. Therefore, $\rho(A \vee e) - \rho(e) = \rho(A)$ for each $A \in [\mathbf{0}, H]$. It follows that \mathcal{M}/e and $\mathcal{M}|_H$ are lattice-equivalent (\mathcal{L}, r) -polymatroids. This yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}; z) &= (\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|_e; z) + 1)\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}/e; z) - \sum_{\substack{y \in \mathcal{A}: \\ y \not\leq H}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}/y; z) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|_e; z)\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}/e; z) - \sum_{\substack{y \in \mathcal{A}: \\ y \not\leq H, y \neq e}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}/y; z). \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 3.5. If we apply Corollary 3.3 (1) to a polymatroid \mathcal{M} , then we obtain the statement

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}; z) = z^{\rho(E) - \rho(H)} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|_H; z) - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}/e; z),$$

where e is the unique complement of the coatom H in the Boolean lattice. In the case that \mathcal{M} is a matroid, this returns the more familiar looking contraction-deletion identities that can be read in several texts; e.g. see [Kun96, Section 5]. For example, if $\rho(E) - \rho(H) = 0$, then e is not an isthmus of \mathcal{M} and we have $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}; z) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|_H; z) - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}/e; z)$, while if $\rho(E) - \rho(H) = 1$, then e is an isthmus and as in the proof of Corollary 3.4 (2), we have $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}/e; z) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|_H; z) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M} \setminus e; z)$, which gives $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}; z) = (z - 1)\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M} \setminus e; z) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|_e; z)\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M} \setminus e; z)$.

Remark 3.6. If we apply Corollary 3.3 (1) to a q -matroid \mathcal{M} , we obtain the corrected statement of [Jan23, Theorem 5.14].

Example 3.7. In Figure 1 (see also, Figure 3), we illustrate a $(2, 3)$ -polymatroid \mathcal{M} defined on the subspace lattice $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{F}_2^3)$. The rank function ρ of \mathcal{M} is defined by a weighting on the edges of the Hasse diagram of $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{F}_2^3)$. Blue edges have a weighting of 3, black edges have a weighting of 2, red edges have a weighting of 1, and green edges have a weighting of 0. The rank of an

element A of $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{F}_2^3)$ is the sum of the weights of the edges of a maximal chain in $[\mathbf{0}, A]$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(\langle 110 \rangle) &= \rho(\langle 111 \rangle) = 2, \\ \rho(\langle 100 \rangle) &= \rho(\langle 010 \rangle) = \rho(\langle 011 \rangle) = \rho(\langle 101 \rangle) = \rho(\langle 001 \rangle) = 3, \\ \rho(\langle 010, 001 \rangle) &= \rho(\langle 101, 010 \rangle) = \rho(\langle 110, 001 \rangle) = 4, \\ \rho(\langle 100, 010 \rangle) &= \rho(\langle 100, 011 \rangle) = \rho(\langle 100, 001 \rangle) = \rho(\langle 101, 011 \rangle) = \rho(\mathbb{F}_2^3) = 5.\end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to check that the weighted lattice shown is indeed a q -polymatroid and that its characteristic polynomial is $\mathbb{P}(M; z) = z^5 - 2z^3 - 5z^2 + 6z = z(z-1)(z^3 - z^2 - z - 6)$. Note that $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{F}_2^3)$ has no coloops. Let $H = \langle 100, 010 \rangle$. Then $\rho(\mathbb{F}_2^3) - \rho(H) = 0$ and one can check that $\mathbb{P}(M|_H; z) = z^5 - z^3 - 2z^2 + 2$. Moreover, we have $\mathbb{P}(M/\langle 001 \rangle; z) = z^2 - 2z + 1 = (z-1)^2$, $\mathbb{P}(M/\langle 101 \rangle; z) = z^2 - z = z(z-1)$, $\mathbb{P}(M/\langle 111 \rangle; z) = z^3 - 2z + 1 = (z-1)(z^2 + z - 1)$, $\mathbb{P}(M/\langle 011 \rangle; z) = z^2 - z$. It can be verified that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(M|_H; z) - (\mathbb{P}(M/\langle 001 \rangle; z) + \mathbb{P}(M/\langle 101 \rangle; z) + \mathbb{P}(M/\langle 111 \rangle; z) + \mathbb{P}(M/\langle 011 \rangle; z)) &= \\ z^5 - z^3 - 2z^2 + 2 - (z^2 - 2z + 1) - (z^2 - z) - (z^3 - 2z + 1) - (z^2 - z) &= \\ z^5 - 2z^3 - z^2 + 6z = \mathbb{P}(M; z),\end{aligned}$$

as predicted by Corollary 3.3 (1).




FIGURE 1. The $(2, 3)$ -polymatroid from Example 3.7. $(3, 2, 1, 0)$

Example 3.8. We remark that the assumption that \mathcal{L} is lower semimodular is required in order for the statement of Theorem 3.2 to hold. Consider the \mathcal{L}_i -polymatroids, as shown in Figure 2. We have $\rho_1(a) = 1, \rho_1(b) = \rho_1(c) = 3, \rho_1(Y) = 5, \rho_1(H) = 4, \rho_1(\mathbf{1}) = 5$, while \mathcal{M}_2 is dual to \mathcal{M}_1 . Neither \mathcal{L}_1 nor \mathcal{L}_2 is a modular lattice, however, \mathcal{L}_1 is lower semimodular and \mathcal{L}_2 is upper semimodular.




FIGURE 2. Mutually dual lattice polymatroids from Example 3.8. $(3, 2, 1, 0)$

We have $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_1; z) = z^5 - z^3 - 2z^2 + z + 1$, $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_1|_H; z) = z^4 - 2z + 1$, $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_1|_Y; z) = z^5 - z^3 - z^2 + 1$, and $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_1/a; z) = z^3 - 1$, $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_1/b; z) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_1/c; z) = z^2 - z$. From this it is easily verified that:

$$z\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_1|_H; z) - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_1/a; z) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_1|_Y; z) - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_1/c; z) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_1; z),$$

which is consistent with Corollary 3.3 (1). Now consider \mathcal{M}_2 . We have $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_2; z) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_2|_B; z) = z^4 - z^2 - z + 1$, $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_2|_A; z) = z^3 - 1$, and $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_2|_C; z) = z^4 - z^2$, $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_2/y; z) = 0$, $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_2/h; z) = z^2 - 1$. However,

$$z^{\rho_2(\mathbf{1}) - \rho_2(C)} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_2|_C; z) - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_2/y; z) = z^4 - z^2 \neq z^4 - z^2 - z + 1 = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_2; z).$$

Critical problems for weighted lattices generally involve evaluations of the characteristic polynomial. In the next results, we consider evaluations of the characteristic polynomials of the minors of a weighted lattice. These are all corollaries of Theorem 3.2. They will be applied to obtain inequalities involving the critical exponent of a representable q -polymatroid in Section 4.

Corollary 3.9. Let \mathcal{L} be a lower semimodular lattice. Let $\mathcal{W} = (\mathcal{L}, f)$ be a weighted lattice, let $H \in \mathcal{H}$ and let $g = f(\mathbf{1}) - f(H)$. Let $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\theta^g > 0$ and $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/b; \theta) \geq 0$ for every atom $b \leq H$. If $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}; \theta) > 0$ then $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}|_H; \theta) > 0$.

Proof. The statement follows as a direct consequence of Corollary 3.3 (1). \square

Corollary 3.10. Let \mathcal{L} be a modular, complemented lattice. Let $\mathcal{W} = (\mathcal{L}, f)$ be a weighted lattice. Suppose there exists $\theta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}'; \theta) \geq 0$ for every minor \mathcal{W}' of \mathcal{W} . Let $T \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/T; \theta) > 0$. If U is a complement of T , then $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}|_U; \theta) > 0$.

