

INTEGRAL CLOSURES OF POWERS OF SUMS OF IDEALS

ARINDAM BANERJEE AND HUY TÀI HÀ

ABSTRACT. Let \mathbb{k} be a field, let A and B be polynomial rings over \mathbb{k} , and let $S = A \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} B$. Let $I \subseteq A$ and $J \subseteq B$ be monomial ideals. We establish a binomial expansion for rational powers of $I + J \subseteq S$ in terms of those of I and J . Particularly, for $u \in \mathbb{Q}_+$, we prove that

$$(I + J)_u = \sum_{0 \leq \omega \leq u, \omega \in \mathbb{Q}} I_{\omega} J_{u-\omega},$$

and that the sum on the right hand side is a finite sum. We further give a sufficient condition for this formula to hold for the integral closures of powers of $I + J$ in terms of those of I and J . Under this sufficient condition, we also provide precise formulas for the depth and regularity of $\overline{(I + J)^k}$ in terms of those of powers of I and J . Our methods are linear algebra in nature, making use of the characterization of rational powers of a monomial ideal via optimal solutions to linear programming problems.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let \mathbb{k} be a field. Let A and B be polynomial rings over \mathbb{k} , and let $I \subseteq A$ and $J \subseteq B$ be ideals. A binomial expansion for symbolic powers of the sum $I + J$ in $S = A \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} B$ was given by the second author and various co-authors in [8, 9]. Particularly, it was shown that, for any positive integer $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(1.1) \quad (I + J)^{(k)} = \sum_{\ell=0}^k I^{(\ell)} \cdot J^{(k-\ell)}.$$

This formula was proved for symbolic powers defined using minimal primes in [9]. It was established for symbolic powers defined using all associated primes and, more generally, for saturated powers recently in [8]. The formula has been quite well received and seen many applications since its discovery (cf. [2, 4, 5, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22]).

It is not known if the integral closures of powers of an ideal could be realized as saturated powers. Thus, a natural question arises: *does a similar binomial expansion exist for the integral closures of powers of sums of ideals?* We shall address this question in this paper.

Simple examples exist to illustrate that the binomial expansion (1.1) does not hold in general when symbolic powers are replaced by the integral closures of powers. For instance, by taking $I = (x^2) \subseteq \mathbb{k}[x] = A$ and $J = (y^2) \subseteq B = \mathbb{k}[y]$, it is easy to see that $xy \in \overline{I + J} \subseteq \mathbb{k}[x, y]$, while $\overline{I} + \overline{J} = (x^2, y^2)$ does not contain xy . Particularly,

$$\overline{I + J} \neq \overline{I} + \overline{J}.$$

On the other hand, a recent result of Mau and Trung [15, Theorem 2.1] showed that if $I \subseteq A$ is a *normally torsion-free* squarefree monomial ideal and $J \subseteq B$ is an arbitrary monomial

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 13C13, 90C05, 13D07.

Key words and phrases. Integral closure, monomial ideal, sum of ideals, power of ideal, rational power, depth, regularity.

ideal then, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(1.2) \quad \overline{(I + J)^k} = \sum_{\ell=0}^k \overline{I^\ell} \cdot \overline{J^{k-\ell}}.$$

It is therefore desirable to establish new binomial expansions that work for all monomial ideals, and to find classes of monomial ideals for which the binomial expansion (1.2) holds.

To search for a binomial expansion that holds for all monomial ideals, our solution is to focus instead on *rational powers*. Let $u = \frac{p}{q} \in \mathbb{Q}_+$ be any positive rational number, with $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $q \neq 0$. Following [21, Definition 10.5.1], the u -th *rational power* of an ideal I in a domain A is defined to be

$$I_u = \{x \in A \mid x^q \in \overline{I^p}\}.$$

This definition of I_u does not depend on the particular presentation $u = \frac{p}{q}$. Obviously, if u is a positive integer then $I_u = \overline{I^u}$ is the integral closure of I^u . Our first main theorem reads as follows.

Theorem 2.2. Let $I \subseteq A$ and $J \subseteq B$ be monomial ideals. Let $u \in \mathbb{Q}$ be any positive rational number. Then,

$$(I + J)_u = \sum_{0 \leq \omega \leq u, \omega \in \mathbb{Q}} I_\omega \cdot J_{u-\omega},$$

and the sum on the right hand side is a finite sum.

Theorem 2.2 particularly exhibits a reason why we should not expect the binomial expansion (1.2) to hold for all monomial ideals in general — there are missing terms in the right hand side of (1.2) when $u = k$ is an integer.

