ROOTED ORDER ON MINIMAL GENERATORS OF POWERS OF SOME COVER IDEALS

NURSEL EREY

Abstract. We define a total order, which we call rooted order, on minimal generating set of $J(P_n)^s$ where $J(P_n)$ is the cover ideal of a path graph on $n$ vertices. We show that each power of a cover ideal of a path has linear quotients with respect to the rooted order. Along the way, we characterize minimal generating set of $J(P_n)^s$ for $s \geq 3$ in terms of minimal generating set of $J(P_n)^2$. We also discuss the extension of the concept of rooted order to chordal graphs. Computational examples suggest that such order gives linear quotients for powers of cover ideals of chordal graphs as well.

1. Introduction

Let $S = k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ be the polynomial ring over a field $k$ and let $G$ be a finite simple graph with vertex set $V(G) = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ and edge set $E(G)$. The cover ideal of $G$ is a squarefree monomial ideal of $S$ defined by

$$J(G) = \bigcap_{\{x_i, x_j\} \in E(G)} (x_i, x_j).$$

The cover ideal $J(G)$ is the Alexander dual of the well-known edge ideal of $G$. Cover ideals and their powers were studied in many articles, see for example [2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 15, 19, 20, 21]. Herzog, Hibi and Ohsugi [15] showed that if $G$ is a Cohen-Macaulay chordal graph, then all powers of the cover ideal of $G$ have linear resolutions. Moreover, they proposed the following conjecture:

Conjecture 1.1. [15, Conjecture 2.5] All powers of the vertex cover ideal of a chordal graph are componentwise linear.

Francisco and Van Tuyl [9] showed that cover ideals of chordal graphs are componentwise linear. For a graded ideal $I \subset S$, being componentwise linear is an algebraic property which requires that for all $j$, the ideal $I_{(j)}$, generated by all homogeneous polynomials of degree $j$ belonging to $I$, has a linear resolution. Later, it was proved that chordal graphs in fact have stronger combinatorial properties such as being shellable [22] and vertex decomposable [23]. In [20] it was proved that powers of cover ideals of Cohen-Macaulay chordal graphs have linear quotients. A graph $G$ is called Cohen-Macaulay if the quotient ring $S/I(G)$ is Cohen-Macaulay, where $I(G)$ denotes the edge ideal of $G$. It is well-known [13, Lemma 9.1.10] that the cover ideal
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of a Cohen-Macaulay graph is generated in single degree. Since cover ideal of a path
graph can have minimal generators of different degrees, paths are not necessarily
Cohen-Macaulay. In fact, using the recursive description of the minimal generating
set of \( J(P_n) \) in Lemma 2.2, one can show that \( P_n \) is not Cohen-Macaulay for \( n \geq 5 \).

In a recent preprint [19], Kumar and Kumar proved Conjecture 1.1 for all trees.
Their main tool is a result from [8] which says that for any graph \( G \) the polarization
of \( k^{th} \) symbolic power of \( J(G) \) is the cover ideal of some graph denoted by \( G_k \). Since
symbolic powers and ordinary powers of cover ideal of bipartite graphs coincide
[11], their approach is to show that \( G_k \) is vertex decomposable when \( G \) is a tree.
Although trees contain the class of path graphs, the methods in [19] cannot be
applied to non-bipartite chordal graphs.

The main goal of this paper is to make a contribution to the problem in Conjec-
ture 1.1 and bring up an idea that is applicable to all chordal graphs. We introduce
the notion of rooted order (Definition 2.7 and Definition 5.5) and we show that all
powers of the cover ideal of a path graph have linear quotients with respect to such
order (Theorem 4.3). Our results build on and extend the analogous results pre-
sented in [6] from second powers to all powers. We analyze the minimal generating
set of \( J(P_n)^s \) in relation to rooted order. An interesting byproduct we obtain in the
process is Corollary 3.12 which characterizes the minimal generators of \( J(P_n)^s \) for
\( s \geq 3 \) in terms of those of the second power. Although we focus on the class of path
graphs, the notion of rooted order naturally generalizes to chordal graphs. In fact,
examples we tested on chordal graphs led us to question if one can always find a
rooted order which gives linear quotients for powers of their cover ideals. We discuss
this in Section 5 and we think that the techniques developed in this article may be
helpful to further explore the problem at hand in a more general framework.

2. Preliminaries

Let \( S = \mathbb{k}[x_1, \ldots, x_n] \) be the polynomial ring over a field \( \mathbb{k} \) and let \( I \) be a monomial
ideal. We denote the set of minimal generators of \( I \) by \( G(I) \). We say \( I \) has linear
quotients if there exists an order \( u_1, \ldots, u_k \) on the elements of \( G(I) \) such that for
every \( i = 2, \ldots, k \) the colon ideal \( (u_1, \ldots, u_{i-1}) : (u_i) \) is generated by some variables.
To simplify our notation, for any pair of monomials \( u \) and \( v \) we will write
\[
u : v = \frac{u}{\gcd(u, v)}.
\]
If \( M \) is a subset of \( S \) and \( u \) is a monomial, then we define a new subset \( uM \) by
\[
uM = \{ um : m \in M \}.
\]
Similarly, if \( L = v_1, \ldots, v_t \) is a list (or sequence) of monomials, then \( uL \) denotes a
new list obtained from \( L \) by multiplying each term by \( u \). In other words,
\[
uL = uv_1, \ldots, uv_t.
\]
To keep our notation simple and also to distinguish lists from ideals we will not put
parentheses around lists.

Let \( G \) be a finite simple graph with vertex set \( V(G) = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \) and edge set
\( E(G) \). A set \( C \) of vertices of \( G \) is called a vertex cover if \( e \cap C \neq \emptyset \) for every edge
$e \in E(G)$. A vertex cover $C$ is called *minimal* if no proper subset of $C$ forms a vertex cover for $G$. The *cover ideal* of $G$ is denoted by $J(G)$ and it is defined by

$$J(G) = \bigcap_{\{x_i, x_j\} \in E(G)} (x_i, x_j).$$

The set of minimal generators of $J(G)$ is given by

$$G(J(G)) = \{x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_k} : \{x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_k}\} \text{ is a minimal vertex cover of } G\}.$$  

If the graph $G$ has no edges, then $J(G) = \langle 1 \rangle$. If $A$ is a subset of vertices of $G$, then $G \setminus A$ denotes the graph which is obtained from $G$ by removing the vertices in $A$. We call a graph *chordal* if it has no induced cycle of length greater than 3. We say $x_i$ is a *neighbor* of $x_j$ if $\{x_i, x_j\} \in E(G)$. The set of all neighbors of $x_i$ is denoted by $N(x_i)$. The *closed neighborhood* of $x_i$ is denoted by $N[x_i]$ and it is equal to the union $N(x_i) \cup \{x_i\}$. Every chordal graph has a vertex whose closed neighbourhood induces a complete graph and such vertex is called a simplicial vertex.