Proof. Let U be a complement of T . We claim that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}|_U; \theta) > 0$. We prove the result by induction on the height of T , noting that it holds true vacuously for $T = \mathbf{0}$. Let $a \leq T$, and let $\bar{U} = a \vee U$. Then $\bar{U} \wedge T = (a \vee U) \wedge T = a \vee (T \wedge U) = a$ since \mathcal{L} is modular. Moreover, $\bar{U} \vee T = \mathbf{1}$, that is, \bar{U} is a complement of T in $[a, \mathbf{1}]$. Now \mathcal{W}/T and $(\mathcal{W}/a)/T$ are lattice equivalent and so $\mathbb{P}((\mathcal{W}/a)/T; \theta) > 0$. By the induction hypothesis, we have that $0 < \mathbb{P}((\mathcal{W}/a)|_{\bar{U}}; \theta) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}([a, \bar{U}]); \theta)$. Since $U \triangleleft \bar{U}$, by Theorem 3.2, we have,

$$\theta^{f(\mathbf{1}) - f(U)} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}|_U; \theta) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}|_{\bar{U}}; \theta) + \sum_{b \leq \bar{U}: b \not\leq U} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}([b, \bar{U}]); \theta). \quad (2)$$

Since $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}'; \theta) \geq 0$ for every minor \mathcal{W}' of \mathcal{W} , we have that every term on the right-hand side of (2) is non-negative. Since a is an atom of \mathcal{L} such that $a \leq \bar{U}$ and $a \not\leq U$, we have that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}([a, \bar{U}]); \theta)$, which is positive, is a summand of (2). Therefore $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}|_U; \theta) > 0$ and the result follows. \square

Corollary 3.11. Let \mathcal{L} be a modular, complemented lattice. Let $\mathcal{W} = (\mathcal{L}, f)$ be a weighted lattice. Suppose there exists $\theta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}'; \theta) \geq 0$ for every minor \mathcal{W}' of \mathcal{W} . Let $U \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}|_U; \theta) > 0$. Then there exists a complement V of U in \mathcal{L} and an element $T \leq V$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/T; \theta) > 0$.

Proof. We show the result by induction on the $n - h(U)$. Clearly, if $U = \mathbf{1}$ then the result holds with $T = V = \mathbf{0}$. Let $H \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $U \leq H$. Since $\mathbb{P}((\mathcal{W}|_H)|_U; \theta) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}|_U; \theta) > 0$, by the induction hypothesis, there exists a complement $V_1 \leq H$ of U in $[\mathbf{0}, H]$ and an element $T_1 \leq V_1$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}([T_1, H]); \theta) > 0$. By Theorem 3.2, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/T_1; \theta) = \theta^{f(E) - f(H)} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}([T_1, H]); \theta) - \sum_{\substack{B \in \mathcal{L}: \\ T_1 \triangleleft B \not\leq H}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/B; \theta).$$

If either the set $\{B \in \mathcal{L} : T_1 \triangleleft B, B \not\leq H\}$ is empty, or if $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/B; \theta) = 0$ for each B such that $T_1 \triangleleft B, B \not\leq H$, then $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/T_1; \theta) > 0$ for $T = T_1 \leq V_1$ and by the modularity of \mathcal{L} , V_1 is contained in an element V that is a complement of U in \mathcal{L} . Suppose then that there exists a cover B of T_1 such that $B \not\leq H$ and $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}/B; \theta) > 0$. Since \mathcal{L} is modular, any complement of H has height 1 and any $b \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $b \not\leq H$ is a complement of H . Let $b \leq B$ such that $b \not\leq H$. Since $T_1 \triangleleft B$, we have $B = b \vee T_1$. We have that $U \vee V_1 \vee b = H \vee b = \mathbf{1}$. Also, it can be checked by the modularity of \mathcal{L} that $h((V_1 \vee b) \wedge U) = 0$, and so $(V_1 \vee b) \wedge U = \mathbf{0}$. Therefore, $V = V_1 \vee b$ and $T = B = T_1 \vee b$ are the required elements. \square

4. A CRITICAL THEOREM FOR q -POLYMATROIDS

We now consider properties of a q -polymatroid arising from an \mathbb{F}_q -linear rank-metric code. There are several papers outlining properties of rank-metric codes. The q -polymatroids associated with these structures have been studied in [GLJ22, GJLR20, Shi19]. Throughout this section, we fix $E = \mathbb{F}_q^n$.

Lemma 4.1 ([BCIJ24, GJLR20]). Let C be an \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, k]$ rank-metric code. The following hold.

- (1) $\mathcal{M}[C^\perp] = (\mathcal{M}[C])^*$.
- (2) $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}[C]/U; q) = |C_{=U}|$.
- (3) $W_i(C) = A_{\mathcal{M}[C]}(i; q)$ for each $i \in [n]$.

Remark 4.2. Note that when C is an \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -linear vector code the results of Lemma 4.1 hold with q^m in place of q . Indeed, in the Definition 2.31, the rank function of $\mathcal{M}[C]$ is the rank function of the associated (q, m) -polymatroid as defined in Definition 2.30, divided by m . Since C is \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -linear, C_U is an \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -vector space for each subspace U and so has \mathbb{F}_q -dimension which is a multiple of m . In particular, we have $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}[C]/U; q^m) = |C_{=U}|$ for an \mathbb{F}_{q^m} - $[n, k]$ code C and subspace U .

Note that Lemma 4.1 (2) is an instance of the Critical Theorem [CR70] for representable q -polymatroids. We now present a full extension of this result, which, as in the matroid case, relies on Möbius inversion applied to the underlying lattice. We provide a proof for completeness.

Theorem 4.3 (The Critical Theorem). Let t be a positive integer, let C be an \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, k]$ rank-metric code, let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}[C]$ and let $U \in \mathcal{L}(E)$. Then

$$|\{(X_1, \dots, X_t) \in C^t : \sum_{i=1}^t \text{colsp}(X_i) = U\}| = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}.U; q^t).$$

Proof. For each subspace $W \leq \mathbb{F}_q^n$, define

$$f(W) := |\{(X_1, \dots, X_t) \in C^t : \sum_{i=1}^t \text{colsp}(X_i) = W^\perp\}|,$$

$$g(W) := |\{(X_1, \dots, X_t) \in C^t : \sum_{i=1}^t \text{colsp}(X_i) \leq W^\perp\}|.$$

We have that $g(W) = \sum_{V \in [W, E]} f(V)$ for all $W \in \mathcal{L}(E)$, and

$$g(W) = |\{(X_1, \dots, X_t) \in C^t : \text{colsp}(X_i) \leq W^\perp \forall i \in [t]\}| = |C_W|^t.$$

Let μ be the Möbius function of $\mathcal{L}(E)$. Applying Möbius inversion, we get:

$$f(W) = \sum_{V \in [W, E]} \mu(W, V)g(V) = \sum_{V \in [W, E]} \mu(W, V)|C_V|^t = \sum_{V \in [W, E]} \mu(W, V)q^{t(k-\rho(V))} = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}/W; q^t).$$

Now set $U = W^\perp$ to get that $f(U^\perp) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}.U; q^t)$. \square

We remark that in [Jan23], a proof of the Critical Theorem for the special case of representable q -matroids was given using the concept of the projectivization matroid.

The critical problem was originally formulated by Crapo and Rota as the problem of finding the minimum number of hyperplanes that distinguish a set of points in a projective space. We now consider a q -analogue of this interpretation. We remark that the problem admits different formulations for other combinatorial structures; see [Kun96] for a detailed overview.

For any bilinear form $b : \mathbb{F}_q^n \times \mathbb{F}_q^m \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q$, we let $\text{lker } b$ denote the left kernel of b .

