

On the Eliahou and Villarreal conjecture about the projective dimension of co-chordal graphs

Chwas Ahmed, Amir Mafi and Mohammed Rafiq Namiq*

ABSTRACT. Let $I(G)$ be the edge ideal of a graph G with $|V(G)| = n$ and $R = \mathbb{K}[x \mid x \in V(G)]$ be a polynomial ring in n variables over a field \mathbb{K} . In this paper we are interested in a conjecture of Eliahou and Villarreal which states that $\text{pdim}(R/I(G)) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{\deg_G(x_i)\}$ when G is connected and co-chordal. We show that this conjecture is not true in general. In fact we show that the difference between $\text{pdim}(R/I(G))$ and $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{\deg_G(x_i)\}$ is not necessarily bounded. For any graph G we prove that $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{\deg_G(x_i)\} \leq \text{pdim}(R/I(G))$. For a non-increasing sequence of positive integers (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) , we define the (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree graphs. We show that the independence complex of the complements of these type of trees is vertex decomposable and quasi-forest. Finally we show that the conjecture is valid when the complement of G is a (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree or G has a full-vertex. To our knowledge the results in this paper generalise all the existing classes of graphs for which the conjecture is true.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this work, let G be a finite simple graph (or just a graph) with the set of vertices $V(G) = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ and edges $E(G) = \{\{x_i, x_j\} \mid x_i \text{ is adjacent to } x_j\}$. Let $R = \mathbb{K}[x \mid x \in V(G)]$ be a polynomial ring over a field \mathbb{K} . Villarreal associated an ideal $I(G)$ generated by the set of monomials $\{x_i x_j \mid \{x_i, x_j\} \in E(G)\}$ in R to the graph G , see [17]. The ideal $I(G)$ is called the *edge ideal* of the graph G and the quotient ring $R/I(G)$ is called Stanley-Reisner ring [14]. This association reveals a strong connection between algebraic properties and invariants of $R/I(G)$ on one side and combinatorial properties and invariants of G on the the other side. To be more precise, there is a great interest in finding the regularity and projective dimension of $R/I(G)$ by having some information about G , see [9, 11, 12, 19]. In [5], Eliahou and Villarreal in 1998 tried to find a relation between the projective dimension of $R/I(G)$ and a maximum degree of a graph G for a certain class of graphs. They proposed the following conjecture (see [9, Conjecture 4.13]).

Conjecture 1. *If the edge ideal of a connected graph G has 2-linear resolution, then the projective dimension $R/I(G)$ is equal to the maximum degree of vertices of G .*

This conjecture is not true in general. Indeed, in this paper we show that the difference between the projective dimension and the maximum degree of a graph need not be bounded even for co-chordal graphs, see section 3. There are some attempts to prove

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 13C70, 13C15, 05C07; Secondary 13F55, 05E40.

Key words and phrases. Projective dimension, Maximum degree, d -tree, Chordal graph, Simplicial complex, Edge ideal.

* Corresponding author.

the conjecture for some special cases. Gitler and Valencia in [9] show that the conjecture holds for some graphs in a class of graphs in which the graph and its complement are both chordal. Fröberg in [8] defines d -tree and generalized d -tree graphs. The generalized d -tree graphs are exactly the chordal graphs. In [12], Moradi and Kiani proved the conjecture when the complement of G is a d -tree. Let (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) be a non-increasing sequence of positive integers. In this paper we define the concept of (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree graphs and show that all d -tree graphs are (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree and (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree graphs are chordal, that is

$$d\text{-tree graphs} \Rightarrow (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q)\text{-tree graphs} \Rightarrow \text{chordal graphs}$$

and the converse of the above implications may not hold in general. The graphs define by Gitler and Valencia are also (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree. In Theorem 4.15 we prove that all (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree graphs are vertex decomposable. Morey and Villarreal in [13] show that for any graph G the big height of $I(G)$ is a lower bounded for projective dimension $R/I(G)$ and the equality holds if G is sequentially Cohen-Macaulay. In Theorem 4.10 we prove that the maximum degree of vertices any G is a lower bounded of the big height of $I(G)$. In other words, the maximum degree of vertices is another lower bounded for projective dimension of any graph and the equality holds if the graph has a full vertex or it is the complement of a (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree, see Theorems 4.11 and 4.21. Our Theorem 4.11 generalises the results of Gitler and Valencia in [9] and Moradi and Kiani [12] on Eliahou and Villarreal conjecture.

2. PRELIMINARIES

A *simplicial complex* Δ on the vertex set $V = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ is a collection of subsets of V such that

- i) $\{x_i\} \in \Delta$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$ and
- ii) if $F \in \Delta$ and $H \subseteq F$, then $H \in \Delta$.