A *path* on vertices $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ is denoted by $P_n$. Throughout the paper we will assume that edges of $P_n$ are labelled as

$$E(G) = \{\{x_1, x_2\}, \{x_2, x_3\}, \ldots, \{x_{n-1}, x_n\}\}.$$

**Definition 2.1 (Rooted list).** [6, Definition 2.2] The *rooted list* of $P_n$, denoted by $\mathcal{R}(P_n)$, is recursively defined by the following formulas:

- $\mathcal{R}(P_1) = 1$ 
- $\mathcal{R}(P_2) = x_1, x_2$ 
- $\mathcal{R}(P_3) = x_2, x_1 x_3$ 
- for $n \geq 4$, if $\mathcal{R}(P_{n-2}) = u_1, \ldots, u_r$ and $\mathcal{R}(P_{n-3}) = v_1, \ldots, v_s$ then
  $$\mathcal{R}(P_n) = x_{n-1} u_1, \ldots, x_{n-1} u_r, x_n x_{n-2} v_1, \ldots, x_n x_{n-2} v_s.$$ 

The motivation for this definition is the next lemma.

**Lemma 2.2.** Let $\mathcal{R}(P_n) = u_1, \ldots, u_q$. Then

1. $G(J(P_n)) = \{u_1, \ldots, u_q\}$
2. $J(P_n)$ has linear quotients with respect to $u_1, \ldots, u_q$.

**Proof.** Follows from [6, Lemma 2.1] and the recursive definition of rooted list. \qed

Based on the lemma above, a total order on minimal generators of $J(P_n)$ was defined.

**Definition 2.3 (Rooted order).** [6, Definition 2.2] Let $\mathcal{R}(P_n) = u_1, \ldots, u_q$. The *rooted order*, denoted by $>_\mathcal{R}$, is a total order on $G(J(P_n))$ such that $u_i >_\mathcal{R} u_j$ when $i < j$.

**Definition 2.4.** Let $u = (u_1, \ldots, u_n)$, $v = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ be two elements in $\mathbb{Z}^n$. Then we write $u >_{\text{lex}} v$ if the first non-zero entry in $u - v$ is positive.

The following is a general version of Definition 2.4 in [6].
Definition 2.5 (s-fold product, maximal expression). Let $I = (u_1, \ldots, u_q)$. We say that $M = u_1^{a_1} \cdots u_q^{a_q}$ is an s-fold product of minimal generators of $I$ if each $a_i$ is a non-negative integer and $a_1 + \cdots + a_q = s$. We write $u_1^{a_1} \cdots u_q^{a_q} >_{\text{lex}} u_1^{b_1} \cdots u_q^{b_q}$ if $(a_1, \ldots, a_q) >_{\text{lex}} (b_1, \ldots, b_q)$. We say that $M = u_1^{a_1} \cdots u_q^{a_q}$ is the maximal expression if $(a_1, \ldots, a_q) >_{\text{lex}} (b_1, \ldots, b_q)$ for any other s-fold product $M = u_1^{b_1} \cdots u_q^{b_q}$.

Notation 2.6. If $G(I) = \{u_1, \ldots, u_q\}$, then the set of all s-fold products is denoted by $F(I^s) = \{u_{i_1} \cdots u_{i_s} : u_{i_1}, \ldots, u_{i_s} \in G(I)\}$.

We also generalize Definition 2.6 in [6] from second powers to all powers.

Definition 2.7 (Rooted order/list on powers). Let $\mathcal{R}(P_n) = u_1, \ldots, u_q$. We define a total order $>_{\mathcal{R}}$ on $F(J(P_n)^s)$ which we call rooted order as follows. For $M, N \in F(J(P_n)^s)$ with maximal expressions $M = u_1^{a_1} \cdots u_q^{a_q}$ and $N = u_1^{b_1} \cdots u_q^{b_q}$ we set $M >_{\mathcal{R}} N$ if $(a_1, \ldots, a_q) >_{\text{lex}} (b_1, \ldots, b_q)$.

Let $G(J(P_n)^s) = \{U_1, \ldots, U_r\}$. Then we say $U_1, \ldots, U_r$ is a rooted list of minimal generators of $J(P_n)^s$ if $U_1 >_{\mathcal{R}} \ldots >_{\mathcal{R}} U_r$. In such case, we denote the rooted list of generators by $\mathcal{R}(J(P_n)^s) = U_1, \ldots, U_r$.

Remark 2.8. If $n = 1$, then $\mathcal{R}(J(P_n)^s) = 1$ for every $s$.

![Figure 1. $\mathcal{R}(P_n)$ in 2 steps](image-url)

Remark 2.9. If $n = 6$, then Figure II is still valid if we make the convention $\mathcal{R}(P_0) = 1$. In this case, the lists $\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}$ each has only one term:

$$\mathcal{B} = x_n x_{n-2} x_{n-4}, \mathcal{C} = x_n x_{n-2} x_{n-4}, \mathcal{D} = x_n x_{n-2} x_{n-3} x_{n-5}. $$

3. Properties of rooted order and $G(J(P_n)^s)$

In this section, we will establish some properties of rooted order and minimal generating set of $J(P_n)^s$ which will be useful in the sequel.

Remark 3.1. Observe that if $n \geq 2$, then every minimal vertex cover of $P_n$ contains either $x_n$ or $x_{n-1}$, but not both. Therefore if $U, V \in F(J(P_n)^s)$ such that $U \mid V$, then the highest power of $x_n$ (respectively $x_{n-1}$) dividing $U$ is the same as that of $x_n$ (respectively $x_{n-1}$) dividing $V$. 
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Lemma 3.2. [3] Lemma 3.5] Let \( n \geq 3 \) and let \( u \in G(J(P_n)) \) such that \( x_n | u \). Then there exists \( v \in G(J(P_{n-2})) \) such that \( v \) divides \( u/x_n \).

Remark 3.3. Let \( n \geq 4 \) and let \( R(P_{n-2}) = u_1, \ldots, u_m \). Observe that by definition of rooted order the expression \( u_{i_1} \ldots u_{i_s} \) is maximal with \( i_1 \leq \cdots \leq i_s \) if and only if \( (x_{n-1}u_{i_1}) \ldots (x_{n-1}u_{i_s}) \) is the maximal expression with \( x_{n-1}u_{i_1} \geq_R \cdots \geq_R x_{n-1}u_{i_s} \) in \( R(P_n) \).

Remark 3.4. Let \( n \geq 5 \) and let \( R(P_{n-3}) = u_1, \ldots, u_m \). Observe that by definition of rooted order the expression \( u_{i_1} \ldots u_{i_s} \) is maximal with \( i_1 \leq \cdots \leq i_s \) if and only if \( (x_nx_{n-2}u_{i_1}) \ldots (x_nx_{n-2}u_{i_s}) \) is the maximal expression with \( x_nx_{n-2}u_{i_1} \geq_R \cdots \geq_R x_nx_{n-2}u_{i_s} \) in \( R(P_n) \).

According to recursive definition of rooted list, for \( n \geq 4 \) each factor of an \( s \)-fold product of minimal generators of \( J(P_n) \) belongs to either \( x_{n-1}R(P_{n-2}) \) or \( x_nx_{n-2}R(P_{n-3}) \). If all of the factors are from \( x_{n-1}R(P_{n-2}) \) or all of the factors are from \( x_nx_{n-2}R(P_{n-3}) \), then the \( s \)-fold product is pure. Otherwise \( s \)-fold product is mixed. Now, we make some observations on pure and mixed \( s \)-fold products.