Definition 4.4. Let $U \leq \mathbb{F}_q^n$. Let $\mathcal{B} = (b_1, \dots, b_t)$ be a list of bilinear forms $b_i : \mathbb{F}_q^n \times \mathbb{F}_q^m \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q$. We say that \mathcal{B} **distinguishes** the space U if $\bigcap_{i=1}^t \text{lker } b_i \leq U^\perp$.

Now let C be an \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, k]$ rank-metric code and let $X \in C$. Clearly, $\text{lker } b = \text{colsp}(X)^\perp$, where $b : \mathbb{F}_q^n \times \mathbb{F}_q^m \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q$ is the bilinear form represented by X . We say that a linear map b on \mathbb{F}_q^n is **induced** by C if b arises in this way from a codeword X of C . More generally, we say that a t -tuple $\mathcal{B} = (b_1, \dots, b_t)$ of bilinear forms is induced by C if each b_i is induced by C . The following is a q -analogue of [CR70, Chapter 16, Theorem 1].

Corollary 4.5. Let C be an \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, k]$ rank-metric code and let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}[C]$. Then the number of t -tuples of bilinear forms (b_1, \dots, b_t) induced by C that distinguish $\text{supp}(C)$ is $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}, \text{supp}(C); q^t)$. In particular, if C is non-degenerate then this number is $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}; q^t)$.

Proof. By Theorem 4.3, we have that

$$|\{(X_1, \dots, X_t) \in C^t : \sum_{i=1}^t \text{colsp}(X_i) = \text{supp}(C)\}| = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}, \text{supp}(C); q^t).$$

Let (b_1, \dots, b_t) be a t -tuple of bilinear forms induced by C that distinguishes $\text{supp}(C)$ and for each i let $X_i \in C$ be the matrix representation of b_i . Clearly, $\sum_{j=1}^t \text{colsp}(X_j) \leq \text{supp}(C)$ and hence

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^t \text{lker } b_i \leq \text{supp}(C)^\perp \implies \sum_{i=1}^t \text{colsp}(X_i) = \text{supp}(C).$$

□

Definition 4.6. Let C be a non-degenerate \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, k]$ rank-metric code and let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}[C]$. We denote by $\text{crit}(\mathcal{M})$ the least positive integer t such that there exists a t -tuple of bilinear forms \mathcal{B} induced by C that distinguishes E . We call this the **critical exponent** of \mathcal{M} .

It follows that if \mathcal{M} is a representable (q, m) -polymatroid, satisfying $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}[C]$ for some \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, k]$ rank-metric code C , then $\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}) = \min\{t : \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}; q^t) > 0\}$, if such a t exists in $[k]$. This is the minimum dimension t of a subspace D of C such that $\text{supp}(D) = E$. Note that C is degenerate if and only if there exists $x \in \mathcal{L}(E)$ such that $\text{supp}(C) \leq x^\perp$, which holds if and only if $C_x = C$, i.e. if x is a loop of \mathcal{M} . Therefore, for a representable q -polymatroid \mathcal{M} :

$$\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}) = \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } \mathcal{M} \text{ has a loop,} \\ \min\{t : \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}; q^t) > 0\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Example 4.7. Let C be the \mathbb{F}_2 - $[5 \times 3, 6, 1]$ rank-metric code generated by the matrices

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let $\mathcal{M} = (\mathbb{F}_2^5, \rho)$ be the $(2, 3)$ -polymatroid $\mathcal{M}[C]$. We calculate its characteristic polynomial:

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}; z) := \sum_{X \leq \mathbb{F}_2^5} \mu(0, X) z^{6-\rho(X)} = \sum_{j=1}^5 (-1)^j 2^{\binom{j}{2}} \sum_{\substack{X \leq \mathbb{F}_2^5 \\ \dim(X)=j}} z^{6-\rho(X)}.$$

With the aid of the algebra package MAGMA [BCP97], we obtain:

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}; z) = z^6 - 4z^4 - 25z^3 + 44z^2 + 40z - 56.$$

We have that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}; 1) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}; 2) = 0$. But $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}; 2^2) = 2280 > 0$, hence $\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}) = 2$. Indeed, consider

$$X_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad X_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then $\text{colsp}(X_1) = \langle e_5, e_1 + e_2, e_2 + e_4 + e_5 \rangle$, $\text{colsp}(X_2) = \langle e_4, e_1 + e_2 + e_3, e_2 + e_3 + e_5 \rangle$ and it is easy to see that $\text{colsp}(X_1) + \text{colsp}(X_2) = \mathbb{F}_2^5$.

Remark 4.8. A version of the Critical Theorem for q -polymatroids has been independently shown by Imamura and Shiromoto in [IS23]. However, they require that the chosen subspace $U \in \mathcal{L}(E)$ satisfies $U \cap U^\perp = \mathbf{0}$. This difference is due to a different definition of $\mathcal{M}.U$, which in their case has the following characteristic polynomial:

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}.U; z) = \sum_{X \in [\mathbf{0}, U]} \mu(\mathbf{0}, X) z^{\rho_{[\mathbf{0}, U]}(U) - \rho_{[\mathbf{0}, U]}(X)}.$$

We also point out that in case $U = E$ the two versions coincide. In particular, this means that if C is a non-degenerate code then $\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}[C])$ can be computed using either definition.

It is straightforward to see that the following holds (c.f. [BO92, Proposition 6.4.4]).

Proposition 4.9. Let C be an \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, k, d]$ non-degenerate rank-metric code and let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}[C]$. Let $T, T' \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $T \oplus T' = E$. Then

$$\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}|_T) \leq \text{crit}(\mathcal{M}) \leq \text{crit}(\mathcal{M}|_T) + \text{crit}(\mathcal{M}|_{T'}).$$

Proof. Let $\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}) = \ell$ for some positive integer ℓ . Then there exists an ℓ -dimensional subspace $D \leq C$ whose support is E . Clearly, $\text{supp}(D) = E \geq T$ and so $\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}|_T) \leq \ell$.

Now suppose that $\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}|_T) = \ell$ and that $\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}|_{T'}) = \ell'$ for positive integers ℓ, ℓ' , respectively. Then there exist subcodes D, D' of C of dimensions ℓ, ℓ' , respectively, such that $\text{supp}(D) = T$ and $\text{supp}(D') = T'$. Then $\dim(D + D') \leq \ell + \ell'$ and $E = T \oplus T' = \text{supp}(D) \oplus \text{supp}(D') \leq \text{supp}(D + D')$. Therefore, $\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}) \leq \ell + \ell'$. \square

We remark that the left-hand inequality of Proposition 4.9 is a consequence of Corollary 3.9. We have the following statements, which may be deduced from Corollaries 3.10 and 3.11. Corollary 4.11 extends [ANSO84]; see also [BO92, Section 6.4].

Corollary 4.10. Let C be an \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, k]$ non-degenerate rank-metric code, let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}[C]$ and let $U \in \mathcal{L}(E)$. The following hold.

- (1) There exists $W \in \mathcal{L}(E)$ that is contained in a complement of U , such that $\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}/W) \leq \text{crit}(\mathcal{M}|_U)$.
- (2) For any complement $T \in \mathcal{L}(E)$ of U we have that $\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}|_T) \leq \text{crit}(\mathcal{M}/U)$.