An element F of Δ is a *face* of Δ and a maximal (with respect to inclusion) face is a *facet*. The set of all facets of Δ is denoted by $\mathcal{F}(\Delta)$ and we sometimes write $\langle F \mid F \in \mathcal{F}(\Delta) \rangle$ for Δ . A simplicial complex Δ is called *pure* if the facets have the same cardinality. Let $d = \max\{|F| \mid F \in \Delta\}$, the *dimension* of Δ is $\dim \Delta = d - 1$. The *Stanley-Reisner ideal* of Δ is

$$I_\Delta = \langle x_F \mid F \notin \Delta \rangle$$

where $x_F = \prod_{x_i \in F} x_i$. The quotient algebra $\mathbb{K}[\Delta] = R/I_\Delta$ is the *Stanley-Reisner ring* of Δ over a field \mathbb{K} . The Krull dimension of $\mathbb{K}[\Delta]$ is $\dim \mathbb{K}[\Delta] = \dim \Delta + 1$. A simplicial complex with only one facet is a *simplex*. Let $f_i = f_i(\Delta)$ be the number of faces of Δ of cardinality $i + 1$. The sequence $f(\Delta) = (f_{-1} = 1, f_0, f_1, \dots, f_{d-1})$ is the *f-vector* of Δ . The *h-vector* $h(\Delta) = (h_0, h_1, \dots, h_d)$ of Δ can be computed in terms of *f-vector* as follows:

$$(2.1) \quad h_i = \sum_{j=0}^i (-1)^{i-j} \binom{d-j}{d-i} f_{j-1}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq d.$$

The *Hilbert series* of $\mathbb{K}[\Delta]$ is of the form $H_{\mathbb{K}[\Delta]}(t) = (h_0 + h_1t + \cdots + h_s t^s)/(1-t)^d$. The *Hilbert polynomial* of $\mathbb{K}[\Delta]$ is $P_{\mathbb{K}[\Delta]}(t) = h_0 + h_1t + \cdots + h_s t^s$ with $h_s \neq 0$. The *a-invariant* $a(\mathbb{K}[\Delta])$ is the degree of rational function $H_{\mathbb{K}[\Delta]}(t)$, that is, $s - d$.

A *subcomplex* Γ of Δ is a simplicial complex whose facets are faces of Δ . If $F \in \Delta$ is a face, then the *deletion* of F is the subcomplex

$$\text{del}_\Delta(F) = \{E \in \Delta \mid E \cap F = \emptyset\},$$

of Δ and the *link* of F is the subcomplex of Δ and defined by

$$\text{link}_\Delta(F) = \{E \in \Delta \mid E \cap F = \emptyset \text{ and } E \cup F \in \Delta\}.$$

Let G be a graph and $I(G)$ the edge ideal of G as defined in the introduction section. A *path* P_k of length k in G is a sequence of distinct vertices $x_{i_0}, x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_k}$ and a sequence of edges $\{x_{i_j}, x_{i_{j+1}}\} \in E(G)$. A *cycle* of length k in G is a path P_k together with the edge $\{x_{i_k}, x_{i_0}\}$. A *connected* graph G is a graph that has a path between every pair of vertices, and disconnected otherwise. The *neighbourhood* of a vertex $x \in V(G)$ is the set $N_G(x) = \{x_j \in V(G) \mid x \text{ is adjacent to } x_j\}$. For any subset $F \subseteq V(G)$, the set of neighbourhood of F is $N_G(F) = \bigcup_{x \in F} N_G(x)$. The *closed neighbourhood* of F is $N_G[F] = N_G(F) \cup F$. The *degree* of a vertex $x \in V(G)$ is defined to be $\deg_G(x) = |N_G(x)|$. An *isolated* vertex of G is a vertex of degree zero. A graph H is a *subgraph* of G if $V(H) \subseteq V(G)$ and $E(H) \subseteq E(G)$. An *induced subgraph* on $S \subseteq V(G)$ is a subgraph G_S of G such that $\{x_i, x_j\} \in E(G_S)$ if $\{x_i, x_j\} \in E(G)$ for all $x_i, x_j \in S$. The subgraph $G \setminus S$ is obtained by removing all the vertices of S from G and any edge which has at least one of its endpoints in S . We write $G \setminus x$ instead of $G \setminus \{x\}$ if S consists of a single vertex x . The *complement* of a graph G is the graph \overline{G} such that $V(\overline{G}) = V(G)$ and $E(\overline{G}) = \{\{x_i, x_j\} \mid \{x_i, x_j\} \notin E(G)\}$. A subset $C \subseteq V(G)$ is called a *vertex cover* of G if every edge of G has one its endpoints in C . A vertex cover is *minimal* if it is minimal with respect to set inclusion among the set of vertex covers G . A graph G is *unmixed* if all minimal vertex covers have the same cardinality. A subset $F \subseteq V(G)$ is called an *independent* set of G if no two vertices in F are adjacent. An independent set F is *maximal* if it is not contained in any other independent set. A graph G is well-covered if all maximal independent sets have the same cardinality. Hence, a graph G is unmixed if and only if it is well-covered. A subset $K \subseteq V(G)$ is a *clique* of G if every two distinct vertices of K are adjacent in G . A *complete graph* \mathcal{K}_r is a clique on r vertices. The *independence complex* Δ_G of G is the set of all independent sets of G , that is

$$\Delta_G = \{F \subseteq V(G) \mid F \text{ is an independent set in } G\}.$$

In this case $I_{\Delta_G} = I(G)$. The *clique complex* $\Delta(G)$ of G consists all the clique sets of G , that is

$$\Delta(G) = \{K \subseteq V(G) \mid K \text{ is a clique set of } G\}.$$

Note that the independent simplicial complex of a graph G is the clique complex of \overline{G} . Hence $\Delta_G = \Delta(\overline{G})$. Further, a graph G is unmixed if and only if Δ_G is pure. An *induced k -cycle* C_k in G is cycle of length k such that $G_{V(C_k)} = C_k$. A graph G is called *chordal* if it does not contain any C_k , $k \geq 4$. A graph G is *co-chordal* if \overline{G} is chordal.