Lemma 3.5 (Pure \( s \)-fold product divisible by \( x_{n-1}^s \)). Let \( n \geq 3 \). Then \( U, V \in F(J(P_{n-2})^s) \) if and only if \( x_{n-1}^sU, x_{n-1}^sV \in F(J(P_n)^s) \). Moreover, in such case the following statements hold.

1. \( U >_R V \) if and only if \( x_{n-1}U >_R x_{n-1}V \).
2. \( U \in G(J(P_{n-2})^s) \) if and only if \( x_{n-1}U \in G(J(P_n)^s) \).

Proof. The first statement is clear from the definition of rooted list and Lemma 2.2.

To see (1) let \( R(P_{n-2}) = u_1, \ldots, u_m \). Suppose that \( U = u_{i_1} \ldots u_{i_s} \) and \( V = u_{j_1} \ldots u_{j_s} \), are maximal expressions with \( i_1 \leq \cdots \leq i_s \) and \( j_1 \leq \cdots \leq j_s \). Then by Remark 3.3 the expressions \( (x_{n-1}u_{i_1}) \ldots (x_{n-1}u_{i_s}) \) and \( (x_{n-1}u_{j_1}) \ldots (x_{n-1}u_{j_s}) \) are maximal as well. Suppose \( U \neq V \) and let \( t \) be the smallest index such that \( i_t \neq j_t \). Then \( U >_R V \iff i_t < j_t \iff x_{n-1}U > x_{n-1}V \) as desired. For proof of (2), the direction (\( \Rightarrow \)) is straightforward and the direction (\( \Leftarrow \)) follows from Remark 3.3. \( \square \)

Lemma 3.6 (Pure \( s \)-fold product divisible by \( x_{n-1}^s \)). Let \( n \geq 4 \). Then \( U, V \in F(J(P_{n-3})^s) \) if and only if both \( x_n^s x_{n-2}^sU \) and \( x_n^s x_{n-2}^sV \) belong to \( F(J(P_n)^s) \). Moreover, in such case the following statements hold.

1. \( U >_R V \) if and only if \( x_n^s x_{n-2}^sU > x_n^s x_{n-2}^sV \).
2. \( U \in G(J(P_{n-3})^s) \) if and only if \( x_n^s x_{n-2}^sU \in G(J(P_n)^s) \).

Proof. Similar to proof of Lemma 3.5 using Remark 3.3. \( \square \)

Lemma 3.7 (Mixed \( s \)-fold product). Let \( R(P_{n-2}) = u_1, \ldots, u_q \) and let \( R(P_{n-3}) = v_1, \ldots, v_b \) for some \( n \geq 4 \). Let \( U = u_{i_1} \ldots u_{i_q} \), \( V = v_{j_1} \ldots v_{j_b} \) and \( W = x_{n-1}^q x_{n-2}^k U V \).

1. If \( W = (x_{n-1}u_{i_1}) \ldots (x_{n-1}u_{i_q}) (x_n x_{n-2} v_{j_1}) \ldots (x_n x_{n-2} v_{j_b}) \) is the maximal expression in \( F(J(P_n)^{k+q}) \) with \( x_{n-1}u_{i_1} \geq_R \cdots \geq_R x_{n-1}u_{i_q} >_R x_n v_{j_1} \geq_R \cdots \geq_R x_n v_{j_b} \), then the expression \( U = u_{i_1} \ldots u_{i_q} \) is maximal in \( F(J(P_{n-2})^q) \).
with \( i_1 \leq \cdots \leq i_q \) and the expression \( V = v_{j_1} \cdots v_{j_k} \) is maximal in \( F(J(P_{n-3})^k) \) with \( j_1 \leq \cdots \leq j_k \).

(2) If \( W \in G(J(P_n)^{q+k}) \), then \( U \in G(J(P_{n-2})^q) \) and \( V \in G(J(P_{n-3})^k) \).

**Proof.** Proof is straightforward and left to the reader. \( \square \)

Note that in the previous lemma, the converses of (1) and (2) are not true.

- Consider \( q = k = 1 \) and \( n = 7 \) with \( R(P_2) = u_1, \ldots, u_7 \). Then \( u_4 \in x_6 R(P_3) \) and \( u_5 \in x_7 x_5 R(P_4) \) but \( u_4 u_5 \) is not the maximal expression as \( u_3 u_6 = u_4 u_5 \).
- Thus the converse of (1) is not true.

- Consider \( q = k = 1 \) and \( n = 5 \). Then \( U = x_1 x_3 \in G(J(P_3)) \) and \( V = x_2 \in G(J(P_4)) \) but \( (x_4 U)(x_5 x_3 V) \notin G(J(P_5)^2) \). Thus the converse of (2) is not true.

### 3.1. Reduction to second powers.

In this section we will reduce the problem of describing minimal generating set of \( J(P_n)^s \) to the case when \( s = 2 \). To this end, first we will explicitly describe \( G(J(P_n)^s) \) for some small values of \( n \). These results will then form the basis step of inductive proof of Theorem 3.11 which will be our next goal.

**Lemma 3.8.** If \( 2 \leq n \leq 4 \), then \( G(J(P_n)^s) = F(J(P_n)^s) \) for all \( s \). Moreover, in that case every \( U \in F(J(P_n)^s) \) has a unique expression as an \( s \)-fold product of minimal generators of \( J(P_n) \).

**Proof.** Case 1: Suppose \( n = 2 \) or \( n = 3 \). Then \( R(P_n) = u_1, u_2 \) where \( x_{n-1} \) divides \( u_1 \) and \( x_n \) divides \( u_2 \). Let \( V = u_1^a u_2^\beta \) be an \( s \)-fold product which divisible by another \( s \)-fold product \( U = u_1^a u_2^\gamma \). Since the exponents of \( x_n \) in \( U \) and \( V \) are respectively \( b \) and \( \beta \) it follows from Remark 3.1 that \( b = \beta \). Similarly, since the exponents of \( x_{n-1} \) are equal we get \( a = \alpha \) and \( U = V \).

Case 2: Suppose \( n = 4 \). Then \( R(P_4) = u_1, u_2, u_3 \) where \( u_1 = x_1 x_3, u_2 = x_2 x_3, u_3 = x_2 x_4 \). Let \( U = u_1^a u_2^\beta u_3^\gamma \) and \( V = u_1^a u_2^\delta u_3^\delta \) be \( s \)-fold products such that \( U \) divides \( V \). Remark 3.1 implies that \( c = \gamma \) and \( a + b = \alpha + \beta \). Since the exponents of \( x_1 \) in \( U \) and \( V \) are respectively \( a \) and \( \alpha \) it follows that \( a \leq \alpha \). Similarly, comparing exponents of \( x_2 \) we get \( b \leq \beta \). Thus \( a = \alpha, b = \beta \) and \( U = V \). \( \square \)

**Lemma 3.9.** Let \( R(P_3) = u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4 \). If \( U = u_1^a u_2^b u_3^c u_4^d \in F(J(P_3)^s) \setminus G(J(P_5)^s) \), then \( \beta, \delta > 0 \).