Our methods are based on a previous work of the second author and Trung [10], where the membership in the integral closure $\overline{I^k}$ was characterized in terms of the optimal solution to linear programming problems associated to I . Specifically, let M be the matrix whose columns are exponent vectors of the (unique set of) minimal monomial generators of I and assume that M is of size $n \times m$. For $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{N}^n$, consider the following dual linear programming problems:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(a)} & \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{maximize } \mathbf{1}^m \cdot \mathbf{y}, \\ \text{subject to } M \cdot \mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m \end{array} \right. \quad \text{and} \\ \text{(b)} & \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{minimize } \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{z}, \\ \text{subject to } M^T \cdot \mathbf{z} \geq \mathbf{1}^m, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n. \end{array} \right. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\nu_{\mathbf{a}}^*(I) = \tau_{\mathbf{a}}^*(I)$ be the optimal solutions of these two linear programming problems. (By the Duality Theorem, it is well-known that these two linear programming problems have the same optimal solution; see, for instance, [3, 6].) It was shown in [10, Proposition 1.1] that $x^{\mathbf{a}} \in \overline{I^k}$ if and only if $\nu_{\mathbf{a}}^*(I) \geq k$. We provide a similar criterion for the membership of a rational power I_u ; see Lemma 2.1.

As shown in Theorem 2.2, we cannot expect the binomial expansion (1.2) to hold for all monomial ideals. Our next theorem is a special case of Theorem 2.2 and gives an improvement of the aforementioned result of Mau and Trung [15, Theorem 2.1].

Theorem 2.5. Let $I \subseteq A$ and $J \subseteq B$ be monomial ideals. Suppose that for every nonnegative integral vector α , $\nu_\alpha^*(I) \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\overline{(I + J)^k} = \sum_{\ell=0}^k \overline{I^\ell} \cdot \overline{J^{k-\ell}}.$$

Specific classes of ideals satisfying the condition in Theorem 2.5 include those of squarefree monomial ideals I with $I^{(k)} = \overline{I^k}$ (for instance, normally torsion-free squarefree monomial ideals, as in [15]).

Having a binomial expansion as in (1.2) for $\overline{(I + J)^k}$ allows us to estimate important algebraic invariant, such as the depth and the regularity, of $S/\overline{(I + J)^k}$. Particularly, we give precise formulas for the depth and regularity of $S/\overline{(I + J)^k}$ in terms of those of the integral closures of powers of I and J , under the assumption of Theorem 2.5. Such formulas for the ordinary and symbolic powers of $(I + J)$ were given in [9, 11, 17]. A formula for the integral closure of powers of $(I + J)$ would be desirable, for instance, as stated in [16].

Theorem 3.7. Let $I \subseteq A$ and $J \subseteq B$ be monomial ideals. Suppose that for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^r$, $\nu_\alpha^*(I) \in \mathbb{Z}$. For all $k \geq 1$, we have

- (1) $\text{depth } S/\overline{(I + J)^k} = \min_{\substack{i \in [1, k-1] \\ j \in [1, k]}} \{ \text{depth } A/\overline{I^{k-i}} + \text{depth } B/\overline{J^j} + 1, \text{depth } A/\overline{I^{k-j+1}} + \text{depth } B/\overline{J^j} \},$
- (2) $\text{reg } S/\overline{(I + J)^k} = \max_{\substack{i \in [1, k-1] \\ j \in [1, k]}} \{ \text{reg } A/\overline{I^{k-i}} + \text{reg } B/\overline{J^j} + 1, \text{reg } A/\overline{I^{k-j+1}} + \text{reg } B/\overline{J^j} \}.$

Our approach to proving Theorem 3.7 is similar to that of [9, Theorems 4.2 and 5.3]. Particularly, by setting

$$P_{k,t} = \overline{I^k} \cdot \overline{J^0} + \overline{I^{k-1}} \cdot \overline{J} + \dots + \overline{I^{k-t}} \cdot \overline{J^t},$$

for $0 \leq t \leq k$, and observing that

- (a) $P_{k,t} = P_{k,t-1} + \overline{I^{k-t}} \cdot \overline{J^t}$, and
- (b) $P_{k,t-1} \cap \overline{I^{k-t}} \cdot \overline{J^t} = \overline{I^{k-t+1}} \cdot \overline{J^t}$,

one direction of the inequality in Theorem 3.7 follows from standard short exact sequences:

$$(1.3) \quad 0 \longrightarrow R/P_{k,t-1} \cap \overline{I^{k-t}} \cdot \overline{J^t} \longrightarrow R/P_{k,t-1} \oplus R/\overline{I^{k-t}} \cdot \overline{J^t} \longrightarrow R/P_{k,t} \longrightarrow 0.$$

To establish the reverse inequality, we show that the decomposition $P_{k,t} = P_{k,t-1} + \overline{I^{k-t}} \cdot \overline{J^t}$ is a *Betti splitting*, a notion defined by Francisco, Hà and Van Tuyl [7] to guarantee that the inequality between Betti numbers that result from the exact sequences in (1.3) are in fact equality. To accomplish this last step, we exhibit that the filtration $\{\overline{I^k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\overline{J^k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ are *Tor-vanishing*, in the sense of Nguyen and Vu [17].

