

SPLITTINGS OF TORIC IDEALS OF GRAPHS

ANARGYROS KATSABEKIS AND APOSTOLOS THOMA

ABSTRACT. Let G be a simple graph on the vertex set $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$. An algebraic object attached to G is the toric ideal I_G . We say that I_G is splittable if there exist subgraphs G_1 and G_2 of G such that $I_G = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$, where both I_{G_1} and I_{G_2} are not equal to I_G . We show that I_G is splittable if and only if it is edge splittable. We also prove that the toric ideal of a complete bipartite graph is not splittable. In contrast, we show that the toric ideal of a complete graph K_n is always splittable when $n \geq 4$. Additionally, we show that the toric ideal of K_n has a minimal splitting if and only if $4 \leq n \leq 5$. Finally, we prove that any minimal splitting of I_G is also a reduced splitting.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $A = \{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m\}$ be a subset of \mathbb{N}^n such that A does not contain the zero vector. Consider the polynomial ring $K[x_1, \dots, x_m]$ over any field K . We grade $K[x_1, \dots, x_m]$ by the semigroup $\mathbb{N}A = \{l_1\mathbf{a}_1 + \dots + l_m\mathbf{a}_m\}$ setting $\deg_A(x_i) = \mathbf{a}_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$. The A -degree of a monomial $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} = x_1^{u_1} \dots x_m^{u_m}$ is defined by $\deg_A(\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}) = u_1\mathbf{a}_1 + \dots + u_m\mathbf{a}_m \in \mathbb{N}A$. The A -fiber of a vector $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{N}^n$ is the set of all monomials in $K[x_1, \dots, x_m]$ with A -degree equal to \mathbf{b} . The toric ideal I_A is the prime ideal generated by all the binomials $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}}$ such that $\deg_A(\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}) = \deg_A(\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}})$.

A recent direction in the theory of toric ideals is to decide when I_A is splittable, see [5, 6, 7]. The toric ideal I_A is *splittable* if it has a toric splitting i.e. if there exist toric ideals I_{A_1}, I_{A_2} such that $I_A = I_{A_1} + I_{A_2}$ and $I_{A_i} \neq I_A$, for all $1 \leq i \leq 2$. To every simple graph G one can associate the toric ideal I_G . In [5] G. Favacchio, J. Hofscheier, G. Keiper, and A. Van Tuyl consider the aforementioned problem for the toric ideal I_G , namely they study when I_G has a toric splitting of the form $I_G = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$, where I_{G_i} , $1 \leq i \leq 2$, is the toric ideal of G_i . More precisely, given a graph G and an even cycle C , they consider the graph H which is formed by identifying any edge of G with an edge of C . They show [5, Theorem 3.7] that $I_H = I_G + I_C$ is a splitting of I_H . They also prove [5, Corollary 4.8] that if G_1 and G_2 form a splitting of G along an edge e and at least one of G_1 or G_2 is bipartite, then $I_G = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$ is a splitting of I_G . Moreover, when I_G has such a splitting, they show [5, Theorem 4.11] how the graded Betti numbers of I_G are related with those of I_{G_1} and I_{G_2} . P. Gimenez and H. Srinivasan showed [6, Theorem 3.4] that if G_1 and G_2 form a splitting of G along an edge e , then I_G splits into $I_G = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$ if and only if at least one of G_1 or G_2 is bipartite.

This paper aims to answer [5, Question 5.1], namely for what graphs G can we find graphs G_1 and G_2 so that their respective toric ideals satisfy $I_G = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$? More generally, can we classify when I_G is a splittable toric ideal in terms of G ? We give a complete answer to the latter question. Our approach is based on the graphs $G \setminus e$ and G_S^e introduced in section 2, where e is an edge of G and S is a minimal system of binomial

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 13F65, 14M25, 05C25, 05E40.

Key words and phrases. Splittings, toric ideals, graphs, minimal systems of binomial generators.

Corresponding author: Anargyros Katsabekis.

generators of I_G . We show that I_G is splittable if and only if there is an edge e of G and a minimal generating set of binomials S of I_G such that $I_G = I_{G \setminus e} + I_{G \setminus e}$ is a splitting, see Theorem 2.10. As an application of our results, we prove that the toric ideal of a complete bipartite graph is not splittable (see Corollary 2.13) and the toric ideal of the suspension of a cycle of length $n \geq 3$ is splittable if and only if either $n = 4$ or n is odd, see Theorem 2.14. In section 3 we study the case that G coincides with the complete graph K_n on n vertices. We show that I_{K_n} is splittable if and only if $n \geq 4$, see Theorem 3.1. Moreover, we introduce minimal splittings and show (Theorem 3.10) that I_{K_n} does not have a minimal splitting for $n \geq 6$. In section 4 we define reduced splittings of toric ideals and prove that every minimal splitting of I_G is also reduced, see Theorem 4.7.

2. EDGE SPLITTINGS

In this section, we first collect important notations and definitions used in the paper. For unexplained terminology in graph theory, we refer to [10]. Let G be a finite, connected and undirected graph having no loops and no multiple edges on the vertex set $V(G) = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$, and let $E(G) = \{e_1, \dots, e_m\}$ be the set of edges of G . Two edges of G are called *adjacent* if they share a common vertex. To each edge $e = \{v_i, v_j\} \in E(G)$, we associate the vector $\mathbf{a}_e \in \{0, 1\}^n$ defined as follows: the i th entry is 1, the j th entry is 1, and the remaining entries are zero. By I_G we denote the toric ideal I_{A_G} in $K[e_1, \dots, e_m]$, where $A_G = \{\mathbf{a}_e | e \in E(G)\} \subset \mathbb{N}^n$.

A *walk* of length q of G connecting $v_1 \in V(G)$ with v_{q+1} is a finite sequence of the form $w = (\{v_1, v_2\}, \{v_2, v_3\}, \dots, \{v_{q-1}, v_q\}, \{v_q, v_{q+1}\})$ with each $\{v_i, v_{i+1}\} \in E(G)$, $1 \leq i \leq q$. An *even* (respectively, *odd*) walk is a walk of even (respectively, odd) length. The walk w is called *closed* if $v_{q+1} = v_1$. A *cycle* is a closed walk

$$w = (\{v_1, v_2\}, \{v_2, v_3\}, \dots, \{v_{q-1}, v_q\}, \{v_q, v_1\})$$

with $q \geq 3$ and $v_i \neq v_j$, for every $1 \leq i < j \leq q$. A *cut vertex* is a vertex of G whose removal increases the number of connected components of the remaining subgraph. A graph is called *biconnected* if it is connected and does not contain a cut vertex. A *block* is a maximal biconnected subgraph of G .

Given an even closed walk $w = (e_{i_1}, e_{i_2}, \dots, e_{i_{2q}})$ of G , we write B_w for the binomial $B_w = \prod_{k=1}^q e_{i_{2k-1}} - \prod_{k=1}^q e_{i_{2k}} \in I_G$. By [13, Proposition 10.1.5] the ideal I_G is generated by all the binomials B_w , where w is an even closed walk of G . We say that w is a *primitive walk* if the corresponding binomial B_w is primitive. Recall that given a set of vectors $A \subset \mathbb{N}^n$, the binomial $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}}$ in I_A is called *primitive* if there exists no other binomial $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{w}} - \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{z}} \in I_A$ such that $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{w}}$ divides $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}$ and $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{z}}$ divides $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}}$. Every minimal binomial generator of I_A is primitive, see [11].

