

ON THE STRONGLY ROBUSTNESS PROPERTY OF TORIC IDEALS

DIMITRA KOSTA, APOSTOLOS THOMA, AND MARIUS VLADOIU

ABSTRACT. To every toric ideal one can associate an oriented matroid structure, consisting of a graph and another toric ideal, called bouquet ideal. The connected components of this graph are called bouquets. Bouquets are of three types; free, mixed and non mixed. We prove that the cardinality of the following sets - the set of indispensable elements, minimal Markov bases, the Universal Markov basis and the Universal Gröbner basis of a toric ideal - depends only on the type of the bouquets and the bouquet ideal. These results enable us to introduce the strongly robustness simplicial complex and show that it determines the strongly robustness property. For codimension 2 toric ideals, we study the strongly robustness simplicial complex and prove that robustness implies strongly robustness.

1. INTRODUCTION

An ideal in a polynomial ring is called *robust* if it is minimally generated by the Universal Gröbner basis (see [4]), where the Universal Gröbner basis is the union of all reduced Gröbner bases. For toric ideals, the Universal Gröbner basis is always contained in the Graver basis, see [22, Chapter 4]. If I_A is positively graded then every minimal system of generators of a toric ideal I_A is contained in the Graver basis, see [8, Theorem 2.3]. Thus there exists a stronger notion of robustness for positively graded toric ideals. A positively graded toric ideal is called *strongly robust* if it is minimally generated by its Graver basis, see [24]. It follows that for a strongly robust toric ideal I_A the following sets are identical: the set of indispensable elements, any minimal system of generators, any reduced Gröbner basis, the Universal Gröbner basis and the Graver basis, see for example [19, Section 4]. Robust and strongly robust ideals have been studied in several articles [2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 13, 14, 19, 22, 23, 24, 26].

Strongly robust toric ideals appear in geometry, as defining ideals of non-pyramidal self-dual projective toric varieties, see [6, 28]; in combinatorial commutative algebra, as toric ideals of Lawrence matrices helping in the computation of the Graver basis, see [22, Chapter 7]; in algebraic statistics, as toric ideals whose Markov bases have the distance-reducing property, see [24, 25]. Note that for a toric ideal being strongly robust implies being robust. In [5], Boocher et al. wonder whether robust toric ideals are always strongly robust. In fact, they proved this is the case for toric

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 13F65, 13P10, 14M25, 05C90, 62R01.

Key words and phrases. Toric ideals, Graver basis, Universal Gröbner basis, Markov bases, Robust ideals.

Corresponding author: Dimitra Kosta.

ideals of graphs. On the other hand, based on [20, Theorem 4.2, Remark 4.4], using the theory of bouquets, [19], it follows that if robust toric ideals of hypergraphs are strongly robust then this is true for all positively graded toric ideals.

Theorem 4.2 of [19] suggests a special relation between strongly robust ideals and bouquets. For example, if all the bouquets are mixed then the toric ideal is strongly robust, see [19, Corollary 4.4], thus Petrović et al. raised the question whether all strongly robust toric ideals have at least one mixed bouquet. This question was answered in affirmative by Sullivant [24] for codimension 2 toric ideals based on the reduced Gale diagrams, a useful tool given by Peeva and Sturmfels in [18] for studying problems related to codimension 2 toric ideals. Note that reduced Gale diagrams have a strong relationship with the bouquet structure and they also preserve information about the mixedness or not of the bouquets, see Section 4 of this article.

In Section 2, we strengthen the bouquet results of [19] in the following manner. To every bouquet we can assign a sign $+$ if it is non-mixed, $-$ if it is mixed and 0 if it is free. We prove that if two toric ideals have the same bouquet ideal and the same signatures on the corresponding bouquets, then there is a bijective correspondence between indispensable, Markov bases, Gröbner bases and the universal Gröbner bases of the two ideals. The corresponding result for circuits and the Graver bases was proved in [19]. In Section 3, the previous results help us to define the strongly robustness simplicial complex, about which we show that determines the strongly robustness property for toric ideals, thus partially answering a question posed by Boocher and Robeva [4, Question 3.5]. We show how one can use the second Lawrence lifting to compute the strongly robustness simplicial complex. Then the theory of generalized Lawrence matrices of [19, Section 2] produces examples of strongly robust toric ideals; actually any strongly robust toric ideal can be produced in this way. In Section 4, we use the results of [18, 24] in codimension 2 to provide a Hilbert basis method to compute the strongly robustness simplicial complex and prove that, for codimension 2 toric ideals, robustness implies strongly robustness. Finally, using [24, Lemma 2.7], we prove an interesting property of codimension 2 ideals: if circuits are indispensable then all elements of the Graver basis are indispensable.

2. BOUQUET IDEALS

Let K be a field and $A = [\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n] \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times n}$ be an integer matrix with the set of column vectors $\{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n\}$ such that $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A) \cap \mathbb{N}^n = \{\mathbf{0}\}$. The toric ideal of A is the ideal $I_A \subset K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ generated by the binomials $x^{\mathbf{u}^+} - x^{\mathbf{u}^-}$ where $\mathbf{u} \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$, and $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}^+ - \mathbf{u}^-$ is the expression of \mathbf{u} as a difference of two non-negative vectors with disjoint support, see [22, Chapter 4]. The condition $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A) \cap \mathbb{N}^n = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ means that there is a strictly positive vector on the row span of the matrix A , therefore the toric ideal is positively graded. To the matrix A we associate its Gale transform, which is the $n \times (n - r)$ matrix whose columns span the lattice $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$, and r is the rank of A . We will denote the set of ordered row vectors of the Gale transform by $\{\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_n\}$. The vector \mathbf{a}_i is called *free* if its Gale transform \mathbf{b}_i is equal to the

zero vector, which means that i is not contained in the support of any element in $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$. The *bouquet graph* G_A of I_A is the graph on the set of vertices $\{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n\}$, whose edge set E_A consists of those $\{\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{a}_j\}$ for which \mathbf{b}_i is a rational multiple of \mathbf{b}_j and vice versa. The connected components of the graph G_A are called *bouquets*.

It follows from the definition that the free vectors of A form one bouquet, which we call the *free bouquet* of G_A . The non-free bouquets are of two types: *mixed* and *non-mixed*. A non-free bouquet is mixed if it contains an edge $\{\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{a}_j\}$ such that $\mathbf{b}_i = \lambda \mathbf{b}_j$ for some $\lambda < 0$, and is non-mixed if it is either an isolated vertex or for all of its edges $\{\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{a}_j\}$ we have $\mathbf{b}_i = \lambda \mathbf{b}_j$ with $\lambda > 0$, see [19, Lemma 1.2].

We reorder the vectors $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$ to $\mathbf{a}_{11}, \mathbf{a}_{12}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{1k_1}, \mathbf{a}_{21}, \mathbf{a}_{22}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{2k_2}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{s1}, \mathbf{a}_{s2}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{sk_s}$ in such a way the first k_1 vectors belong to the bouquet B_1 , the next k_2 to B_2 and so on up to the last k_s that belong to the bouquet B_s . Note that $k_1 + k_2 + \dots + k_s = n$. For each bouquet B_i we define two vectors \mathbf{c}_{B_i} and \mathbf{a}_{B_i} which record the bouquet's types and linear dependencies of the bouquet vectors. If the bouquet B_i is free then we set $\mathbf{c}_{B_i} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ to be any nonzero vector such that $\text{supp}(\mathbf{c}_{B_i}) = \{i_1, \dots, i_{k_i}\}$ and with the property that the first nonzero coordinate, c_{i_1} , is positive. For a non-free bouquet B_i of A , consider the Gale transforms of the elements in B_i . All the Gale transforms are nonzero, since the bouquet is not free, and pairwise linearly dependent, since they belong to the same bouquet. Therefore, there exists a nonzero coordinate l in all of them. Let $g_l = \gcd((\mathbf{b}_{i1})_l, (\mathbf{b}_{i2})_l, \dots, (\mathbf{b}_{i_{k_i}})_l)$, where $(\mathbf{w})_l$ is the l -th component of a vector \mathbf{w} . Then \mathbf{c}_{B_i} is the vector in \mathbb{Z}^n whose qj -th component is 0 if $q \neq i$, and $c_{ij} = \varepsilon_{i1}(\mathbf{b}_{ij})_l/g_l$, where ε_{i1} represents the sign of the integer $(\mathbf{b}_{i1})_l$. Note that c_{i1} is always positive. Then the vector \mathbf{a}_{B_i} (see [19, Definition 1.7]), is defined as $\mathbf{a}_{B_i} = \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} (c_{B_i})_j \mathbf{a}_j \in \mathbb{Z}^m$.

If B_i is a non-free bouquet of A , then B_i is a mixed bouquet if and only if the vector \mathbf{c}_{B_i} has a negative and a positive coordinate, see [19, Lemma 1.6], and B_i is non-mixed if and only if the vector \mathbf{c}_{B_i} has all nonzero coordinates positive. Let A_B be the matrix with columns the vectors \mathbf{a}_{B_i} , $1 \leq i \leq s$ then the toric ideal I_{A_B} is the bouquet ideal of A .

Let $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_s) \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A_B)$ then the linear map

$$D(\mathbf{u}) = (c_{11}u_1, c_{12}u_1, \dots, c_{1k_1}u_1, c_{21}u_2, \dots, c_{2k_2}u_2, \dots, c_{s1}u_s, \dots, c_{sk_s}u_s),$$

where all c_{j1} , $1 \leq j \leq s$, are positive, is an isomorphism from $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A_B)$ to $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$, see [19, Theorem 1.9]. Therefore, since the matrices A and A_B have their kernels isomorphic, their toric ideals I_A and I_{A_B} have the same codimension.

Note that the bouquet ideal is simple: a toric ideal is called *simple* if every bouquet is a singleton, in other words if $I_T \subset K[x_1, \dots, x_s]$ and has s bouquets. The bouquet ideal of a simple toric ideal I_A is I_A . All toric ideals $I_A \subset K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ of height one, the ideals of monomial curves, are simple if $n \geq 3$. There are no simple toric ideals in codimension one, except the zero ideal in the polynomial ring in one variable.

Definition 2.1. Let $I_T \subset K[x_1, \dots, x_s]$ be a simple toric ideal and $\omega \subset \{1, \dots, s\}$. A toric ideal I_A is called T_ω -robust ideal if and only if

- the bouquet ideal of I_A is I_T and
- $\omega = \{i \in [s] \mid B_i \text{ is non mixed}\}$.