Acknowledgements. The first author acknowledges supports from DST INSPIRE Faculty Fellowship. The second author is partially supported by Louisiana Board of Regents and the Simons Foundation.

2. BINOMIAL EXPANSION OF INTEGRAL CLOSURES OF POWERS

Throughout the paper, let $A = \mathbb{k}[X_1, \dots, X_r]$, $B = \mathbb{k}[Y_1, \dots, Y_s]$, and $S = A \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} B$. Let $I \subseteq A$ and $J \subseteq B$ be monomial ideals. By abusing notation, we shall write I and J also for their extensions in S .

Observe that the extension of \bar{I} in S is the same as the integral closure of IS in S , i.e., $\overline{IS} = \overline{I}S$. This follows, for instance, from [21, Corollary 19.5.2], since S is a normal extension of A . Therefore, also by abusing notation, we shall write \bar{I} and \bar{J} to refer to the integral closures of I and J , considered both as ideals in A and B , respectively, and as their extensions in S .

Recall that for an ideal $I \subseteq A$ and a positive rational number $u = \frac{p}{q}$, with $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $q \neq 0$, the u -th rational power of I is

$$I_u = \{x \in A \mid x^q \in \overline{I^p}\}.$$

The following membership criterion for rational powers is similar to that of [10, Proposition 1.1].

Lemma 2.1. *Let $I \subseteq A$ be any monomial ideal and let $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{N}^r$. Let $\frac{p}{q}$ be any rational number, where $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $q \neq 0$. Then, $x^{\mathbf{a}} \in I_{\frac{p}{q}}$ if and only if $\nu_{\mathbf{a}}^*(I) \geq \frac{p}{q}$.*

Proof. By definition, $x^{\mathbf{a}} \in I_{\frac{p}{q}}$ if and only if $(x^{\mathbf{a}})^q \in \overline{I^p}$. By [10, Proposition 1.1], this is the case if and only if $\nu_{q\mathbf{a}}^*(I) \geq p$ or, equivalently, $\nu_{\mathbf{a}}^*(I) \geq \frac{p}{q}$. \square

Observe that if I is a monomial ideal then $\overline{I^p}$ is a monomial ideal. This, particularly, implies that the u -th rational power I_u , for $u = \frac{p}{q}$, is also a monomial ideal. Our first main result is stated as follows.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $I \subseteq A$ and $J \subseteq B$ be monomial ideal. Let $u \in \mathbb{Q}$ be any positive rational number. Then,*

$$(I + J)_u = \sum_{0 \leq \omega \leq u, \omega \in \mathbb{Q}} I_{\omega} \cdot J_{u-\omega},$$

and the sum on the right hand side is a finite sum.

Proof. Fix a rational number $0 \leq \omega \leq u$. By using the same denominator, without loss of generality, we may assume that $u = \frac{p}{q}$, and $\omega = \frac{k}{q}$ for some $0 \leq k \leq p$. Consider arbitrary monomials $x^{\mathbf{a}} \in I_{\omega}$ and $x^{\mathbf{e}} \in J_{u-\omega}$. By definition, we have

$$(x^{\mathbf{a}})^q \in \overline{I^k} \text{ and } (x^{\mathbf{e}})^q \in \overline{J^{p-k}}.$$

It follows that $(x^{\mathbf{a}+\mathbf{e}})^q \in \overline{I^k} \cdot \overline{J^{p-k}} \subseteq \overline{(I+J)^p}$, where the later inclusion is a consequence of [21, Proposition 10.5.2]. Particularly, $x^{\mathbf{a}+\mathbf{e}} \in (I+J)_{\frac{p}{q}}$. This proves that $I_{\omega}J_{u-\omega} \subseteq (I+J)_u$. Since this holds for all rational numbers $0 \leq \omega \leq u$, we obtain the inclusion

$$(I + J)_u \supseteq \sum_{0 \leq \omega \leq u, \omega \in \mathbb{Q}} I_{\omega} \cdot J_{u-\omega}.$$

We shall proceed to get the reverse inclusion. As observed before, $(I+J)_u$ is a monomial ideal. Thus, it suffices to show that all monomials in $(I+J)_u$ belong to $\sum_{0 \leq \omega \leq u, \omega \in \mathbb{Q}} I_{\omega} \cdot J_{u-\omega}$.