Proof. Since $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}([X, Y]); q^t)$ is the cardinality of a set for every interval $[X, Y] \subseteq \mathcal{L}(E)$, it is non-negative for every positive integer t . Suppose that $\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}|_U) = t$ for some positive integer t . From Corollary 3.11, there exists W contained in a complement of U such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}/W; q^t) > 0$ and so $\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}/W) \leq t = \text{crit}(\mathcal{M}|_U)$. This proves (1). We show that (2) holds. Let T be a complement of U and suppose that $\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}/U) = t$ for some positive integer t . Then $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}/U; q^t) > 0$ and so from Corollary 3.10, we have that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|_T; q^t) > 0$. Therefore, $\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}|_T) \leq t = \text{crit}(\mathcal{M}/U)$. \square

Corollary 4.11. Let C be an \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, k]$ non-degenerate rank-metric code, let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}[C]$ and let $U \in \mathcal{L}(E)$. Let ℓ be a positive integer. The following are equivalent.

- (1) U is minimal in the set $\mathcal{S}_1 := \{S \in \mathcal{L}(E) : \text{crit}(\mathcal{M}|_{S'}) \leq \ell, \forall S' \text{ s.t. } S \oplus S' = E\}$.
- (2) U is minimal in the set $\mathcal{S}_2 := \{S \in \mathcal{L}(E) : \text{crit}(\mathcal{M}/S) \leq \ell\}$.

In particular, $\mathcal{S}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{S}_1$ and the minimal elements of \mathcal{S}_1 coincide with the minimal elements of \mathcal{S}_2 .

Proof. Clearly, $\mathcal{S}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{S}_1$ by Corollary 4.10 (2). Let U be minimal in \mathcal{S}_1 . By Corollary 4.10 (1), there exists $S \leq U$ such that $\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}/S) \leq \ell$. Again, by Corollary 4.10 (2), we have $\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}|_{S'}) \leq \ell$ for every complement S' of S , i.e. $S \in \mathcal{S}_1$. By the minimality of U , we have $U = S$. Therefore, (1) implies (2).

Let U be minimal in $\mathcal{S}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{S}_1$. Let $T \leq U$ be minimal in \mathcal{S}_1 . By the preceding argument, T is minimal in \mathcal{S}_2 , from which it follows that $U = T$. This shows that (2) implies (1). \square

We close this section with some observations on the case for which \mathcal{M} is a q -matroid: the specialisation of Corollary 4.5, to the case of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -linear codes gives the Critical Theorem for representable q -matroids; see also [Jan23, Theorem 6.20].

Corollary 4.12. Let C be an \mathbb{F}_{q^m} - $[n, k, d]$ rank-metric code and let t be a positive integer. Let $U \in \mathcal{L}(E)$. Then the number of t -tuples $(x_1, \dots, x_t) \in C^t$ such that $\text{supp}(\langle x_1, \dots, x_t \rangle) = U$ is $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}.U; q^{mt})$.

There is a geometric description of the Critical Theorem for representable q -matroids that aligns more closely with the matroid case. We start by recalling the geometric structure of vector rank-metric codes and their connection with the theory of q -systems; see [ABNR22, Ran20] for a more detailed treatment.

Definition 4.13. An $[n, k, d]_{q^m/q}$ **system** \mathcal{U} is an \mathbb{F}_q -subspace of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^k$ of dimension n , such that $\langle \mathcal{U} \rangle_{\mathbb{F}_{q^m}} = \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^k$ and

$$d = n - \max \left\{ \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{U} \cap H) : H \text{ is an } \mathbb{F}_{q^m}\text{-hyperplane of } \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^k \right\}.$$

Theorem 4.14. [ABNR22, Ran20, She19] Let C be a non-degenerate \mathbb{F}_{q^m} - $[n, k, d]$ rank-metric code and let G be a generator matrix for C . Let $\mathcal{U} \leq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^k$ be the \mathbb{F}_q -span of the columns of G . The rank weight of an element $xG \in C$, with $x \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^k$ is $\text{rk}(xG) = n - \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{U} \cap \langle x \rangle^\perp)$.

The \mathbb{F}_q -span of the columns of a generator matrix G of a non-degenerate \mathbb{F}_{q^m} - $[n, k]$ rank-metric code C is called a **q -system associated to C** . There is a bijection between the equivalence classes of non-degenerate \mathbb{F}_{q^m} - $[n, k, d]$ rank-metric codes and equivalence classes of $[n, k, d]_{q^m/q}$ systems; the interested reader is referred to [ABNR22, Ran20].

The following result follows easily from Theorem 4.3 and Corollary 4.5.

Proposition 4.15. Let C be a non-degenerate \mathbb{F}_{q^m} - $[n, k]$ rank-metric code, let \mathcal{U} be a $[n, k]_{q^m/q}$ system associated with C and let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}[C]$. Then

$$\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}) = \min\{r \in \mathbb{N} : \exists \mathbb{F}_{q^m}\text{-hyperplanes } H_1, \dots, H_r \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{U} \cap H_1 \cap \dots \cap H_r = 0\}.$$

Remark 4.16. Although the definition of q -system \mathcal{U} depends on the choice of generator matrix G , the critical exponent is an invariant of the equivalence class of \mathcal{U} .

5. CRITICAL EXPONENTS OF SOME RANK-METRIC CODES

In this section we compute the critical exponents of q -polymatroids arising from some families of \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, k]$ rank-metric codes. In the case of a non-degenerate \mathbb{F}_{q^m} - $[n, k]$ vector rank-metric code, we show that its corresponding q -matroid has critical exponent equal to $\lceil \frac{n}{m} \rceil$. However, determining the critical exponent of an arbitrary representable q -polymatroid is not so straightforward. First we give a lower bound on the critical exponent of the q -polymatroid induced by a rank-metric code.

Proposition 5.1. Let C be a non-degenerate \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, k]$ code and let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}[C]$. Then

$$\left\lceil \frac{n}{m} \right\rceil \leq \text{crit}(\mathcal{M}) \leq k. \quad (3)$$

Proof. The upper bound follows immediately from the fact that $\dim(C) = k$ and $\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}) \leq \ell$ if C has a non-degenerate subcode of dimension at most ℓ . Now suppose that $\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}) = t$ for

some positive integer t . Then there exist $X_1, \dots, X_t \in C$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^t \text{colsp}(X_i) = \mathbb{F}_q^n.$$

Clearly, the maximum rank that a codeword in C can have is at most $\min(m, n)$, so we get that

$$n = \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} \left(\sum_{i=1}^t \text{colsp}(X_i) \right) \leq mt,$$

and hence we conclude that $t \geq \lceil \frac{n}{m} \rceil$. \square

We now show that the lower bound in Eq. (3) is sharp, i.e. there are codes whose critical exponents meets the bound with equality. To this end, if we can guarantee that a code contains enough codewords of rank $\min(n, m)$ with certain distinct supports, then we are done. We first consider \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -linear codes, making use of the following observation.

Lemma 5.2. [ABNR22, Proposition 3.11] Let C be a non-degenerate \mathbb{F}_{q^m} - $[n, k]$ code, then C contains a codeword of rank equal to $\min(m, n)$.

Theorem 5.3. Let C be a non-degenerate \mathbb{F}_{q^m} - $[n, k]$ code and let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}[C]$ be the q -matroid induced by C . Then

$$\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}) = \left\lceil \frac{n}{m} \right\rceil.$$

Proof. Write $n = am + b$, with $a, b \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $0 \leq b < m$. We will prove the statement by induction on a . If $a = 0$, then $n < m$. In this case, since C is non-degenerate, from Lemma 5.2 we immediately conclude that there exists a codeword in C of rank n , hence $\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}) = 1 = \lceil \frac{n}{m} \rceil$. Assume that an \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -linear non-degenerate rank-metric code of length n' satisfying $\lceil \frac{n'}{m} \rceil \leq a$ corresponds to a q -matroid with critical exponent equal to $\lceil \frac{n'}{m} \rceil$. Since C is non-degenerate, from Lemma 5.2 there exists a codeword $c \in C$, with rank weight equal to m . Hence there exists $A \in \text{GL}_n(q)$ such that $x = (x_1, \dots, x_m, 0, \dots, 0) \in CA = \{xA : x \in C\}$, where $\dim(\text{supp}(cA)) = m$. It follows that $\langle e_1, \dots, e_m \rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q} = \text{supp}(x)$, where e_i denotes the i -th standard basis vector of \mathbb{F}_q^n , for each $i \in [m]$.