Consider the following minimal graded free resolution of $\mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] = R/I(G)$ over R

$$0 \longrightarrow \bigoplus_j R(-j)^{\beta_{p,j}} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow \bigoplus_j R(-j)^{\beta_{1,j}} \longrightarrow \bigoplus_j R(-j)^{\beta_{0,j}} \longrightarrow R \longrightarrow \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] \longrightarrow 0$$

where $R(-j)$ denotes the R -module obtained by shifting the degrees of R by j . The integer $\beta_{i,j}(\mathbb{K}[\Delta_G]) := \beta_{i,j}$ is called the i^{th} graded Betti number of $\mathbb{K}[\Delta_G]$ in degree j . The length p of the resolution is called the *projective dimension* of $\mathbb{K}[\Delta_G]$ over R , that is

$$\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] = \max \{i \mid \beta_{i,j}(\mathbb{K}[\Delta_G]) \neq 0 \text{ for some } j\}.$$

The (Castelnuovo–Mumford) *regularity* of $\mathbb{K}[\Delta_G]$ over R is

$$\text{reg } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] = \max\{j - i \mid \beta_{i,j}(\mathbb{K}[\Delta_G]) \neq 0\}.$$

The 2-linear resolution (over R) of $\mathbb{K}[\Delta_G]$ is the minimal graded free resolution of the form

$$0 \longrightarrow R(-2-p)^{\beta_p} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow R(-3)^{\beta_1} \longrightarrow R(-2)^{\beta_0} \longrightarrow R \longrightarrow \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] \longrightarrow 0.$$

In [8], Fröberg prove that $\mathbb{K}[\Delta_G]$ has a 2-linear resolution if and only if G is co-chordal. We refer the reader to [10, 15, 18] for further details regarding the terminologies in this section.

3. A COUNTEREXAMPLE TO THE CONJECTURE

In this section we give an example which shows the conjecture of Eliahou and Villarreal does not hold in general. The conjecture states that

$$\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{\deg_G(x_i)\},$$

whenever G is connected and it is the complement of a co-chordal graph. Indeed, the difference between the projective dimension and a maximum degree of a graph may not be bounded in general. The following inequality is well known (see [16, Corollary B.4.1])

$$(3.1) \quad \deg P_{\mathbb{K}[\Delta_G]}(t) - \text{reg } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] \leq \dim \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] - \text{depth } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G]$$

and the equality holds if $\mathbb{K}[\Delta_G]$ has 2-linear resolution. Hence the equality holds in Equation (3.1) if G is a co-chordal graph.

The *r-barbell* graph is a chordal graph obtained by connecting two copies of a complete graph \mathcal{K}_r by a bridge, for example see Figure 1.




FIGURE 1. The 4-barbell graph.

For $r \geq 3$, let G be the complement of the r -barbell graph. Then the independence complex of G is $\Delta_G = \langle V(\mathcal{K}_r), V(\mathcal{K}_r), \{x_1, x_2\} \rangle$ on $|V(G)| = 2r$. The f -vector of Δ_G is $(1, 2\binom{r}{1}, 2\binom{r}{2} + 1, 2\binom{r}{3}, 2\binom{r}{4}, \dots, 2)$ and $\dim \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] = r$. From Equation (2.1) one can find $h_r = 0$ and $h_{r-1} = (-1)^{r-1}(-2)$ after some simple calculations. Hence $h_{r-1} \neq 0$ and so the degree of Hilbert polynomial of $\mathbb{K}[\Delta_G]$ is $\deg P_{\mathbb{K}[\Delta_G]}(t) = r - 1$. Thus the equality of Equation (3.1) gives $\text{depth } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] = r - (r - 1) + 1 = 2$. The Auslander-Buchsbaum formula $\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] + \text{depth } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] = \dim R$ in [1] implies $\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] = 2r - 2$. Note that $\max_{1 \leq i \leq 2r} \{\deg_G(x_i)\} = r$. Therefore

$$\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] - \max_{1 \leq i \leq 2r} \{\deg_G(x_i)\} = r - 2.$$

4. MAIN RESULTS

In this section we show that the maximum degree of vertices of any graph G is a lower bounded of $\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G]$. Further, a sufficient condition for which $\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{\deg_G(x_i)\}$ is given. The main results in this section are Theorems 4.10, 4.11, 4.15, and 4.21. We start by proving the following standard Lemma:

Lemma 4.1. *Let G be a graph and $F \subseteq V(G)$. Then F is a maximal independent set of G if and only if $N_G[F] = V(G)$ and $F \cap N_G(F) = \emptyset$.*

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Let F be a maximal independent set. Then $V(G) \setminus F$ is the set of all neighbourhoods of F . Hence $F \cup N_G(F) = V$ and $F \cap N_G(F) = \emptyset$.

(\Leftarrow) Let $v \in F$. Then $v \notin N_G(F)$ since $F \cap N_G(F) = \emptyset$. Thus there is no edge between the vertices of F . Therefore F is an independent set. Now suppose there is an independent set A in G with $F \subsetneq A$. Let $a \in A \setminus F$. Then $a \in N_G(F)$ and so $\{a, v_i\}$ is an edge for some $v_i \in F$. Hence $F \cup \{a\} \subseteq A$ is not an independent set in G which is contradiction. Therefore F is maximal. \square

Definition 4.2. Let $F = \{v_1, \dots, v_r\}$ be an ordered independent set of a graph G . For $1 \leq i \leq r$, the graph G_i is obtained from G inductively as follows:

- i) $G_0 = G$,
- ii) $G_i = G_{i-1} \setminus N_{G_{i-1}}[v_i]$.

