arXiv:1710.04614v1 [math.AC] 12 Oct 2017

MONO: AN ALGEBRAIC STUDY OF TORUS CLOSURES

JUSTIN CHEN

Abstract. Given an ideal I in a polynomial ring, we consider the largest monomial subideal contained in I, denoted $\mathrm{mono}(I)$. We study mono as an interesting operation in its own right, guided by questions that arise from comparing the Betti tables of I and $\mathrm{mono}(I)$. Many examples are given throughout to illustrate the phenomena that can occur.

Let $R = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a polynomial ring over a field k in n variables. For any ideal $I \subseteq R$, let $\mathrm{mono}(I)$ denote the largest monomial subideal of I, i.e. the ideal generated by all monomials contained in I. Geometrically, $\mathrm{mono}(I)$ defines the smallest torus-invariant subscheme containing $V(I) \subseteq \operatorname{Spec} R$ (the so-called *torus-closure* of $V(I)$).

The concept of mono has been relatively unexplored, despite the naturality of the definition. The existing work in the literature concerning mono has been essentially algorithmic and/or computational. For convenience, we summarize this in the following two theorems:

Theorem 0.1 ([5], Algorithm 4.4.2)**.** *Let $I = (f_1, \dots, f_r)$. Fix new variables $y_1, \dots, y_n$, and let $\widetilde{f}_i := f_i(\frac{x_1}{y_1}, \dots, \frac{x_n}{y_n}) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n y_i^{\deg_{x_i}(f)}$ be the multi-homogenization of f_i with respect to $\underline{y}$. Let $>$ be an elimination term order on $k[\underline{x}, \underline{y}]$ satisfying $y_i > x_j$ for all i, j. If $\mathcal{G}$ is a reduced Gröbner basis for $(\widetilde{f}_1, \dots, \widetilde{f}_r) : (\prod_{i=1}^n y_i)^\infty$ with respect to $>$, then the monomials in $\mathcal{G}$ generate* $\mathrm{mono}(I)$.

Cf. also [2] for a generalization computing the largest A-graded subideal of an ideal, for an integer matrix A (mono being the special case when A is the identity matrix). The next theorem gives an alternate description of mono for a particular class of ideals, involving the dual concept of Mono, which is the smallest monomial ideal containing a given ideal (notice that $\mathrm{Mono}(I)$ is very simple to compute, being generated by all terms appearing in a generating set of I).

Theorem 0.2 ([4], Lemma 3.2)**.** *Let I be an unmixed ideal, and suppose there exists a regular sequence $\underline{\beta} \subseteq I$ consisting of* $\operatorname{codim} I$ *monomials. Then* $\mathrm{mono}(I) = (\underline{\beta}) : \mathrm{Mono}((\underline{\beta}) : I)$.

However, it appears that no systematic study of mono as a operation on ideals has yet been made. It is the goal of this note to provide first steps in this direction; in particular exploring the relationship between I and $\mathrm{mono}(I)$. By way of understanding mono as an algebraic process, we consider the following questions:

(1) When is $\mathrm{mono}(I) = 0$, or prime, or primary, or radical?
(2) To what extent does taking mono depend on the ground field?
(3) Which invariants are preseved by taking mono? For instance, do I and $\mathrm{mono}(I)$ have the same (Castelnuovo-Mumford) regularity?

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 13D02, 13C99, 13A02, 05E40.

(4) How do the Betti tables of I and $\mathrm{mono}(I)$ compare? Do they have the same shape?
(5) To what extent is mono non-unique? E.g. which monomial ideals arise as mono of a non-monomial ideal?
(6) What properties of I are preseved by $\mathrm{mono}(I)$, and conversely, what properties of I are reflected by $\mathrm{mono}(I)$?

1. Basic properties

We first give some basic properties of mono, which describe how mono interacts with various algebraic operations. As above, R denotes a polynomial ring $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, and $\mathfrak{m} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ denotes the homogeneous maximal ideal of R.