Let $C_1 = \Pi(C, A, [m]) \leq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{n-m}$, i.e. C_1 is the \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -linear code of length $n - m$ obtained from CA by deleting the first m coordinates of every codeword of CA . As observed in Remark 2.26, C_1 is a non-degenerate code of length $n' = n - m = (a - 1)m + b$ and so, by the induction hypothesis, the critical exponent of $\mathcal{M}[C_1]$ is $\lceil \frac{n-m}{m} \rceil = a$. Choose some $u^{(1)}, \dots, u^{(a)} \in C_1$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^a \text{supp}(u^{(i)}) = \mathbb{F}_q^{n-m}$. It is not hard to see that the elements of CA corresponding to these words, say $x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(a)} \in CA$, satisfy the property that $\langle (v^{(1)}, 0, \dots, 0) + e_{m+1}, \dots, (v^{(n-m)}, 0, \dots, 0) + e_n \rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q} \leq \sum_{i=1}^a \text{supp}(x^{(i)})$, for some $v^{(i)} \in \mathbb{F}_q^m$. It follows that $\mathbb{F}_q^n = \text{supp}(x) + \sum_{i=1}^a \text{supp}(x^{(i)})$ and so $\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}[CA]) = a + 1 = \lceil \frac{n}{m} \rceil$. Since the critical exponent is an invariant of code equivalence, the result follows. \square

Remark 5.4. An alternative proof of Theorem 5.3 can be given using the equivalent description of a non-degenerate \mathbb{F}_{q^m} - $[n, k]$ rank metric code as a q -system and [PSSZ23, Lemma 4.6].

In general, a non-degenerate \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, k]$ rank-metric code does not necessarily contain a codeword of rank $\min(n, m)$; see for instance Example 5.10. The next result shows that in some cases we can ensure the existence of such a codeword. We will use the fact that for any \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, k]$ matrix code C , with $m \leq n$, if $k = t \cdot n$ and $\max(\text{rk}(X) : X \in C) \leq t$, then $C = U \otimes \mathbb{F}_q^m$ for some subspace U of dimension equal to t ; see [Mes85, Theorem 3].

Proposition 5.5. Let $\ell \geq 2$ and let $A \in \text{GL}_{\ell m}(\mathbb{F}_q)$. Let C be an \mathbb{F}_q - $[\ell m \times m, m(\ell - 1)(m - 1)]$ non-degenerate rank-metric code. Let $I \subseteq [\ell m]$ be a set of indices of size m . If the punctured code $\Pi(C, A, I)$ has dimension equal to $m(\ell - 1)(m - 1)$, then $\Pi(C, A, I)$ contains a codeword of rank m . In particular, C contains a codeword of rank m .

Proof. Let $I \subseteq [\ell m]$ be a set of size m . Let $\Pi(C, A, I) \leq \mathbb{F}_q^{m(\ell-1) \times m}$ be the code obtained by deleting the m rows of each matrix in AC indexed by I . Assume that $\Pi(C, A, I)$ is an \mathbb{F}_q - $[m(\ell-1) \times m, m(\ell-1)(m-1)]$ code. Towards a contradiction, suppose that every word of $\Pi(C, A, I)$ has rank at most $m-1$. By hypothesis, we have that $\dim(\Pi(C, A, I)) = m(\ell-1)(m-1)$. Therefore, by [Mes85, Theorem 3] C is degenerate, which is a contradiction to Remark 2.26. \square

Computing the critical exponent of $\mathcal{M}[C]$ for an arbitrary matrix code is difficult. However, for the case $m = n-1$, we have the following result on matrix codes.

Proposition 5.6. Let C be an \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times (n-1), k]$ non-degenerate code and let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}[C]$ be the q -polymatroid associated to C . Then

$$\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}) = \left\lceil \frac{n}{n-1} \right\rceil = 2.$$

Proof. If the supports of all the codewords of C are contained in the same hyperplane, then C is degenerate and we get a contradiction. Hence, there are at least two codewords M_1, M_2 with rank $n-1$ whose supports are contained in two distinct hyperplanes in \mathbb{F}_q^n , then $\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}) = 2$, since

$$\text{colsp}(M_1) + \text{colsp}(M_2) = \mathbb{F}_q^n.$$

\square

We now consider the class of \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, k, d]$ **1-binomial moment determined** (BMD) rank-metric codes, which are precisely those codes for which

$$\min(n, m) - d < d^\perp$$

and which was shown to be the disjoint union of the DQMRD codes and the MRD codes [BCR20]. We will use the following result from [Rav16].

Lemma 5.7. Let C be an \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, k, d]$ code and let U be a u -dimensional subspace of \mathbb{F}_q^n . Then

$$|C_U| = q^{k-mu} |C_{U^\perp}^\perp|.$$

In particular,

$$|C_U| = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n-d < u, \\ q^{k-mu} & \text{if } d^\perp > u. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 5.8. Let $n > m$ and let C be an \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, k, d]$ 1-BMD code such that $n+d \leq 2m$. Let U be an $(n-m)$ -dimensional subspace of \mathbb{F}_q^n . Then $C_{=U} \neq \emptyset$ and hence U^\perp is a support of a codeword of C .

Proof. Since C is 1-BMD and $n > m$, we have $d^\perp > m-d \geq n-m = \dim(U)$ and so from Lemma 5.7, we have that $|C_U| = q^{k-m(n-m)}$. Furthermore, if V is any subspace of \mathbb{F}_q^n of dimension $n-m+1$, then $|C_V| = q^{k-m(n-m+1)}$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} C_U &= C_{=U} \cup \{X \in C : \text{colsp}(X) \leq V^\perp, \text{ for some } V \text{ s.t. } U \leq V, \dim(V) = n-m+1\} \\ &= C_{=U} \cup \bigcup_{\substack{V: U \leq V, \\ \dim(V) = n-m+1}} C_V, \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$q^{k-mu} = |C_U| \leq |C_{=U}| + \sum_{\substack{V: U \leq V, \\ \dim(V) = n-m+1}} |C_V| \leq |C_{=U}| + \binom{m}{1}_q q^{k-m(n-m+1)}.$$

Therefore,

$$|C_{=U}| \geq q^{k-m(n-m)} \left(1 - \binom{m}{1}_q q^{-m} \right) > 0.$$

It follows that $C_{=U}$ is non-empty and hence C has a codeword whose support is U^\perp . \square

Theorem 5.9. Let C be an \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, k, d]$ MRD code and let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}[C]$. Then

$$\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}) = \left\lceil \frac{n}{m} \right\rceil,$$

if one of the following conditions hold:

- (1) $n \leq m$,
- (2) $m < n \leq 2m - d$,
- (3) $k = n = m + 1$.

Proof. Let $n \leq m$. We already observed in Lemma 2.29 that MRD codes have the same weight distribution. Moreover, they exist for every choice of parameters q, n, m, d . In particular, given an \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, m(n - d + 1), d]$ MRD code, there exists an \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -linear MRD code with the same weight distribution. By Lemma 5.2, then C has at least one codeword of rank-weight n , hence in this case $\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}[C]) = 1 = \left\lceil \frac{n}{m} \right\rceil$.