The T_\emptyset -robust toric ideals are always strongly robust ideals, see [19, Section 4], while the $T_{[s]}$ -robust toric ideals are the stable ideals, see [19, Section 3]. Every toric ideal I_A is a T_ω -robust ideal where I_T is the bouquet ideal of I_A and ω is the set of indices corresponding to the non mixed bouquets of I_A . The complement of ω in $[s]$ is the set of indices corresponding to the free and the mixed bouquets. The ideal I_A has a free bouquet if and only if the bouquet ideal I_T has a free bouquet, consisting of one free vector since I_T is simple. Thus the combination of the information given by ω and T provides the signatures of all the bouquets of a T_ω -robust toric ideal. The results of this section can be summarized: the cardinality of the sets of different toric bases depend only on the signatures of the bouquets and the bouquet ideal. Remark that in [19, Theorem 1.11] it was proved that the cardinality of the set of circuits and of the Graver basis, respectively, depends only on the bouquet ideal. Also in the case of any two $T_{[s]}$ -robust toric ideals there is a one-to-one correspondence between all different toric bases, [19, Theorem 3.7]. The aim of this section is to generalize these results for all toric ideals with the same signatures and the same bouquet ideal, by proving that in these cases there exists also a one-to-one correspondence between the indispensable elements, minimal Markov bases, the universal Markov bases (see Theorem 2.2), reduced Gröbner bases and the universal Gröbner bases (see Theorem 2.3).

A *Markov basis* of A is a finite subset \mathcal{M} of $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$ such that whenever $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^n$ and $\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{v} \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$ there exists a subset $\{\mathbf{u}_i : i = 1, \dots, r\}$ of \mathcal{M} that *connects* \mathbf{w} to \mathbf{v} . Here, connectedness means that $\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{v} = \sum_{i=1}^r \mathbf{u}_i$, and $(\mathbf{w} - \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbf{u}_i) \in \mathbb{N}^n$ for all $1 \leq p \leq r$ and $\mathbf{u}_i \in \mathcal{M}$ means that $\mathbf{u}_i \in \mathcal{M}$ or the opposite $-\mathbf{u}_i \in \mathcal{M}$. (We will also express that $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}^n$ by writing $\mathbf{w} \geq \mathbf{0}$, that is, each component w_i of \mathbf{w} is non-negative.) A Markov basis \mathcal{M} is minimal if no proper subset of \mathcal{M} is a Markov basis. The universal Markov basis $\mathcal{M}(A)$ of A is the union of all minimal Markov bases of A , up to identification of opposite vectors, and the set of indispensable elements $S(A)$ is the intersection of all different minimal Markov bases, via the same identification. By a classical result of Diaconis and Sturmfels [12] minimal Markov bases of A correspond to minimal system of generators for the toric ideal I_A : \mathcal{M} is minimal Markov basis of A if and only if $\{\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}^+} - \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}^-} \mid \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{M}\}$ is a minimal system of binomial generators for the toric ideal I_A . The set of indispensable binomials $S(I_A)$ of the toric ideal is the set $\{\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}^+} - \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}^-} \mid \mathbf{u} \in S(A)\}$, that is the intersection of all minimal systems of binomial generators of I_A , up to identification of opposite binomials.

For the proofs of the next two theorems we need the following notation. Let $B_1^{(j)}, \dots, B_s^{(j)}$ be the bouquets of the toric ideal I_{A_j} with $\mathbf{c}_{B_1^{(j)}}, \dots, \mathbf{c}_{B_s^{(j)}}$ the corresponding vectors for $j = 1, 2$. Furthermore, we denote by k_i and l_i , respectively, the number of elements of the i -th bouquet of $B_i^{(1)}$ and $B_i^{(2)}$, respectively, and by $c_{i1}^{(1)}, \dots, c_{ik_i}^{(1)}$ and $c_{i1}^{(2)}, \dots, c_{il_i}^{(2)}$ the nonzero coordinates of $\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}}$ and $\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(2)}}$, respectively. Furthermore, associated to the matrices A_1 and A_2 we consider the toric ideals $I_{A_1} \subset K[x_{11}, \dots, x_{1k_1}, \dots, x_{s1}, \dots, x_{sk_s}]$ and $I_{A_2} \subset K[y_{11}, \dots, y_{1l_1}, \dots, y_{s1}, \dots, y_{sl_s}]$. According to [19, Theorem 1.9], for each $j = 1, 2$ there is a one-to-one correspondence between the elements of $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(T)$ and the elements of $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A_j)$ given by the

map $D_j : \mathbf{u} \mapsto D_j(\mathbf{u})$, which sends the element $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_s) \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(T)$ to $D_j(\mathbf{u}) := \mathbf{c}_{B_1^{(j)}} u_1 + \dots + \mathbf{c}_{B_s^{(j)}} u_s \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A_j)$. Therefore, all elements of $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A_j)$ are in the form $D_j(\mathbf{u})$ for a unique $\mathbf{u} \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(T)$.

Theorem 2.2. *Let I_{A_1}, I_{A_2} be two T_ω -robust toric ideals. If \mathcal{M}_1 is a minimal Markov basis of A_1 then $\mathcal{M}_2 = \{D_2(\mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(T) \text{ such that } D_1(\mathbf{u}) \in \mathcal{M}_1\}$ is a minimal Markov basis of A_2 . Thus there exists a one-to-one correspondence between the sets of all different minimal Markov bases of the two ideals. In particular, there exists a one-to-one correspondence between the indispensable elements and the universal Markov bases of A_1 and A_2 , respectively.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{M}_1 be a minimal Markov basis of A_1 . First we want to prove that $\mathcal{M}_2 = \{D_2(\mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(T) \text{ such that } D_1(\mathbf{u}) \in \mathcal{M}_1\}$ is a Markov basis of A_2 . It is enough to prove that one can connect $D_2(\mathbf{v})^+$ to $D_2(\mathbf{v})^-$ for every $\mathbf{v} \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(T)$.

Since \mathcal{M}_1 is a Markov basis of A_1 there exists a subset $\{D_1(\mathbf{u}_j) \mid j = 1, \dots, r\}$ of \mathcal{M}_1 such that for the element $D_1(\mathbf{v}) \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A_1)$ we have $D_1(\mathbf{v})^+ - D_1(\mathbf{v})^- = \sum_{j=1}^r D_1(\mathbf{u}_j)$ and $D_1(\mathbf{v})^+ - \sum_{j=1}^p D_1(\mathbf{u}_j) \geq \mathbf{0}$ for all $1 \leq p \leq r$. Therefore, we have that

$$\left(\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}} v_i\right)^+ - \left(\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}} u_{1i} + \dots + \mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}} u_{pi}\right) \geq \mathbf{0} \quad \forall 1 \leq p \leq r, \forall 1 \leq i \leq s,$$

which we can further write at coordinate level as

$$\left(\left(c_{i1}^{(1)}, c_{i2}^{(1)}, \dots, c_{ik_i}^{(1)}\right) v_i\right)^+ \geq \left(c_{i1}^{(1)}, c_{i2}^{(1)}, \dots, c_{ik_i}^{(1)}\right) u_{1i} + \dots + \left(c_{i1}^{(1)}, c_{i2}^{(1)}, \dots, c_{ik_i}^{(1)}\right) u_{pi},$$

for all $1 \leq p \leq r$ and for all $1 \leq i \leq s$.

Case 1: Let $i \in \omega, v_i > 0$. In this case the bouquet $B_i^{(1)}$ is non-mixed and all $c_{ij}^{(1)} > 0$. We have for all $1 \leq p \leq r$ and for all $1 \leq j \leq k_i$

$$c_{ij}^{(1)} v_i \geq c_{ij}^{(1)} (u_{1i} + \dots + u_{pi})$$

which gives

$$v_i \geq u_{1i} + \dots + u_{pi}.$$

Since the toric ideal I_{A_2} is T_ω -robust, $B_i^{(2)}$ is also non-mixed and all $c_{ij}^{(2)} > 0$. Therefore, the last set of inequalities becomes by multiplication with $c_{ij}^{(2)}$

$$c_{ij}^{(2)} v_i \geq c_{ij}^{(2)} (u_{1i} + \dots + u_{pi}) \quad \forall 1 \leq j \leq l_i,$$

which implies

$$\left(\left(c_{i1}^{(2)}, c_{i2}^{(2)}, \dots, c_{il_i}^{(2)}\right) v_i\right)^+ \geq \left(c_{i1}^{(2)}, c_{i2}^{(2)}, \dots, c_{il_i}^{(2)}\right) u_{1i} + \dots + \left(c_{i1}^{(2)}, c_{i2}^{(2)}, \dots, c_{il_i}^{(2)}\right) u_{pi},$$

for all $1 \leq p \leq r$.

Case 2: Let $i \in \omega, v_i \leq 0$. Here again the bouquet $B_i^{(1)}$ is non-mixed and $c_{ij}^{(1)} > 0$ for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, k_i$. We have

$$0 \geq c_{ij}^{(1)} (u_{1i} + \dots + u_{pi})$$

which gives

$$0 \geq u_{1i} + \dots + u_{pi}.$$

Again the toric ideal I_{A_2} is T_ω -robust, $B_i^{(2)}$ is also non-mixed and all $c_{ij}^{(2)} > 0$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, l_i$. Therefore, the last set of inequalities becomes by multiplication with $c_{ij}^{(2)}$

$$0 \geq c_{ij}^{(2)}(u_{1i} + \dots + u_{pi}) \quad \forall 1 \leq j \leq l_i,$$

which implies

$$\left(\left(c_{i1}^{(2)}, c_{i2}^{(2)}, \dots, c_{il_i}^{(2)} \right) v_i \right)^+ \geq \left(c_{i1}^{(2)}, c_{i2}^{(2)}, \dots, c_{il_i}^{(2)} \right) u_{1i} + \dots + \left(c_{i1}^{(2)}, c_{i2}^{(2)}, \dots, c_{il_i}^{(2)} \right) u_{pi},$$

for all $1 \leq p \leq r$.