Proposition 1.1. *Let I be an R-ideal.*

(1) mono *is decreasing, inclusion-preserving, and idempotent.*
(2) mono *commutes with radicals, i.e.* $\mathrm{mono}(\sqrt{I}) = \sqrt{\mathrm{mono}(I)}$.
(3) mono *commutes with intersections, i.e.* $\mathrm{mono}(\bigcap I_i) = \bigcap \mathrm{mono}(I_i)$ *for any ideals I_i.*
(4) $\mathrm{mono}(I_1)\,\mathrm{mono}(I_2) \subseteq \mathrm{mono}(I_1 I_2) \subseteq \mathrm{mono}(I_1) \cap \mathrm{mono}(I_2)$.

Proof. (1) Each property – $\mathrm{mono}(I) \subseteq I$, $I_1 \subseteq I_2 \implies \mathrm{mono}(I_1) \subseteq \mathrm{mono}(I_2)$, $\mathrm{mono}(\mathrm{mono}(I)) = \mathrm{mono}(I)$ – is clear from the definition.
(2) If $u \in \sqrt{\mathrm{mono}(I)}$ is a monomial, say $u^m \in \mathrm{mono}(I)$, then $u \in \sqrt{I} \implies u \in \mathrm{mono}(\sqrt{I})$. Conversely, if $u \in \mathrm{mono}(\sqrt{I})$ is monomial, then $u \in \sqrt{I}$, say $u^m \in I$ and hence $u^m \in \mathrm{mono}(I) \implies u \in \sqrt{\mathrm{mono}(I)}$.
(3) $\bigcap I_i \subseteq I_i \implies \mathrm{mono}(\bigcap I_i) \subseteq \mathrm{mono}(I_i)$, hence $\mathrm{mono}(\bigcap I_i) \subseteq \bigcap \mathrm{mono}(I_i)$. On the other hand, an arbitrary intersection of monomial ideals is monomial, and $\bigcap \mathrm{mono}(I_i) \subseteq \bigcap I_i$, hence $\bigcap \mathrm{mono}(I_i) \subseteq \mathrm{mono}(\bigcap I_i)$.
(4) $\mathrm{mono}(I_1)\,\mathrm{mono}(I_2) \subseteq I_1 I_2$, and a product of two monomial ideals is monomial, hence $\mathrm{mono}(I_1)\,\mathrm{mono}(I_2) \subseteq \mathrm{mono}(I_1 I_2)$. The second containment follows from applying (1) and (3) to the containment $I_1 I_2 \subseteq I_1 \cap I_2$. □

Next, we consider how prime and primary ideals behave under taking mono:

Proposition 1.2. *Let I be an R-ideal.*

(1) If I is prime resp. primary, then so is $\mathrm{mono}(I)$.
(2) $\mathrm{Ass}(R/\,\mathrm{mono}(I)) \subseteq \{\mathrm{mono}(P) \mid P \in \mathrm{Ass}(R/I)\}$.
(3) $\mathrm{mono}(I)$ *is prime iff* $\mathrm{mono}(I) = \mathrm{mono}(P)$ *for some minimal prime P of I. In particular,* $\mathrm{mono}(I) = 0$ *iff* $\mathrm{mono}(P) = 0$ *for some* $P \in \mathrm{Min}(I)$.

Proof. (1) To check that $\mathrm{mono}(I)$ is prime (resp. primary), it suffices to check that if u, v are monomials with $uv \in \mathrm{mono}(I)$, then $u \in \mathrm{mono}(I)$ or $v \in \mathrm{mono}(I)$ (resp. $v^m \in \mathrm{mono}(I)$ for some n). But this holds, as I is prime (resp. primary) and u, v are monomials.
(2) If $I = Q_1 \cap \ldots \cap Q_r$ is a minimal primary decomposition of I, so that $\mathrm{Ass}(R/I) = \{\sqrt{Q_i}\}$, then $\mathrm{mono}(I) = \mathrm{mono}(Q_1) \cap \ldots \cap \mathrm{mono}(Q_r)$ is a primary decomposition of $\mathrm{mono}(I)$, so every associated prime of $\mathrm{mono}(I)$ is of the form $\sqrt{\mathrm{mono}(Q_i)} = \mathrm{mono}(\sqrt{Q_i})$ for some i.
(3) $\mathrm{mono}(I) = \sqrt{\mathrm{mono}(I)} = \mathrm{mono}(\sqrt{I}) = \bigcap_{P \in \mathrm{Min}(I)} \mathrm{mono}(P)$. Since $\mathrm{mono}(I)$ is prime and the intersection is finite, $\mathrm{mono}(I)$ must equal one of the terms in the intersection. The converse follows from (1). □