Now consider the case $2m - d \geq n > m$. By Lemma 5.8, $C_{=U^\perp}$ is non-empty for every U of dimension m and hence for each such U there exists $X \in C$ such that $\text{colsp}(X) = U$. The result now follows by taking any collection of $\left\lceil \frac{n}{m} \right\rceil$ m -dimensional subspaces whose vector space sum is \mathbb{F}_q^n . Finally, the case $k = n = m - 1$ is an immediate consequence of Proposition 5.6. \square

Note that in general, the critical exponent of the q -polymatroid associated with an \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, k]$ rank-metric code need not be $\left\lceil \frac{n}{m} \right\rceil$, as next example shows.

Example 5.10. Let C be the (non-degenerate) \mathbb{F}_2 - $[3 \times 3, 4, 2]$ code generated by the following matrices

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Every nonzero codeword in C has the same rank 2, hence, the critical exponent of the q -polymatroid $\mathcal{M}[C]$ induced by C is at least 2 (and indeed is exactly 2), which strictly exceeds $\left\lceil \frac{n}{m} \right\rceil = 1$.

In the discussion above, we pointed out that there are several rank-metric codes whose induced q -(poly)matroid has critical exponent that meets the lower bound (3) with equality. In particular, we can summarize all the results above in the following corollary.

Corollary 5.11. Let C be an \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, k, d]$ rank-metric code and let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}[C]$. If one of the following conditions is satisfied, then $\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}) = \left\lceil \frac{n}{m} \right\rceil$.

- (a) C is \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -linear and non-degenerate.
- (b) $m = n - 1$, $k = n$ and C is non-degenerate.
- (c) $n \leq m$ and C is MRD.
- (d) $m < n \leq 2m - d$ and C is 1-BMD.

The conditions of Corollary 5.11 are not necessary, as the following example illustrates.

Example 5.12. Let C be the \mathbb{F}_2 - $[4 \times 2, 3, 1]$ rank-metric code, generated by the following matrices

$$X_1 := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad X_2 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad X_3 := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that C is linear over \mathbb{F}_2 , but not over \mathbb{F}_4 , hence condition (a) is not satisfied. Clearly, also (b)–(d) are not satisfied. However, $\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}[C]) = 2 = n/m$, indeed $\text{colsp}(X_1) + \text{colsp}(X_2) = \mathbb{F}_2^4$.

It is known that if $n \leq m$, the q -polymatroid induced by an MRD code is the uniform q -matroid $\mathcal{U}_{n-d+1, k}$ of rank $n - d + 1$, where d is the minimum rank distance of the code. However, this is not true for $n > m$; see [GJLR20].

Corollary 5.13. Let $n \leq m$. The uniform q -matroid $\mathcal{U}_{k,n}$ is representable over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} and has critical exponent $\text{crit}(\mathcal{U}_{k,n}) = 1$.

We point out the similarity between the critical exponent of the matroid induced by an MDS code and the one of the q -matroid induced by an \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -linear MRD code. In the matroid case, a uniform matroid $U_{k,n}$ that is representable over \mathbb{F}_q has critical exponent $\text{crit}(U_{k,n}) \leq 2$. In particular,

$$\text{crit}(U_{k,n}) = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } n = q + 1 \text{ and } k = 2, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Simplex rank-metric codes have been recently defined as the natural counterpart of simplex Hamming-metric codes from a geometric point of view; see [ABNR22, Ran20]. In these works it has been shown that simplex rank-metric codes are the only non-degenerate one-weight codes in the rank-metric, just like simplex codes in the Hamming metric, up to repetition. They are formally defined as follows.

Definition 5.14. Let $k \geq 2$ and C be an \mathbb{F}_{q^m} - $[mk, k]$ non-degenerate code. Then C is a one-weight code with minimum distance m and it is called a **simplex rank-metric code**.

As an immediate consequence of Proposition 5.1 we have the following result.

Corollary 5.15. Let $k \geq 2$, let C be the \mathbb{F}_{q^m} - $[mk, k, m]$ simplex rank-metric code and let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}[C]$ be the q -matroid associated to C . Then $\text{crit}(\mathcal{M}) = k$.

Note that $U_{2,q+1}$ is representable over \mathbb{F}_q as an \mathbb{F}_q - $[q+1, 2]$ Hamming-metric code, satisfying the classical Singleton bound. This code is also a simplex code and in analogy with Corollary 5.15, its critical exponent is equal to the dimension of the code.

6. GENERALISATIONS OF THE CRITICAL THEOREM

In [Bri05], the Critical Theorem was extended in order to describe, to the widest possible extent, the matroidal properties of a linear code. If we consider the Critical Theorem (either for representable matroids or q -polymatroids), what is being counted is the number of r -tuples of codewords with a certain property, namely that the support of the code spanned by these codewords is equal to a given element A of the underlying support lattice \mathcal{L} , which is the Boolean lattice in the case of matroids and the subspace lattice in the case of q -polymatroids. The Critical Theorem shows that this quantity is determined by an evaluation of the characteristic polynomial of the associated (q) -(poly)matroid, and in particular is a function of the ranks of the elements in the interval $[A, \mathbf{1}]$. In revisiting this topic, in [Bri05] Britz considered the problem of counting more general objects arising from a linear code, and showed that if such *structures* exhibit a certain level of invariance, then the number of such structures with support equal to A is also determined by the ranks of the elements in the interval $[A, \mathbf{1}]$. A similar result can be stated for q -polymatroids.

Let \mathcal{C} be a multiset of elements of a set S . A structure of order 1 over \mathcal{C} is a finite multiset or a finite tuple of elements of \mathcal{C} . A structure of order 2 over \mathcal{C} is a finite multiset or finite tuple of structures of order at most 1 over \mathcal{C} . We hence recursively construct a structure of order ℓ over \mathcal{C} as either a finite tuple or a finite multiset of structures, each of order at most $\ell - 1$ over \mathcal{C} . The ground set of \mathcal{C} is the set $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{C}) := S$. More generally, the ground-set of a structure γ over \mathcal{C} is the set $\mathcal{G}(\gamma) := \cup_{\alpha \in \gamma} \mathcal{G}(\alpha)$. A collection of structures over \mathcal{C} may be defined in terms of a predicate \mathcal{X} , in which case we denote this set of structures by $\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{C})$. Several examples of such structures are listed in [Bri05, Tables 1 and 2], for the case that \mathcal{C} is a multiset of elements of a union of linear codes, possibly over different finite fields.

Notation 6.1. We adopt the following notation throughout this section.

- μ denotes the Möbius function on $\mathcal{L}(E)$.
- $k := \rho(E)$.
- $C^{(i)}$ denotes an arbitrary but fixed \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m_i, k_i]$ rank-metric code, for each $i \in [s]$.

- For each $U \in \mathcal{L}(E)$, U^\perp denotes the image of U under an arbitrary but fixed anti-automorphism of $\mathcal{L}(E)$.
- $\mathcal{M}[C^{(i)}] = (\mathcal{L}(E), \rho_i)$, i.e., $\rho_i(U) := \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(C^{(i)}) - \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(C_U^{(i)})$, for each $i \in [s]$.

We assume that $\mathcal{M}[C^{(1)}], \dots, \mathcal{M}[C^{(s)}]$ are all scaling-equivalent to the (q, m) -polymatroid $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{L}(E), \rho)$. That is, we assume that for each $i \in [s]$, there exists a positive $\ell_i \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $\rho(U) = \ell_i \rho_i(U)$ for each $U \in \mathcal{L}(E)$. This means in particular that $k = \ell_i k_i$ for each $i \in [s]$.

We will be concerned with structures over \mathcal{C} for which $\mathcal{C} = (C^{(1)}, \dots, C^{(s)})$.

Definition 6.2. We say that the predicate \mathcal{X} is **invariant** if the cardinality of $\mathcal{X}((C^{(1)}, \dots, C^{(s)}))$ depends only on $((m_1, \ell_1), \dots, (m_s, \ell_s))$ and k . If \mathcal{X} is invariant, we denote this cardinality by $\Theta(\mathcal{X}; ((m_i, \ell_i) : i \in [s]); k)$. If $(m_i, \ell_i) = (N, L)$ for some positive integers N, L for each $i \in [s]$, we will use the notation $\Theta(\mathcal{X}; (N, L); k)$.