**Proof.** Let \( u_1 = x_2 x_4, u_2 = x_1 x_3 x_4, u_3 = x_1 x_3 x_5, u_4 = x_2 x_3 x_5 \). Let \( V = u_1^a u_2^b u_3^c u_4^d \in G(J(P_3)^s) \) such that \( V \mid U \). First note that by Remark 3.1 we have

\[
(3.1) \quad a + b = \alpha + \beta \quad \text{and} \quad c + d = \gamma + \delta.
\]

Moreover, since the degree of \( V \) is less than degree of \( U \) we have

\[
(3.2) \quad 2a + 3b + 3c + 3d < 2\alpha + 3\beta + 3\gamma + 3\delta.
\]

Combining (3.1) and (3.2) we obtain \( b < \beta \) and thus \( \beta > 0 \). Then we get \( a > \alpha \). Comparing the exponents of \( x_2 \) in \( U \) and \( V \) we get \( a + d < a + \delta \) and thus \( \delta > 0 \). \( \square \)

**Lemma 3.10.** Let \( R(P_n) = u_1, \ldots, u_r \) with \( n \geq 2 \) and let \( s \geq 2 \).
(1) If \( u_1 \ldots u_s \in G(J(P_n)^s) \), then \( u_pu_q \in G(J(P_n)^2) \) for all \( p, q \in \{i_1, \ldots, i_s\} \).

(2) If \( u_1 \ldots u_s \) is the maximal expression for some \( i_1 \leq \cdots \leq i_s \), then for all \( p, q \in \{i_1, \ldots, i_s\} \) with \( p < q \) the expression \( u_pu_q \) is maximal.

Proof. To see (1) assume for a contradiction \( u_1 \ldots u_s \in G(J(P_n)^s) \) but there exist \( p, q \in \{i_1, \ldots, i_s\} \) such that \( u_pu_q \notin G(J(P_n)^2) \). Then there exists \( u_p'u_q' \in G(J(P_n)^2) \) which strictly divides \( u_pu_q \). Then \( u_1 \ldots u_s u_p'u_q'/(u_pu_q) \) is an s-fold product and it strictly divides \( u_1 \ldots u_s \), contradicting our initial assumption. Proof of (2) is similar.

**Theorem 3.11.** Let \( G(J(P_n)) = \{u_1, \ldots, u_r\} \) with \( n \geq 2 \) and \( s \geq 2 \). Let \( U = u_1^{a_1} \ldots u_r^{a_r} \) be an s-fold product in \( F(J(P_n)^s) \). If \( U \notin G(J(P_n)^s) \), then there exist \( p \) and \( q \) with \( a_p, a_q > 0 \) such that \( u_pu_q \notin G(J(P_n)^2) \).

Proof. We use induction on \( n \). Suppose that \( U \notin G(J(P_n)^s) \). If \( n = 4 \), then the statement is vacuously true by Lemma 3.8. If \( n = 5 \), then \( u_1u_3 \) strictly divides \( u_2u_4 \) and the statement is true by Lemma 3.9. Therefore let us assume that \( n \geq 6 \).

Keeping Figure 1 in mind, observe that if \( x_{n-1}^s \) divides \( U \), then the result follows from Lemma 3.3 and the induction assumption on \( P_{n-2} \). Similarly, if \( x_n^{s-1} \) divides \( U \), then the result follows from Lemma 3.6 and the induction assumption on \( P_{n-3} \). Therefore, let us assume that \( U \) is divisible by \( x_nx_{n-1} \).

If there exist \( p \) and \( q \) with \( a_p, a_q > 0 \) such that \( x_{n-4}x_{n-1}|u_p \) and \( x_{n-3}x_n|u_q \), then the result follows from [5] Lemma 4.1. Therefore, it suffices to consider the following cases:

**Case 1:** Suppose that \( U \) is product of factors from \( \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C} \) in Figure 1 such that at least one factor from \( \mathcal{A} \) or \( \mathcal{B} \) is divisible by \( x_{n-4} \). Then we can write

\[
U = (x_{n-1}x_{n-3})^\alpha V(x_{n-1}x_{n-2}x_{n-4})^\beta W(x_{n}x_{n-2}x_{n-4})^\gamma Y
\]

for some \( V \in F(J(P_{n-4})^\alpha) \), \( W \in F(J(P_{n-5})^\beta) \), \( Y \in F(J(P_{n-5})^\gamma) \). Let \( U' \in G(J(P_n)^s) \) such that \( U' \) strictly divides \( U \). Keeping Remark 2.9 in mind, suppose that

\[
U' = (x_{n-1}x_{n-3})^{\alpha'} V'(x_{n-1}x_{n-2}x_{n-4})^{\beta'} W'(x_{n}x_{n-2}x_{n-4})^{\gamma'} Y' (x_{n}x_{n-2}x_{n-3}x_{n-5})^{\delta'} Z'
\]

for some \( V' \in F(J(P_{n-4})^{\alpha'}) \), \( W' \in F(J(P_{n-5})^{\beta'}) \), \( Y' \in F(J(P_{n-5})^{\gamma'}) \), \( Z' \in F(J(P_{n-6})^{\delta'}) \). We claim that

\[
(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, 0) = (\alpha', \beta', \gamma', \delta').
\]

By Remark 3.1 we have \( \alpha + \beta = \alpha' + \beta' \) and \( \gamma = \gamma' + \delta' \). Since the exponent of \( x_{n-2} \) in \( U' \) is less than or equal to that of \( U \) we have

\[
\beta + \gamma \geq \beta' + \gamma' + \delta'.
\]

Similarly, since the exponent of \( x_{n-3} \) in \( U' \) is less than or equal to that of \( U \) we have

\[
\alpha \geq \alpha' + \delta'.
\]

Then adding up the inequalities we get \( \delta' = 0 \). Then \( \gamma = \gamma' + \delta' \) implies \( \gamma = \gamma' \). Therefore \( \alpha = \alpha' \) and \( \beta = \beta' \) as desired.
Therefore, $V'W'Y'$ strictly divides $VWy$. By recursive definition of $\mathcal{R}(P_{n-2})$ (see Figure 2) observe that
\[
U^* = x_{n-3}^a V(x_{n-2}x_{n-4})^\beta W(x_{n-2}x_{n-4})^\gamma Y \in F(J(P_{n-2})^s) \setminus G(J(P_{n-2})^s).
\]
Then by induction assumption on $P_{n-2}$, one of $V, W$ or $Y$ contains a non-minimal 2-fold product. By adding the suitable variables, one can see that $U$ satisfies the desired condition.

Case 2: Suppose that $U$ is product of factors from $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}$ such that no factor from $\mathcal{A}$ is divisible by $x_{n-4}$. Then we can write
\[
U = (x_{n-1}x_{n-3})^\mu V(x_{n}x_{n-2})^\nu X
\]
for some $V \in F(J(P_{n-4})^\mu)$, $X \in F(J(P_{n-3})^\nu)$, where $\mu, \nu > 0$ and $\mu + \nu = s$. We claim that $U$ is divisible by some $U' \in G(J(P_{n})^s)$ of the same form. Indeed, if
\[
U' = (x_{n-1}x_{n-3})^\mu' V'(x_{n-1}x_{n-2}x_{n-4})^\beta W'(x_{n}x_{n-2})^\nu' X'
\]
for some $V' \in F(J(P_{n-4})^\mu')$, $W' \in F(J(P_{n-5})^\beta')$ and $X' \in F(J(P_{n-3})^\nu')$, then we must have $\mu' + \beta' = \mu$ and $\nu' = \nu'$ by Remark 3.1. Then comparing the exponents of $x_{n-2}$ in $U$ and $U'$ we see that $\beta' = 0$.