Case 3: Let $i \notin \omega$ and the bouquet $B_i^{(1)}$ is the free bouquet of I_{A_1} , if it has a free bouquet. Since $\mathbf{v} \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(T)$ and $B_i^{(1)}$ is the free bouquet then v_i is zero. Since this is true for all elements of $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(T)$ it means I_{A_2} has a free bouquet, the $B_i^{(2)}$, and all $v_i = u_{1i} = \dots = u_{pi} = 0$. Thus

$$\left(\left(c_{i1}^{(2)}, c_{i2}^{(2)}, \dots, c_{il_i}^{(2)} \right) v_i \right)^+ = \left(c_{i1}^{(2)}, c_{i2}^{(2)}, \dots, c_{il_i}^{(2)} \right) u_{1i} + \dots + \left(c_{i1}^{(2)}, c_{i2}^{(2)}, \dots, c_{il_i}^{(2)} \right) u_{pi} = \mathbf{0}.$$

Case 4: Let $i \notin \omega$, $v_i > 0$ and the bouquet $B_i^{(1)}$ is mixed, namely the vector $\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}}$ has both positive and negative coordinates and splits as $\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}} = \left(\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}} \right)^+ - \left(\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}} \right)^-$. We have

$$\left(\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}} \right)^+ v_i \geq \left(\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}} \right)^+ (u_{1i} + \dots + u_{pi})$$

and

$$\mathbf{0} \geq -\left(\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}} \right)^- (u_{1i} + \dots + u_{pi}).$$

Combined together they give $v_i \geq u_{1i} + \dots + u_{pi} \geq 0$. Since the toric ideals I_{A_1} and I_{A_2} are T_ω -robust, whenever $B_i^{(1)}$ is mixed, $B_i^{(2)}$ is also mixed. In this case $\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(2)}}$ has both positive and negative coordinates and splits as $\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(2)}} = \left(\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(2)}} \right)^+ - \left(\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(2)}} \right)^-$. We have

$$\left(\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(2)}} \right)^+ v_i \geq \left(\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(2)}} \right)^+ (u_{1i} + \dots + u_{pi})$$

and

$$\mathbf{0} \geq -\left(\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(2)}} \right)^- (u_{1i} + \dots + u_{pi})$$

which imply

$$\left(\left(c_{i1}^{(2)}, c_{i2}^{(2)}, \dots, c_{il_i}^{(2)} \right) v_i \right)^+ \geq \left(c_{i1}^{(2)}, c_{i2}^{(2)}, \dots, c_{il_i}^{(2)} \right) u_{1i} + \dots + \left(c_{i1}^{(2)}, c_{i2}^{(2)}, \dots, c_{il_i}^{(2)} \right) u_{pi},$$

for all $1 \leq p \leq r$.

Case 5: Let $i \notin \omega$, $v_i \leq 0$ and the bouquet $B_i^{(1)}$ is mixed, namely the vector $\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}}$ has both positive and negative coordinates and splits as $\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}} = \left(\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}} \right)^+ - \left(\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}} \right)^-$. We have

$$-\left(\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}} \right)^- v_i \geq -\left(\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}} \right)^- (u_{1i} + \dots + u_{pi})$$

and

$$\mathbf{0} \geq \left(\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}} \right)^+ (u_{1i} + \cdots + u_{pi}).$$

Combined together they give $v_i \leq u_{1i} + \cdots + u_{pi} \leq 0$. By multiplying appropriately the above inequalities by either $\left(\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(2)}} \right)^+$ or $\left(\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(2)}} \right)^-$ we have

$$- \left(\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(2)}} \right)^- v_i \geq - \left(\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(2)}} \right)^- (u_{1i} + \cdots + u_{pi})$$

and

$$\mathbf{0} \geq \left(\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(2)}} \right)^+ (u_{1i} + \cdots + u_{pi})$$

which imply

$$\left(\left(c_{i1}^{(2)}, c_{i2}^{(2)}, \dots, c_{il_i}^{(2)} \right) v_i \right)^+ \geq \left(c_{i1}^{(2)}, c_{i2}^{(2)}, \dots, c_{il_i}^{(2)} \right) u_{1i} + \cdots + \left(c_{i1}^{(2)}, c_{i2}^{(2)}, \dots, c_{il_i}^{(2)} \right) u_{pi},$$

for all $1 \leq p \leq r$.

Finally combining all five cases we arrive at

$$\left(D_2(\mathbf{v})^+ - \sum_{j=1}^p D_2(\mathbf{u}_j) \right) \geq 0 \text{ for all } 1 \leq p \leq r.$$

Also, we have that $D_1(\mathbf{v})^+ - D_1(\mathbf{v})^- = D_1(\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{j=1}^r D_1(\mathbf{u}_j) \Rightarrow D_2(\mathbf{v})^+ - D_2(\mathbf{v})^- = D_2(\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{j=1}^r D_2(\mathbf{u}_j)$, since both D_1, D_2 are linear maps.

Therefore, this concludes that for any element $D_2(\mathbf{v}) \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A_2)$, there exists a subset $\{D_2(\mathbf{u}_j) \mid j = 1, \dots, r\}$ of \mathcal{M}_2 that connects $D_2(\mathbf{v})^+$ and $D_2(\mathbf{v})^-$.

This one-to-one correspondence between Markov bases of A_1 and A_2 , ensures also that the map $f : D_1(\mathbf{u}) \mapsto D_2(\mathbf{u})$ preserves the minimality of the Markov bases. Indeed, if \mathcal{M}_1 is a minimal Markov basis of A_1 then, as we saw, $\mathcal{M}_2 = \{D_2(\mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(T) \text{ such that } D_1(\mathbf{u}) \in \mathcal{M}_1\}$ is a Markov basis of A_2 , and if it were not minimal then a proper subset \mathcal{M}'_2 of \mathcal{M}_2 would be a minimal Markov basis, and thus by repeating the previous argument we would obtain that a proper subset $\mathcal{M}'_1 = \{D_1(\mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(T) \text{ such that } D_2(\mathbf{u}) \in \mathcal{M}'_2\}$ of the minimal Markov basis \mathcal{M}_1 would be a Markov basis of A_1 , a contradiction.

The set of indispensable elements is the intersection of all different minimal Markov bases and the universal Markov basis is the union of all minimal Markov bases. Therefore it follows that $f : D_1(\mathbf{u}) \mapsto D_2(\mathbf{u})$ is a one-to-one correspondence between the two sets of the indispensable elements and the same is true for the universal Markov bases of A_1 and A_2 . \square

Theorem 2.3. *Let I_{A_1}, I_{A_2} be two T_ω -robust toric ideals. If \mathcal{G} is a reduced Gröbner basis of I_{A_1} with respect to a monomial order $<_1$ then there exists a monomial order $<_2$ such that $\mathcal{G}' = \{y^{D_2(\mathbf{u})^+} - y^{D_2(\mathbf{u})^-} \mid \mathbf{u} \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(T) \text{ s.t. } x^{D_1(\mathbf{u})^+} - x^{D_1(\mathbf{u})^-} \in \mathcal{G}\}$ is a reduced Gröbner basis of I_{A_2} . Furthermore, if*

$$\text{in}_{<_1}(I_{A_1}) = (x^{D_1(\mathbf{u}_1)^+}, \dots, x^{D_1(\mathbf{u}_r)^+})$$

then

$$\text{in}_{<_2}(I_{A_2}) = (y^{D_2(\mathbf{u}_1)^+}, \dots, y^{D_2(\mathbf{u}_r)^+}),$$

for some $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_r \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(T)$. Thus there exists a one-to-one correspondence between the reduced Gröbner bases of the two ideals. In particular, there is a one-to-one correspondence between the universal Gröbner bases of I_{A_1} and I_{A_2} .

Proof. It is enough to prove that if $\mathcal{G} = \{x^{D_1(\mathbf{u}_1)^+} - x^{D_1(\mathbf{u}_1)^-}, \dots, x^{D_1(\mathbf{u}_r)^+} - x^{D_1(\mathbf{u}_r)^-}\}$ is a reduced Gröbner basis of the toric ideal I_{A_1} with respect to the monomial order $<_1$ on $K[x_{11}, \dots, x_{1k_1}, \dots, x_{s1}, \dots, x_{sk_s}]$ for some $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_r \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(T)$, then there exists a monomial order $<_2$ on $K[y_{11}, \dots, y_{1l_1}, \dots, y_{s1}, \dots, y_{sl_s}]$ with respect to which

$$\mathcal{G}' = \left\{ y^{D_2(\mathbf{u}_1)^+} - y^{D_2(\mathbf{u}_1)^-}, \dots, y^{D_2(\mathbf{u}_r)^+} - y^{D_2(\mathbf{u}_r)^-} \right\}$$

is a reduced Gröbner basis of the toric ideal I_{A_2} .

We recall that the nonzero coordinates of $\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}}$ are $c_{i1}^{(1)}, c_{i2}^{(1)}, \dots, c_{iki}^{(1)}$. We write each vector $\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}}$ as $\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}}^+ - \mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}}^-$, where for $i \in \omega$ we have $\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}}^- = \mathbf{0}$. The coordinates of $\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}}^+$ and $\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}}^-$ are denoted by $c_{ij}^{(1)+}$ and $c_{ij}^{(1)-}$, respectively. One of them is zero and the other $|c_{ij}^{(1)}|$. Similarly, one defines the corresponding notation for the coordinates of $\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(2)}}$.

By [22, Proposition 1.11], there exists a weight vector $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}^{k_1 + \dots + k_s}$, say $\mathbf{w} = (w_{11}, \dots, w_{1k_1}, \dots, w_{s1}, \dots, w_{sk_s})$ such that $\text{in}_{<_1}(I_{A_1}) = \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(I_{A_1})$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $x^{D_1(\mathbf{u}_p)^+} >_1 x^{D_1(\mathbf{u}_p)^-}$, i.e. the dot product $\mathbf{w} \cdot D_1(\mathbf{u}_p) > 0$, for any $p = 1, \dots, r$. Thus

$$\dots + \left(c_{i1}^{(1)+} w_{i1} + \dots + c_{iki}^{(1)+} w_{iki} \right) u_{pi} - \left(c_{i1}^{(1)-} w_{i1} + \dots + c_{iki}^{(1)-} w_{iki} \right) u_{pi} + \dots > 0.$$

We denote by $\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}}^+ \cdot \mathbf{w} = c_{i1}^{(1)+} w_{i1} + c_{i2}^{(1)+} w_{i2} + \dots + c_{iki}^{(1)+} w_{iki}$ and by $\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}}^- \cdot \mathbf{w} = c_{i1}^{(1)-} w_{i1} + c_{i2}^{(1)-} w_{i2} + \dots + c_{iki}^{(1)-} w_{iki}$. Next, if we let r_i^+ be the number of positive elements in $\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(2)}}$ and r_i^- the number of negative elements in $\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(2)}}$, then we define the

vector $\mathbf{w}' \in \mathbb{N}^{l_1 + \dots + l_s}$ such that its it -th coordinate is equal to $\frac{\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}}^+ \cdot \mathbf{w}}{c_{it}^{(2)} r_i^+}$ if $c_{it}^{(2)} > 0$ and $\frac{\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}}^- \cdot \mathbf{w}}{-c_{it}^{(2)} r_i^-}$ if $c_{it}^{(2)} < 0$. Note that always $r_i^+ \geq 1$, but $r_i^- = 0$ for non mixed bouquets.