For any structure γ over the multiset $\mathcal{C} = (C^{(1)}, \dots, C^{(s)})$ we define the **support** of γ to be $\text{supp}(\gamma) := \sum_{X \in \mathcal{G}(\gamma)} \text{colsp}(X)$. In other words, the support of γ is the sum of the column spaces of the elements of the ground set of γ .

Lemma 6.3. Let C be an \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, k]$ code and let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}[C]$. Let $U \in \mathcal{L}(E)$. Then $\mathcal{M}[C_U] = (\mathcal{L}(E), \rho_U)$, where $\rho_U(V) := \rho(U + V) - \rho(U)$ for all $V \in \mathcal{L}(E)$.

Proof. We have $\rho_U(V) = \dim(C_U) - \dim((C_U)_V)$ for all $V \in \mathcal{L}(E)$ by definition. Since

$$(C_U)_V = \{X \in C : \text{colsp}(X) \leq U^\perp \cap V^\perp\} = \{X \in C : \text{colsp}(X) \leq (U + V)^\perp\} = C_{U+V},$$

we get $\rho_U(V) = \dim(C_U) - \dim(C_{U+V}) = k - \rho(U) - (k - \rho(U + V)) = \rho(U + V) - \rho(U)$. \square

Lemma 6.4. Let \mathcal{X} be an invariant predicate and let $U \in \mathcal{L}(E)$. Then

$$|\{\gamma \in \mathcal{X}(C_U^{(1)}, \dots, C_U^{(s)})\}| = \Theta(\mathcal{X}; ((m_i, \ell_i) : i \in [s]); k - \rho(U)).$$

Proof. From Lemma 6.3, for each $i \in [s]$, $\mathcal{M}[C_U^{(i)}] = (\mathcal{L}(E), \rho_{i,U})$ where $\rho_{i,U}(V) = \rho_i(U + V) - \rho_i(U)$. Let $\mathcal{M}_U = (\mathcal{L}(E), \rho_U)$, be the q -polymatroid for which $\rho_U(V) := \rho(U + V) - \rho(U)$ for all $V \in \mathcal{L}(E)$. Then for each $i \in [s]$, $\ell_i \rho_{i,U}(V) = \rho_U(V)$ for all $V \in \mathcal{L}(E)$ and hence $\mathcal{M}[C_U^{(i)}]$ is scaling-equivalent to \mathcal{M}_U and $\ell_i \rho_{i,U}(E) = \rho_U(E) = k - \rho(U)$. Since \mathcal{X} is invariant, the result now follows. \square

The following is an extension of the Critical Theorem. We will apply it to counting the number of structures over \mathcal{C} whose support is equal to a fixed element of $\mathcal{L}(E)$.

Theorem 6.5. Let \mathcal{X} be an invariant predicate and let $\mathcal{C} = (C^{(1)}, \dots, C^{(s)})$. Then for every $U \leq E$, we have:

$$|\{\gamma \in \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{C}) : \text{supp}(\gamma) = U^\perp\}| = \sum_{V \in [U, E]} \mu(U, V) \Theta(\mathcal{X}; ((m_i, \ell_i) : i \in [s]); k - \rho(V)).$$

Proof. Let $W \in \mathcal{L}(E)$. By definition, for any $\gamma \in \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{C})$ we have that $\text{supp}(\gamma) = \sum_{X \in \mathcal{G}(\gamma)} \text{colsp}(X)$. Therefore, we have that $\text{supp}(\gamma) \leq W^\perp$ if and only if $\text{colsp}(X) \leq W^\perp$ for each $X \in \mathcal{G}(\gamma)$. In particular, we have that a structure over \mathcal{C} has support contained in W^\perp if and only if it is a structure over $(C_W^{(1)}, \dots, C_W^{(s)})$. For each i , we have that $\mathcal{M}[C_W^{(i)}] = (\mathcal{L}(E), \rho_{i,W})$ where $\rho_{i,W}(Z) = \rho_i(W + Z) - \rho_i(W)$ for all $Z \in \mathcal{L}(E)$. Also, $\dim(C_W^{(i)}) = k_i - \rho_i(W) = \ell_i^{-1}(k - \rho(W))$. By the invariance of \mathcal{X} , from Lemma 6.4 we have that $|\{\gamma \in \mathcal{X}(C_W^{(1)}, \dots, C_W^{(s)})\}| = \theta(\mathcal{X}; ((m_i, \ell_i) : i \in [s]); k - \rho(W))$. It follows that for all $U \in \mathcal{L}(E)$, we have:

$$|\{\gamma \in \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{C}) : \text{supp}(\gamma) \leq U^\perp\}| = \sum_{V \in [U, E]} \Theta(\mathcal{X}; ((m_i, \ell_i) : i \in [s]); k - \rho(V)).$$

The result now follows by applying Möbius inversion. \square

We obtain other generalisations of the Critical Theorem by appropriate specialisations of Theorem 6.5. We mention a few here.

1. We retrieve Theorem 4.3 by setting $\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{C}) = \{(X_1, \dots, X_s) : X_i \in C\}$, which is a collection of structures of order 1 over C for some \mathbb{F}_q - $[n \times m, k]$ rank-metric code C . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta(\mathcal{X}; (m, 1); k - \rho(U)) &= |\{(X_1, \dots, X_s) : X_i \in C, \text{colsp}(X_i) \leq U^\perp, i \in [s]\}| \\ &= |C_U|^s = q^{s(k-\rho(U))}. \end{aligned}$$

2. If we set $\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{C}) = \{(X_1, \dots, X_s) : X_i \in C^{(i)}, i \in [s]\}$, then we retrieve a q -analogue of [Kun96, Theorem 4.3]. We have

$$\Theta(\mathcal{X}; ((m_i, \ell_i) : i \in [s]); k - \rho(U)) = |\{(X_i : i \in [s]) : \text{colsp}(X_i) \leq U^\perp\}| = \prod_{i=1}^s |C_U^{(i)}|.$$

This yields that:

$$\begin{aligned} |\{\gamma \in \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{C}) : \text{supp}(\gamma) = U^\perp\}| &= \sum_{V \in [U, E]} \mu(U, V) \prod_{i=1}^s |C_V^{(i)}| \\ &= \sum_{V \in [U, E]} \mu(U, V) \prod_{i=1}^s q^{\ell_i^{-1}(k-\rho(V))}. \end{aligned}$$

3. Let $\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{C}) = \{(D_1, \dots, D_s) : D_i \leq C^{(i)}, \dim(D_i) = d_i, i \in [s]\}$. That is, $\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{C})$ is the structure of s -tuples of \mathbb{F}_q -subcodes of $C^{(i)}$ of dimension d_i . Then

$$\Theta(\mathcal{X}; ((m_i, \ell_i) : i \in [s]); k - \rho(U)) = |\{\gamma \in \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{C}) : \text{supp}(\gamma) \leq U^\perp\}| = \prod_{i=1}^s \begin{bmatrix} k_i - \rho_i(U) \\ d_i \end{bmatrix}_q,$$

and so

$$|\{\gamma \in \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{C}) : \text{supp}(\gamma) = U^\perp\}| = \sum_{V \in [U, E]} \mu(U, V) \prod_{i=1}^s \begin{bmatrix} \ell_i^{-1}(k - \rho(V)) \\ d_i \end{bmatrix}_q.$$

This gives a q -analogue of [Bri05, Corollary 7].