Let m_1 and m_2 be the number of minimal generators of I and J , respectively. Let M_1 be the $r \times m_1$ exponent matrix of I and let M_2 be the $s \times m_2$ exponent matrix of J . Set $n = r + s$ and $m = m_1 + m_2$. Relabel the variables of S to be x_1, \dots, x_n (corresponding to $X_1, \dots, X_r, Y_1, \dots, Y_s$). Define M to be the following $n \times m$ matrix:

$$M = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} M_1 & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline \mathbf{0} & M_2 \end{array} \right).$$

Consider any monomial $x^{\mathbf{a}} \in (I + J)_u$. We have $(x^{\mathbf{a}})^q \in \overline{(I + J)^p}$; that is, $x^{q \cdot \mathbf{a}} \in \overline{(I + J)^p}$. By [10, Proposition 1.1], we get $\nu_{q \cdot \mathbf{a}}^*(M) \geq p$ or, equivalently, $\nu_{\mathbf{a}}^*(M) \geq u$. This condition states that the optimal solution to the following linear programming problem is at least u :

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{maximize } \mathbf{1}^m \cdot \mathbf{y}, \\ \text{subject to } M \cdot \mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m. \end{array}$$

Suppose that $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m$ is a vector that gives the optimal solution to (2.1). Then, we have

$$M \cdot \mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{a} \text{ and } \mathbf{1}^m \cdot \mathbf{y} \geq u.$$

Write $\mathbf{a} = (\alpha, \mathbf{0}) + (\mathbf{0}, \beta)$, where $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^r$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^s$, and $\mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{0}) + (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{y}_2)$, where $\mathbf{y}_1 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{m_1}$ and $\mathbf{y}_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{m_2}$. Observe that the optimization problem (2.1) is equivalent to the following two problems:

$$(\dagger) \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{maximize } \mathbf{1}^{m_1} \cdot \mathbf{y}_1, \\ \text{subject to } M_1 \cdot \mathbf{y}_1 \leq \alpha, \mathbf{y}_1 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{m_1} \end{array} \right. \quad \text{and} \quad (\ddagger) \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{maximize } \mathbf{1}^{m_2} \cdot \mathbf{y}_2, \\ \text{subject to } M_2 \cdot \mathbf{y}_2 \leq \beta, \mathbf{y}_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{m_2}. \end{array} \right.$$

Let ω be the optimal solution to (\dagger) . It can be seen that the system $M_1 \cdot \mathbf{y}_1 \leq \alpha$ (here, $\mathbf{a} = (\alpha, \mathbf{0}) + (\mathbf{0}, \beta)$ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^r$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^s$) consists of linear inequalities with rational coefficients, so its feasible set has rational vertices. This implies that $\omega = \nu_{\alpha}^*(M_1) \in \mathbb{Q}$. We also have $\nu_{\beta}^*(M_2) = \nu_{\mathbf{a}}^*(M) - \nu_{\alpha}^*(M_1) \geq u - \omega \in \mathbb{Q}$. It then follows from Lemma 2.1 that $x^{\alpha} \in I_{\omega}$ and $x^{\beta} \in J_{u-\omega}$. As a consequence, $x^{\mathbf{a}} = x^{\alpha} \cdot x^{\beta} \in I_{\omega} J_{u-\omega}$. This is true for any monomial $x^{\mathbf{a}} \in (I + J)_u$. Hence, we obtain the inclusion

$$(I + J)_u \subseteq \sum_{0 \leq \omega \leq u, \omega \in \mathbb{Q}} I_{\omega} \cdot J_{u-\omega},$$

and the first assertion is established.

We continue to prove the second assertion. Observe that, by [21, Proposition 10.5.5], there exist integers e and f such that every rational power I_{ω} and J_{ω} is of the form $I_{\frac{p}{e}}$ and $J_{\frac{q}{f}}$ for some $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$. Particularly, it was shown in [21, Proposition 10.5.5] that

$$I_u = I_{\frac{[ue]}{e}} = I_{\frac{n}{e}} \text{ and } J_u = J_{\frac{[uf]}{f}} = J_{\frac{m}{f}},$$

where $n = [ue]$, and $m = [uf]$.

It can be seen that $\frac{n-1}{e} < u$ and $\frac{m-1}{f} < u$. Moreover, by [21, Proposition 10.5.2], $I_{\alpha} \supseteq I_{\beta}$ if $\alpha \leq \beta$. Therefore, it follows that $\{I_{\omega} \mid 0 \leq \omega \leq u\}$ coincides with $\{I_{\frac{p}{e}} \mid 0 \leq p \leq n\}$ and $\{J_{u-\omega} \mid 0 \leq \omega \leq u\}$ coincides with $\{J_{\frac{q}{f}} \mid 0 \leq q \leq m\}$. Hence, in the sum $\sum_{0 \leq \omega \leq u, \omega \in \mathbb{Q}} I_{\omega} J_{u-\omega}$, only finitely many terms appear. This completes the second assertion of the theorem. \square