We now examine the sharpness of various statements in Propositions 1.1 and 1.2:

Example 1.3. Let $R = k[x, y]$, where k is an infinite field, and let I be an ideal generated by 2 random quadrics. Then R/I is an Artinian complete intersection of regularity 2, so $\mathfrak{m}^3 \subseteq I$. By genericity, I does not contain any monomials in degrees $\leq \operatorname{reg}(R/I)$, so $\operatorname{mono}(I) = \mathfrak{m}^3$. On the other hand, I^2 is a 3-generated perfect ideal of grade 2, so the Hilbert-Burch resolution of R/I^2 shows that $\operatorname{reg} R/I^2 = 4$, hence $\mathfrak{m}^5 \subseteq I^2 \subseteq \mathfrak{m}^4$ as I^2 is generated by quartics (in fact, $\operatorname{mono}(I^2) = \mathfrak{m}^5$). Thus for such $I = I_1 = I_2$, both containments in Proposition 1.1(4) are strict.

Similar to Proposition 1.1(4), the containment in Proposition 1.2(2) is also strict in general: take e.g. $I = I' \cap \mathfrak{m}^N$ where $\operatorname{mono}(I') = 0$ and $N > 0$ is such that $I' \not\subseteq \mathfrak{m}^N$. However, combining these two statements yields:

Corollary 1.4. *Let I be an R-ideal.*

(1) Nonzerodivisors on R/I are also nonzerodivisors on $R/\operatorname{mono}(I)$.
(2) Let $u \in R$ be a monomial that is a nonzerodivisor on R/I. Then $\operatorname{mono}((u)I) = (u)\operatorname{mono}(I)$.

Proof. (1) $$\bigcup_{P \in \operatorname{Ass}(R/\operatorname{mono}(I))} P \subseteq \bigcup_{P \in \operatorname{Ass}(R/I)} \operatorname{mono}(P) \subseteq \bigcup_{P \in \operatorname{Ass}(R/I)} P.$$
(2) This follows from (1) and Proposition 1.1(4). □

Remark 1.5. Since monomial prime ideals are generated by (sets of) variables, if $P \subseteq \mathfrak{m}^2$ is a nondegenerate prime, then $\operatorname{mono}(P) = 0$. It thus follows from Proposition 1.2(3) that "most" ideals I satisfy $\operatorname{mono}(I) = 0$: namely, this is always the case unless each component of $V(I)$ is contained in some coordinate hyperplane in $\mathbb{A}^n = \operatorname{Spec} R$. The case that $\operatorname{mono}(I)$ is prime is analogous: if $\operatorname{mono}(I) = (x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_r})$ for some $\{i_1, \ldots, i_r\} \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$, then $V(I)$ becomes nondegenerate upon restriction to the coordinate subspace $V(x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_r}) \cong \mathbb{A}^r$ (i.e. $\operatorname{mono}(\overline{I}) = \overline{0}$ where $\overline{(\cdot)}$ denotes passage to the quotient $R/(x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_r})$.)

In contrast to the simple picture when $\operatorname{mono}(I)$ is prime, the case where $\operatorname{mono}(I)$ is primary is much more interesting, due to nonreducedness issues. The foremost instance of this case is when $\operatorname{mono}(I)$ is $\mathfrak{m}$-primary, i.e. $\operatorname{mono}(I)$ is Artinian. A first indication that this case is interesting is that under this assumption, $\operatorname{mono}(I)$ is guaranteed not to be 0. For this and other reasons soon to appear, we will henceforth deal primarily with this case – the reader should assume from now on that I is an Artinian ideal.

2. Dependence on scalars

We now briefly turn to Question 2: to what extent does taking mono depend on the ground field k? To make sense of this, let $S = \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ be a polynomial ring over $\mathbb{Z}$. Then for any field k, the universal map $\mathbb{Z} \to k$ induces a ring map $S \to S_k := S \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} k = k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$. Given an ideal $I \subseteq S$, one can consider the extended ideal IS_k. The question is then: as the field k varies, how does $\operatorname{mono}(IS_k)$ change?