REFERENCES

- [AAB14] Emmanuel Abbe, Noga Alon, and Afonso S. Bandeira. Linear Boolean classification, coding and “the critical problem”. In *2014 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, pages 1231–1235, 2014.
- [ABNR22] Gianira N. Alfarano, Martino Borello, Alessandro Neri, and Alberto Ravagnani. Linear cutting blocking sets and minimal codes in the rank metric. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 192:105658, 2022.
- [ANSO84] Takao Asano, Takao Nishizeki, Nobuji Saito, and James Oxley. A note on the critical problem for matroids. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 5(2):93–97, 1984.
- [BCIJ24] Eimear Byrne, Michela Ceria, Sorina Ionica, and Relinde Jurrius. Weighted subspace designs from q -polymatroids. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 201:105799, 2024.
- [BCP97] Wieb Bosma, John Cannon, and Catherine Playoust. The Magma algebra system. I. The user language. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 24(3-4):235–265, 1997. Computational algebra and number theory (London, 1993).
- [BCR20] Eimear Byrne, Giuseppe Cotardo, and Alberto Ravagnani. Rank-metric codes, generalized binomial moments and their zeta functions. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 604:92–128, 2020.
- [Bir40] Garrett Birkhoff. *Lattice Theory*, volume 25. American Mathematical Society, 1940.
- [BO92] Thomas Brylawsky and James Oxley. The Tutte polynomial and its applications. In *Matroid Applications*, volume 40 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*, pages 123–215. Cambridge University Press, Providence, RI, 1992.
- [Bri05] Thomas Britz. Extensions of the Critical Theorem. *Discrete Mathematics*, 305(1-3):55–73, 2005.
- [BRS09] Thomas Britz, Gordon Royle, and Keisuke Shiromoto. Designs from matroids. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 23(2):1082–1099, 2009.
- [CR70] Henry H. Crapo and Gian-Carlo Rota. *On the Foundations of Combinatorial Theory: Combinatorial Geometries*. M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, MA and London, 1970.
- [Cra69] Henry H. Crapo. Möbius inversion in lattices. *Archiv der Mathematik*, 19(6):595–607, 1969.

- [Del78] Philippe Delsarte. Bilinear forms over a finite field, with applications to coding theory. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 25(3):226–241, 1978.
- [dlCGLR18] Javier de la Cruz, Elisa Gorla, Hiram López, and Alberto Ravagnani. Weight distribution of rank-metric codes. *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, 86:1–16, 2018.
- [Dow71] Thomas A. Dowling. Codes, packings and the critical problem. In *A. Barlotti, ed., Atti del Convegno di Geometria Combinatoria e sue Applicazioni, 1971*, pages 209–224. (A. Barlotti, ed.), 1971.
- [Gab85] Ernst M. Gabidulin. Theory of codes with maximum rank distance. *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii*, 21(1):3–16, 1985.
- [GJLR20] Elisa Gorla, Relinde Jurrius, Hiram H López, and Alberto Ravagnani. Rank-metric codes and q -polymatroids. *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics*, 52:1–19, 2020.
- [GLJ22] Heide Gluesing-Luerssen and Benjamin Jany. q -Polymatroids and their relation to rank-metric codes. *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics*, pages 1–29, 2022.
- [Gor21] Elisa Gorla. Rank-metric codes. In *Concise Encyclopedia of Coding Theory*, pages 227–250. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2021.
- [Gre76] Curtis Greene. Weight enumeration and the geometry of linear codes. *Studies in Applied Mathematics*, 55(2):119–128, 1976.
- [GRSZ23] Anina Gruica, Alberto Ravagnani, John Sheekey, and Ferdinando Zullo. Rank-metric codes, semi-fields, and the average critical problem. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 37(2):1079–1117, 2023.
- [IS21] Koji Imamura and Keisuke Shiromoto. Critical problem for codes over finite chain rings. *Finite Fields and their Applications*, 76:101900, 2021.
- [IS23] Koji Imamura and Keisuke Shiromoto. Critical problem for a q -analogue of polymatroids. *preprint*, 2023.
- [Jan23] Benjamin Jany. The projectivization matroid of a q -matroid. *SIAM Journal on Applied Algebra and Geometry*, 7(2):386–413, 2023.
- [JP18] Relinde Jurrius and Ruud Pellikaan. Defining the q -analogue of a matroid. *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 25(3):P3.2, 2018.
- [KMS18] Yoshitaka Koga, Tatsuya Maruta, and Keisuke Shiromoto. On critical exponents of Dowling matroids. *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, 87(8):1947–1962, 2018.
- [Kun96] Joseph P. S. Kung. Critical problems. In J. Bonin, J. Oxley, and B. Servatius, editors, *Matroid Theory*, pages 1–127. Contemporary Mathematics, American Mathematical Society, 1996.
- [Mes85] Roy Meshulam. On the maximal rank in a subspace of matrices. *The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics*, 36(2):225–229, 1985.
- [PSSZ23] Olga Polverino, Paolo Santonastaso, John Sheekey, and Ferdinando Zullo. Divisible linear rank metric codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 69(7):4528–4536, 2023.
- [Ran20] Tovohery H. Randrianarisoa. A geometric approach to rank metric codes and a classification of constant weight codes. *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, 88(7):1331–1348, 2020.
- [Rav16] Alberto Ravagnani. Rank-metric codes and their duality theory. *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, 80:197–216, 2016.
- [Rom08] Steven Roman. *Lattices and Ordered Sets*. Springer, 2008.
- [Seg55] Beniamino Segre. Curve razionali normali e k -archi negli spazi finiti. *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata*, 39(1):357–379, 1955.
- [She19] John Sheekey. (Scattered) linear sets are to rank-metric codes as arcs are to Hamming-metric codes. In Marcus Greferath, Camilla Hollanti, and Joachim Rosenthal, editors, *Oberwolfach Report No. 13/2019*, 2019.
- [Shi19] Keisuke Shiromoto. Codes with the Rank Metric and Matroids. *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, 87(8):1765–1776, 2019.
- [Sta11] Richard P. Stanley. *Enumerative Combinatorics*, volume 1. 2nd edition, 2011.
- [Tut54] William T. Tutte. A contribution to the theory of chromatic polynomials. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 6:80–91, 1954.
- [vLW92] Jack H. van Lint and Richard M. Wilson. *A Course in Combinatorics*. Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- [Whi93] Geoff Whittle. Characteristic polynomials of weighted lattices. *Advances in Mathematics*, pages 125–151, 1993.
- [Zas87] Thomas Zaslavsky. The Möbius function and the characteristic polynomial. In *Combinatorial Geometries*, volume 29 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*, pages 114–138. Cambridge University Press, Providence, RI, 1987.

APPENDIX A.

In Figure 3 we illustrate the minors described in Example 3.7, along with their characteristic polynomials.




FIGURE 3. Minors of a (2,3)-polymatroid and their characteristic polynomials.

In Table 1 we provide some examples (computed using the MAGMA software package [BCP97]) to compare the lower bound that we provided in Proposition 5.1 with the actual critical exponent (CE) of some q -polymatroids induced by rank-metric codes.

$[n \times m, k, d]_q$	Code	$\lfloor \frac{n}{m} \rfloor$	CE
\mathbb{F}_2 - $[6 \times 3, 5, 2]$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$	2	3
\mathbb{F}_2 - $[5 \times 5, 6, 3]$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \right.$ $\left. \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$	1	2
\mathbb{F}_2 - $[4 \times 4, 5, 3]$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \right.$ $\left. \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$	1	2
\mathbb{F}_2 - $[5 \times 4, 15, 1]$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \right.$ $\left. \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle_{\perp}$	2	2
\mathbb{F}_2 - $[6 \times 3, 4, 2]$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$	2	3

TABLE 1. Critical exponents of some representable q -polymatroids