Every even primitive walk $w = (e_{i_1}, e_{i_2}, \dots, e_{i_{2q}})$ partitions the set of edges of w in the two sets $E_1 = \{e_{i_j} | j \text{ odd}\}$ and $E_2 = \{e_{i_j} | j \text{ even}\}$. The edges of E_1 are called *odd edges* of w and those of E_2 even. A *sink* of a block B is a common vertex of two odd or two even edges of the primitive walk w which belongs to B . The primitive walk w is called *strongly primitive* if it has no two sinks with distance one in any cyclic block.

Let $w = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{2q})$ be an even primitive walk and $f = \{v_i, v_j\}$ be a chord of w with $i < j$, namely an edge $f = \{v_i, v_j\}$ of G such that $f \notin E(w)$. Then f breaks w in two walks: $w_1 = (e_1, \dots, e_{i-1}, f, e_j, \dots, e_{2q})$ and $w_2 = (e_i, \dots, e_{j-1}, f)$. The chord f is called *bridge* of w if there exist two different blocks B_i, B_j of w such that $v_i \in B_i$ and $v_j \in B_j$. The chord f is called *even* (respectively *odd*) if it is not a bridge and breaks w in two even walks (respectively odd).

Let $f = \{v_i, v_j\}$ be an odd chord of w with $i < j$ and $f' = \{v_k, v_l\}$ be another odd chord of w with $k < l$. We say that the odd chords f and f' *cross effectively* in w if $k - i$ is odd and either $i < k < j < l$ or $k < i < l < j$. We call an F_4 of the walk w a cycle (e, f, e', f') of length four which consists of two edges e, e' of the walk w both odd or both even, and two odd chords f and f' which cross effectively in w . We say that the odd chords f, f' cross *strongly effectively* in w if they cross effectively and they do not form an F_4 in w .

A binomial $B_w \in I_G$ is called *minimal* if it belongs to a minimal system of binomial generators of I_G . Since I_G is homogeneous, the graded version of Nakayama's Lemma implies that every minimal system of generators of I_G has the same cardinality.

The next theorem provides a characterization for the minimal binomials of I_G .

Theorem 2.1. ([10, Theorem 4.13]) *Let w be an even closed walk of G . Then B_w is a minimal binomial if and only if*

- (1) *w is strongly primitive,*
- (2) *all the chords of w are odd and there are not two of them which cross strongly effectively and*
- (3) *no odd chord crosses an F_4 of the walk w .*

A binomial $B_w \in I_G$ is called *indispensable* if every system of binomial generators of I_G contains B_w or $-B_w$. The next theorem provides a characterization for the indispensable binomials of I_G .

Theorem 2.2. ([10, Theorem 4.14]) *Let w be an even closed walk of G . Then B_w is an indispensable binomial if and only if w is a strongly primitive walk, all the chords of w are odd and there are not two of them that cross effectively.*

It follows from Theorems 2.1, 2.2 that the binomial B_w is not indispensable due to the existence of F_4 's in the walk w . Moreover, a minimal binomial B_w of I_G is indispensable if and only if the walk w does not have any F_4 .

Note that there may exist a subgraph H of the graph G such that $I_H = I_G$. This can happen when there are edges in G that are not used in any walk w such that B_w is a minimal binomial of I_G .

Given an edge e of G , we denote by $G \setminus e$ the graph with the same vertex set as G and whose edge set consists of all edges of G except e . For any set $F \subset E(G)$ of edges of G , we use $G \setminus F$ to denote the subgraph of G containing the same vertices as G but with all the edges of F removed.

Let $S = \{B_{w_1}, B_{w_2}, \dots, B_{w_r}\}$ be a minimal generating set of I_G . Given an edge e of G , we define G_S^e to be the subgraph of G on the vertex set

$$V(G_S^e) = \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq r \text{ and } e \in E(w_i)} V(w_i)$$

with edges

$$E(G_S^e) = \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq r \text{ and } e \in E(w_i)} E(w_i).$$

Thus to form the graph G_S^e one needs first to find all binomials $B_{w_i} \in S$, $1 \leq i \leq r$, such that e is an edge of the walk w_i . Then we take all vertices and edges of such walks.

We use the symbol G_S^e to emphasize that the graph depends not only on the edge e but also on the minimal system of binomial generators S , see Example 2.3. For a toric ideal I_G with a unique minimal system of binomial generators S , we will simply write G^e instead of G_S^e .

Example 2.3. Recall that the complete graph K_n is the graph with n vertices in which each vertex is connected to every other vertex. Let $G = K_4$ be the complete graph on the vertex set $\{v_1, \dots, v_4\}$. Let $w_1 = (\varepsilon_{12}, \varepsilon_{23}, \varepsilon_{34}, \varepsilon_{14})$, $w_2 = (\varepsilon_{12}, \varepsilon_{24}, \varepsilon_{34}, \varepsilon_{13})$ and $w_3 = (\varepsilon_{23}, \varepsilon_{13}, \varepsilon_{14}, \varepsilon_{24})$, where $\varepsilon_{ij} = \{v_i, v_j\}$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq 4$. Then $S = \{B_{w_1} = \varepsilon_{12}\varepsilon_{34} - \varepsilon_{23}\varepsilon_{14}, B_{w_2} = \varepsilon_{12}\varepsilon_{34} - \varepsilon_{24}\varepsilon_{13}\}$ and $T = \{B_{w_1}, B_{w_3} = \varepsilon_{23}\varepsilon_{14} - \varepsilon_{13}\varepsilon_{24}\}$ are minimal generating sets of I_G . Let $e = \varepsilon_{23}$, then G_S^e is the cycle given by the walk w_1 while G_T^e is the whole graph G .

Theorem 2.4. Let G be a graph and e be an edge of G . Let $S = \{B_{w_1}, B_{w_2}, \dots, B_{w_r}\}$ be a minimal generating set of I_G , then $I_G = I_{G_S^e} + I_{G \setminus e}$.

Proof. We have that $G \setminus e \subset G$ and $G_S^e \subset G$, so $I_{G \setminus e} \subset I_G$ and $I_{G_S^e} \subset I_G$. Thus $I_{G_S^e} + I_{G \setminus e} \subset I_G$. Let B_{w_i} , $1 \leq i \leq r$, be a minimal binomial in S . Then there are two cases:

- (1) $e \in E(w_i)$. Then B_{w_i} belongs to the ideal $I_{G_S^e}$.
- (2) $e \notin E(w_i)$. Then B_{w_i} belongs to the ideal $I_{G \setminus e}$.