Therefore, $V'X'$ strictly divides $VX$. Then by recursive definition of $\mathcal{R}(P_{n-1})$ observe that
\[
U^* = x_{n-2}^\nu X(x_{n-1}x_{n-3})^\mu V \in F(J(P_{n-1})^s) \setminus G(J(P_{n-1})^s).
\]
Then by induction assumption on $P_{n-1}$, either $V$ or $X$ contains a non-minimal 2-fold product. By adding the suitable variables, one can see that $U$ satisfies the desired condition.

\[
\begin{tikzpicture}
  \node (P0) at (0,0) {$\mathcal{R}(P_{n-2})$};
  \node (P1) at (-1,-1) {$x_{n-3}\mathcal{R}(P_{n-4})$};
  \node (P2) at (1,-1) {$x_{n-2}x_{n-4}\mathcal{R}(P_{n-5})$};
  \draw (P0) -- (P1);
  \draw (P0) -- (P2);
\end{tikzpicture}
\]

**Figure 2.** Recursive definition of rooted list of $P_{n-2}$

As a consequence of Theorem 3.11 we characterize minimal generating set of $J(P_n)^s$ for $s \geq 3$ in terms of minimal generating set of second power of $J(P_n)$.

**Corollary 3.12.** Let $G(J(P_n)) = \{u_1, \ldots, u_r\}$ and let $s \geq 2$. The following statements are equivalent.

1. $u_1 \ldots u_s \in G(J(P_n)^s)$.
2. $u_p u_q \in G(J(P_n)^2)$ for all $p, q \in \{i_1, \ldots, i_s\}$.

**Proof.** Immediate from Lemma 3.10 and Theorem 3.11. \qed
Given a monomial ideal $I$, let $\mu(I)$ denote the cardinality of $G(I)$. If $G(I) = \{u_1, \ldots, u_q\}$, then by counting the number of $s$-element multi-subsets of $[q] = \{1, \ldots, q\}$ one can see that $\mu(I^s) \leq \binom{q+s-1}{s}$. This upper bound may not be achieved in general for two reasons. Firstly, a product of the form $u_{i_1} \ldots u_{i_s}$ may be equal to another product $u_{j_1} \ldots u_{j_s}$ with $\{i_1, \ldots, i_s\} \neq \{j_1, \ldots, j_s\}$ as multi-sets. Secondly, $u_{i_1} \ldots u_{i_s}$ may be strictly divisible by another product $u_{j_1} \ldots u_{j_s}$. In fact, when $I$ is generated by monomials of the same degrees, the latter cannot happen. Therefore, although the computation of $\mu(I^s)$ is a challenging problem, one can describe the set $G(I^s)$ explicitly when $I$ is generated in the same degree. On the other hand, when $I$ is not generated in the same degree, description of $G(I^s)$ remains a difficult problem as well as computation of $\mu(I^s)$.

It is well-known ([15]) that the function $g(s) = \mu(I^s)$ is a polynomial in $s$ for $s \geq 0$. In [1], the authors addressed the question of how small $\mu(I^2)$ can be in terms of $\mu(I)$ when $I$ is a monomial ideal in polynomial ring with $n = 2$ variables. Behaviour of $\mu(I^s)$ was considered in some other articles, see for example [1, 10, 16, 17]. Recently, Drabkin and Guerrieri [3] studied Freiman cover ideals. Given a cover ideal $J(G)$, it is a demanding task to find the minimal generating set of $J(G)^s$ or $\mu(J(G)^s)$. Therefore, Corollary 3.12 might be of interest in computation of $\mu(J(P_n)^s)$.

We will next see how Theorem 3.11 will be useful to extend the following result to all powers of $J(P_n)$.

**Lemma 3.13.** [6, Lemma 4.5] Let $U \in F(J(P_n)^2) \setminus G(J(P_n)^2)$. Then there exists $V \in G(J(P_n)^2)$ such that $V \succ U$ and $V|U$.

**Lemma 3.14.** Let $U \in F(J(P_n)^s) \setminus G(J(P_n)^s)$. Then there exists $V \in G(J(P_n)^s)$ such that $V \succ U$ and $V|U$.

**Proof.** Let $R(P_n) = u_1, \ldots, u_p$ with $n \geq 2$. Let $U = u_1^{a_1} \ldots u_p^{a_p}$ be the maximal expression. By Theorem 3.11 there exists $u_iu_j$ with $\alpha_i, \alpha_j \neq 0$ and $u_iu_j \notin G(J(P_n)^2)$. Without loss of generality assume that $i \leq j$. Note that $u_iu_j$ is the maximal expression by Lemma 5.10. Then by Lemma 3.13 there exists $v \in G(J(P_n)^2)$ such that $v$ strictly divides $u_iu_j$ and $v \succ u_iu_j$. Let $v = u_ku_\ell$ be the maximal expression with $k \leq \ell$. Consider the $s$-fold product $V = (Uu_ku_\ell)/(u_iu_j)$. Observe that $V \succ U$ and $V$ strictly divides $U$. If $V$ is a minimal generator, then we are done, otherwise this process can be repeated.

### 4. Linear Quotients of $J(P_n)^s$ with respect to Rooted Order

In this section we will show that $J(P_n)^s$ has linear quotients with respect to rooted order. Before that, we prove the following result which will be crucial in the last case of proof of Theorem 4.3.

**Proposition 4.1.** Let $R(P_n) = u_1, \ldots, u_q$ and let $R(J(P_n)^s) = Y_1, \ldots, Y_p$. Suppose that $Y_r = u_{i_1} \ldots u_{i_s}$ is the maximal expression for some $2 \leq r \leq p$ with $i_1 \leq \cdots \leq i_s$.

1. For each $1 \leq t \leq s$ with $2 \leq i_t$ we have
   $$(u_{i_1}, u_{i_2}, \ldots, u_{i_{t-1}}) : (u_{i_t}) \subseteq (Y_{r-1}) : (Y_r).$$
2. If $x_n|Y_r$, then $x_{n-1} \in (Y_1, \ldots, Y_{r-1}) : (Y_r)$.
Proof. (1): First note that by Lemma 2.2 the ideal \((u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{i-1}) : (u_i)\) is generated by variables. Let \(\ell < i\) with \(u_\ell : u_i = x_i\) for some variable \(x_i\). Consider the \(s\)-fold product \(M = Y_r u_\ell / u_i\). Then \(M : Y_r = x_i\) and \(M >_R Y_r\). If \(M\) is a minimal generator, nothing is left to show. Otherwise, by Lemma 3.14 there exists \(M' \in G(J(P_n)^s)\) such that \(M' >_R M\) and \(M'|M\). Then since \(M' \neq Y_r\) and \(M' : Y_r\) divides \(M : Y_r\) it follows that \(M' : Y_r = x_i\) and \(x_i \in (Y_1, \ldots, Y_{r-1}) : (Y_r)\).