Example 2.3. Consider $I = (x^2) \subseteq \mathbb{k}[x]$ and $J = (y^2, yz) \subseteq \mathbb{k}[y, z]$. By [21, Theorem 10.3.5 and Proposition 10.5.5], the constants e and f as in the proof of Theorem 2.2 for rational

powers of I and J can be taken to be $e = f = 2$. Thus, Theorem 2.2 gives the following binomial expansion

$$\overline{(I + J)^2} = I_2 + I_{\frac{3}{2}} \cdot J_{\frac{1}{2}} + I_1 \cdot J_1 + I_{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot J_{\frac{3}{2}} + J_2 = \overline{I^2} + I_{\frac{3}{2}} \cdot J_{\frac{1}{2}} + \overline{I} \cdot \overline{J} + I_{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot J_{\frac{3}{2}} + \overline{J^2}.$$

It can be verified directly that

$$\overline{(I + J)^2} = (y^2 z^2, y^3 z, xy^2 z, x^2 y z, y^4, xy^3, x^2 y^2, x^3 y, x^4),$$

while

$$\overline{I^2} + \overline{I} \cdot \overline{J} + \overline{J^2} = (x^4, y^2 z^2, y^3 z, y^4, x^2 y z, x^2 y^2).$$

Clearly, $\overline{(I + J)^2} \neq \overline{I^2} + \overline{I} \cdot \overline{J} + \overline{J^2}$.

On the other hand, it is easy to see that $x^2 \in I \subseteq \overline{I}$ and $y^6 \in I^3 \subseteq \overline{I^3}$, so $x \in I_{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $y^3 \in J_{\frac{3}{2}}$. Thus, $xy^3 \in I_{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot J_{\frac{3}{2}}$. Similarly, it can be seen that $xy^2 z \in I_{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot J_{\frac{3}{2}}$ and $x^3 y \in I_{\frac{3}{2}} \cdot J_{\frac{1}{2}}$.

It would be desirable to see if the binomial expansion for rational powers in Theorem 2.2 holds for arbitrary ideals.

Question 2.4. Let $I \subseteq A$ and $J \subseteq B$ be arbitrary (or homogeneous) proper ideals. Is it true that for any $u \in \mathbb{Q}_+$, we have

$$(I + J)_u = \sum_{0 \leq \omega \leq u, \omega \in \mathbb{Q}} I_\omega \cdot J_{u-\omega}?$$

As illustrated in Example 2.3, when $u = k$ is a positive integer, the right hand side of the binomial expansion for $\overline{(I + J)^k} = (I + J)_u$ given in Theorem 2.2 has more terms than just the integral closures of powers of I and J , which were as expressed in (1.2). This explains why we cannot expect (1.2) to hold for arbitrary monomial ideals. Our next result gives a sufficient condition for the binomial expansion (1.2) to hold and generalizes [15, Theorem 2.1] to a larger class of ideals.

Theorem 2.5. Let $I \subseteq A$ and $J \subseteq B$ be monomial ideals. Suppose that for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^r$, $\nu_\alpha^*(I) \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\overline{(I + J)^k} = \sum_{\ell=0}^k \overline{I^\ell} \cdot \overline{J^{k-\ell}}.$$

Proof. It is easy to see that $\sum_{\ell=0}^k \overline{I^\ell} \cdot \overline{J^{k-\ell}} \subseteq \overline{(I + J)^k}$ (see, for example, [21, Proposition 10.5.2]). We shall prove the other inclusion. Since $\overline{(I + J)^k}$ is a monomial ideal, it suffices to show that all monomials in $\overline{(I + J)^k}$ belong to $\sum_{\ell=0}^k \overline{I^\ell} \cdot \overline{J^{k-\ell}}$.

Let M_1, M_2 and M be exponent matrices as in Theorem 2.2 (and using the same notations). Consider any monomial $x^{\mathbf{a}} \in \overline{(I + J)^k}$, for $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{N}^n$. By [10, Proposition 1.1], we have $\nu_{\mathbf{a}}^*(M) \geq k$. This condition states that the optimal solution to the linear programming problem (2.1) is at least k .

Suppose that $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m$ is a vector that gives the optimal solution to (2.1). Then, we have

$$M \cdot \mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{a} \text{ and } \mathbf{1}^m \cdot \mathbf{y} \geq k.$$

As before, write $\mathbf{a} = (\alpha, \mathbf{0}) + (\mathbf{0}, \beta)$, where $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^r$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^s$, and $\mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{0}) + (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{y}_2)$, where $\mathbf{y}_1 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{m_1}$ and $\mathbf{y}_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{m_2}$. As observed in the proof of Theorem 2.2, the optimization problem (2.1) is equivalent to the two optimization problems (†) and (‡).