Remark 4.3. From the Definition 4.2 we note that $N_G(F) = \bigcup_{i=1}^r N_{G_{i-1}}(v_i)$ and $N_{G_{i-1}}(v_i) \cap N_{G_{j-1}}(v_j) = \emptyset$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq r$.

Example 4.4. Consider the graph G in Figure 2. Choose an independent set, say $F = \{x_1, x_5\}$. One can choose $v_1 = x_1$ and $v_2 = x_5$. This order is chosen for the sake of illustration, one can choose another order but in this case the G_i s may differ. Then the graph G , $G_1 = G \setminus N_G[x_1]$ and $G_2 = G_1 \setminus N_{G_1}[x_5]$ are illustrated in Figure 2.

Lemma 4.5. *Let G be a graph and $F = \{v_1, \dots, v_r\}$ be an independent set of G . Then $G_r = \emptyset$ if and only if F is a maximal independent set of G .*

Proof. We have $G_r = G_{r-1} \setminus N_{G_{r-1}}[v_r] = G \setminus N_G[F]$. Then $G_r = \emptyset$ if and only if $\emptyset = G \setminus N_G[F]$ if and only if $N_G[F] = V(G)$. Now the assertion follows from Lemma 4.1. \square




FIGURE 2

Lemma 4.6. *Let G be a graph. If $F = \{v_1, \dots, v_r\}$ is a maximal independent set of G . Then $|N_G(F)| = \sum_{i=1}^r \deg_{G_{i-1}}(v_i)$.*

Proof. For $1 \leq i \leq r$, from the construction of G_i s and Lemma 4.5 we have $G_r = \emptyset$ and $V(G) = N_G(v_1) \cup N_{G_1}(v_2) \cup \dots \cup N_{G_{r-1}}(v_r) \cup F$. Comparing with Lemma 4.1 we get that $N_G(F) = \bigcup_{i=1}^r N_{G_{i-1}}(v_i)$. Thus $|N_G(F)| = \sum_{i=1}^r \deg_{G_{i-1}}(v_i) = n - r$. \square

Remark 4.7. We note that $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Delta_G)$ has maximum (minimum) cardinality if and only if $\sum_{i=1}^r \deg_{G_{i-1}}(v_i)$ is minimum (maximum).

Definition 4.8. For $1 \leq i \leq r$, a *max-process* is a procedure that produces an ordered independent subset F of $V(G)$ as follows:

- i) $F_1 = \{v_1 \in V(G) \mid \deg_G(v_1) \text{ is maximum}\}$ and $G_1 = G \setminus N_G[v_1]$,
- ii) $F_i = F_{i-1} \cup \{v_i \in V(G) \mid \deg_{G_{i-1}}(v_i) \text{ is maximum}\}$ and $G_i = G_{i-1} \setminus N_{G_{i-1}}[v_i]$,
- iii) $F = F_r$.

By Lemma 4.5 we note that the set F in the definition of max-process is a maximal independent set of G if and only if $G_r = \emptyset$.

Example 4.9. Consider the graph G given in Figure 3. Note that for $i = 2, 3, 4, 5, 6$ $\deg_G(x_i)$ is maximum in G . If $v_1 = x_3$, then $F_1 = \{x_3\}$ and $G_1 = G \setminus N_G[x_3]$. Now the vertices x_1 and x_2 are of degree zero in G_1 . We have two options for v_2 , set $v_2 = x_1$. Then $F_2 = \{x_3, x_1\}$ and $G_2 = G_1 \setminus N_{G_1}[x_1]$. Finally, let $v_3 = x_6$. Then $F = \{x_3, x_1, x_6\}$ and $G_3 = \emptyset$. Thus by Lemma 4.5 F is a maximal independent set of G .

The *big height* $\text{bight } I(G)$ of an edge ideal $I(G)$ is the maximum cardinality of minimal vertex covers of G , equivalently, the cardinality of a set whose complement of a maximal independent set of minimum cardinality. The following bound on the projective dimension of $\mathbb{K}[\Delta_G]$ is proved by Moray and Villarreal in Corollary 3.33 [13]. For any graph G we have

$$\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] \geq \text{bight } I(G)$$

and the equality holds if $\mathbb{K}[\Delta_G]$ is sequentially Cohen-Macaulay (see [15, Definition 2.9] for the definition of sequentially Cohen-Macaulay). The following theorem gives a lower bounded for big height of the edge ideal of any graph.




FIGURE 3

Theorem 4.10. *Let G be a graph. Then $\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] \geq \text{bight } I(G) \geq \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{\deg_G(x_i)\}$.*

Proof. Let $F = \{v_1, \dots, v_r\}$ be a maximal independent set produced by max-process. Then $s \leq r \leq d$ where s is the minimum cardinality of a maximal independent set and $\dim \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] = d$. By the definition of F we have $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{\deg_G(x_i)\} = \deg_G(v_1)$. By Lemma 4.6 we have $\deg_G(v_1) \leq \sum_{i=1}^r \deg_{G_{i-1}}(v_i) = |N_G(F)| = n - r$ since F is a maximal independent set. By [13, Corollary 3.33] we have that $\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] \geq \text{bight } I(G) = n - s \geq n - r \geq \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{\deg_G(x_i)\}$. \square

In the rest of this section we provide two different sufficient conditions on G for which $\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{\deg_G(x_i)\}$. The first class of graphs for which the equality holds is the class of graphs with a full-vertex. A vertex $x \in V(G)$ is called a *full-vertex* if $N_G[x] = V(G)$. A full-vertex is also known as a universal vertex or a dominating vertex.