Consequently $I_G \subset I_{G_S^e} + I_{G \setminus e}$. □

Example 2.5. We return to Example 2.3. We have that $I_{G_S^e} = \langle B_{w_1} \rangle$ and $I_{G_T^e} = I_G$. Also $G \setminus e$ is the graph with edges $\varepsilon_{12}, \varepsilon_{34}, \varepsilon_{14}, \varepsilon_{13}, \varepsilon_{24}$, thus $I_{G \setminus e} = \langle B_{w_2} \rangle$. Then $I_G = I_{G_S^e} + I_{G \setminus e}$ is a splitting of I_G , while $I_G = I_{G_T^e} + I_{G \setminus e}$ is not a splitting of I_G since $I_{G_T^e} = I_G$.

Definition 2.6. A splitting $I_G = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$ of I_G is called edge splitting if there exist an edge e of G and a minimal generating set S of I_G such that $G_1 = G_S^e$ and $G_2 = G \setminus e$ or $G_1 = G \setminus e$ and $G_2 = G_S^e$. The toric ideal I_G is called edge splittable if there exists an edge splitting of I_G .

Remark 2.7. It is not necessary for all splittings (if any) of the toric ideal of a graph to be edge splittings. Consider the complete graph K_5 on the vertex set $\{v_1, \dots, v_5\}$. Let $\varepsilon_{ij} = \{v_i, v_j\}$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq 5$. Consider the subgraphs $G_1 = K_5 \setminus \{\varepsilon_{12}, \varepsilon_{34}\}$ and $G_2 = K_5 \setminus \{\varepsilon_{14}, \varepsilon_{23}\}$ of K_5 . We have that $S = \{\varepsilon_{13}\varepsilon_{24} - \varepsilon_{14}\varepsilon_{23}, \varepsilon_{14}\varepsilon_{25} - \varepsilon_{15}\varepsilon_{24}, \varepsilon_{23}\varepsilon_{45} - \varepsilon_{24}\varepsilon_{35}, \varepsilon_{13}\varepsilon_{25} - \varepsilon_{15}\varepsilon_{23}, \varepsilon_{13}\varepsilon_{45} - \varepsilon_{14}\varepsilon_{35}\}$ is a generating set of I_{G_1} and $T = \{\varepsilon_{12}\varepsilon_{34} - \varepsilon_{13}\varepsilon_{24}, \varepsilon_{24}\varepsilon_{35} - \varepsilon_{25}\varepsilon_{34}, \varepsilon_{13}\varepsilon_{45} - \varepsilon_{15}\varepsilon_{34}, \varepsilon_{12}\varepsilon_{45} - \varepsilon_{15}\varepsilon_{24}, \varepsilon_{12}\varepsilon_{35} - \varepsilon_{13}\varepsilon_{25}\}$ is a generating set of I_{G_2} . Also, $S \cup T$ is a generating set of I_{K_5} and $I_{G_i} \neq I_{K_5}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 2$, so $I_{K_5} = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$ is a splitting of I_{K_5} which is not an edge splitting.

Next two Theorems provide a necessary and sufficient condition for a toric ideal I_G to be splittable in terms of the graph G .

Theorem 2.8. The ideal I_G is edge splittable if and only if there is a minimal system of binomial generators $S = \{B_{w_1}, \dots, B_{w_r}\}$ of I_G with $r \geq 2$ and an edge $e \in E(w_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq r$, such that $I_{G_S^e} \neq I_G$.

Proof. (\implies) Suppose that the ideal I_G is edge splittable, then there exist a minimal system of binomial generators $S = \{B_{w_1}, \dots, B_{w_r}\}$ of I_G with $r \geq 2$ and an edge e of G such that $I_G = I_{G_S^e} + I_{G \setminus e}$ is a splitting. Thus $I_{G \setminus e} \neq I_G$, so there is $B_{w_i} \in I_G$, $1 \leq i \leq r$, such that $B_{w_i} \notin I_{G \setminus e}$ and therefore $e \in E(w_i)$.

(\impliedby) Suppose that there is a minimal system of binomial generators $S = \{B_{w_1}, \dots, B_{w_r}\}$ of I_G with $r \geq 2$ and an edge $e \in E(w_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq r$, such that $I_{G_S^e} \neq I_G$. Then from Theorem 2.4 we have that $I_G = I_{G_S^e} + I_{G \setminus e}$. Since $e \in E(w_i)$, we have that $B_{w_i} \notin I_{G \setminus e}$ and therefore $I_{G \setminus e} \neq I_G$. From the hypothesis, it holds that $I_{G_S^e} \neq I_G$. Consequently, I_G is edge splittable. □




FIGURE 1. The graph G_8

Example 2.9. Let P_n be the graph with $2n + 1$ vertices: the n vertices of a regular n -gon, the n midpoints of the edges of the polygon and the center of the polygon. The graph P_n has $3n$ edges: the n radii of the inscribed circle in the polygon corresponding to the midpoints of the edges of the polygon and the $2n$ segments joining the vertices of the polygon to the two adjacent midpoints. Consider the graph G_n which is the cartesian product of the graph P_n with a single edge. Thus G_n has $4n + 2$ vertices and $8n + 1$ edges. In Figure 1 we plot the graph G_8 with 34 vertices and 65 edges. Since G_n is bipartite, we have, from [8, Theorem 2.3], that I_{G_n} has a unique minimal system of generators consisting of all binomials B_w , where w is an even cycle with no chords. The graph G_n has exactly $5n + 2$ cycles without a chord and all of them are of length 4, except two of length $2n$. Note that G_8 has exactly 42 cycles with no chords, see Figure 1. Let e be the edge of G_n joining the two centers of the polygons. We plot in Figure 2 the graph $G_8 \setminus e$ and in Figure 3 the graph G_8^e . Note that the toric ideal of the graph $G_8 \setminus e$ has 62 minimal binomials, while the toric ideal of G_8^e has 8 minimal binomials. In general, $I_{G_n \setminus e}$ has $4n + \binom{n}{2} + 2$ minimal binomials, while the ideal $I_{G_n^e}$ has n minimal binomials. Notice that the $\binom{n}{2}$ minimal binomials of $I_{G_n \setminus e}$ correspond to cycles in $G_n \setminus e$ of length 6 that in the graph G_n had e as an even chord. It follows from Theorem 2.8 that $I_{G_n} = I_{G_n^e} + I_{G_n \setminus e}$ is an edge splitting. Actually, for each edge b of G_n , there is a splitting $I_{G_n} = I_{G_n^b} + I_{G_n \setminus b}$ of I_{G_n} .

Next we state and prove the main result of this article, namely if the toric ideal of a graph has a splitting then it has also an edge splitting.

Theorem 2.10. *The toric ideal I_G is splittable if and only if it is edge splittable.*

Proof. (\Leftarrow) If I_G is edge splittable, then $I_G = I_{G^e} + I_{G \setminus e}$ is a splitting of I_G , and therefore it is splittable.