In this last case there is no reason to define the number $\frac{\mathbf{c}_{B_i^{(1)}}^- \cdot \mathbf{w}}{-c_{it}^{(2)} r_i^-}$ since $c_{it}^{(2)}$ is always greater than 0.

Let \prec be an arbitrary monomial order on $K[y_{11}, \dots, y_{1l_1}, \dots, y_{s1}, \dots, y_{sl_s}]$. We define by $<_2$ the monomial order $\prec_{\mathbf{w}'}$ on $K[y_{11}, \dots, y_{1l_1}, \dots, y_{s1}, \dots, y_{sl_s}]$ induced by \prec and \mathbf{w}' , see [22, Chapter 1] for definition. Next we prove that $x^{D_1(\mathbf{u})^+} >_1 x^{D_1(\mathbf{u})^-}$ implies that $y^{D_2(\mathbf{u})^+} >_2 y^{D_2(\mathbf{u})^-}$. Indeed, since $x^{D_1(\mathbf{u})^+} >_1 x^{D_1(\mathbf{u})^-}$ then $\mathbf{w} \cdot D_1(\mathbf{u}) > 0$, where $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_s)$. It follows now from the definition of \mathbf{w}' that

$$\mathbf{w}' \cdot D_2(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{w} \cdot D_1(\mathbf{u}) > 0,$$

which implies $y^{D_2(\mathbf{u})^+} >_2 y^{D_2(\mathbf{u})^-}$, as desired. In particular, we obtain that $y^{D_2(\mathbf{u}_p)^+} >_2 y^{D_2(\mathbf{u}_p)^-}$ for all $p = 1, \dots, r$, and as a consequence

$$\left(y^{D_2(\mathbf{u}_1)^+}, \dots, y^{D_2(\mathbf{u}_r)^+} \right) \subset \text{in}_{<_2}(I_{A_2}).$$

For the converse inclusion, let $y^{D_2(\mathbf{u})^+} - y^{D_2(\mathbf{u})^-} \in I_{A_2}$ be an arbitrary element, and say that $y^{D_2(\mathbf{u})^+} >_2 y^{D_2(\mathbf{u})^-}$, the other case being similar. It follows from the previous considerations that $x^{D_1(\mathbf{u})^+} >_1 x^{D_1(\mathbf{u})^-}$ and thus there exists an integer p such that $x^{D_1(\mathbf{u}_p)^+} | x^{D_1(\mathbf{u})^+}$. That means $x_{ij}^{(D_1(\mathbf{u}_p)^+)} | x_{ij}^{(D_1(\mathbf{u})^+)}$ for every i, j , where $(D_1(\mathbf{u}_p)^+)_{ij}$ and $(D_1(\mathbf{u})^+)_{ij}$ represent the ij -th coordinate of the vectors $D_1(\mathbf{u}_p)^+$ and $D_1(\mathbf{u})^+$, respectively. The exponent of x_{ij} in $x^{D_1(\mathbf{u}_p)^+}$ is $c_{ij}^{(1)+} u_{pi}^+ + c_{ij}^{(1)-} u_{pi}^-$, while in $x^{D_1(\mathbf{u})^+}$ is $c_{ij}^{(1)+} u_i^+ + c_{ij}^{(1)-} u_i^-$. We consider the following cases:

Case 1: Let $i \in \omega, u_i > 0$. In this case the bouquets $B_i^{(1)}, B_i^{(2)}$ are non-mixed and all $c_{ij}^{(1)} > 0, c_{it}^{(2)} > 0$. Then $x_{ij}^{c_{ij}^{(1)+} u_{pi}^+ + c_{ij}^{(1)-} u_{pi}^-} | x_{ij}^{c_{ij}^{(1)+} u_i^+ + c_{ij}^{(1)-} u_i^-}$ means $x_{ij}^{c_{ij}^{(1)+} u_{pi}^+ + 0 u_{pi}^-} | x_{ij}^{c_{ij}^{(1)+} u_i^+ + 0 u_i^-}$. Thus $u_{pi}^+ \leq u_i$. Therefore $y_{it}^{c_{it}^{(2)+} u_{pi}^+ + 0 u_{pi}^-} | y_{it}^{c_{it}^{(2)+} u_i^+ + 0}$ and thus $y_{it}^{(D_2(\mathbf{u}_p)^+)}_{it} | y_{it}^{(D_2(\mathbf{u})^+)}_{it}$.

Case 2: Let $i \in \omega, u_i \leq 0$. In this case the bouquets $B_i^{(1)}, B_i^{(2)}$ are non-mixed and all $c_{ij}^{(1)} > 0, c_{it}^{(2)} > 0$. Then $x_{ij}^{c_{ij}^{(1)+} u_{pi}^+ + c_{ij}^{(1)-} u_{pi}^-} | x_{ij}^{c_{ij}^{(1)+} u_i^+ + c_{ij}^{(1)-} u_i^-}$ implies that $x_{ij}^{c_{ij}^{(1)+} u_{pi}^+ + 0 u_{pi}^-}$ divides $x_{ij}^{c_{ij}^{(1)+} u_i^+ + 0 u_i^-} = 1$, and thus $u_{pi}^+ = 0$. Therefore $1 = y_{it}^{c_{it}^{(2)+} u_{pi}^+ + 0 u_{pi}^-} | y_{it}^{c_{it}^{(2)+} u_i^+ + 0 u_i^-} = 1$ and consequently $y_{it}^{(D_2(\mathbf{u}_p)^+)}_{it} | y_{it}^{(D_2(\mathbf{u})^+)}_{it}$.

Case 3: Let $i \notin \omega$, and $B_i^{(1)}, B_i^{(2)}$ are free. In this case, since $\mathbf{u}_p, \mathbf{u} \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbf{T})$, then both u_{pi}, u_i are zero and consequently $1 = y_{it}^{c_{it}^{(2)+} u_{pi}^+ + c_{it}^{(2)-} u_{pi}^-} | y_{it}^{c_{it}^{(2)+} u_i^+ + c_{it}^{(2)-} u_i^-} = 1$. Therefore, we obtain $y_{it}^{(D_2(\mathbf{u}_p)^+)}_{it} | y_{it}^{(D_2(\mathbf{u})^+)}_{it}$.

Case 4: Let $i \notin \omega, u_i > 0$, and $B_i^{(1)}, B_i^{(2)}$ are mixed. In this case there is at least one $c_{ij}^{(1)} > 0$ and at least one $c_{ik}^{(1)} < 0$. For ij such that $c_{ij}^{(1)} > 0$ the relation $x_{ij}^{c_{ij}^{(1)+} u_{pi}^+ + c_{ij}^{(1)-} u_{pi}^-} | x_{ij}^{c_{ij}^{(1)+} u_i^+ + c_{ij}^{(1)-} u_i^-}$ implies $x_{ij}^{c_{ij}^{(1)+} u_{pi}^+ + 0 u_{pi}^-} | x_{ij}^{c_{ij}^{(1)+} u_i^+ + 0 u_i^-}$. Thus we have

$u_{pi}^+ \leq u_i$. For ik such that $c_{ik}^{(1)} < 0$ the relation $x_{ik}^{c_{ik}^{(1)+} u_{pi}^+ + c_{ik}^{(1)-} u_{pi}^-} | x_{ik}^{c_{ik}^{(1)+} u_i^+ + c_{ik}^{(1)-} u_i^-}$ implies $x_{ik}^{0 u_{pi}^+ + c_{ik}^{(1)-} u_{pi}^-} | x_{ik}^{0 u_i^+ + c_{ik}^{(1)-} u_i^-} = 1$, and then $u_{pi}^- = 0$. Summing up, we have obtained $0 \leq u_{pi}^+ = u_{pi} \leq u_i$. Therefore $y_{it}^{c_{it}^{(2)+} u_{pi}^+ + c_{it}^{(2)-} u_{pi}^-} | y_{it}^{c_{it}^{(2)+} u_i^+ + c_{it}^{(2)-} u_i^-}$, and thus $y_{it}^{(D_2(\mathbf{u}_p)^+)}_{it} | y_{it}^{(D_2(\mathbf{u})^+)}_{it}$.

Case 5: Let $i \notin \omega, u_i \leq 0$, and $B_i^{(1)}, B_i^{(2)}$ are mixed. In this case there is at least one $c_{ij}^{(1)} > 0$ and at least one $c_{ik}^{(1)} < 0$. For ij such that $c_{ij}^{(1)} > 0$ the relation $x_{ij}^{c_{ij}^{(1)+} u_{pi}^+ + c_{ij}^{(1)-} u_{pi}^-} | x_{ij}^{c_{ij}^{(1)+} u_i^+ + c_{ij}^{(1)-} u_i^-}$ implies $x_{ij}^{c_{ij}^{(1)+} u_{pi}^+ + 0 u_{pi}^-} | x_{ij}^{c_{ij}^{(1)+} u_i^+ + 0 u_i^-} = 1$. Thus we have $u_{pi}^+ = 0$. For ik such that $c_{ik}^{(1)} < 0$ the relation $x_{ik}^{c_{ik}^{(1)+} u_{pi}^+ + c_{ik}^{(1)-} u_{pi}^-} | x_{ik}^{c_{ik}^{(1)+} u_i^+ + c_{ik}^{(1)-} u_i^-}$ implies

$x_{ik}^{0u_{pi}^+ + c_{ik}^{(1)-} u_{pi}^-} \mid x_{ik}^{0u_i^+ + c_{ik}^{(1)-} u_i^-}$, and then $u_{pi}^- \leq u_i^-$. Summing up, we have obtained that $u_i = -u_i^- \leq -u_{pi}^- = u_{pi} \leq 0$. Therefore $y_{it}^{c_{it}^{(2)+} u_{pi}^+ + c_{it}^{(2)-} u_{pi}^-} \mid y_{it}^{c_{it}^{(2)+} u_i^+ + c_{it}^{(2)-} u_i^-}$ and thus $y_{it}^{(D_2(\mathbf{u}_p)^+)_it} \mid y_{it}^{(D_2(\mathbf{u})^+)_it}$.