Let ℓ be the optimal solution to (†); that is, $\nu_\alpha^*(I) = \nu_\alpha^*(M_1) = \ell$. Then, the optimal solution to (‡) satisfies $\nu_\beta^*(M_2) \geq k - \ell$. By the hypotheses, $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $k - \ell \in \mathbb{Z}$. The inequalities $\nu_\alpha^*(M_1) \geq \ell$ and $\nu_\beta^*(M_2) \geq k - \ell$, by [10, Proposition 1.1], then imply that $x^\alpha \in \overline{I}^\ell$ and $x^\beta \in \overline{J^{k-\ell}}$. As a consequence, we get that $x^\mathbf{a} \in \overline{I}^\ell \cdot \overline{J^{k-\ell}}$, which belong to the right hand side of the desired equality. The theorem is proved. \square

As immediate consequences of Theorem 2.5, we obtain the following corollaries which generalize [15, Theorem 2.1].

Corollary 2.6. *Let $I \subseteq A$ and $J \subseteq B$ be monomial ideals. Suppose that I is squarefree and $I^{(k)} = \overline{I^k}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*

$$\overline{(I + J)^k} = \sum_{\ell=0}^k \overline{I}^\ell \cdot \overline{J^{k-\ell}}.$$

Proof. By [10, Proposition 1.1], for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^r$, we have $\nu_\alpha^*(I) = \tau_\alpha^*(I) = \tau_\alpha(I) \in \mathbb{Z}$. The conclusion now follows from Theorem 2.5. \square

Corollary 2.7 ([15, Theorem 2.1]). *Let $I \subseteq A$ be a normally torsion-free squarefree monomial ideal, and let $J \subseteq B$ be an arbitrary monomial ideal. Then, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*

$$\overline{(I + J)^k} = \sum_{\ell=0}^k I^\ell \cdot \overline{J^{k-\ell}}.$$

Proof. Since I is a squarefree monomial ideal, we have $I^k \subseteq \overline{I^k} \subseteq I^{(k)}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The assumption that I is normally torsion-free then implies that $I^k = \overline{I^k} = I^{(k)}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The assertion now follows from Corollary 2.6. \square

3. DEPTH AND REGULARITY

Depth and regularity are perhaps among the most important invariant associated to ideals and modules. We shall now establish precise formulas for the depth and regularity of $\overline{(I + J)^k}$ under the sufficient condition of Theorem 2.5. Clearly, $\{\overline{(I + J)^k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a filtration of ideals (see, for instance, [21, Proposition 10.5.2]), so by [9, Theorem 4.2], we obtain the following bounds.

Lemma 3.1 ([9, Theorem 4.2]). *Let $I \subseteq A$ and $J \subseteq B$ be monomial ideals. Suppose that for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^r$, $\nu_\alpha^*(I) \in \mathbb{Z}$. For all $k \geq 1$, we have*

$$(1) \text{ depth } S/\overline{(I + J)^k} \geq \min_{\substack{i \in [1, k-1] \\ j \in [1, k]}} \{ \text{depth } A/\overline{I^{k-i}} + \text{depth } B/\overline{J^j} + 1, \text{depth } A/\overline{I^{k-j+1}} + \text{depth } B/\overline{J^j} \},$$

$$(2) \text{ reg } S/\overline{(I + J)^k} \leq \max_{\substack{i \in [1, k-1] \\ j \in [1, k]}} \{ \text{reg } A/\overline{I^{k-i}} + \text{reg } B/\overline{J^j} + 1, \text{reg } A/\overline{I^{k-j+1}} + \text{reg } B/\overline{J^j} \}.$$

We will show that the inequalities in Lemma 3.1 are in fact equalities. To this end, for $0 \leq t \leq k$, set

$$P_{k,t} = \overline{I^k} \cdot \overline{J^0} + \overline{I^{k-1}} \cdot \overline{J} + \dots + \overline{I^{k-t}} \cdot \overline{J^t}.$$

Then, as pointed out in the proof of [9, Theorem 4.2], we have

- (a) $P_{k,t} = P_{k,t-1} + \overline{I^{k-t}} \cdot \overline{J^t}$ for $1 \leq t \leq k$;
- (b) $P_{k,t-1} \cap \overline{I^{k-t}} \cdot \overline{J^t} = \overline{I^{k-t+1}} \cdot \overline{J^t}$.

These decomposition allow us to evoke the following notion and property of a Betti splitting to investigate the depth and regularity of $P_{k,t}$; see [7]. For homogeneous ideals P, I, J in S such that $P = I + J$, the sum $P = I + J$ is called a *Betti splitting* if the graded Betti numbers of P, I, J and $I \cap J$ satisfy the following relation:

$$\beta_{i,j}(P) = \beta_{i,j}(I) + \beta_{i,j}(J) + \beta_{i-1,j}(I \cap J) \text{ for all } i \geq 0 \text{ and } j \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Lemma 3.2 ([7, Corollary 2.2]). *Let $P = I + J$ be a Betti splitting in S . Then,*

- (a) $\text{depth } S/P = \min\{\text{depth } S/I, \text{depth } S/J, \text{depth } S/I \cap J - 1\}$,
- (b) $\text{reg } S/P = \max\{\text{reg } S/I, \text{reg } S/J, \text{reg } S/I \cap J - 1\}$.