(\Rightarrow) Suppose that I_G is splittable and let $I_G = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$ be a splitting of I_G . Notice that $I_{G_1} \subsetneq I_G$ and $I_{G_2} \subsetneq I_G$. Let $\{f_1, \dots, f_s\}$ be a binomial generating set of I_{G_1} and $\{g_1, \dots, g_t\}$ be a binomial generating set of I_{G_2} . Then $\{f_1, \dots, f_s, g_1, \dots, g_t\}$ is a generating set of I_G , therefore it contains a minimal binomial generating set $S = \{B_{w_1}, \dots, B_{w_r}\}$ of I_G , since toric ideals of graphs are homogeneous. Note that $r \geq 2$, since I_{G_1} and I_{G_2} are nonzero ideals. But $S \subset \{f_1, \dots, f_s, g_1, \dots, g_t\}$, so each B_{w_i} , $1 \leq i \leq r$, belongs to at




FIGURE 2. The graph $G_8 \setminus e$




FIGURE 3. The graph G_8^e

least one of I_{G_1}, I_{G_2} . If for every $1 \leq i \leq r$ it holds that $B_{w_i} \in I_{G_2}$, then $I_{G_2} = I_G$ a contradiction. Thus there exists $1 \leq i \leq r$ such that $B_{w_i} \in I_{G_1}$ and $B_{w_i} \notin I_{G_2}$, so there is $e \in E(w_i)$ such that $e \notin E(G_2)$. For every even closed walk w_j such that $e \in E(w_j)$ we have that $B_{w_j} \in I_{G_1}$, thus $I_{G_S^e} \subset I_{G_1}$ and therefore $I_{G_S^e} \neq I_G$ since $I_{G_1} \subsetneq I_G$. By Theorem 2.8 the toric ideal I_G is edge splittable. \square

Example 2.11. Consider the graph G on the vertex set $\{v_1, \dots, v_{10}\}$ with edges $e_1 = \{v_1, v_2\}$, $e_2 = \{v_2, v_3\}$, $e_3 = \{v_3, v_4\}$, $e_4 = \{v_4, v_5\}$, $e_5 = \{v_5, v_6\}$, $e_6 = \{v_6, v_7\}$, $e_7 = \{v_7, v_8\}$, $e_8 = \{v_8, v_9\}$, $e_9 = \{v_9, v_{10}\}$, $e_{10} = \{v_1, v_{10}\}$, $e_{11} = \{v_1, v_5\}$, $e_{12} = \{v_2, v_6\}$ and $e_{13} = \{v_6, v_8\}$. Then $S = \{e_1e_5 - e_{11}e_{12}, e_1e_9e_{13} - e_8e_{10}e_{12}, e_5e_8e_{10} - e_9e_{11}e_{13}, e_2e_4e_6e_{13} - e_3e_5e_7e_{12}, e_2e_4e_6e_8e_{10} - e_3e_7e_9e_{11}e_{12}\}$ is a minimal generating set of I_G . For the edge $f = e_1$ of G we have that $I_{G \setminus f} = \langle e_5e_8e_{10} - e_9e_{11}e_{13}, e_2e_4e_6e_{13} - e_3e_5e_7e_{12}, e_2e_4e_6e_8e_{10} - e_3e_7e_9e_{11}e_{12} \rangle$. Moreover $E(G_S^f) = \{e_1, e_5, e_8, e_9, e_{10}, e_{11}, e_{12}, e_{13}\}$ and also $I_{G_S^f} = \langle e_1e_5 - e_{11}e_{12}, e_1e_9e_{13} - e_8e_{10}e_{12}, e_5e_8e_{10} - e_9e_{11}e_{13} \rangle$. Thus $I_G \neq I_{G_S^f}$ and therefore $I_G = I_{G_S^f} + I_{G \setminus f}$ is a splitting of I_G by Theorem 2.8.

Example 2.12. In [6, Example 3.5] P. Gimenez and H. Srinivasan provide an example of a graph G obtained by gluing two bow ties G_1 and G_2 along an edge. Since neither G_1

nor G_2 is bipartite, $I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$ is not a splitting of I_G by [6, Theorem 3.4(1)]. The ideal I_G has a unique minimal system of generators S consisting of five binomials and $I_{G_\xi^e} = I_G$, for every edge e of G . By Theorem 2.8, the ideal I_G is not edge splittable, and therefore it is not splittable by Theorem 2.10. Thus I_G does not have a splitting in the form $I_{H_1} + I_{H_2}$ for any subgraphs H_1, H_2 of G . It is worth mentioning that if a graph G is a gluing of two arbitrary disjoint connected graphs G_1 and G_2 , bipartite or not, along an edge, then from [6, Theorem 3.4(3)] there exists a 3-uniform hypergraph H such that $I_H = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$.

Theorems 2.8 and 2.10 are easier to apply when I_G has a unique minimal system of binomial generators. In particular, this is true for the toric ideal of a bipartite graph since it is minimally generated by all binomials of the form B_w , where w is an even cycle with no chords, see [8, Theorem 2.3].

A graph G is called a *complete bipartite* graph if its vertex set can be partitioned into two subsets V_1 and V_2 such that each edge of G connects a vertex of V_1 to a vertex of V_2 . It is denoted by $K_{m,n}$, where m and n are the numbers of vertices in V_1 and V_2 respectively. The next corollary shows that toric ideals of complete bipartite graphs do not admit a splitting.

Corollary 2.13. *The toric ideal of $K_{m,n}$ is not splittable.*

Proof. Let $V_1 = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$, $V_2 = \{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ be the bipartition of the complete bipartite graph $K_{m,n}$ and $E(K_{m,n}) = \{b_{ij} | 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n\}$, where $b_{ij} = \{x_i, y_j\}$. Then $I_{K_{m,n}}$ is minimally generated by the 2×2 minors of the matrix $M = (b_{ij})$, see [13, Proposition 10.6.2]. Thus $I_{K_{m,n}}$ is minimally generated by the set S of all binomials $b_{ij}b_{kl} - b_{il}b_{kj}$ which are in the form B_w , where w is a cycle in $K_{m,n}$ of length 4. Since $K_{m,n}$ is bipartite, the set S is the unique minimal system of binomial generators of $I_{K_{m,n}}$.

Notice that if $m = 1$ or $n = 1$, then $I_{K_{m,n}} = \{0\}$. Moreover if $m = 2$ and $n = 2$, then $I_{K_{m,n}}$ is minimally generated by $b_{11}b_{22} - b_{12}b_{21}$ and therefore it is not splittable. Assume that $m \geq 2$, $n \geq 2$ and $I_{K_{m,n}} \neq I_{K_{2,2}}$. Let $e = b_{ij}$ be any edge of $K_{m,n}$. We claim that $K_{m,n}^e = K_{m,n}$ which implies the equality $I_{K_{m,n}^e} = I_{K_{m,n}}$. By definition $K_{m,n}^e$ is a subgraph of $K_{m,n}$. It suffices to show that all edges of $K_{m,n}$ belong also to the graph $K_{m,n}^e$. Let $\xi = b_{kl} \in E(K_{m,n})$. There are four cases:

- (1) $k = i$ and $l = j$. Then $\xi = e$ which belongs to $K_{m,n}^e$.
- (2) $k = i$ and $l \neq j$. Let $1 \leq i' \leq m$ with $i' \neq i$. Consider the cycle $w = (e, \xi, b_{i'l}, b_{i'j})$, then $B_w \in S$ and therefore ξ belongs to $K_{m,n}^e$.
- (3) $k \neq i$ and $l = j$. Let $1 \leq j' \leq n$ with $j' \neq j$. Consider the cycle $w = (e, \xi, b_{kj'}, b_{ij'})$, then $B_w \in S$ and therefore ξ belongs to $K_{m,n}^e$.
- (4) $k \neq i$ and $l \neq j$. Consider the cycle $w = (e, b_{il}, \xi, b_{kj})$, then $B_w \in S$ and therefore ξ belongs to $K_{m,n}^e$.