Theorem 4.11. *Let G be a graph with a full-vertex x . Then*


$$\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{\deg_G(x_i)\} = n - 1.$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.5, $F = \{x\}$ is a maximal independent set with minimum cardinality. Lemma 4.6 implies that $|N_G(x)| = \deg_G(x) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{\deg_G(x_i)\} = n - 1$. Using Theorem 4.10 we have $\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] \geq \text{bight } I(G) = n - 1$. We claim $\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] = n - 1$. For if not, assume $\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] = n$. Then the Auslander-Buchsbaum formula implies that $\text{depth } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] = 0$. Note that the maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} is an associated prime of $\mathbb{K}[\Delta_G]$ if and only if $\text{depth } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] = 0$. It follows that $\text{bight } I(G) = n$ which is a contradiction. Hence $\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{\deg_G(x_i)\} = n - 1$. \square

Example 4.12. Here we consider some graphs with a full-vertex.

- We have $\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_{\mathcal{K}_n}] = n - 1$ since each vertex $x \in V(\mathcal{K}_n)$ is a full-vertex.
- The *wheel* graph W_n is a graph obtained by connecting a vertex x to all vertices of an induced cycle with $n - 1$ vertices, see W_5 in Figure 8. Hence $\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_{W_n}] = n - 1$.
- A *star complete* graph is obtained by attaching complete graphs to a vertex x , in each case we attach all the vertices of the complete graphs to x . For example, a bowtie graph is star complete graph since it is obtained by attaching two copies

On the Eliahou and Villarreal conjecture about the projective dimension of co-chordal graphs 8
of \mathcal{K}_2 to a vertex. Then the projective dimension of a star complete graph with n vertices is $n - 1$.



A star complete graph

Remark 4.13. Let $n \geq 6$. Note that W_n is not a co-chordal graph. Hence $\mathbb{K}[\Delta_{W_n}]$ does not have a 2-linear resolution but $\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_{W_n}] = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{\deg_{W_n}(x_i)\}$.

The class of d -tree and generalized d -tree graphs are initially defined by Fröberg in [8]. In fact generalized d -tree graphs are exactly the chordal graphs. Here we define a new class of graphs which lie strictly between the d -trees and chordal graphs.

Definition 4.14. Let (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) be a non-increasing sequence of positive integers. Then a (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree is a graph G constructed inductively as follows:

- i) The graph $H_1 = \mathcal{K}_{d_1}$,
- ii) $H_i = H_{i-1} \cup_{\mathcal{K}_{d_{i-1}}} \mathcal{K}_{d_i}$ for $2 \leq i \leq q$, and
- iii) $G = H_q$.

The clique complex of a (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree is $\Delta(G) = \langle F_1, \dots, F_q \rangle$ where $F_i = V(\mathcal{K}_{d_i})$ for $1 \leq i \leq q$. From the construction of (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree we observe that a d -tree is (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree with $d_i = d$ for $1 \leq i \leq q$. Also (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree is a chordal graph. That is, we have the following implications.

$$d\text{-tree graphs} \Rightarrow (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q)\text{-tree graphs} \Rightarrow \text{chordal graphs.}$$

However the converse of implications do not hold in general, for example see Figure 4.





FIGURE 4


 FIGURE 5. Two non-isomorphic $(3, 3, 2)$ -tree graphs.

Note that for any sequence (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) in the definition 4.14, there is at least one (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree. Indeed, we can have two non-isomorphic (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -trees in general, see Figure 5.

Faridi [6] introduced the notion of a leaf for a simplicial complex Δ as follows, a facet F of Δ is called *leaf* if there is a facet M of Δ with $F \neq M$ such that $N \cap F \subset M \cap F$ for all facet N of Δ with $N \neq F$. Then Zheng [19] defined the concept of quasi-forest. A simplicial complex Δ is *quasi-forest* if there is an order F_1, \dots, F_r of the facets of Δ , called a *leaf order*, such that F_i is a leaf of the simplicial complex $\langle F_1, \dots, F_i \rangle$ for each $i = 1, \dots, r$. A *free vertex* is a vertex which belongs to exactly one facet. Björner and Wachs extended the definitions of vertex decomposability and shellability for non-pure cases, see [2, Definition 2.1] and [3, Definition 11.1]. A simplicial complex Δ is *vertex decomposable* if Δ is an empty set, Δ is a simplex or there exists a vertex $v \in V$ such that

- i) $\text{del}_\Delta(v)$ and $\text{link}_\Delta(v)$ are both vertex decomposable.
- ii) No facet F of $\text{link}_\Delta(v)$ is also a facet of $\text{del}_\Delta(v)$ (equivalently, every facet of $\text{del}_\Delta(v)$ is a facet of Δ).

If Δ is pure, we call Δ pure vertex decomposable. A vertex v that satisfies condition (ii) is called *shedding vertex*. A simplicial complex Δ is *shellable* if the facets of Δ can be ordered, say F_1, \dots, F_r , such that for all $1 \leq i < j \leq r$, there exists some $v \in F_j \setminus F_i$ and some $1 \leq k < j$ with $F_j \setminus F_k = \{v\}$. Such ordering F_1, \dots, F_r is called a *shelling order*. If Δ is pure, we call Δ pure shellable. Björner and Wachs showed that if Δ is a vertex decomposable, then Δ is shellable [3, Theorem 11.3]. Stanley showed that if Δ is shellable, then Δ is sequentially Cohen-Macaulay [15, p.87]. Hence, if Δ is vertex decomposable, then Δ is sequentially Cohen-Macaulay. Dirac's theorem [4] on chordal graphs says that Δ_G is quasi-forest if and only if G is co-chordal. Hence by [8, Theorem 1], Δ_G is quasi-forest if and only if $\mathbb{K}[\Delta_G]$ has 2-linear resolution.