It is easy to see that if k_1 and k_2 have the same characteristic, then $\operatorname{mono}(IS_{k_1})$ and $\operatorname{mono}(IS_{k_2})$ have identical minimal generating sets. Thus it suffices to consider prime fields $\mathbb{Q}$ and $\mathbb{F}_p$, for $p \in \mathbb{Z}$ prime. Another moment's thought shows that mono can certainly change in passing between different characteristics; e.g. if all but one

of the coefficients of some generator of I is divisible by a prime p. However, even excluding simple examples like this, by requiring that the generators of I all have unit coefficients, mono still exhibits dependence on characteristic. We illustrate this with a few examples:

Example 2.1. Let $S = \mathbb{Z}[x, y, z]$ be a polynomial ring in 3 variables.

(1) Set $I := (x^3, y^3, z^3, xy(x + y + z))$. Then $xyz^2 \in \operatorname{mono}(IS_k)$ iff $\operatorname{char} k = 2$ (consider $xy(x + y + z)^2 \in I$). Notice that I is equi-generated, i.e. all minimal generators of I have the same degree.

(2) For a prime $p \in \mathbb{Z}$, set $I_p := (x^p, y^p, x + y + z)$. Then $z^p \in \operatorname{mono}(I_p S_k)$ iff $\operatorname{char} k = p$ (consider $(x + y + z)^p \in I_p$). If the presence of the linear form is objectionable, one may increase the degrees, e.g. $(x^{2p}, y^{2p}, x^2 + y^2 + z^2)$.

From these examples we see that mono is highly sensitive to characteristic in general. However, this is not the whole story: cf. Remark 4.2 for one situation where taking mono is independent of characteristic.

3. Betti tables

We now consider how invariants of I behave when passing to $\operatorname{mono}(I)$. As mentioned in Remark 1.5, although I and $\operatorname{mono}(I)$ are typically quite different, for Artinian graded ideals there is a much closer relationship:

Proposition 3.1. *Let I be a graded R-ideal. Then I is Artinian iff* $\operatorname{mono}(I)$ *is Artinian. In this case,* $\operatorname{reg}(R/I) = \operatorname{reg}(R/\operatorname{mono}(I))$.

Proof. Since $I \subseteq \mathfrak{m}$ is graded, I is Artinian iff $\mathfrak{m}^s \subseteq I$ for some $s > 0$. This occurs iff $\mathfrak{m}^s \subseteq \operatorname{mono}(I)$ for some $s > 0$ iff $\operatorname{mono}(I)$ is Artinian.

Next, recall that if $M = \bigoplus M_i$ is Artinian graded, then the regularity of M is $\operatorname{reg} M = \max\{i \mid M_i \neq 0\}$. The inclusion $\operatorname{mono}(I) \subseteq I$ induces a (graded) surjection $R/\operatorname{mono}(I) \twoheadrightarrow R/I$, which shows that $\operatorname{reg}(R/\operatorname{mono}(I)) \geq \operatorname{reg}(R/I)$. Now if $u \in R$ is a standard monomial of $\operatorname{mono}(I)$ of top degree $(= \operatorname{reg}(R/\operatorname{mono}(I)))$, then $u \notin \operatorname{mono}(I) \implies u \notin I$, hence $\operatorname{reg}(R/I) \geq \deg u = \operatorname{reg}(R/\operatorname{mono}(I))$. □

A restatement of Proposition 3.1 is that for any Artinian graded ideal I, the graded Betti tables of I and $\operatorname{mono}(I)$ have the same number of rows and columns (since any Artinian ideal has projective dimension $n = \dim R$). However, it is not true (even in the Artinian case) that the Betti tables of I and $\operatorname{mono}(I)$ have the same shape (= (non)zero pattern) – e.g. take an ideal I' with $\operatorname{mono}(I') = 0$, and consider $I := I' + \mathfrak{m}^N$ for $N \gg 0$. Despite this, there is one positive result in this direction:

Proposition 3.2. *Let I be an Artinian graded R-ideal. Then* $\beta_{n,j}(R/\operatorname{mono}(I)) \neq 0 \implies \beta_{n,j}(R/I) \neq 0$, *for any j.*