We conclude that in all cases ξ belongs to $K_{m,n}^e$, so $K_{m,n}^e = K_{m,n}$. From Theorem 2.8 it follows that $I_{K_{m,n}}$ is not edge splittable, and therefore $I_{K_{m,n}}$ is not splittable by Theorem 2.10. \square

The *suspension* \widehat{G} of a graph G is the graph obtained from G by adding a new vertex adjacent to all vertices of G . Given a cycle C_n in G of length $n \geq 3$, the next theorem determines when the toric ideal $I_{\widehat{C}_n}$ is splittable.

Theorem 2.14. *Let C_n be a cycle of length $n \geq 3$ and \widehat{C}_n be the suspension of C_n .*

- (1) *Suppose that n is even. Then $I_{\widehat{C}_n}$ is splittable if and only if $n = 4$.*

(2) If n is odd, then $I_{\widehat{C}_n}$ is splittable.

Proof. Let $C_n = (\{v_1, v_2\}, \{v_2, v_3\}, \dots, \{v_{n-1}, v_n\}, \{v_1, v_n\})$ and $G = \widehat{C}_n$ be the suspension of C_n obtained by adding a new vertex v_{n+1} such that $\{v_i, v_{n+1}\}$ is an edge of G , for every $1 \leq i \leq n$.

(1) Suppose that $n \geq 4$ is even. From [9, Proposition 5.5] there is a bipartite graph H such that $I_G = I_H$, thus I_G has a unique minimal system of generators. We distinguish the following cases.

(a) $n = 4$. Let $C_4 = (\varepsilon_{12} = \{v_1, v_2\}, \varepsilon_{23} = \{v_2, v_3\}, \varepsilon_{34} = \{v_3, v_4\}, \varepsilon_{14} = \{v_1, v_4\})$ and $\varepsilon_{i5} = \{v_i, v_5\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq 4$. Then

$$S = \{\varepsilon_{12}\varepsilon_{45} - \varepsilon_{14}\varepsilon_{25}, \varepsilon_{12}\varepsilon_{35} - \varepsilon_{23}\varepsilon_{15}, \varepsilon_{12}\varepsilon_{34} - \varepsilon_{23}\varepsilon_{14}, \varepsilon_{23}\varepsilon_{45} - \varepsilon_{34}\varepsilon_{25}, \varepsilon_{15}\varepsilon_{34} - \varepsilon_{14}\varepsilon_{35}\}$$

is a minimal generating set of I_G . Let $e = \varepsilon_{15}$, then $E(G^e) = \{\varepsilon_{12}, \varepsilon_{14}, \varepsilon_{15}, \varepsilon_{23}, \varepsilon_{34}, \varepsilon_{35}\}$. Notice that $\varepsilon_{12}\varepsilon_{45} - \varepsilon_{14}\varepsilon_{25} \in I_G$ and $\varepsilon_{12}\varepsilon_{45} - \varepsilon_{14}\varepsilon_{25} \notin I_{G^e}$, so $I_{G^e} \neq I_G$. Also e is an edge of the cycle $w = (\varepsilon_{12}, \varepsilon_{23}, \varepsilon_{35}, \varepsilon_{15})$. Thus $I_G = I_{G^e} + I_{G \setminus e}$ is a splitting of I_G by Theorem 2.8.

(b) $n > 4$. Let e be an edge of G then there are two cases:

(i) e is an edge of the cycle C_n , for the sake of simplicity let $e = \varepsilon_{12}$. We will show that $G = G^e$. Since C_n is a cycle with no chords, B_{C_n} is a minimal binomial of I_G by Theorem 2.2, and therefore $E(C_n) \subset E(G^e)$. Consider now the odd cycles $w_1 = (e, \{v_2, v_{n+1}\}, \{v_{n+1}, v_1\})$ and $w_2 = (\{v_i, v_{i+1}\}, \{v_{i+1}, v_{n+1}\}, \{v_{n+1}, v_i\})$, where $4 \leq i \leq n-2$, which share only one vertex, namely v_{n+1} . The even closed walk $w = (w_1, w_2)$ has no chords and no bridges, and therefore B_w is a minimal binomial of I_G by Theorem 2.2. Thus $\{v_i, v_{n+1}\} \in E(G^e)$ for $i = 1, 2, 4, 5, \dots, n-1$. Consider now the cycle

$$\gamma = (\{v_{n+1}, v_1\}, e, \{v_2, v_3\}, \{v_3, v_{n+1}\})$$

and notice that γ has exactly one odd chord, namely $\{v_2, v_{n+1}\}$, so from Theorem 2.2 B_γ is a minimal binomial of I_G . Thus $\{v_3, v_{n+1}\} \in E(G^e)$. Consider the cycle $\delta = (\{v_{n+1}, v_2\}, e, \{v_1, v_n\}, \{v_n, v_{n+1}\})$ and notice that δ has exactly one odd chord, namely $\{v_1, v_{n+1}\}$. By Theorem 2.2 B_δ is a minimal binomial of I_G . Thus $\{v_n, v_{n+1}\} \in E(G^e)$ and therefore $E(G) = E(G^e)$. Consequently $G = G^e$, so from Theorems 2.8, 2.10 the ideal I_G is not splittable.

(ii) $e = \{v_i, v_{n+1}\}$ with $1 \leq i \leq n$. For the sake of simplicity we let $i = 1$, namely $e = \{v_1, v_{n+1}\}$. Consider the odd cycles $w_1 = (e, \{v_2, v_{n+1}\}, \{v_1, v_2\})$ and $w_2 = (\{v_i, v_{i+1}\}, \{v_{i+1}, v_{n+1}\}, \{v_{n+1}, v_i\})$, where $4 \leq i \leq n-2$, which share only one vertex, namely v_{n+1} . The even closed walk $w = (w_1, w_2)$ has no chords and no bridges, so B_w is a minimal binomial of I_G by Theorem 2.2. Thus $\{v_i, v_{n+1}\} \in E(G^e)$ for $i = 2, 4, 5, \dots, n-1$. Moreover $\{v_i, v_{i+1}\} \in E(G^e)$ for $i = 1, 4, 5, \dots, n-2$. Consider now the cycle $\gamma = (e, \{v_1, v_2\}, \{v_2, v_3\}, \{v_3, v_{n+1}\})$ and notice that it has exactly one odd chord, namely $\{v_2, v_{n+1}\}$. By Theorem 2.2 B_γ is a minimal binomial of I_G . Thus $\{v_2, v_3\} \in E(G^e)$ and also $\{v_3, v_{n+1}\} \in E(G^e)$. Consider the cycle $\delta = (\{v_2, v_{n+1}\}, e, \{v_1, v_n\}, \{v_n, v_{n+1}\})$ and notice that δ has exactly one odd chord, namely $\{v_1, v_2\}$. By Theorem 2.2 B_δ is a minimal binomial of I_G . Thus $\{v_1, v_n\} \in E(G^e)$ and also $\{v_n, v_{n+1}\} \in E(G^e)$. Furthermore