From all of the above cases we conclude that $y^{D_2(\mathbf{u}_p)^+} \mid y^{D_2(\mathbf{u})^+}$. Therefore $y^{D_2(\mathbf{u})^+} \in (y^{D_2(\mathbf{u}_1)^+}, \dots, y^{D_2(\mathbf{u}_r)^+})$ and thus \mathcal{G}' is a Gröbner basis of I_{A_2} with respect to $<_2$. Finally, to prove that \mathcal{G}' is reduced we argue by contradiction. This implies that there exists an integer p such that $y^{D_2(\mathbf{u}_p)^-} \in \text{in}_{<_2}(I_{A_2})$, so $y^{D_2(\mathbf{u}_p)^-}$ is divisible by some $y^{D_2(\mathbf{u}_j)^+}$. This in turn, by a similar argument like the division argument before, implies that $x^{D_1(\mathbf{u}_j)^+} \mid x^{D_1(\mathbf{u}_p)^-}$, a contradiction since \mathcal{G} is reduced. Therefore we obtain that \mathcal{G}' is a reduced Gröbner basis with respect to $<_2$, as desired. It follows that $f : D_1(\mathbf{u}) \mapsto D_2(\mathbf{u})$ is a one-to-one correspondence between the universal Gröbner bases of I_{A_1} and I_{A_2} . \square

Note that every reduced Gröbner basis is also a Markov basis, not necessarily minimal, thus the set of indispensable elements of I_A is a subset of the intersection of all the reduced Gröbner bases. Note that the set of indispensables from [16, Theorem 2.4] is the intersection of the lexicographic reduced Gröbner bases or from [17, Theorem 13] is the intersection of the degree reverse lexicographic reduced Gröbner bases. Therefore the set of indispensable elements of I_A is the intersection of all reduced Gröbner bases. This observation and Theorem 2.3 provides a second proof of the fact that there exists a one-to-one correspondence between the indispensable binomials of the two T_ω -robust toric ideals I_{A_1} and I_{A_2} .

3. STRONGLY ROBUST IDEALS

A binomial $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}^+} - \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}^-} \in I_A$ is called primitive if there is no other binomial $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}^+} - \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}^-} \in I_A$ such that $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}^+}$ divides $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}^+}$ and $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}^-}$ divides $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}^-}$. The set of the primitive binomials is finite, it is called the Graver basis of I_A and is denoted by $\text{Gr}(I_A)$, [22, Chapter 4]. By $\text{Gr}(A)$ we denote the set $\{\mathbf{u} \mid \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}^+} - \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}^-} \in \text{Gr}(I_A)\}$, it is the set of elements in $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$ that do not have a *proper conformal decomposition*. An element $\mathbf{u} \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$ has a conformal decomposition $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v} +_c \mathbf{w}$ if it can be written in the form $\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w}$, where $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$ and $\mathbf{u}^+ = \mathbf{v}^+ + \mathbf{w}^+$, $\mathbf{u}^- = \mathbf{v}^- + \mathbf{w}^-$. The conformal decomposition is called proper if both \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{w} are not zero.

A *strongly robust* toric ideal is a toric ideal I_A for which the Graver basis $\text{Gr}(I_A)$ is a minimal system of generators. Furthermore, since the ideal I_A is positively graded, then any minimal system of binomial generators is a subset of the Graver basis, see for example [8, Theorem 2.3], and therefore there is only one minimal system of generators, which is the Graver basis. We conclude that, in a strongly robust toric ideal, every Graver basis element is indispensable. As was explained at the end of Section 2, the set of indispensable elements is the intersection of all reduced Gröbner bases, which is a subset of the Universal Gröbner basis, which at its own is a subset of the Graver basis (see [22, Chapter 4]). Thus, we conclude that for a strongly robust toric ideal I_A , the following sets are identical: the set

of indispensable elements, any minimal system of generators, any reduced Gröbner basis, the Universal Gröbner basis and the Graver basis.

The following results will enable us to define a simplicial complex, *the strongly robustness complex*, which determines the strongly robustness property for toric ideals. According to Theorem 2.2, for any two T_ω -robust toric ideals I_{A_1}, I_{A_2} , we have that $D_1(\mathbf{u})$ is an indispensable element of A_1 if and only if $D_2(\mathbf{u})$ is an indispensable element of A_2 , for an element $\mathbf{u} \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(T)$. Actually $\mathbf{u} \in \text{Gr}(T)$, since indispensable elements of I_{A_1} are in the Graver basis of I_{A_1} and there is a one-to-one correspondence between $\text{Gr}(I_T)$ and $\text{Gr}(I_{A_1})$, given by the map $\mathbf{u} \mapsto D_1(\mathbf{u})$, see [19, Theorem 1.11]. Therefore, the set of elements \mathbf{u} which belong to $\text{Gr}(T)$, such that $D(\mathbf{u})$ is indispensable in a T_ω -robust toric ideal I_A , does not depend on the I_A chosen, but only on T and ω . Thus, the following definition is meaningful.

Definition 3.1. *Let I_T be a simple toric ideal and $\omega \subseteq [s]$. We denote by*

$$S_\omega(T) = \{\mathbf{u} \in \text{Gr}(T) \mid D(\mathbf{u}) \in S(A)\}$$

and call $S_\omega(T)$ the T_ω -indispensable set, where I_A is an T_ω -robust toric ideal and $S(A)$ is the set of indispensable elements of A .

In the next example we compute several sets $S_\omega(T)$ for different ω 's. It is easy to observe an important property of the sets $S_\omega(T)$, displayed in Proposition 3.3, that will help us introduce a simplicial complex on the set $[s]$.

Example 3.2. Let I_T be the simple toric ideal with $T = (7 \ 8 \ 9)$. Then, using *4ti2* [1], we obtain that $\text{Gr}(T)$ has the following 11 elements: $(1, -2, 1), (5, -1, -3), (4, 1, -4), (0, 9, -8), (1, 7, -7), (2, 5, -6), (3, 3, -5), (9, 0, -7), (6, -3, -2), (8, -7, 0), (7, -5, -1)$. For each subset $\omega \subseteq [3]$ we compute with *4ti2* [1] a Markov basis for one example of a T_ω -robust ideal. Using the simple Algorithm 1 of [9, Section 3] we compute the indispensable elements for each example. Then, Theorem 2.2 gives us that the T_ω -indispensable sets for different ω 's are:

$$S_\emptyset(T) = \text{Gr}(T),$$

$$S_{\{1\}}(T) = \{(1, -2, 1), (5, -1, -3), (4, 1, -4), (9, 0, -7), (6, -3, -2), (7, -5, -1), (8, -7, 0)\},$$

$$S_{\{2\}}(T) = \{(1, -2, 1), (5, -1, -3), (4, 1, -4), (0, 9, -8), (1, 7, -7), (2, 5, -6), (3, 3, -5), (6, -3, -2), (7, -5, -1), (8, -7, 0)\},$$

$$S_{\{3\}}(T) = \{(1, -2, 1), (5, -1, -3), (4, 1, -4), (0, 9, -8), (1, 7, -7), (2, 5, -6), (3, 3, -5), (9, 0, -7)\},$$

$$S_{\{1,2\}}(T) = \{(1, -2, 1), (5, -1, -3), (4, 1, -4), (6, -3, -2), (7, -5, -1), (8, -7, 0)\},$$

$$S_{\{1,3\}}(T) = \{(1, -2, 1), (5, -1, -3), (4, 1, -4), (9, 0, -7)\},$$

$$S_{\{2,3\}}(T) = \{(1, -2, 1), (5, -1, -3), (4, 1, -4), (0, 9, -8), (1, 7, -7), (2, 5, -6), (3, 3, -5)\} \text{ and } S_{\{1,2,3\}}(T) = \{(1, -2, 1), (5, -1, -3), (4, 1, -4)\}.$$

For the next proof we will exploit the notion of semiconformal decomposition which characterizes the indispensable elements of toric ideals (see [15, Lemma 3.10] and [7, Proposition 1.1]). We recall from [15, Definition 3.9] that for vectors $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$ such that $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w}$, the sum is said to be a semiconformal decomposition of \mathbf{u} , written $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v} +_{sc} \mathbf{w}$, if $v_i > 0$ implies that $w_i \geq 0$, and $w_i < 0$ implies that

$v_i \leq 0$, for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. The decomposition is called *proper* if both \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} are nonzero. The set of indispensable elements $\mathcal{S}(A)$ of A consists of all nonzero vectors in $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$ with no proper semiconformal decomposition, see [7, Proposition 1.1].

Proposition 3.3. *Let $I_T \subset K[x_1, \dots, x_s]$ be a simple toric ideal and $\omega_1 \subseteq \omega_2 \subseteq [s]$. Then we have that $S_{\omega_1}(T) \supseteq S_{\omega_2}(T)$.*

Proof. Consider the T_{ω_2} -robust toric ideal I_{A_2} . According to Definition 3.1, we have that the bouquet ideal of I_{A_2} is I_T and $\omega_2 = \{i \in [n] \mid B_i^{(2)} \text{ is non-mixed}\}$. Consider now a subset $\omega_1 \subseteq \omega_2$. Similarly, from Definition 3.1, the bouquet ideal of a T_{ω_1} -robust toric ideal I_{A_1} is I_T and $\omega_1 = \{i \in [n] \mid B_i^{(1)} \text{ is non-mixed}\}$.

Let $\mathbf{u} \in S_{\omega_2}(T)$, our goal is to show that $\mathbf{u} \in S_{\omega_1}(T)$. According to the Definition 3.1, applied for $S_{\omega_2}(T)$, we have $D_2(\mathbf{u}) \in S(A_2)$. Since $D_2(\mathbf{u}) \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A_2)$, from the one-to-one correspondence between the elements of $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(T)$ and the elements of each of $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A_1)$ and $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A_2)$ (see [19, Theorem 1.9]), we have that $D_1(\mathbf{u}) \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A_1)$ as well.

Suppose that $D_1(\mathbf{u}) = D_1(\mathbf{v}) +_{sc} D_1(\mathbf{w})$ is a semiconformal decomposition of $D_1(\mathbf{u})$, where $D_1(\mathbf{v}), D_1(\mathbf{w}) \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A_1)$. For each $i = 1, \dots, s$, at coordinate level we have that

$$\left(c_{i1}^{(1)}, c_{i2}^{(1)}, \dots, c_{ik_i}^{(1)}\right) u_i = \left(c_{i1}^{(1)}, c_{i2}^{(1)}, \dots, c_{ik_i}^{(1)}\right) v_i +_{sc} \left(c_{i1}^{(1)}, c_{i2}^{(1)}, \dots, c_{ik_i}^{(1)}\right) w_i,$$

where we know that all $c_{i1}^{(1)}$ are positive, while the $c_{ij}^{(1)}$ are all positive if the bouquet $B_i^{(1)}$ is non-mixed, and some of the $c_{ij}^{(1)}$ are negative if the bouquet $B_i^{(1)}$ is mixed.