(2): Suppose that \(x_n\) divides \(u_i\) for some \(k \in \{1, \ldots, s\}\). Then by definition of rooted list \(i_k \geq 2\). By part (1) it suffices to show that

\[x_{n-1} \in (u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{i_{k-1}}) : (u_{i_k})\]

which is immediate from [6, Lemma 3.6]. □

We will also need the following result from [6].

Proposition 4.2. [6, Proposition 4.2] Let \(R(P_n) = u_1, \ldots, u_k\) where \(n \geq 2\). Let \(1 < i < j < k\). Suppose \(u_j\) contains a variable from \((u_1, \ldots, u_{i-1}) : (u_i)\). Then either \(u_i u_j\) is not a minimal generator of \(J(P_n)^2\) or \(u_i u_j\) is not the maximal \(2\)-fold expression.

We can now prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 4.3. Let \(R(J(P_n)^s) = Y_1, \ldots, Y_p\). Then \(J(P_n)^s\) has linear quotients with respect to \(Y_1, \ldots, Y_p\).

Proof. We will proceed by induction on \(n+s\). We will show that \((Y_1, \ldots, Y_{r-1}) : (Y_r)\) is generated by variables, for all \(r \geq 2\).

Basis step (\(n \leq 3\) or \(s = 1\)): The case when \(s = 1\) is Lemma 2.2. If \(n = 2\) or \(n = 3\) with \(R(P_n) = u_1, u_2\), then by Lemma 3.3 we have \(R(J(P_n)^s) = u_1, u_1^{s-1} u_2, \ldots, u_2^s\) and it is straightforward to show that \((Y_1, \ldots, Y_{r-1}) : (Y_r) = (u_1) : (u_2) = (x_{n-1})\) holds for every \(r \geq 2\).

Induction step: Let us assume that \(n \geq 4\) and \(s \geq 2\). We set some notation for the following rooted lists.

- \(R(P_{n-2}) = u_1, \ldots, u_n\)
- \(R(P_{n-3}) = v_1, \ldots, v_B\)
- \(R(J(P_{n-2})^s) = U_1, \ldots, U_A\)
- \(R(J(P_{n-3})^s) = V_1, \ldots, V_B\).

Case 1: Suppose that \(x_n^s\) divides \(Y_r\). Assume that \(Y_r\) has the maximal expression

\[Y_r = (x_n x_{n-2} v_{i_1} x_n x_{n-2} v_{i_2}) \cdots (x_n x_{n-2} v_{i_s})\]

for some \(i_1 \leq \cdots \leq i_s\). From Proposition 4.1 (2) we know that \(x_{n-1}\) is a generator of \((Y_1, \ldots, Y_{r-1}) : (Y_r)\). From Lemma 3.6 we can set \(V_t = v_{i_1} v_{i_2} \cdots v_{i_t}\) for some \(t \in \{1, \ldots, B\}\). If \(t = 1\), then by definition of rooted order we have

\[(Y_1, \ldots, Y_{r-1}) : (Y_r) = (x_{n-1})\]

and nothing is left to show. Therefore let us assume that \(t > 1\). Observe that because of induction assumption on \(P_{n-3}\) it suffices to show the equality

\[(x_{n-1}) + (V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_{t-1}) : (V_t) = (Y_1, \ldots, Y_{r-1}) : (Y_r)\]
Because of Lemma 3.6 we already have the inclusion
\[(x_{n-1}) + (V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_{t-1}) : (V_t) \subseteq (Y_1, \ldots, Y_{r-1}) : (Y_r)\).
We now prove the reverse containment. For any \(\ell \leq r - 1\), if \(x_{n-1}|Y_\ell\), then it is clear that \(Y_\ell : Y_r \in (x_{n-1})\). Otherwise, \((x_{n-2}x_n)\alpha|Y_\ell\) and by Lemma 3.6 we have \(Y_\ell/(x_{n-2}x_n) = V_k\) for some \(k\). Moreover, since \(Y_\ell \succ R Y_r\) Lemma 3.6 implies that \(V_k \succ R Y_\ell\). Hence \(Y_\ell : Y_r = V_k : Y_\ell\), proving the reverse containment.

**Case 2:** Suppose that \(x_{n-1}^\ast\) divides \(Y_r\). Let
\[Y_r = (x_{n-1}u_1)(x_{n-1}u_2) \cdots (x_{n-1}u_s)\]
be the maximal expression for some \(i_1 \leq \cdots \leq i_s\). Then the expression \(u_1 \cdots u_s\) is also maximal by Remark 3.3. By Lemma 3.5 we can set \(U_t = u_1 \cdots u_s\) for some \(t > 1\) as \(r > 1\). By induction assumption on \(P_{n-2}\) it suffices to show that
\[(U_1, \ldots, U_{t-1}) : (U_t) = (Y_1, \ldots, Y_{r-1}) : (Y_r)\].

By Lemma 3.5 the inclusion \(\subseteq\) is clear. To see the reverse, let \(\ell \leq r - 1\). By definition of rooted list, \(Y_\ell\) is divisible by either \(x_{n-1}^\ast\) or \(x_{n-1}x_n\). Because of Lemma 3.6 we may assume that \(Y_r\) is divisible by \(x_{n-1}x_n\). Let \(Y_\ell\) have the maximal expression
\[Y_\ell = (x_{n-1}u_1)(x_{n-1}u_2) \cdots (x_{n-1}u_{j_1})(x_{n-1}u_{j_2}) \cdots (x_{n-1}u_{j_a})\]
for some \(1 \leq j_1 \leq \cdots \leq j_a \leq a\) and \(1 \leq k_1 \leq \cdots \leq k_d \leq b\).

By Lemma 3.2 we can form the \(s\)-fold product
\[P = (x_{n-1}u_1)(x_{n-1}u_2) \cdots (x_{n-1}u_{j_1})(x_{n-1}u_{j_2}) \cdots (x_{n-1}u_{j_a})\]
where \(u_{k_1}'\) divides \(x_{n-2}v_1\), for each \(i = 1, \ldots, d\). By definition of \(\succ R\) we now have
\[P \succ R Y_\ell \succ R Y_r\ in F(J(P_n)'),\]
Lemma 3.5 implies that
\[u_{j_1} \cdots u_{j_a}u_{k_1}' \cdots u_{k_d}' \succ R u_1 \cdots u_s\ in F(J(P_{n-2}')).\]
Observe that
\[P \in G(J(P_n)') \implies u_{j_1} \cdots u_{j_a}u_{k_1}' \cdots u_{k_d}' = U_{t'}\] for some \(t' \leq t\) by Lemma 3.5
\[\implies P : Y_r' \in (U_1, \ldots, U_{t-1}) : (U_t)\] as \(P : Y_r = U_{t'} : U_t\)
\[\implies Y_\ell : Y_r' \in (U_1, \ldots, U_{t-1}) : (U_t)\] as \(P : Y_r'\) divides \(Y_\ell : Y_r'\) as desired. On the other hand, if \(P \notin G(J(P_n)')\), then by Lemma 3.14 there exists \(Y_\alpha \in G(J(P_n)')\) such that \(Y_\alpha|P\) and \(Y_\alpha \succ R P\). Since \(Y_\alpha|P\) it follows from Remark 3.14 that \(x_{n-1}|Y_\alpha\). Since \(Y_\alpha > Y_\ell\) by Lemma 3.5 we get \(Y_\alpha : Y_r \in (U_1, \ldots, U_{t-1}) : (U_t)\).
Since \(Y_\alpha : Y_r\) divides \(P : Y_r\) and \(P : Y_r\) divides \(Y_\ell : Y_r\), we have \(Y_\alpha : Y_r\) divides \(Y_\ell : Y_r\) and \(Y_\ell : Y_r \in (U_1, \ldots, U_{t-1}) : (U_t)\) as desired.