As in the proof of [9, Theorem 5.3], to establish the equality in Lemma 3.1, it suffices to show that $P_{k,t} = P_{k,t-1} + \overline{I^{k-t}} \cdot \overline{J^t}$ is a Betti splitting. This is also how we proceed. It turns out that Betti splitting can be characterized by *Tor-vanishing* homomorphisms. We shall recall the following necessary terminology and results from [7, 9, 17].

Definition 3.3 (See [9, 17]).

- (1) We say that a homomorphism $\phi : M \rightarrow N$ of graded S -modules is *Tor-vanishing* if

$$\text{Tor}_i^S(\mathbb{k}, \phi) = 0 \text{ for all } i \geq 0.$$

- (2) We say that a filtration $\{Q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of S -modules is a *Tor-vanishing filtration* if, for all $k \geq 1$, the inclusion map $Q_k \rightarrow Q_{k-1}$ is *Tor-vanishing*. That is, $\text{Tor}_i^S(\mathbb{k}, Q_k) \rightarrow \text{Tor}_i^S(\mathbb{k}, Q_{k-1})$ is the zero map for all $k \geq 1$.

Lemma 3.4 ([7, Proposition 2.1]). *The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) *The decomposition $P = I + J$ is a Betti splitting, and*
- (2) *The inclusion maps $I \cap J \rightarrow I$ and $I \cap J \rightarrow J$ are Tor-vanishing.*

In light of Lemmas 3.2 and 3.4, to show that the inequality in Lemma 3.1 are equality, our argument is based on the following essential fact: the family of integral closures of powers of a monomial ideal is a Tor-vanishing filtration.

Lemma 3.5. *Let I be a monomial ideal in A .*

- (1) $\{\overline{I^k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ *is a Tor-vanishing filtration of ideals.*
- (2) *Assuming that \mathfrak{m} is the maximal homogeneous ideal in A , for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*

$$\overline{I^k} \subseteq \mathfrak{m} \cdot \overline{I^{k-1}}.$$

Proof. (1) Recall from [9] that for a monomial ideal I , $\delta^*(I)$ denotes the ideal generated by elements of the form f/x , where f is a minimal monomial generator of I and x is a variable dividing f . By [17, Proposition 4.4 and Lemma 4.2] (see also [1, Proposition 3.5]), it suffices to show that

$$(3.1) \quad \delta^*(\overline{I^k}) \subseteq \overline{I^{k-1}}.$$

Let M be any minimal monomial generator of $\overline{I^k}$. Then,

$$M^r \in (I^k)^r = I^{kr} \text{ for some } r \in \mathbb{N}.$$

That is, there exist monomials $f_1, \dots, f_{kr} \in I$ (not necessarily distinct) such that $M^r = f_1 \cdots f_{kr}$.

Let x be a variable dividing M . Clearly, $x^r \mid M^r$. This implies that there exist i_1, \dots, i_s , for some $s \leq r$ such that x appears in $f_{i_1} \cdots f_{i_s}$ with powers at least r . By considering the product of f_i 's for $i \neq i_1, \dots, i_s$, it is easy to see that $(M/x)^r \in I^{kr-r} = (I^{k-1})^r$. Thus, $M/x \in \overline{I^{k-1}}$. We have established (3.1).

(2) The statement is trivial for $k = 1$. Suppose that $k \geq 2$. By definition, we have

$$\overline{I^k} \subseteq \mathfrak{m} \cdot \delta^*(\overline{I^k}).$$

The desired containment now follows from (3.1). \square

As a consequence of Lemma 3.5, we immediately obtain the following containment, which is of independent interest.

Corollary 3.6. *For any positive integer e we have*

$$\overline{I^{k+e}} \subseteq \mathfrak{m}^e \cdot \overline{I^k}.$$

Proof. The assertion follows from a repeated application of part (2) of Lemma 3.5. \square

We are now ready to state our last main result.