$$\mu = (\{v_{n-1}, v_n\}, \{v_n, v_1\}, e, \{v_{n-1}, v_{n+1}\})$$

is an even cycle with exactly one odd chord, namely $\{v_n, v_{n+1}\}$. By Theorem 2.2 B_μ is a minimal binomial of I_G , and therefore $\{v_{n-1}, v_n\}$ is an edge of G^e . Consider the odd cycles $\zeta_1 = (e, \{v_1, v_n\}, \{v_n, v_{n+1}\})$, $\zeta_2 = (\{v_3, v_4\}, \{v_4, v_{n+1}\}, \{v_3, v_{n+1}\})$ and let $\zeta = (\zeta_1, \zeta_2)$. Then B_ζ is a minimal binomial of I_G by Theorem 2.2, since ζ does not have any chords or bridges, and therefore $\{v_3, v_4\} \in E(G^e)$. Thus $E(G) = E(G^e)$, so $G = G^e$ and therefore I_G is not splittable by Theorems 2.8, 2.10.

(2) Suppose that n is odd. Then any odd cycle of G either coincides with C_n or has at least three vertices, namely v_{n+1} and two vertices of C_n . Thus G has no two odd vertex disjoint cycles. For $n = 3$ we have that $\widehat{C_3}$ is the complete graph on the vertex set $\{v_1, \dots, v_4\}$, so $I_{\widehat{C_3}}$ is splittable by Example 2.5. Suppose that $n \geq 5$. Consider a minimal binomial $B_w \in I_G$. For the walk w there are two cases:

- (1) w is a cycle of length 4 with exactly one odd chord. Then B_w is indispensable of I_G by Theorem 2.2.
- (2) w has no chords or bridges and it is of the form $w = (w_1, w_2)$ where w_1, w_2 are odd cycles of length 3 intersecting in exactly one vertex, namely v_{n+1} . By Theorem 2.2 the binomial B_w is indispensable of I_G .

Thus I_G has a unique minimal system of generators.

Let $e = \{v_1, v_2\}$, then there is no cycle of length 4 in G containing the edges e and $\varepsilon_{34} = \{v_3, v_4\}$. Consider the odd cycles $\gamma_1 = (e, \{v_2, v_{n+1}\}, \{v_1, v_{n+1}\})$ and $\gamma_2 = (\varepsilon_{34}, \{v_4, v_{n+1}\}, \{v_3, v_{n+1}\})$ intersecting in v_{n+1} . Let $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$, then B_γ is not a minimal binomial of I_G since there is a bridge $\{v_2, v_3\}$. Thus the edge ε_{34} does not belong to $E(G^e)$. Consider the even cycle $\zeta = (\{v_2, v_3\}, \{v_3, v_4\}, \{v_4, v_{n+1}\}, \{v_2, v_{n+1}\})$, then B_ζ is a minimal binomial of I_G and also $B_\zeta \notin I_{G^e}$. Thus $I_G \neq I_{G^e}$ and therefore I_G is splittable by Theorem 2.8. \square

3. THE COMPLETE GRAPH AND MINIMAL SPLITTINGS

In this section, we study the special case of toric ideals of complete graphs. In contrast to toric ideals of (complete) bipartite graphs which always have a unique minimal set of binomial generators, toric ideals of complete graphs have a huge number of different minimal systems of binomial generators.

Let $n \geq 4$ be an integer and K_n be the complete graph on the vertex set $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ with edges $\{\varepsilon_{ij} | 1 \leq i < j \leq n\}$, where $\varepsilon_{ij} = \{v_i, v_j\}$. By [12, Theorem 3.3] the set

$$T = \{\varepsilon_{ij}\varepsilon_{kl} - \varepsilon_{il}\varepsilon_{jk}, \varepsilon_{ik}\varepsilon_{jl} - \varepsilon_{il}\varepsilon_{jk} | 1 \leq i < j < k < l \leq n\}$$

is a minimal generating set of I_{K_n} . Let $\{\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n\}$ be the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^n . Since T is a minimal generating set of I_{K_n} , the only A_{K_n} -fibers contributing to minimal generators are those consisting of all monomials with A_{K_n} -degree $\mathbf{e}_i + \mathbf{e}_j + \mathbf{e}_k + \mathbf{e}_l$, where $1 \leq i < j < k < l \leq n$. There are $\binom{n}{4}$ such fibers and each one consists of three monomials, namely $\varepsilon_{ij}\varepsilon_{kl}, \varepsilon_{il}\varepsilon_{jk}$ and $\varepsilon_{ik}\varepsilon_{jl}$, which have no common factor other than 1. Therefore to generate the ideal I_{K_n} we need to take any two of the three binomials $\varepsilon_{ij}\varepsilon_{kl} - \varepsilon_{il}\varepsilon_{jk}, \varepsilon_{ik}\varepsilon_{jl} - \varepsilon_{il}\varepsilon_{jk}, \varepsilon_{ij}\varepsilon_{kl} - \varepsilon_{ik}\varepsilon_{jl}$, for every $1 \leq i < j < k < l \leq n$, see [2, 4] for more details. The monomials $\varepsilon_{ij}\varepsilon_{kl}, \varepsilon_{il}\varepsilon_{jk}$ and $\varepsilon_{ik}\varepsilon_{jl}$, where $1 \leq i < j \leq n$, are indispensable monomials, namely each one is a monomial term of at least one binomial in every minimal system of binomial generators of I_{K_n} . Thus every minimal system of binomial generators of I_{K_n} consists of $2\binom{n}{4}$ binomials. By [2, Theorem 2.9] the ideal I_{K_n} has $3\binom{n}{4}$ different minimal systems of binomial generators, which is a huge number even for a small n .

Theorem 3.1. *The toric ideal of K_n is splittable if and only if $n \geq 4$.*

Proof. For $n \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ we have that $I_{K_n} = \{0\}$, so I_{K_n} is not splittable. Suppose that $n \geq 4$. From the analysis above we deduce that

$$S = \{\varepsilon_{ij}\varepsilon_{kl} - \varepsilon_{ik}\varepsilon_{jl}, \varepsilon_{il}\varepsilon_{jk} - \varepsilon_{ik}\varepsilon_{jl} \mid 1 \leq i < j < k < l \leq n\}$$

is a minimal generating set for I_{K_n} . The set S has a nice geometric interpretation, see [3].