**Case 3:** Suppose that \(Y_r\) is divisible by \(x_nx_{n-1}\) and it has the maximal expression
\[Y_r = (x_{n-1}u_1)(x_{n-1}u_2) \cdots (x_{n-1}u_{j_1})(x_{n-1}x_n) \cdots (x_{n-1}x_n)\]
for some \(1 \leq i_1 \leq \cdots \leq i_q \leq a\) and \(1 \leq j_1 \leq \cdots \leq j_k \leq b\). First note that from Proposition 4.1 we have
\[(4.1)\]
\[x_{n-1} \in (Y_1, \ldots, Y_{r-1}) : (Y_r).\]
Let \( t < r \). Since \( Y_t \triangleright R Y_r \) and because of (4.1) we may assume that \( Y_t \) has the maximal expression

\[
Y_t = (x_{n-1} u_{a_1}) \cdots (x_{n-1} u_{a_{q'}})(x_n x_{n-2} v_{\beta_1}) \cdots (x_n x_{n-2} v_{\beta_{k'}})
\]

for some \( 1 \leq \alpha_1 \leq \cdots \leq \alpha_{q'} \leq a \) and \( 1 \leq \beta_1 \leq \cdots \leq \beta_{k'} \leq b \) with \( q' \leq q \). We will now consider the following cases.

Case 3.1: Suppose that \( i_\ell = \alpha_\ell \) for all \( \ell = 1, \ldots, q' \). Then \( q' = q \) since \( Y_t \triangleright R Y_r \). This implies \( k = k' \). By Lemma 3.7 we get \( v_{\beta_1} \cdots v_{\beta_k} \triangleright R v_{j_1} \cdots v_{j_k} \) in \( \mathcal{R}(J(P_{n-3})^k) \). Observe that

\[
Y_t : Y_r = v_{\beta_1} \cdots v_{\beta_k} : v_{j_1} \cdots v_{j_k}.
\]

By the induction assumption on \( J(P_{n-3})^k \) there exists a variable \( x_z \) such that

\[
x_z \text{ divides } v_{\beta_1} \cdots v_{\beta_k} : v_{j_1} \cdots v_{j_k} \text{ and } x_z = v_{\gamma_1} \cdots v_{\gamma_k} : v_{j_1} \cdots v_{j_k}
\]

for some \( v_{\gamma_1} \cdots v_{\gamma_k} \triangleright R v_{j_1} \cdots v_{j_k} \) in \( \mathcal{R}(J(P_{n-3})^k) \). Therefore it suffices to show that

\[
x_z \in (Y_1, \ldots, Y_{r-1}) : (Y_r).
\]

Consider the \( s \)-fold product \( P = (x_{n-1} u_{i_1}) \cdots (x_{n-1} u_{i_q})(x_n x_{n-2} v_{\gamma_1}) \cdots (x_n x_{n-2} v_{\gamma_k}) \). By definition of rooted order \( P \triangleright R Y_r \). Clearly \( P : Y_r = x_z \). If \( P \in G(J(P_n)^s) \) nothing is left to show. Otherwise, the result follows from Lemma 3.14.

Case 3.2: Suppose that there is a smallest index \( \ell \) among \( 1, \ldots, q' \) such that \( i_\ell \neq \alpha_\ell \). Since \( Y_t \triangleright R Y_r \) we have \( i_\ell > \alpha_\ell \). Then according to Lemma 2.2 there exists a variable in \( (u_1, \ldots, u_{i-1}) : (u_i) \), say \( x_z \), which divides \( u_{\alpha_\ell} : u_{i_\ell} \). Note that \( x_z \neq x_{n-2} \) because of recursive definition of \( \mathcal{R}(P_{n-2}) \). Also, it is clear that \( x_z \neq x_n, x_{n-1} \) because \( x_z \) is a vertex of \( P_{n-2} \). From Proposition 4.2 we see that

\[
x_z \in (x_{n-1} u_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{n-1} u_{i_{\ell-1}}) : (x_{n-1} u_{i_\ell}) \subseteq (Y_1, \ldots, Y_{r-1}) : (Y_r)
\]

and thus it suffices to show that \( x_z \) divides \( Y_t : Y_r \). From Lemma 3.10 and Proposition 4.2 we see that

\[
x_z \nmid (x_{n-1} u_{i_\ell})(x_{n-1} u_{i_{\ell+1}}) \cdots (x_{n-1} u_{i_q})(x_n x_{n-2} v_{j_1}) \cdots (x_n x_{n-2} v_{j_k}).
\]

By the choice of \( \ell \) since \( u_{i_1} \cdots u_{i_{\ell-1}} = u_{\alpha_1} \cdots u_{\alpha_{\ell-1}} \) the result follows. \( \square \)

Using Theorem 4.3 one can obtain an exact formula for the regularity of powers of \( J(P_n) \) as in the next corollary.

**Corollary 4.4.** For any \( n \geq 2 \) and \( s \geq 1 \)

\[
\text{reg}(J(P_n)^s) = \begin{cases} 
2ks & \text{if } n = 3k + 1 \text{ or } n = 3k \\
2ks + s & \text{if } n = 3k + 2.
\end{cases}
\]

**Proof.** Similar to proof of [9] Corollary 5.3, \( \square \)
5. Rooted order for chordal graphs

In this section we will see how to generalize the concept of rooted list to chordal graphs. To simplify the notation we will use a set $A$ of vertices of $G$ interchangeably with the squarefree monomial $\prod_{x_i \in A} x_i$.

**Notation 5.1.** For each $i = 1, \ldots, r$ let $L_i$ be the list $L_i = a^i_1, \ldots, a^i_{k_i}$. Then by $L = L_1, L_2, \ldots, L_r$ we denote a new list $L$ which is obtained by joining the lists in the given order. More precisely,

$$L = a^1_1, \ldots, a^1_{k_1}, a^2_1, \ldots, a^2_{k_2}, \ldots, a^r_1, \ldots, a^r_{k_r}.$$  

**Definition 5.2 (Rooted list for chordal graphs).** Suppose that $G$ is a chordal graph with a simplicial vertex $x_1$ such that $N[x_1] = \{x_1, \ldots, x_m\}$ for some $m \geq 2$. We say $\mathcal{R}(G)$ is a rooted list of $G$ if it can be written in the form

$$\mathcal{R}(H_1)N(x_1), \mathcal{R}(H_2)N(x_2), \ldots, \mathcal{R}(H_m)N(x_m)$$

where the list $\mathcal{R}(H_i)$ is a rooted list of the subgraph $H_i = G \setminus N[x_1]$ for each $i = 1, \ldots, m$. If $G$ has no edges, then we set $\mathcal{R}(G) = 1$.

**Remark 5.3.** Observe that one can construct rooted lists in different ways as they depend on the choice of simplicial vertex. In Definition 2.1 we always picked the last vertex $x_n$ of $P_n$ as a simplicial vertex.