For all i , we have from $c_{i1}^{(1)} u_i = c_{i1}^{(1)} v_i +_{sc} c_{i1}^{(1)} w_i$ that the sum $u_i = v_i +_{sc} w_i$ of the i -th coordinates is a semiconformal sum, since all $c_{i1}^{(1)} > 0$. For $i \notin \omega_1$, we have a stronger relation, namely that the sum $u_i = v_i +_{sc} w_i$ of the i -th coordinates is a conformal sum. Indeed, if $B_i^{(1)}$ is free we have $u_i = v_i = w_i = 0$ and the sum $0 = 0 + 0$ is conformal. Otherwise, if $B_i^{(1)}$ is mixed we distinguish three cases.

Case 1: If $u_i > 0$, then $c_{i1}^{(1)} u_i > 0$ and the sum being semiconformal implies that $c_{i1}^{(1)} w_i \geq 0 \Rightarrow w_i \geq 0$. Since $B_i^{(1)}$ is mixed at least one of the $c_{ij}^{(1)}$, for $j \geq 2$ is negative, in which case $c_{ij}^{(1)} u_i < 0$ and from the semiconformality we have that $c_{ij}^{(1)} v_i \leq 0 \Rightarrow v_i \geq 0$. Therefore we proved that

$$u_i > 0 \Rightarrow v_i \geq 0 \text{ and } w_i \geq 0.$$

Case 2: If $u_i < 0$, then $c_{i1}^{(1)} u_i < 0$ and the sum being semiconformal implies that $c_{i1}^{(1)} v_i \leq 0 \Rightarrow v_i \leq 0$. As before, since $B_i^{(1)}$ is mixed, at least one $c_{ij}^{(1)}$ is negative, and thus $c_{ij}^{(1)} u_i > 0$. It follows now from the semiconformality that $c_{ij}^{(1)} w_i \geq 0 \Rightarrow w_i \leq 0$, therefore

$$u_i < 0 \Rightarrow v_i \leq 0 \text{ and } w_i \leq 0.$$

Case 3: Finally, if $u_i = 0$, then $c_{i1}^{(1)} u_i = 0$ and the sum being semiconformal implies that $c_{i1}^{(1)} v_i \leq 0$ and $c_{i1}^{(1)} w_i \geq 0$. Since $c_{i1}^{(1)} > 0$, we have that $v_i \leq 0$ and $w_i \geq 0$. Since $B_i^{(1)}$ is mixed, there exists a negative $c_{ij}^{(1)}$, and we know from the semiconformality

that $c_{ij}^{(1)} v_i \leq 0$ and $c_{ij}^{(1)} w_i \geq 0$, which implies that $v_i \geq 0$ and $w_i \leq 0$. Again we have proved that

$$u_i = 0 \Rightarrow v_i = 0 \text{ and } w_i = 0.$$

The three cases analyzed before imply that for $i \notin \omega_1$ the sum $u_i = v_i + w_i$ of the i -th coordinates is a conformal sum.

For $i \in \omega_2$, the sum $u_i = v_i +_{sc} w_i$ is semiconformal and stays semiconformal if it is multiplied with a positive $c_{ij}^{(2)}$. For $i \notin \omega_2$, we have that $i \notin \omega_1$, since $\omega_1 \subseteq \omega_2$, therefore the sum $u_i = v_i + w_i$ is conformal and remains conformal if it is multiplied by a positive or a negative $c_{ij}^{(2)}$. Since conformality implies semiconformality then $D_2(\mathbf{u}) = D_2(\mathbf{v}) +_{sc} D_2(\mathbf{w})$, and $D_2(\mathbf{u}) \in S(A_2)$. Thus either $D_2(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{0}$ or $D_2(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{0}$, since indispensable elements do not have proper semiconformal decomposition [7, Proposition 1.1]. But this in turn gives that either $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}$ or $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{0}$ which implies that either $D_1(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{0}$ or $D_1(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{0}$. This means that $D_1(\mathbf{u}) \in S(A_1)$ or equivalently $\mathbf{u} \in S_{\omega_1}(T)$, as desired. \square

Definition 3.4. *The set $\Delta_T = \{\omega \subseteq [s] \mid S_\omega(T) = \text{Gr}(T)\}$ is called the strongly robustness complex of T .*

Corollary 3.5. *The strongly robustness complex of T is a simplicial complex.*

Proof. Suppose that $\omega \in \Delta_T$ and let $\omega' \subseteq \omega$. Then $\text{Gr}(T) = S_\omega(T) \subseteq S_{\omega'}(T) \subseteq \text{Gr}(T)$, by Proposition 3.3. Thus $S_\omega = \text{Gr}(T)$ and $\omega' \in \Delta_T$. \square

In the Example 3.2 the strongly robustness complex Δ_T is the empty set. In the case that all bouquets are mixed, Corollary 4.4 of [19] states that the ideal is strongly robust, thus $S_\emptyset(T) = \text{Gr}(T)$ and therefore $\emptyset \in \Delta_T$. This means that Δ_T is never the void simplicial complex.

Boocher and Robeva posed the problem of describing combinatorially the robustness property for toric ideals, see [4, Question 3.5]. According to Theorem 3.6 below, the simplicial complex Δ_T determines the strongly robustness property for toric ideals. However, it is still an open problem whether the robustness property of toric ideals is equivalent to the strongly robustness property, see Section 4 for more details and results.

Theorem 3.6. *Let I_A be a T_ω -robust toric ideal. The toric ideal I_A is strongly robust if and only if ω is a face of the strongly robustness complex Δ_T .*

Proof. A toric ideal I_A is strongly robust if and only if every Graver basis element is indispensable. Thus for the T_ω -robust ideal I_A we have: I_A is strongly robust if and only if $S(I_A) = \text{Gr}(I_A)$ if and only if $S_\omega(T) = \text{Gr}(T)$ if and only if $\omega \in \Delta_T$. \square

The following theorem provides a way to compute the strongly robustness complex of a simple toric ideal I_T . By $\Lambda(T)$ we denote the second Lawrence lifting of T , which is the $(m + s) \times 2s$ matrix $\begin{pmatrix} T & 0 \\ I_s & I_s \end{pmatrix}$. By $\Lambda(T)_\omega$ we denote the matrix taken from $\Lambda(T)$ by removing the $(m + i)$ -th row and the $(s + i)$ -th column for each $i \in \omega$. For

example, for $T = \begin{pmatrix} 12 & 9 & 8 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 & 4 & 12 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\omega = \{2, 4\}$, we have that

$$\Lambda(T) = \begin{pmatrix} 12 & 9 & 8 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 & 4 & 12 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda(T)_\omega = \begin{pmatrix} 12 & 9 & 8 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 & 4 & 12 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Theorem 3.7. *The set ω is a face of the strongly robustness complex Δ_T if and only if $\Lambda(T)_\omega$ is strongly robust.*

Proof. Note that if $\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_s$ are the row vectors of the Gale transform of T then $\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_s, -\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, -\mathbf{b}_s$ are the row vectors of the Gale transform of $\Lambda(T)$ and $\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_s$, and $-\mathbf{b}_j$ for $j \notin \omega$ are the row vectors of the Gale transform of $\Lambda(T)_\omega$. Therefore $\Lambda(T)_\omega$ has s bouquets of the form: $\{\mathbf{a}_i\}$ for $i \in \omega$, and $\{\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{a}_{j+s}\}$ for $j \notin \omega$, where the indices are the indices of the columns of $\Lambda(T)$. The former are non-mixed and the later are free if $\mathbf{b}_j = \mathbf{0}$ or mixed, since $\mathbf{b}_{j+s} = -\mathbf{b}_j$. This means that $I_{\Lambda(T)_\omega}$ is a T_ω -robust toric ideal. Then $\omega \in \Delta_T$ if and only if $\Lambda(T)_\omega$ is strongly robust, by Theorem 3.6. \square

It follows also that the strongly robustness simplicial complex depends only on the simple toric ideal I_T .

Example 3.8. Theorem 3.7 provides a way to construct strongly robust ideals. Consider the 2×4 integer matrix

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} 12 & 9 & 8 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 & 4 & 12 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Computing the Gale transform one can easily see that I_T is a simple toric ideal, see Example 4.3.

To find the vertices of the simplicial complex one first computes, e.g. using 4ti2 [1], minimal Markov and Graver bases of $\Lambda(T)_{\{i\}}$ for all $i \in [4]$. It turns out that $\Lambda(T)_{\{2\}}$, $\Lambda(T)_{\{4\}}$ are strongly robust, since in both cases the Graver basis and a minimal Markov basis given by 4ti2 are identical, while $\Lambda(T)_{\{1\}}$ and $\Lambda(T)_{\{3\}}$ are not strongly robust. Thus 2 and 4 are the only vertices of Δ_T . Finally, in this example, one has to check whether $\{2, 4\}$ belongs or not to Δ_T . It turns out that $\Lambda(T)_{\{2,4\}}$ is strongly robust, thus, the simplicial complex Δ_T is $\{\emptyset, \{2\}, \{4\}, \{2, 4\}\}$. From Theorem 3.6, all $T_\emptyset, T_{\{2\}}, T_{\{4\}}, T_{\{2,4\}}$ -robust toric ideals are strongly robust, while for instance none of the $T_{\{3\}}$ or $T_{\{1,3,4\}}$ -robust toric ideals are strongly robust. To construct a strongly robust ideal take any $\omega \in \Delta_T$, say $\{2, 4\}$, and choose four primitive integer vectors in such a way that the first and the third are mixed while the second and the fourth are not mixed. For example, say $\mathbf{c}_1 = (1, -1)$, $\mathbf{c}_2 = (5, 6, 7, 8)$, $\mathbf{c}_3 = (2023, -2022, 11)$, $\mathbf{c}_4 = (13, 14, 15)$. Computing any integer solution of the equation $1 = \lambda_{i1}c_{i1} + \dots + \lambda_{im_i}c_{im_i}$ for each vector $\mathbf{c}_i = (c_{i1}, c_{i2}, \dots, c_{im_i})$, for example $1 = 1 \cdot 1 + 0 \cdot (-1)$, $1 = -1 \cdot 5 + 1 \cdot 6 + 0 \cdot 7 + 0 \cdot 8$, $1 = 1 \cdot 2023 + 1 \cdot (-2022) + 0 \cdot (11)$,

$1 = 0 \cdot 13 + (-1) \cdot 14 + 1 \cdot 15$, we get the following generalized Lawrence matrix

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} 12 & 0 & -9 & 9 & 0 & 0 & 8 & 8 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -3 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 4 & 4 & 0 & 0 & -12 & 12 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -6 & 5 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -7 & 0 & 5 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -8 & 0 & 0 & 5 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2022 & 2023 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -11 & 0 & 2023 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -14 & 13 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -15 & 0 & 13 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{Z}^{10 \times 12},$$

for more details see [19, Section 2]. Then I_D is a $T_{\{2,4\}}$ -robust ideal, therefore it is strongly robust by Theorem 3.6, since $\{2, 4\} \in \Delta_T$.