Theorem 4.15. *Let G be a graph such that \overline{G} is a (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree. Then Δ_G is vertex decomposable quasi-forest (hence shellable and sequentially Cohen-Macaulay).*

Proof. For $i = 1, \dots, q$, let $F_i = V(\mathcal{K}_{d_i})$. Then from the definition of (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree the complex $\Delta_G = \langle F_1, F_2, \dots, F_q \rangle$ is the clique complex of \overline{G} . By Dirac's theorem, see [4, Theorem 1 and 2], the graph \overline{G} is chordal. Hence Δ_G is quasi-forest.

For the rest of the proof we use induction on $|V(G)|$ to show that Δ_G is vertex decomposable. If $|V(G)| = 2$, then G is an edge. Clearly \overline{G} is $(1, 1)$ -tree and Δ_G is vertex decomposable. Suppose $|V(G)| = n > 2$ for some integer n and the statement is true for any graph with less than n vertices. By definition of (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree, there is a vertex $x \in F_q \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{q-1} F_i$ and $F_q \setminus F_j = \{x\}$ for some $1 \leq j < q - 1$. Hence x is a shedding vertex. Then $\text{del}_{\Delta_G}(x) = \langle F_1, \dots, F_{q-1} \rangle$ and $\text{link}_{\Delta_G}(x) = \langle F_q \setminus \{x\} \rangle$. Note that $\overline{G} \setminus x$ is a

(d_1, \dots, d_{q-1}) -tree and $\overline{G} \setminus N_{\overline{G}}[x]$ is $(d_q - 1)$ -tree. On the other hand $\text{del}_{\Delta_G}(x) = \Delta_{G \setminus x}$ and $\text{link}_{\Delta_G}(x) = \Delta_{G \setminus N_G[x]}$. Hence by induction hypothesis $\text{del}_{\Delta_G}(x)$ and $\text{link}_{\Delta_G}(x)$ are vertex decomposable. Therefore Δ_G is vertex decomposable. \square

Remark 4.16. Let $\Delta_G = \langle F_1, \dots, F_q \rangle$ be the independence complex of a graph G such that \overline{G} is a (d_1, \dots, d_q) -tree. Then from the definition of shelling and leaf order we note that F_1, \dots, F_q is a shelling and a leaf order of Δ_G .

The following Corollary follows immediately from Theorem 4.15 and [7, Lemma 3.6].

Corollary 4.17. *The clique complex of a d -tree is pure vertex decomposable (hence pure shellable [12, Theorem 2.13] and Cohen-Macaulay [8, Theorem 2]).*

In the following we provide some necessary conditions for a graph to be a (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree.

Proposition 4.18. *Let G be a graph such that \overline{G} is a (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree. Then any vertex of maximum degree in G is a free and shedding vertex of Δ_G .*

Proof. For $i = 1, \dots, q$, let $F_i = V(\mathcal{K}_{d_i})$. Then from the definition of (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree the complex $\Delta_G = \langle F_1, F_2, \dots, F_q \rangle$ is the independence complex of G . Let x be a vertex of the maximum degree in G . Then degree of x is minimum in \overline{G} . But since F_q contains a free vertex and it is of minimum cardinality in Δ_G we have $|F_j| = |F_q|$ whenever $x \in F_j$, for $1 \leq j \leq q$. Thus x is a free vertex, otherwise degree of x cannot be minimum in \overline{G} . To show x is a shedding vertex we start by considering the case when $x \in F_1$. Then we have $|F_1| = |F_j|$ for all j . Suppose that x is not shedding. Then $F_1 \setminus \{x\}$ is not a face of $\langle F_2, \dots, F_q \rangle$. Hence \mathcal{K}_{d_2} is attached to \mathcal{K}_{d_1} from at most \mathcal{K}_{d_2-2} , that is \overline{G} is not a (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree which is a contradiction. Now, if $x \in F_j$ for some $2 \leq j \leq q$, then there is $1 \leq i < j$ such that $F_j \setminus F_i = \{x\}$. Hence in all cases x is a shedding vertex. \square

Proposition 4.19. *If G is a graph such that \overline{G} is a (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree, then any two vertices of G with maximum degree are adjacent.*

Proof. Suppose that G has two non-adjacent vertices x and x' of maximum degree. Then we show that $N_G(x) = N_G(x')$. Assume there is $v' \in N_G(x') \setminus N_G(x)$. Then $d(x, x') \geq 2$ and $d(x, v') \geq 2$. Hence $G \setminus N_G[x]$ contains at least the edge $\{x', v'\}$. Hence x is not a free vertex in Δ_G , this contradicts Proposition 4.18. Therefore $N_G(x) = N_G(x')$. Then any facet $F \in \Delta_G$ containing x must also contain x' . Hence $F \setminus \{x\}$ is a facet of $\text{del}_{\Delta_G}(x)$. Thus x is not a shedding vertex, again this contradicts Proposition 4.18. \square

Example 4.20. Consider the following applications of Propositions 4.18 and 4.19.

- Let G be the complement of the graph in Figure 6. The degree of x is maximum in G but x is not a free vertex in Δ_G . Hence \overline{G} is not a (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree.
- The complement of C_4 is not a (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree since it has non-adjacent vertices of maximum degrees.
- The complement of the graph G in Example 4.9 is not (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree since x_2 and x_4 are non-adjacent maximum degrees of G .