**Lemma 5.4.** Let $G$ be a chordal graph with a rooted list $\mathcal{R}(G) = u_1, \ldots, u_q$. Then

1. $G(J(G)) = \{u_1, \ldots, u_q\}$
2. $J(G)$ has linear quotients with respect to $u_1, \ldots, u_q$.

**Proof.** Proof follows from [5, Theorem 3.1] and [22, Theorem 2.13].

**Definition 5.5 (Rooted order/list for powers).** Let $G$ be a chordal graph with a rooted list $\mathcal{R}(G) = u_1, \ldots, u_q$. We define a total order $>_R$ on $F(J(G)^s)$ which we call rooted order as follows. For $M, N \in F(J(G)^s)$ with maximal expressions $M = u^{a_1}_1 \ldots u^{a_q}_q$ and $N = u^{b_1}_1 \ldots u^{b_q}_q$ we set $M >_R N$ if $(a_1, \ldots, a_q) >_{\text{lex}} (b_1, \ldots, b_q)$.

Let $G(J(G)^s) = \{U_1, \ldots, U_r\}$. Then we say $U_1, \ldots, U_r$ is a rooted list of minimal generators of $J(G)^s$ if $U_1 >_R \ldots >_R U_r$. In such case, we denote the rooted list of generators by $\mathcal{R}(J(G)^s) = U_1, \ldots, U_r$.

The following lemma is a version of Proposition 4.1.

**Lemma 5.6.** Let $G$ be a chordal graph with $F(J(G)^s) = G(J(G)^s)$. Let $\mathcal{R}(G) = u_1, \ldots, u_q$ and let $\mathcal{R}(J(G)^s) = Y_1, \ldots, Y_p$. Suppose that $Y_r = u_{j_1} \ldots u_{j_s}$ is the maximal expression for some $2 \leq r \leq p$ with $j_1 \leq \cdots \leq j_s$. For each $1 \leq t \leq s$ with $2 \leq j_t$ we have

$$(u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{j_t-1}) : (u_{j_t}) \subseteq (Y_1, \ldots, Y_{t-1}) : (Y_r).$$

**Proof.** The ideal $(u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{j_t-1}) : (u_{j_t})$ is generated by variables since the rooted order gives linear quotients by Lemma 5.3. Let $\ell < j_t$ with $u_{\ell} : u_{j_t} = x_s$ for some variable $x_s$. Consider the $s$-fold product $M = Y_r u_{\ell} / u_{j_t}$. Then $M : Y_r = x_s$ and $M >_R Y_r$. By assumption $M$ is a minimal generator of $J(G)^s$ and the proof follows. \(\square\)
In the next chordal example, we construct a rooted list \( \mathcal{R}(G) \) such that rooted order \( >_\mathcal{R} \) on the generators of \( J(G)^s \) yield linear quotients for all \( s \geq 1 \).

**Example 5.7.** Let \( G \) be the chordal graph in Figure 3. As in notation of Definition 5.2, the vertex \( x_1 \) is a simplicial vertex and \( N(x_1) = \{x_2, x_3\} \). Observe that \( H_1 \) is the graph consisting of the isolated vertex \( x_4 \). Also, \( H_2 \) and \( H_3 \) are empty graphs. Therefore we take \( \mathcal{R}(H_1) = \mathcal{R}(H_2) = \mathcal{R}(H_3) = 1 \). Then the rooted list of \( G \) is \( \mathcal{R}(G) = u_1, u_2, u_3 \) where

\[
u_1 = x_2x_3, \quad u_2 = x_1x_3x_4, \quad u_3 = x_1x_2x_4.
\]

It is not hard to see that

\[ F(J(G)^s) = G(J(G)^s) \]

and every \( s \)-fold product has a unique expression. Let \( \mathcal{R}(J(G)^s) = Y_1, \ldots, Y_p \). Now we will show that \( J(G)^s \) has linear quotients with respect to the order \( Y_1, \ldots, Y_p \). Suppose that \( Y_r = u_1^{\ell_1}u_2^{\ell_2}u_3^{\ell_3} \) with \( r \geq 2 \). Consider the ideal \( I \) defined by

\[
I = \begin{cases} 
(x_2, x_3) & \text{if } \beta \neq 0 \text{ and } \gamma \neq 0 \\
(x_3) & \text{if } \beta = 0 \text{ and } \gamma \neq 0 \\
(x_2) & \text{if } \beta \neq 0 \text{ and } \gamma = 0 
\end{cases}
\]

Since \( r \geq 2 \), we claim that \( I = (Y_1, \ldots, Y_{r-1}) : (Y_r) \). It is clear from Lemma 5.6 that \( I \subseteq (Y_1, \ldots, Y_{r-1}) : (Y_r) \) because \( (u_1) : (u_2) = (x_2) \) and \( (u_1, u_2) : (u_3) = (x_3) \). To see the reverse, assume for a contradiction there exists \( \ell < r \) such that no variable in \( I \) divides \( Y_\ell : Y_r \). Let \( Y_\ell = u_1^{\ell_1}u_2^{\ell_2}u_3^{\ell_3} \).

**Case 1:** Suppose \( \beta \neq 0 \) and \( \gamma \neq 0 \). Comparing exponents of \( x_2 \) and \( x_3 \) in \( Y_\ell \) and \( Y_r \) we see that \( \alpha' + \gamma' \leq \alpha + \gamma \) and \( \alpha' + \beta' \leq \alpha + \beta \). Since both \( Y_\ell \) and \( Y_r \) are \( s \)-fold products we have \( \alpha + \beta + \gamma = \alpha' + \beta' + \gamma' \) and thus \( \alpha' \leq \alpha \). Since \( Y_\ell >_\mathcal{R} Y_r \) by definition of rooted order we get \( \alpha' = \alpha \). This implies \( \beta = \beta' \) and \( \gamma = \gamma' \) and \( \ell = r \), contradiction.

**Case 2:** Suppose \( \beta = 0 \) and \( \gamma \neq 0 \). Comparing exponents of \( x_3 \) in \( Y_\ell \) and \( Y_r \) we see that \( \alpha' + \gamma' \leq \alpha + \gamma \). In particular \( \alpha' \leq \alpha \). By definition of rooted order \( \alpha' = \alpha \) must hold. This implies \( \beta' = 0 \) and \( \gamma' = \gamma \). Therefore \( \ell = r \), contradiction.

**Case 3:** Suppose \( \beta \neq 0 \) and \( \gamma = 0 \). Comparing exponents of \( x_2 \) in \( Y_\ell \) and \( Y_r \) we see that \( \alpha' + \gamma' \leq \alpha \). In particular \( \alpha' \leq \alpha \). By definition of rooted order \( \alpha' = \alpha \) must hold. This implies \( \gamma' = 0 \) and \( \beta' = \beta \). Therefore \( \ell = r \), contradiction.
We do not know any example of a power of a chordal graph which does not give linear quotients with respect to a rooted order. Therefore this led us to the following question.

**Question 5.8.** Given a chordal graph $G$, does there exist a rooted list $\mathcal{R}(G)$ such that the rooted order $\succ_{\mathcal{R}}$ on the minimal generating set of $J(G)^s$ yields linear quotients for every $s \geq 1$?
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