Proof. Notice that $\beta_{n,j}(R/I) \neq 0$ iff the socle of R/I contains a nonzero form of degree j. Let $m \in R$ be a monomial with $\overline{0} \neq \overline{m} \in \operatorname{soc}(R/\operatorname{mono}(I))$ and $\deg m = j$. Then $m \in (\operatorname{mono}(I) :_R \mathfrak{m}) \setminus \operatorname{mono}(I)$, hence $m \in (I :_R \mathfrak{m}) \setminus I$ as well, i.e. $\overline{0} \neq \overline{m} \in \operatorname{soc}(R/I)$. □

Corollary 3.3. *Let I be an Artinian graded level R-ideal (i.e.* $\operatorname{soc}(R/I)$ *is nonzero in only one degree). Then* $\operatorname{mono}(I)$ *is also level, with the same socle degree as I.*

Proof. Follows immediately from Proposition 3.2. □

We illustrate these statements with some examples of how the Betti tables of R/I and $R/\operatorname{mono}(I)$ can differ:

Example 3.4. Let $R = k[x,y,z,w]$, $J = I_2\begin{pmatrix} x & y^2 & yw & z \\ y & xz & z^2 & w \end{pmatrix}$ the ideal of the rational quartic curve in $\mathbb{P}^3$, and $I = J + (x^2, y^4, z^4, w^4)$. Then the Betti tables of R/I and $R/\operatorname{mono}(I)$ respectively in Macaulay2 format are:

```
            0 1  2  3 4
      total: 1 7 15 13 4
          0: 1 .  .  . .
          1: . 2  .  . .
          2: . 3  5  1 .
          3: . 2  5  4 1
          4: . .  4  5 1
          5: . .  1  3 2
```

```
            0  1  2  3 4
      total: 1 11 28 26 8
          0: 1  .  .  . .
          1: .  1  .  . .
          2: .  2  1  . .
          3: .  6 10  5 1
          4: .  2 14 14 3
          5: .  .  3  7 4
```

Notice that $\beta_{1,5}(R/\operatorname{mono}(I)) = 2 \neq 0 = \beta_{1,5}(R/I)$, and likewise $\beta_{3,5}(R/I) = 1 \neq 0 = \beta_{3,5}(R/\operatorname{mono}(I))$. In addition, $\beta_{1,2}, \beta_{1,3}, \beta_{2,4}$ for $R/\operatorname{mono}(I)$ are all strictly smaller than their counterpart for R/I (and still nonzero).

Example 3.5. Let $R = k[x,y,z]$, $\ell \in R_1$ a general linear form (e.g. $\ell = x+y+z$), and $I = (x\ell, y\ell, z\ell) + (x,y,z)^3$. Then $\operatorname{mono}(I) = (x,y,z)^3$, and the Betti tables of R/I and $R/\operatorname{mono}(I)$ respectively are:

```
            0 1  2 3
      total: 1 7 10 4
          0: 1 .  . .
          1: . 3  3 1
          2: . 4  7 3
```

```
            0  1  2 3
      total: 1 10 15 6
          0: 1  .  . .
          1: .  .  . .
          2: . 10 15 6
```

Here $\operatorname{mono}(I)$ is level, but I is not. This shows that the converse to Corollary 3.3 is not true in general.

Example 3.6. We revisit Example 1.3. Since $\operatorname{mono}(I)$ is a power of the maximal ideal, $R/\operatorname{mono}(I)$ has a linear resolution, whereas R/I has a Koszul resolution (with no linear forms), so in view of Proposition 3.2, the Betti tables of R/I and $R/\operatorname{mono}(I)$ have as disjoint shapes as possible. Thus no analogue of Proposition 3.2 can hold for β_i, $i < n$, in general.

From the examples above, one can see that the earlier propositions on Betti tables are fairly sharp. Another interesting pattern observed above is that even when the ideal-theoretic description of $\operatorname{mono}(I)$ became simpler than that of I, the Betti table often grew worse (e.g. had larger numbers on the whole). This leads to some natural refinements of Questions 4 and 6:

(7) Are the total Betti numbers of $\operatorname{mono}(I)$ always at least those of I?
(8) Does $\operatorname{mono}(I)$ Gorenstein imply I Gorenstein?

Notice that the truth of Question 7 implies the truth of Question 8. As it turns out, the answer to these will follow from the answer to Question 5.