FIGURE 6

In the following result we provide a sufficient condition for which the Eliahou and Villarreal conjecture is true. To our knowledge the given condition together with Theorem 4.11 generalise all the existing classes of graphs for which the conjecture holds.

Theorem 4.21. *Let G be a connected graph such that \overline{G} is a (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree. Then $\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{\deg_G(x_i)\}$.*

Proof. For $i = 1, \dots, q$, let $F_i = V(\mathcal{K}_{d_i})$. Then $\Delta_G = \langle F_1, F_2, \dots, F_q \rangle$ is the clique complex of \overline{G} . By the definition of (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree there is a free vertex x in F_q and $\text{bight } I(G) = n - |F_q|$. Note that $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{\deg_G(x_i)\} = \deg_G(x)$ since x is a free vertex of F_q and F_q is of minimum cardinality. Let $F_q = \{x, v_2, \dots, v_r\}$. By Lemmas 4.1 and 4.5, $\text{bight } I(G) = n - |F_q| = |N_G[F_q]| - |F_q| = |N_G(F_q)| = \deg_G(x) + \sum_{i=2}^r \deg_{G_i}(v_i)$. We have $G \setminus N_G[x]$ is a set of isolated vertices since x is a free vertex in Δ_G . Hence $\sum_{i=2}^r \deg_{G_{i-1}}(v_i) = 0$. Thus $\text{bight } I(G) = \deg_G(x)$. Theorem 4.15 and [13, Corollary 3.33] imply that $\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] = \text{bight } I(G) = \deg_G(x)$. \square

Remark 4.22. Note that if G is the complement of a (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree. Then by Auslander-Buchsbaum formula and Theorem 4.21 we have $\text{depth } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] = d_q$.

Example 4.23. Consider the graphs G_1 and G_2 in Figure 7. Then \overline{G}_1 is $(2, 2, 1)$ -tree and \overline{G}_2 is $(4, 3, 3, 3, 3)$ -tree. Hence $\text{depth } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_{G_1}] = 1$, $\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_{G_1}] = 3$, $\text{depth } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_{G_2}] = 3$ and $\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_{G_2}] = 5$.




FIGURE 7

The converse of Theorem 4.21 need not hold in general. In order to see this, let G be the graph in Figure 8. By Theorem 4.11 $\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] = \max_{1 \leq i \leq 5} \{\deg_G(x_i)\} = 4$ since x is a full-vertex of G . But \overline{G} is not a (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree.

In [12, Theorem 2.13], Moradi and Kiani proved that the projective dimension of $\mathbb{K}[\Delta_G]$ is equal to the maximum degree of vertices of G whenever \overline{G} is a d -tree. In the next corollary we show that Moradi and Kiani's result is a consequence of Theorem 4.21.



FIGURE 8

Corollary 4.24 ([12, Theorem 2.13]). *Let G be a graph such that \overline{G} is a d -tree. Then $\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{\deg_G(x_i)\}$.*

Proof. Any d -tree graph is an unmixed (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree. The graph G is connected since \overline{G} is d -tree. Then the result follows from Theorem 4.21. □

For integers $m \geq 1$ and $r \geq 0$, the graph $G_{m,r}$ is obtained by attaching r edges at each vertex of \mathcal{K}_m . Gitler and Valencia in [9] show that $\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_{G_{m,r}}] = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{\deg_{G_{m,r}}(x_i)\}$ where $n = m(r + 1)$. Theorem 4.21 generalises their result, since the complement of $G_{m,r}$ is $(mr, \underbrace{(m - 1)r + 1, (m - 1)r + 1, \dots, (m - 1)r + 1}_{m\text{-times}})$ -tree.

Corollary 4.25 ([9, Proposition 4.9 and Proposition 4.12]). *Let $G = G_{m,r}$ or let $G = G_{m,i_1,\dots,i_m}$ be the graph obtained by attaching i_j edges at each vertex x_j of \mathcal{K}_m such that $i_j \leq i_{j+1}$ for all j . Then $\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{\deg_G(x_i)\}$.*

A *separating set* in a connected graph G is a set of edges whose deletion turns G into a disconnected graph. If G is connected and not a complete graph, its *edge connectivity* $\lambda(G)$ is the size of the smallest separating set in G . A graph G is k -connected if $\lambda(G) \geq k$.

Lemma 4.26. *For $q \geq 2$, let G be a connected (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree. Then G is $d_q - 1$ -connected.*

Proof. Let x be the free vertex in the facet $F_q = V(\mathcal{K}_{d_q})$ of $\Delta(G)$. Then $\lambda(G) = d_q - 1$ since F_q has the minimum cardinality and G is a chordal graph. Therefore G is $d_q - 1$ -connected. □

Example 4.27. Consider the graphs G_1 and G_2 in Figure 9. Then G_1 is a $(3, 2)$ -tree and G_2 is a $(3, 3)$ -tree. Hence by Lemma 4.26, G_1 is 1-connected and G_2 is 2-connected.




FIGURE 9

Let Δ_G be a quasi-forest simplicial complex. If G is disconnected, then it is a union of totally disconnected graph with a connected component. Hence, after dropping the connectedness assumption in Theorem 4.21 our formula for computing the projective dimension becomes

$$\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{\deg_G(x_i)\} + \text{number of isolated vertices.}$$

For example consider the following graph G in Figure 10. Let G' be the connected component of G . By Theorem 4.21 we have $\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_{G'}] = 3$ since $\overline{G'}$ is a $(2, 1, 1)$ -tree. Hence $\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] = 3 + 1 = 4$.