Let $G = K_n$ and $e = \varepsilon_{12}$. First we show that the graph G_S^e contains all edges of G , except perhaps the edges ε_{1n} and ε_{23} . Let ε_{ij} be an edge of G where $\{i, j\} \cap \{1, 2\} = \emptyset$ and $3 \leq i < j \leq n$. Since $\{v_1, v_2, v_i, v_j\}$ is a set of vertices of K_n , the binomials $\varepsilon_{12}\varepsilon_{ij} - \varepsilon_{1i}\varepsilon_{2j}$ and $\varepsilon_{i2}\varepsilon_{1j} - \varepsilon_{1i}\varepsilon_{2j}$ belong to S , thus ε_{ij} is an edge of G_S^e . From the above binomials we also deduce that ε_{1i} , for $3 \leq i \leq n-1$, and ε_{2j} , for $4 \leq j \leq n$, are edges of G_S^e . With the possible exception of the edges ε_{1n} and ε_{23} , the graph G_S^e contains all edges of G . Suppose that ε_{1n} is an edge of G_S^e , so there exists a binomial $B \in S$ in four variables which contains the variables ε_{12} and ε_{1n} . Then $B = \varepsilon_{12}\varepsilon_{in} - \varepsilon_{1i}\varepsilon_{2n}$ where $3 \leq i \leq n-1$. But $\{v_1, v_2, v_i, v_n\}$ is a set of vertices of K_n which contributes the binomials $\varepsilon_{12}\varepsilon_{in} - \varepsilon_{1i}\varepsilon_{2n}$ and $\varepsilon_{1n}\varepsilon_{2i} - \varepsilon_{1i}\varepsilon_{2n}$ in S . Thus B does not belong to S , a contradiction. Consequently ε_{1n} is not an edge of G_S^e . Similar arguments show that ε_{23} is not an edge of G_S^e . Since $\varepsilon_{12}\varepsilon_{3n} - \varepsilon_{1n}\varepsilon_{23} \in I_G$ and $\varepsilon_{12}\varepsilon_{3n} - \varepsilon_{1n}\varepsilon_{23} \notin I_{G_S^e}$, we get $I_{G_S^e} \neq I_G$ and therefore $I_G = I_{G_S^e} + I_{G \setminus e}$ is a splitting of I_G by Theorem 2.8. \square

Definition 3.2. Let $I_G = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$ be a splitting of I_G , $S = \{f_1, \dots, f_r\}$ be a minimal system of binomial generators of I_{G_1} and $T = \{g_1, \dots, g_t\}$ be a minimal system of binomial generators of I_{G_2} . We say that the splitting $I_G = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$ is a minimal splitting of I_G if $\{f_1, \dots, f_r, g_1, \dots, g_t\}$ is a minimal system of generators of I_G .

Remark 3.3. (1) The property of being minimal splitting does not depend on the minimal systems of generators chosen in the definition. Suppose that $\{f'_1, \dots, f'_r\}$ is a minimal system of binomial generators of I_{G_1} and $\{g'_1, \dots, g'_t\}$ is a minimal system of binomial generators of I_{G_2} . But $I_G = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$, so $\{f'_1, \dots, f'_r, g'_1, \dots, g'_t\}$ is a generating set of I_G consisting of $r + t$ elements and therefore it is a minimal system of generators.

(2) Let $I_G = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$ be a minimal splitting of I_G . For any $f_i \in S$, $1 \leq i \leq r$, we have that neither f_i nor $-f_i$ belongs to T . For any $g_j \in T$, $1 \leq j \leq t$, we have that neither g_j nor $-g_j$ belongs to S .

(3) All the splittings which appeared in [5, 6] are minimal splittings.

(4) The splitting of I_{G_n} in Example 2.9 is not minimal, since the ideal $I_{G_n \setminus e}$ has a minimal system of generators with $4n + \binom{n}{2} + 2$ binomials, while the ideal $I_{G_n^e}$ has a minimal system of generators with n binomials and the ideal I_{G_n} is generated minimally with $5n + 2$ binomials.

Example 3.4. Let K_4 be the complete graph on the vertex set $\{v_1, \dots, v_4\}$. Let $G_1 = K_4 \setminus \{\varepsilon_{12}, \varepsilon_{34}\}$ and $G_2 = K_4 \setminus \{\varepsilon_{14}, \varepsilon_{23}\}$ be subgraphs of K_4 , then $I_{K_4} = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$ is a minimal splitting of I_{K_4} , since $I_{G_1} = \langle \varepsilon_{13}\varepsilon_{24} - \varepsilon_{14}\varepsilon_{23} \rangle$, $I_{G_2} = \langle \varepsilon_{13}\varepsilon_{24} - \varepsilon_{12}\varepsilon_{34} \rangle$ and $I_{K_4} = \langle \varepsilon_{13}\varepsilon_{24} - \varepsilon_{14}\varepsilon_{23}, \varepsilon_{13}\varepsilon_{24} - \varepsilon_{12}\varepsilon_{34} \rangle$.

We will show that the toric ideal of K_n has no minimal splitting for $n \geq 6$.

Proposition 3.5. Let $n \geq 4$ be an integer and $w = (a, b, c, d)$ be an even cycle of K_n . Then

$$I_{K_n} = I_{K_n \setminus \{a, c\}} + I_{K_n \setminus \{b, d\}}$$

is a splitting of I_{K_n} .

Proof. Since K_n is the complete graph, the cycle w has two chords, namely e and f . Then $ac - ef \in I_{K_n}$ does not belong to $I_{K_n \setminus \{a,c\}}$, thus $I_{K_n \setminus \{a,c\}} \neq I_{K_n}$. Also $I_{K_n \setminus \{b,d\}} \neq I_{K_n}$ since $ef - bd \in I_{K_n}$ does not belong to $I_{K_n \setminus \{b,d\}}$.

It remains to show that $I_{K_n} \subset I_{K_n \setminus \{a,c\}} + I_{K_n \setminus \{b,d\}}$. Let B_γ be a binomial belonging to the set S defined in the proof of Theorem 3.1. Clearly if B_γ belongs to $I_{K_n \setminus \{a,c\}}$ or $I_{K_n \setminus \{b,d\}}$, then B_γ belongs to $I_{K_n \setminus \{a,c\}} + I_{K_n \setminus \{b,d\}}$. Suppose that B_γ does not belong to $I_{K_n \setminus \{a,c\}}$ or $I_{K_n \setminus \{b,d\}}$. Then γ contains at least one edge from the set $\{a,c\}$, say a , and at least one edge from the set $\{b,d\}$, say b . Let $\gamma = (a, b, c', d')$ and e', f' be the chords of the walk γ . Notice that $ac' - e'f'$ belongs to $I_{K_n \setminus \{b,d\}}$ and $bd' - e'f'$ belongs to $I_{K_n \setminus \{a,c\}}$. Thus

$$B_\gamma = ac' - bd' = (ac' - e'f') - (bd' - e'f') \in I_{K_n \setminus \{a,c\}} + I_{K_n \setminus \{b,d\}}.$$

So $I_{K_n} = I_{K_n \setminus \{a,c\}} + I_{K_n \setminus \{b,d\}}$ is a splitting. \square

Remark 3.6. Let $I_A = I_{A_1} + I_{A_2}$ be a splitting of I_A . If there exists a set A'_1 such that $I_{A_1} \subset I_{A'_1} \subsetneq I_A$ then $I_A = I_{A'_1} + I_{A_2}$ is also a splitting. By Proposition 3.5, $I_{K_n} = I_{K_n \setminus \{a,c\}} + I_{K_n \setminus \{b,d\}}$ is a splitting of I_{K_n} , and therefore $I_{K_n} = I_{K_n \setminus a} + I_{K_n \setminus b}$, $I_{K_n} = I_{K_n \setminus \{a,c\}} + I_{K_n \setminus b}$ and $I_{K_n} = I_{K_n \setminus a} + I_{K_n \setminus \{b,d\}}$ are also splittings of I_{K_n} .