4. Uniqueness and the Gorenstein property

Lemma 4.1. *Let M be a monomial ideal, and $u_1 \neq u_2$ standard monomials of M. Then* $\operatorname{mono}(M + (u_1 + u_2)) = M$ *iff* $M : u_1 = M : u_2$.

Proof. $\Rightarrow$: By symmetry, it suffices to show that $M : u_1 \subseteq M : u_2$. Let m be a monomial in $M : u_1$. Then $mu_2 = m(u_1+u_2) - mu_1 \in \text{mono}(M + (u_1+u_2)) = M$, i.e. $m \in M : u_2$.

$\Leftarrow$: Passing to R/M, it suffices to show that $(\overline{u_1} + \overline{u_2})$ contains no monomials in R/M. Let $g \in R$ be such that $\overline{g}(\overline{u_1}+\overline{u_2}) \neq \overline{0} \in R/M$, and write $g = g_1 + \ldots + g_s$ as a sum of monomials. By assumption, $g_i u_1 \in M$ iff $g_i u_2 \in M$, so after removing some terms of g we may assume there exists g_i of top degree in g such that $g_i u_1, g_i u_2 \notin M$. But then $\overline{g_i u_1}$ and $\overline{g_i u_2}$ both appear as distinct terms in $\overline{g}(\overline{u_1} + \overline{u_2})$, so $\overline{g}(\overline{u_1} + \overline{u_2})$ is not a monomial in R/M. □

Remark 4.2. Since colons of monomial ideals are characteristic-independent, the second condition in Lemma 4.1 is independent of the ground field k. Thus if I is an ideal defined over $\mathbb{Z}$ which is "nearly" monomial (i.e. is generated by monomials and a single binomial), and $\text{mono}(I)$ is as small as possible in one characteristic, then $\text{mono}(I)$ is the same in all characteristics.

Remark 4.3. For any polynomial $f \in R$, it is easy to see that

$$\text{mono}(M + (f)) \supseteq M + \sum_{u \in \text{terms}(f)} \text{mono}(M : f - u)u$$

If $f = u_1 + u_2$ is a binomial, then this simplifies to the statement that $\text{mono}(M + (u_1 + u_2)) \supseteq M + (M : u_2)u_1 + (M : u_1)u_2$. However, equality need not hold: e.g. $M = (x^6, y^6, x^2y^4)$, $u_1 = x^2y$, $u_2 = xy^2$ (or even $M = (x^3, y^2)$, $u_1 = x$, $u_2 = y$ if one allows linear forms).

Theorem 4.4. *The following are equivalent for a monomial ideal M:*

1. *There exists a graded non-monomial ideal I such that* $\text{mono}(I) = M$.
2. *There exist $t \geq 2$ monomials $u_1, \ldots, u_t$ not contained in M and of the same degree, such that $M : u_i = M : u_j$ for all i, j.*
3. *There exist monomials $u_1 \neq u_2$ with $u_1, u_2 \notin M$, $\deg u_1 = \deg u_2$ and $M : u_1 = M : u_2$.*

Proof. (1) $\implies$ (2): Fix $f \in I \setminus M$ graded of minimal support size t (so $t \geq 2$), and write $f = u_1 + \ldots + u_t$ where u_i are standard monomials of M of the same degree. Fix $1 \leq i \leq t$, and pick a monomial $m \in M : u_i$. Then $m(f - u_i) \in I$ has support size $< t$, so minimality of t gives $m(f - u_i) = \sum_{j \neq i} mu_j \in M$. Since M is monomial, $mu_j \in M$ for each $j \neq i$, i.e. $m \in M : u_j$ for all j. By symmetry, $M : u_i = M : u_j$ for all i, j.

(2) $\implies$ (3): Clear.

(3) $\implies$ (1): Set $I := M + (u_1 + u_2)$, and apply Lemma 4.1. Notice that I is not monomial: if it were, then $u_1 + u_2 \in I \implies u_1 \in I \implies u_1 \in \text{mono}(I) = M$, contradiction. □

Corollary 4.5. *Let I be an Artinian graded R-ideal. Then* $\text{mono}(I)$ *is a complete intersection iff* $\text{mono}(I)$ *is Gorenstein iff $I = \mathfrak{m}^b := (x_1^{b_1}, \ldots, x_n^{b_n})$ for some $b \in \mathbb{N}^n$.*