In fact, Theorem 3.6 implies that all strongly robust ideals are taken in this way since: 1) every toric ideal is a T_ω -robust ideal for some T and ω , and 2) all toric ideals have a representation in the form $I_{A'}$ where A' is a generalized Lawrence matrix, see [19, Corollary 2.3].

4. THE CODIMENSION TWO CASE

Let A be an integer matrix $m \times n$ of rank $n - 2$ such that the toric ideal I_A is positively graded. Then the columns of A form an acyclic vector configuration, see [29, Section 6.2]. Let $\{\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \dots, \mathbf{b}_n\}$ be the Gale transform of A , where $\mathbf{b}_i = (b_{i1}, b_{i2})$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, and B the $n \times 2$ matrix with rows $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \dots, \mathbf{b}_n$. Let $\tilde{B} = \{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_2, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_n\}$ be the reduced Gale transform of A , the set where $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i = \gcd(b_{i1}, b_{i2})^{-1}(-b_{i2}, b_{i1})$ if $\mathbf{b}_i \neq (0, 0)$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i = (0, 0)$ if $\mathbf{b}_i = (0, 0)$. Note that $\mathbf{b}_i = (0, 0)$ means that \mathbf{a}_i is a free vector. Since both configurations are totally cyclic, see [29, Section 6.4], we can reorder all the nonzero vectors $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \dots, \mathbf{b}_{n'}$, $n' \leq n$, in such a way that in the interior of the cone $\langle \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i+1} \rangle$ there is no other $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_j$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{n'+1} = \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_1$. The minimal generating set of the monoid $\text{cone}(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i+1}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^2$ is the Hilbert basis of the cone $\langle \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i+1} \rangle$ and is denoted by H_i .

Theorem 4.1. [24, Corollary 2.5] [18, Theorem 3.7] *Let $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{(n-2) \times n}$ of rank $n - 2$ and $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A) \cap \mathbb{N}^n = \{\mathbf{0}\}$.*

- *A vector $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ has either \mathbf{u} or $-\mathbf{u}$ in $H_1 \cup H_2 \cup \dots \cup H_{n'}$ if and only if $x^{\mathbf{u}^+} - x^{\mathbf{u}^-}$ is in the Graver basis of I_A .*
- *A vector $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ has both \mathbf{u} and $-\mathbf{u}$ in $H_1 \cup H_2 \cup \dots \cup H_{n'}$ if and only if $x^{\mathbf{u}^+} - x^{\mathbf{u}^-}$ is an indispensable element of I_A .*

Let I_A be a T_ω -robust ideal of codimension 2, and $\tilde{B} = \{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_n\}$ be the reduced Gale transform of A and $\{\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{t}}_s\}$ be the reduced Gale transform of T . Using the isomorphism D from $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(T)$ to $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$, we get that if $\mathbf{t}_i = (t_{i1}, t_{i2})$ then for an \mathbf{a}_j that is the k -th element of the bouquet B_i we have $\mathbf{b}_j = (c_{ik}t_{i1}, c_{ik}t_{i2})$. If c_{ik} is positive then $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_j = \tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i$, and if c_{ik} is negative then $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_j = -\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i$. Thus, if \mathbf{a}_j belongs to a non-mixed or free bouquet B_i , then $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_j = \tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i$. For a mixed bouquet B_i , we have $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_j = \tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i$ for at least one $\mathbf{a}_j \in B_i$ and we also have $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_k = -\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i$ for at least one $\mathbf{a}_k \in B_i$.

Theorem 4.2. *Let I_T be a simple codimension 2 toric ideal. Then the strongly robustness complex Δ_T is a simplicial subcomplex of the simplex with vertices $i \in [s]$, such that $\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i$ is not a vertex of the centrally symmetric polygon*

$$P = \text{conv} \left(\left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i, -\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i \mid i \in [s] \right\} \right).$$

Proof. Let I_A be a T_ω -robust ideal, $\tilde{B} = \{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_n\}$ be the reduced Gale transform of A and $\tilde{T} = \{\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{t}}_s\}$ be the reduced Gale transform of T . Then, as explained before, the set \tilde{B} is equal to $\{\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{t}}_s\} \cup \{-\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i \mid i \notin \omega\}$. Then we claim that $\text{conv}(\tilde{B})$ is centrally symmetric if and only if $P = \text{conv}(\tilde{B})$. Indeed, if $P = \text{conv}(\tilde{B})$, then $\text{conv}(\tilde{B})$ is centrally symmetric since P is centrally symmetric. Conversely, if $\text{conv}(\tilde{B})$ is centrally symmetric, then for each $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_j \in \tilde{B}$ we have $-\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_j \in \text{conv}(\tilde{B})$. Thus, all $\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i$ and $-\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i$ are in $\text{conv}(\tilde{B})$, and $P = \text{conv}(\{\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i, -\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i \mid i \in [s]\})$ therefore

$$P \subseteq \text{conv}(\tilde{B}) = \text{conv} \left(\left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{t}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{t}}_s \right\} \cup \left\{ -\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i \mid i \notin \omega \right\} \right) \subseteq \text{conv} \left(\left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i, -\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i \mid i \in [s] \right\} \right) = P,$$

thus $P = \text{conv}(\tilde{B})$.

Let $\omega \in \Delta_T$. Then $S_\omega(T) = \text{Gr}(T)$, and therefore I_A is strongly robust. Using [24, Theorem 1.2] we obtain that $\text{conv}(\tilde{B})$ is a centrally symmetric polygon, and thus $P = \text{conv}(\tilde{B})$. We conclude that $P = \text{conv} \left(\tilde{B} = \left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{t}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{t}}_s \right\} \cup \left\{ -\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i \mid i \notin \omega \right\} \right)$, which implies that for $i \in \omega$, $\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i$ is not a vertex of the centrally symmetric polygon P . \square

Example 4.3. Theorem 4.2 provides an alternative way to the one developed in Section 3 to construct the strongly robustness simplicial complex for codimension 2 toric ideals. Consider again the 2×4 integer matrix

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} 12 & 9 & 8 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 & 4 & 12 \end{pmatrix},$$

which has the following Gale transform B , and whose matrix associated to the reduced Gale transform, denoted by \tilde{B} , respectively,

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 3 \\ 0 & -4 \\ -3 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{B} = \begin{pmatrix} -3 & 2 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then I_T is a simple toric ideal, since no two column vectors are parallel, and the convex hull of the set $\{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i, -\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i \mid i \in [s]\}$ is a parallelogram P with vertices $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_1 = (-3, 2)$, $-\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_1 = (3, -2)$, $-\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_3 = (0, 1)$, $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_3 = (0, -1)$. According to Theorem 4.2, the geometry of this polygon influences the simplicial complex Δ_T , which is a subcomplex of $\{\emptyset, \{2\}, \{4\}, \{2, 4\}\}$, since $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_2, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_4$ are not vertices of P . However, by [24, Proposition 2.4], $-\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_2 = (-1, 0)$ is in the Hilbert basis of the cone($\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_3$) and $-\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_4 = (1, -1)$ is in the Hilbert basis of the cone($\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_3, -\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_1$), both of which do not involve the indices 2, 4. Therefore, all the sets $\{2\}, \{4\}, \{2, 4\}$ are faces of Δ_T . Thus, $\Delta_T = \{\emptyset, \{2\}, \{4\}, \{2, 4\}\}$.

Finally, an ideal is called robust if the universal Gröbner basis is a minimal generating set. It follows from [26, Theorem 5.10] that the universal Gröbner basis is the set of indispensables, and thus every strongly robust toric ideal is robust. In [5], Boocher et al. proved that every robust toric ideal associated to a graph is strongly robust and they asked if for every toric ideal robust implies strongly robust. In Theorem 4.5, we prove that this is true for codimension 2 toric ideals. Note that for toric ideals of codimension 1 this is obvious, since they are principal. A key result for the proof is that circuits are always included in the Universal Gröbner basis, see [22, Proposition 4.11]. We recall that *circuits* are irreducible binomials with minimal support.

Lemma 4.4. *Let I_A be a codimension 2 toric ideal. Then C is a circuit if and only if there exists an i such that $C = x^{(B\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i)^+} - x^{(B\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i)^-}$, where B is the Gale transform of A .*

Proof. Let C be a circuit of I_A . Then $C \in I_A$ and has no monomial factor, therefore it is in the form $x^{(B\mathbf{u}^t)^+} - x^{(B\mathbf{u}^t)^-}$ for some nonzero $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. Since I_A is a codimension 2 ideal and C has minimal support, then there exists an $i \notin \text{supp}(C)$ and $\mathbf{b}_i \neq (0, 0)$. (Note that if $\mathbf{b}_i = (0, 0)$, then \mathbf{a}_i belongs to the free bouquet and therefore i does not belong to the support of any binomial in the form $x^{\mathbf{v}^+} - x^{\mathbf{v}^-}$, where $\mathbf{v} \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$.) Then the matrix product $\mathbf{b}_i \mathbf{u}^t = 0$ implies $\mathbf{u} = \lambda \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i$ and $\mathbf{u}, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i$ are *primitive vectors*, they have the greatest common divisor of their coordinates equal to 1, therefore $\lambda = 1$ or $\lambda = -1$. Thus $C = x^{(B\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i)^+} - x^{(B\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i)^-}$.