FIGURE 10. The graph G .

5. SOME QUESTIONS

In this section we propose some questions which may naturally arise after looking at the results of this paper.

Question 1. Is there a graph G that is not a member of the following classes of graphs:

- i) class of graphs with a full vertex,
- ii) class of graphs whose complement is a (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree for some non-increasing sequence of integers (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) .

but $\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{\deg_G(x_i)\}$?

The answer of Question 1 is positive. For example, let G be a graph as Figure 11. Then $\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] = \deg_G(x) = 3$ but G does not have a full vertex or it is not the complement of a (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree.




FIGURE 11. The graph G .

In Theorem 4.10 we showed that for any graph G we have $\text{bight } I(G) \geq \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{\deg_G(x_i)\}$, it may be reasonable to consider the following questions.

Question 2. For which class of graphs $\mathcal{C}(G)$ we have $\text{bight } I(G) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{\deg_G(x_i)\}$?

Question 3. Let k be a positive integer, for which class of graphs $\mathcal{C}(G)$ we have $\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_G] = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{\deg_G(x_i)\} + k$?

Regarding the Questions 2 and 3, we have $\text{bight } I(C_4) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq 4} \deg_{C_4}(x_i) = 2$ and $\text{pdim } \mathbb{K}[\Delta_{C_4}] = \max_{1 \leq i \leq 4} \deg_{C_4}(x_i) + 1 = 3$.

A positive answer to the following question with Theorem 4.15 characterise the vertex decomposable quasi-forest simplicial complexes in terms of (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -trees.

Question 4. A simplicial complex Δ_G is vertex decomposable quasi-forest, then is there a non-increasing sequence of positive integers (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) such that \overline{G} is a (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q) -tree?

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Auslander and D. A. Buchsbaum. Homological dimension in local rings. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, **85**(2):390–405, 1957.
- [2] A. Björner and M. L. Wachs. Shellable nonpure complexes and posets, I. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, **384**(4):1299–1327, 1996.
- [3] A. Björner and M. L. Wachs. Shellable nonpure complexes and posets, II. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, **349**(10):3945–3975, 1997.
- [4] G. A. Dirac. On rigid circuit graphs. *Abhandlungen aus dem Mathematischen Seminar der Universität Hamburg*, **25**(1):71–76, 1961.
- [5] S. Eliahou and R. H. Villarreal. The second betti number of an edge ideal. In *XXXI National Congress of the Mexican Mathematical Society (Hermosillo, 1998)*, volume **25**, pages 115–119. Sociedad Matemática Mexicana México, 1999.
- [6] S. Faridi. Simplicial trees are sequentially Cohen-Macaulay. *Journal of Pure Applied Algebra*, **190**:121–136, 2003.
- [7] C. A. Francisco and A. V. Tuyl. Sequentially Cohen-Macaulay edge ideals. *Proceeding of American Mathematical Society*, **135**(8):2327–2337, 2007.
- [8] R. Fröberg. On Stanley-Reisner rings. *Topics in Algebra, Banach Center Publications*, **26**(2):57–70, 1990.
- [9] I. Gitler and C. E. Valencia. Bounds for invariants of edge-rings. *Communications in Algebra*, **33**(5):1603–1616, 2005.
- [10] J. Herzog and T. Hibi. *Monomial ideals*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, **260**, Springer-Verlag London, 2011.
- [11] K. Kimura. Non-vanishingness of betti numbers of edge ideals. In *Harmony of Gröbner bases and the modern industrial society*, pages 153–168. World Scientific Publishing, Hackensack, 2012.
- [12] S. Moradi and D. Kiani. Bounds for the regularity of edge ideal of vertex decomposable and shellable graphs. *Bulletin of the Iranian Mathematical Society*, **36**(2):267–277, 2010.
- [13] S. Morey and R. H. Villarreal. Edge ideals: algebraic and combinatorial properties. *Progress in Commutative Algebra*, **1**:85–126, 2012.
- [14] R. P. Stanley. Balanced Cohen-Macaulay complexes. *Transactions of American Mathematical Society*, **249**(1):139–157, 1979.
- [15] R. P. Stanley. *Combinatorics and commutative algebra*. Progress in Mathematics, **41**, Birkhäuser, Boston, 2 edition, 1996.
- [16] W. V. Vasconcelos. *Computational methods in commutative algebra and algebraic geometry*. Algorithms and Computation in Mathematics, **2**, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1998.
- [17] R. H. Villarreal. Cohen-Macaulay graphs. *Manuscripta Mathematica*, **66**(3):277–293, 1990.
- [18] R. H. Villarreal. *Monomial algebras*. Monographs and Research Notes in Mathematics, CRC Press, Boca Raton, 2015.
- [19] X. Zheng. Resolutions of facet ideals. *Communications in Algebra*, **32**(6):2301–2324, 2004.

CHWAS AHMED, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, COLLEGE OF SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF SULAIMANI, KURDISTAN REGION, IRAQ.

Email address: `chwas.ahmed@univsul.edu.iq`

A. MAFI, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF KURDISTAN, P.O. Box: 416, SANANDAJ, IRAN.

Email address: `a_mafi@ipm.ir`

MOHAMMED RAFIQ NAMIQ, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, COLLEGE OF SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF SULAIMANI, KURDISTAN REGION, IRAQ.

Email address: `mohammed.namiq@univsul.edu.iq`