Proof. Any Artinian Gorenstein monomial ideal is irreducible, hence is of the form $\mathfrak{m}^b$, which is a complete intersection. By Theorem 4.4, it suffices to show that for $M := \mathfrak{m}^b$, no distinct standard monomials of M satisfy $M : u_1 = M : u_2$. To see this, note that since $u_1 \neq u_2$, there exists $j \in [n]$ such that x_j appears to different powers $a_1 \neq a_2$ in u_1 and u_2, respectively. Taking $a_1 < a_2$ WLOG gives $x_j^{b_j - a_2} \in (M : u_2) \setminus (M : u_1)$. □

Combining the proofs above shows that an Artinian monomial ideal is not expressible as mono of *any* non-monomial ideal iff it is Gorenstein:

Corollary 4.6. *Let M be an Artinian monomial ideal. Then there exists a non-monomial R-ideal I with* $\operatorname{mono}(I) = M$ *iff M is not Gorenstein (iff M is not of the form $\mathfrak{m}^b$ for $b \in \mathbb{N}^n$).*

Proof. $\Rightarrow$: If $M = \operatorname{mono}(I)$ were Gorenstein, then by Corollary 4.5 I is necessarily of the form $\mathfrak{m}^b$, contradicting the hypothesis that I is non-monomial.

$\Leftarrow$: Since M is not Gorenstein, there exist monomials $u_1 \neq u_2$ in the socle of R/M. Then $u_1 \in M : \mathfrak{m} \implies \mathfrak{m} \subseteq M : u_1 \implies \mathfrak{m} = M : u_1$, and similarly $\mathfrak{m} = M : u_2$. By Lemma 4.1, $I := M + (u_1 + u_2)$ is a non-monomial ideal with $\operatorname{mono}(I) = M$. □

As evidenced by Remark 4.3, finding $\operatorname{mono}(M + (f))$ can be subtle, for arbitrary $f \in R$. There is one situation however which can be determined completely:

Theorem 4.7. *Let M be a monomial ideal, and let $u_1, \ldots, u_r$ be the socle monomials of R/M. Let $f_j := \sum_{i=1}^{r} a_{ij} u_i$, $1 \leq j \leq s$, be k-linear combinations of the u_i. Then* $\operatorname{mono}(M + (f_1, \ldots, f_s)) = M$ *iff no standard basis vector e_i is in the column span of the matrix (a_{ij}) over k.*

Proof. Let $v \in \operatorname{mono}(M + (f_1, \ldots, f_r))$ be a monomial. Pick $g_i \in R$ and $m \in M$ such that $v = m + \sum_{j=1}^{s} g_j f_j$. Write $g_j = b_j + g_j'$ where $b_j \in k$ and $g_j' \in \mathfrak{m}$. Since $f_j \in \operatorname{soc}(R/M)$, this is the same as saying $\overline{v} = \sum_{j=1}^{s} b_j \overline{f_j}$ in R/M. Since v is a monomial, it must appear as one of the terms in the sum, hence v must be a socle monomial of M. Then $v = u_i$ for some i, so v corresponds to a standard basis vector e_i, and then writing v as a k-linear combination of f_j is equivalent to writing e_i as a k-linear combination of the columns of (a_{ij}). □

Example 4.8. Let $R = k[x, y, z]$, and set $M := (x^2, xy, xz, y^2, z^2)$. Then R/M has a 2-dimensional socle $k\langle x, yz\rangle$, so $\operatorname{mono}(M + (x + yz)) = M$ by Lemma 4.1 or Theorem 4.7. However, the only standard monomials of M of the same degrees are x, y, z, which have distinct colons into M. Thus by Theorem 4.4 there is no *graded* non-monomial I with $\operatorname{mono}(I) = M$.

In general, even if there are u_1, u_2 of the same degree with $M : u_1 = M : u_2$, there may not be any such in top degree: e.g. $(x^2, y^2)\mathfrak{m} + (z^3)$ is equi-generated with symmetric Hilbert function $1, 3, 6, 3, 1$, but is not level (hence not Gorenstein).