For the converse, suppose $C_i = x^{(B\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i)^+} - x^{(B\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i)^-}$. Then for every $\mathbf{a}_k \in B_i$, the i -th bouquet of A , we have $\mathbf{b}_k \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i = l\mathbf{b}_i \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i = 0$, for some $l \in \mathbb{Q}$, therefore $k \notin \text{supp}(C)$. Note also from the comments before Theorem 4.2 that for $\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{a}_j$ in the same bouquet we have either $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i = \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_j$ or $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i = -\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_j$. The complement of the support of $C_i = x^{(B\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i)^+} - x^{(B\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i)^-}$ is the union of the elements of the bouquet that contains \mathbf{a}_i and the elements of the free bouquet. Therefore, all the $C_i = x^{(B\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i)^+} - x^{(B\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i)^-}$ are circuits. Furthermore, the cardinality of the set of circuits is the number of non free bouquets. \square

Theorem 4.5. *Let I_A be a codimension 2 toric ideal. Then I_A is robust if and only if it is strongly robust.*

Proof. Strongly robust toric ideals are always robust. Suppose that I_A is robust. From Lemma 4.4 $x^{(B\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i)^+} - x^{(B\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i)^-}$ is a circuit and circuits are always in the Universal Gröbner basis therefore $x^{(B\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i)^+} - x^{(B\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i)^-}$ belongs to a minimal set of generators of I_A . By [26, Theorem 5.10] every generator of a robust toric ideal is indispensable. Thus also $x^{(B\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i)^+} - x^{(B\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i)^-}$ is indispensable, and therefore by Theorem 4.1 $-\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i$ belongs in $H_1 \cup H_2 \cup \dots \cup H_{n'}$. Applying now [24, Lemma 2.7] we obtain that I_A is strongly robust. \square

In [5] Boocher et al. remarked on the central role that circuits play for the robustness property of toric ideals of graphs. They asked the question: if the circuits

of I_A are indispensable then is it true that the toric ideal is robust? And they provide a counterexample of a toric ideal of a graph of codimension 3 in which all circuits are indispensable but the ideal I_A is not robust. The graph G_t in Fig.1 is a small alteration of their counterexample, where in one of the two cut vertices, instead of one cycle of length 3 we add t cycles of length 3, $t \geq 1$. Every cycle of odd length added on the second cut vertex increases the codimension by one. The toric ideal of the graph with t cycles has codimension $2+t$. The Graver basis, of the toric ideal of G_t , is identical with the Universal Gröbner basis and consists of $t(t-1)/2 + 8t + 4$ elements in the form $B_{1i} = e_4e_7e_8e_{12}^2c_i - e_5e_6e_{10}^2a_ib_i$, $B_2 = e_4e_7e_9e_{12} - e_5e_6e_{10}e_{11}$, $B_{3i} = e_1e_5^2e_{10}^2a_ib_i - e_2e_3e_7^2e_{12}^2c_i$, $B_{4i} = e_8e_{11}e_{12}c_i - e_9e_{10}a_ib_i$, $B_5 = e_1e_4e_5e_8 - e_2e_3e_6e_7$, $B_{6i} = e_1e_4^2e_8^2e_{12}^2c_i - e_2e_3e_6^2e_{10}^2a_ib_i$, $B_7 = e_1e_4^2e_8e_9e_{12} - e_2e_3e_6^2e_{10}e_{11}$, $B_{8i} = e_1e_4^2e_9^2a_ib_i - e_2e_3e_6^2e_{11}^2c_i$, $B_9 = e_1e_5^2e_8e_{10}e_{11} - e_2e_3e_7^2e_9e_{12}$, $B_{10i} = e_4e_7e_9^2a_ib_i - e_5e_6e_8e_{11}^2c_i$, $B_{11i} = e_1e_5^2e_8^2e_{11}^2c_i - e_2e_3e_7^2e_9^2a_ib_i$, $B_{12i} = e_1e_4e_5e_9e_{10}a_ib_i - e_2e_3e_6e_7e_{11}e_{12}c_i$, $B_{13(i,j)} = a_ib_jc_j - a_jb_jc_i$ where $i, j \in [t]$, see [21, 27]. All of them are circuits except t of them in the form B_{12i} . The circuits are minimal and indispensable since they do not have any chords. The t elements in the form B_{12i} are not, since they are not minimal, every one of them has an even chord, the e_8 . For details see Theorems 4.13, 4.14 in [21] and 3.4 in [27]. All these mean that for these toric ideals I_{G_t} of codimension $2+t \geq 3$ all




FIGURE 1. The graph G_t

the circuits are indispensable and generate the toric ideal. The t elements B_{12i} are not minimal but they are elements of the Universal Gröbner basis (and the Graver basis). We conclude that all I_{G_t} are not robust.

Therefore the answer to the question is negative for toric ideals of codimension greater than three. For codimension 1 is obviously true since in this case the ideal is principal. Next corollary shows that the answer to the question of Boocher & al. ([5]) about circuits and robustness for codimension two toric ideals is positive.

Corollary 4.6. *Let I_A be a codimension 2 toric ideal. The circuits of I_A are indispensable if and only if I_A is robust.*

Proof. It follows from Lemma 4.4 that the circuits are of the form $x^{(B\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i)^+} - x^{(B\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i)^-}$. Using Theorem 4.1 we obtain that the circuits of I_A are indispensable if and only if both $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i$ and $-\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i$ are in $H_1 \cup H_2 \cup \dots \cup H_n$ if and only if I_A is strongly robust, by [24, Lemma 2.7]. Finally, since I_A is a co-dimension 2 toric ideal we have I_A is strongly robust if and only if it is robust, by Theorem 4.5. \square

The preceding discussions highlight the importance of better understanding the properties of the strongly robustness simplicial complex Δ_T in all codimensions. In particular, some of the key research directions to investigate are the following:

- Are there any classes of simple toric ideals I_T for which we can determine Δ_T ?
- What kind of properties of T determine Δ_T ?
- When is Δ_T different than the empty simplicial complex?
- What can one say about the dimension of Δ_T ?

Note that, in [19], Petrović et al. posed the question of whether every strongly robust ideal has a mixed bouquet. In [24], Sullivant proved that codimension 2 strongly robust toric ideals have at least two mixed bouquets and posed the stronger question of whether every strongly robust ideal of codimension r has r mixed bouquets. Finally, note that, in terms of the strongly robustness simplicial complex Δ_T , Sullivant's question becomes one about the dimension of Δ_T . Namely, for every simple codimension r toric ideal I_T in the polynomial ring of s variables, is it true that $\dim \Delta_T < s - r$?

Acknowledgments. The first author has been supported by the Royal Society Dorothy Hodgkin Research Fellowship DHF\R1\201246. The third author has been partially supported by the grant PN-III-P4-ID-PCE-2020-0029, within PNCDI III, financed by Romanian Ministry of Research and Innovation, CNCS - UEFISCDI.

REFERENCES

- [1] 4ti2 team, 4ti2 - a software package for algebraic, geometric and combinatorial problems on linear spaces, available at www.4ti2.de (2007).
- [2] D. Bernstein, A. Zelevinsky, Combinatorics of maximal minors, *J. Algebraic Combin.* 2(2), 111–121 (1993).
- [3] A. Boocher, Free resolutions and sparse determinantal ideals, *Math. Res. Letters* 19(4) 805–821 (2012).
- [4] A. Boocher, E. Robeva, Robust toric ideals, *J. Symbolic Comput.*, 68(1), 254–264 (2015).
- [5] A. Boocher, B. C. Brown, T. Duff, L. Lyman, T. Murayama, A. Nesky and K. Schaefer, Robust graph ideals, *Ann. Comb.* 19(4), 641–660 (2015).
- [6] M. Bourel, A. Dickenstein, A. Rittatore, Self-dual projective toric varieties, *J. London Math. Soc.* (2) 84, 514–540 (2011).
- [7] H. Charalambous, A. Thoma, M. Vladioiu, Markov complexity of monomial curves, *J. Algebra* 417, 391–411 (2014).
- [8] H. Charalambous, A. Thoma, M. Vladioiu, Markov bases and generalized Lawrence liftings, *Ann. Comb.* 19(4), 661–669 (2015).
- [9] H. Charalambous, A. Thoma, M. Vladioiu, Binomial fibers and indispensable binomials, *J. Symb. Comput.* (74) 578–591 (2016).

- [10] A. Conca, E. De Negri, E. Gorla, Universal Gröbner bases for maximal minors, *International Mathematics Research Notices* 11, 3245–3262 (2015).
- [11] A. Conca, E. De Negri, E. Gorla, Cartwright–Sturmfels ideals associated to graphs and linear spaces. *J. Comb. Algebra* 2 (3), 231–257 (2018).
- [12] P. Diaconis, B. Sturmfels, Algebraic algorithms for sampling from conditional distributions, *Annals of Statistics* 26(1), 363–397 (1998).
- [13] I. Garcia-Marco, Ch. Tatakis, On robustness and related properties on Toric ideals, *J. Alg. Comb.* to appear.
- [14] E. Gross, S. Petrović, Combinatorial degree bound for toric ideals of hypergraphs, *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.* 23 (6) 1503–1520 (2013).
- [15] S. Hoşten, S. Sullivant, A finiteness theorem for Markov bases of hierarchical models, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 114, 311–321 (2007).
- [16] H. Ohsugi, T. Hibi, Toric ideals arising from contingency tables, *Proceedings of the Ramanujan Mathematical Society’s Lecture Notes Series*, 87–111, (2006).
- [17] I. Ojeda, A. Vigneron-Tenorio, Indispensable binomials in semigroup ideals, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 138(12), 4205–4216 (2010).
- [18] I. Peeva, B. Sturmfels, Syzygies of codimension 2 lattice ideals, *Math. Z.* 229, 163–194 (1998).
- [19] S. Petrović, A. Thoma, M. Vladoiu, Bouquet algebra of toric ideals, *J. Algebra* 512, 493–525 (2018).
- [20] S. Petrović, A. Thoma, M. Vladoiu, Hypergraph encodings of arbitrary toric ideals, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 166, 11–41 (2019).
- [21] E. Reyes, Ch. Tatakis, A. Thoma, Minimal generators of toric ideals of graphs, *Adv. Appl. Math.* 48, 64–78 (2012).
- [22] B. Sturmfels, *Gröbner Bases and Convex Polytopes*, University Lecture Series, No 8, MAS, R.I. (1995).
- [23] B. Sturmfels, A. Zelevinsky, Maximal minors and their leading terms, *Adv. Math.* 98(1), 65–112 (1993).
- [24] S. Sullivant, Strongly Robust Toric Ideals in Codimension 2, *J. Algebr. Stat.* 10, 128–136 (2019).
- [25] A. Takemura, S. Aoki, Distance-reducing Markov bases for sampling from a discrete sample space, *Bernoulli*, 11(5), 793–813 (2005).
- [26] Ch. Tatakis, Generalized robust toric ideals, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* 220, 263–277 (2016).
- [27] Ch. Tatakis, A. Thoma, On the universal Gröbner bases of toric ideals of graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 118, 1540–1548 (2011).
- [28] A. Thoma, M. Vladoiu, The defining matrices of self-dual projective toric varieties, in preparation.
- [29] G. Ziegler, *Lectures on Polytopes*, Graduate Texts in Math. 152 Springer, New York (1995).

DIMITRA KOSTA, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH AND MAXWELL INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNITED KINGDOM

Email address: D.Kosta@ed.ac.uk

APOSTOLOS THOMA, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF IOANNINA, IOANNINA 45110, GREECE

Email address: athoma@uoi.gr

MARIUS VLADUIU, FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF BUCHAREST, STR. ACADEMIEI 14, BUCHAREST, RO-010014, ROMANIA, AND

“SIMION STOILOW” INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS OF THE ROMANIAN ACADEMY, P.O. BOX 1-764, 014700, BUCHAREST, ROMANIA

Email address: vladoiu@fmi.unibuc.ro