Theorem 3.7. *Let $I \subseteq A$ and $J \subseteq B$ be monomial ideals. Suppose that for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^r$, $\nu_\alpha^*(I) \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then, the inequalities in Lemma 3.1 are equality.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.5, we have that $\{\overline{I^k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\overline{J^k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ are Tor-vanishing filtrations of ideals in A and B , respectively. It then follows from the proof of [9, Theorem 5.3] that $P_{k,t} = P_{k,t-1} + \overline{I^{k-t}} \cdot \overline{J^t}$ is a Betti splitting for all $1 \leq t \leq k$. Noticing again that $P_{k,t-1} \cap \overline{I^{k-t}} \cdot \overline{J^t} = \overline{I^{k-t+1}} \cdot \overline{J^t}$. Now, applying Lemma 3.2 and [12, Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3] in the same way as in the proof of [9, Theorems 4.2 and 5.3], we obtain the desired equality. \square

As noted before, the condition that $\nu_\alpha^*(I) \in \mathbb{Z}$ in Theorem 3.7 is satisfied, for instance, when $I^{(k)} = \overline{I^k}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Corollary 3.8. *Let $I \subseteq A$ and $J \subseteq B$ be monomial ideals. Suppose that $I^{(k)} = \overline{I^k}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, the inequalities in Lemma 3.1 are equality.*

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Ahangari Maleki, The Golod property of powers of ideals and Koszul ideals. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* 223 (2019), no. 2, 605–618.
- [2] S. Bisui, H.T. Hà, A.V. Jayanthan, and A.C. Thomas, Resurgence numbers of fiber products of projective schemes. *Collect. Math.* 72 (2021), no. 3, 605–614.
- [3] P. Duchet, Hypergraphs, In *Handbook of Combinatorics*, Ed. by R. Graham, M. Grötschel and L. Lovász, 1995.
- [4] V. Ene and J. Herzog, On the symbolic powers of binomial edge ideals. In: Stamate D., Szemberg T. (eds) *Combinatorial Structures in Algebra and Geometry*. NSA 2018. Springer Proceedings in Mathematics & Statistics, vol 331. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-52111-0_4
- [5] V. Ene, G. Rinaldo, and N. Terai, *Licci binomial edge ideals*. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 175 (2020), 105278, 23 pp.

- [6] S.I. Gass and M.C. Fu, Encyclopedia of Operations Research and Management Science. 3rd Edition. Springer, New York, 2013.
- [7] C.A. Francisco, H.T. Hà, and A. Van Tuyl, Splittings of monomial ideals. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 137 (2009), no. 10, 3271–3282.
- [8] H.T. Hà, A.V. Jayanthan, A. Kumar and H.D. Nguyen, Binomial expansion for saturated and symbolic powers of sums of ideals. Preprint (2021), arXiv:2112.09338.
- [9] H.T. Hà, H.D. Nguyen, N.V. Trung and T.N. Trung, Symbolic powers of sums of ideals. Math. Z. 294 (2020), 1499–1520.
- [10] H.T. Hà and N.V. Trung, Membership criteria and containments of powers of monomial ideals. Acta Math. Vietnam. 44 (2019), 117–139.
- [11] H.T. Hà, N.V. Trung and T.N. Trung, Depth and regularity of powers of sums of ideals. Math. Z. 282 (2016), no. 3-4, 819-838.
- [12] L.T. Hoa and N.D. Tam, On some invariants of a mixed product of ideals. Arch. Math. 94 (2010), 327-337.
- [13] A. Kumar, R. Kumar, and R. Sarkar, Certain algebraic invariants of edge ideals of join of graphs. J. Algebra Appl. **20** (2021), no. 6, Paper No. 2150099, 12 pp.
- [14] K.-N. Lin and Y.-H. Shen, Symbolic powers of generalized star configurations of hypersurfaces. Preprint (2021), arXiv:2106.02955.
- [15] D.H. Mau and T.N. Trung, Stability of associated primes and depth of integral closures of powers of edge ideals. Preprint (2021), arXiv:2108.01830.
- [16] N. C. Minh and T. Vu, Integral closure of small powers of edge ideals and their regularity. Preprint (2021), arXiv:2109.09268.
- [17] H.D. Nguyen and T. Vu, Powers of sums and their homological invariants. J. Pure Appl. Algebra 223 (2019), no. 7, 3081–3111.
- [18] J.L. O’Rourke, Local cohomology and degree complexes of monomial ideals. Preprint (2019), arXiv:1910.14140.
- [19] S.A. Seyed Fakhari, Regularity of symbolic powers of edge ideals of Cameron-Walker graphs. Comm. Algebra **48** (2020), no. 12, 5215–5223.
- [20] I. Swanson and R. Walker, Tensor-multinomial sums of ideals: primary decompositions and persistence of associated primes. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **147** (2019), no. 12, 5071–5082.
- [21] I. Swanson and C. Huneke, Integral closure of ideals, rings, and modules. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series 336. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [22] R. Walker, Uniform symbolic topologies via multinomial expansions. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **146** (2018), no. 9, 3735–3746.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, KHARAGPUR, WEST BENGAL, INDIA

Email address: 123.arindam@gmail.com

MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, TULANE UNIVERSITY, 6823 ST. CHARLES AVENUE, NEW ORLEANS, LA 70118, USA

Email address: tha@tulane.edu