Example 4.9. For an exponent vector $b \in \mathbb{N}^n$ with $b_i \geq 2$ for all i, the irreducible ideal $\mathfrak{m}^b$ has a unique socle element $x^{b-1} := x_1^{b_1-1} \ldots x_n^{b_n-1}$. Let $M := \mathfrak{m}^b + (x^{b-1})$, which is Artinian level with n-dimensional socle $\langle \frac{x^{b-1}}{x_i} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n \rangle =: \langle s_1, \ldots, s_n \rangle$. By setting all socle elements of M equal to each other we obtain a graded ideal $I := M + (s_1 - s_i \mid 2 \leq i \leq n)$. As all the non-monomial generators are in the socle of R/M, we may apply Theorem 4.7: the coefficient matrix (a_{ij}) is given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \ldots & 1 \\ -1 & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & \ldots & \vdots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \ldots & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$$

so by Theorem 4.7, $\mathrm{mono}(I) = M$. For $b = (2, 2, 3, 3)$, the Betti tables of R/I and $R/\mathrm{mono}(I)$ respectively are:

```
            0 1  2  3 4                0 1  2  3 4
total:      1 7 17 16 5       total:   1 5 10 10 4
    0:      1 .  .  . .           0:   1 .  .  . .
    1:      . 2  .  . .           1:   . 2  .  . .
    2:      . 2  1  . .           2:   . 2  1  . .
    3:      . .  4  . .           3:   . .  4  . .
    4:      . 3 12 16 4           4:   . .  1  2 .
    5:      . .  .  . 1           5:   . 1  4  8 4
```

Notice that the (total) Betti numbers of R/I are strictly greater than those of $R/\mathrm{mono}(I)$. This shows that the answer to Question 7 is false in general.

Finally, we include a criterion for recognizing when a monomial subideal of I is equal to $\mathrm{mono}(I)$, in terms of its socle monomials:

Proposition 4.10. *Let I be an R-ideal and $M \subseteq I$ an Artinian monomial ideal. Then the following are equivalent:*

(a) $M = \mathrm{mono}(I)$
(b) *I contains no socle monomials of M*
(c) $(M : \mathfrak{m}) \cap \mathrm{mono}(I) \subseteq M$

Proof. (a) $\implies$ (b), (a) $\implies$ (c): Clear.

(b) $\implies$ (a): Recall that for an Artinian monomial ideal M, a monomial x^b is nonzero in $\mathrm{soc}(R/M)$ iff $\mathfrak{m}^{b+1}$ appears in the unique irreducible decomposition of M into irreducible monomial ideals (here $b + 1 = (b_1 + 1, \ldots, b_n + 1)$: cf. [3], Exercise 5.8). Let $x^{b_1}, \ldots, x^{b_r}$ be the socle monomials of R/M. Then by assumption $x^{b_1}, \ldots, x^{b_r}$ are also socle monomials of $R/\mathrm{mono}(I)$, so $\mathfrak{m}^{b_1+1}, \ldots, \mathfrak{m}^{b_r+1}$ all appear in the irreducible decomposition of $\mathrm{mono}(I)$, hence $\mathrm{mono}(I) \subseteq M$.

(b) $\iff$ (c): Notice that (b) is equivalent to: any monomial $u \in (M : \mathfrak{m}) \setminus M$ is not in I; or alternatively, any monomial in both $M : \mathfrak{m}$ and I is also in M; i.e. $\mathrm{mono}((M : \mathfrak{m}) \cap I) \subseteq M$. Now apply Proposition 1.1(3). □

References

[1] Grayson, Daniel R.; Stillman, Michael E. *Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry*. Available at `http://www.math.uiuc.edu/Macaulay2/`.

[2] Miller, Ezra. Finding all monomials in a polynomial ideal. `arXiv:1605.08791`

[3] Miller, Ezra; Sturmfels, Bernd. Combinatorial commutative algebra. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 227. *Springer-Verlag, New York*, 2005.

[4] Polini, Claudia; Ulrich, Bernd; Vitulli, Marie A. The core of zero-dimensional monomial ideals. *Adv. Math.* 211 (2007), no. 1, 72–93.

[5] Saito, Mutsumi; Sturmfels, Bernd; Takayama, Nobuki. Grbner deformations of hypergeometric differential equations. Algorithms and Computation in Mathematics, 6. *Springer-Verlag, Berlin*, 2000.

Department of Mathematics, University of California, Berkeley, California, 94720 U.S.A

E-mail address: `jchen@math.berkeley.edu`