Proposition 3.7. Let $n \geq 4$ be an integer and $I_{K_n} = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$ be a splitting of I_{K_n} . If e is an edge of K_n which does not belong to G_1 and f is an edge of K_n which does not belong to G_2 , then the edges e, f are adjacent in K_n . Moreover, if h is another edge of K_n which does not belong to G_2 , then the edges f, h are not adjacent in K_n .

Proof. Suppose that the edges e, f are not adjacent. Let $e = \{v_i, v_j\}$, $f = \{v_k, v_l\}$ and $e \cap f = \emptyset$. Let $\{g_1, \dots, g_r\}$ be a system of binomial generators of I_{G_1} and $\{h_1, \dots, h_s\}$ be a system of binomial generators of I_{G_2} , then $\{g_1, \dots, g_r, h_1, \dots, h_s\}$ is a generating set of I_G . Therefore we can find a minimal system of generators V of I_{K_n} formed by binomials belonging to either I_{G_1} or I_{G_2} . From the introduction of section 3 the monomial $ef = \varepsilon_{ij}\varepsilon_{kl}$ is indispensable of I_{K_n} , so it is a monomial term in a binomial B_w of I_{G_1} or I_{G_2} . Since e is not an edge of G_1 , we have that $B_w \notin I_{G_1}$. But f is not an edge of G_2 , so $B_w \notin I_{G_2}$. Thus B_w does not belong to I_{G_1} or I_{G_2} , a contradiction. Consequently, the edges e, f are adjacent.

Let $e = \varepsilon_{ij}$ and $f = \varepsilon_{jk}$. Suppose that h is another edge of K_n which does not belong to G_2 . Since e does not belong to G_1 , we have, from the first part of the Proposition, that the edges e, h are adjacent. We claim that f and h are not adjacent. Suppose that f, h are adjacent. Since h is adjacent to both e and f , there are two cases for the edge h , namely either $h = \varepsilon_{ik}$ or $h = \varepsilon_{jl}$ for an index l different than i, j, k .

- (1) $h = \varepsilon_{ik}$. Let l be an index different than i, j, k . In a previous step we found that there is a minimal system of generators V formed by binomials belonging to either I_{G_1} or I_{G_2} . Moreover, V must contain exactly two of the following three binomials $\varepsilon_{ij}\varepsilon_{kl} - \varepsilon_{il}\varepsilon_{jk} = e\varepsilon_{kl} - \varepsilon_{il}f$, $\varepsilon_{ik}\varepsilon_{jl} - \varepsilon_{il}\varepsilon_{jk} = h\varepsilon_{jl} - \varepsilon_{il}f$, $\varepsilon_{ij}\varepsilon_{kl} - \varepsilon_{ik}\varepsilon_{jl} = e\varepsilon_{kl} - h\varepsilon_{jl}$. But none of them belongs to I_{G_2} , since $f, h \notin E(G_2)$, while $e\varepsilon_{kl} - \varepsilon_{il}f$ and $e\varepsilon_{kl} - h\varepsilon_{jl}$ do not belong to I_{G_1} , since $e \notin E(G_1)$. A contradiction.
- (2) $h = \varepsilon_{jl}$. We argue similarly as above. The set V must contain two of the following three binomials $e\varepsilon_{kl} - \varepsilon_{il}f$, $\varepsilon_{ik}h - \varepsilon_{il}f$, $e\varepsilon_{kl} - \varepsilon_{ik}h$. But none of them belongs to I_{G_2} , since $f, h \notin E(G_2)$, while $e\varepsilon_{kl} - \varepsilon_{il}f$ and $e\varepsilon_{kl} - \varepsilon_{ik}h$ do not belong to I_{G_1} , since $e \notin E(G_1)$. A contradiction.

Consequently, the edges f, h are not adjacent. \square

Remark 3.8. From Proposition 3.7 we deduce that any of the graphs G_1, G_2 contains all edges of K_n except at most two. Suppose not, and let $e = \varepsilon_{ij} \notin E(G_1)$, $\{f_1, f_2, f_3\} \subset E(K_n)$ such that $f_l \notin E(G_2)$, for every $1 \leq l \leq 3$. By Proposition 3.7, any of the edges f_1, f_2, f_3 is adjacent to $e = \varepsilon_{ij}$, so v_i is a vertex of the edges f_1, f_2, f_3 or v_j is a vertex of the edges f_1, f_2, f_3 . Thus either v_i or v_j is a vertex of at least two of the edges f_1, f_2, f_3 , and therefore two of the edges f_1, f_2, f_3 are adjacent, a contradiction to the second part of Proposition 3.7.

Proposition 3.9. *Let $n \geq 4$ be an integer and $I_{K_n} = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$ be a splitting of I_{K_n} . Then there exists a cycle $w = (a, b, c, d)$ in K_n such that*

- (1) $G_1 = K_n \setminus a$ and $G_2 = K_n \setminus b$ or
- (2) $G_1 = K_n \setminus \{a, c\}$ and $G_2 = K_n \setminus b$ or
- (3) $G_1 = K_n \setminus a$ and $G_2 = K_n \setminus \{b, d\}$ or
- (4) $G_1 = K_n \setminus \{a, c\}$ and $G_2 = K_n \setminus \{b, d\}$.

Proof. Since $I_{G_1} \subsetneq I_{K_n}$, there exists an edge a of K_n such that a is not an edge of G_1 . Thus $I_{G_1} \subset I_{K_n \setminus a}$. Since $I_{G_2} \subsetneq I_{K_n}$, there exists an edge b of K_n such that b is not an edge of G_2 . Thus $I_{G_2} \subset I_{K_n \setminus b}$. By Proposition 3.7, the edges a, b are adjacent. We distinguish the following cases:

- (1) $G_1 = K_n \setminus a$ and $G_2 = K_n \setminus b$. Since a, b are adjacent edges in the complete graph K_n with $n \geq 4$ vertices, there exists a cycle w of length 4 in K_n with two consecutive edges a, b .
- (2) $G_1 \subsetneq K_n \setminus a$ and $G_2 = K_n \setminus b$. In this case, there exists an edge c of $K_n \setminus a$ such that c is not an edge of G_1 . By Proposition 3.7, the edges a, c do not share a common vertex and they are adjacent to b . Furthermore, G_1 contains all edges of K_n except at most two. Thus $G_1 = K_n \setminus \{a, c\}$ and there exists a cycle w of length 4 in K_n with three consecutive edges a, b, c .
- (3) $G_1 = K_n \setminus a$ and $G_2 \subsetneq K_n \setminus b$. In this case, there exists an edge d of $K_n \setminus b$ such that d is not an edge of G_2 . By Proposition 3.7, the edges b, d do not share a common vertex and they are adjacent to a . Moreover, G_2 contains all edges of K_n except at most two. Thus $G_2 = K_n \setminus \{b, d\}$ and there exists a cycle w of length 4 in K_n with three consecutive edges d, a, b .
- (4) $G_1 \subsetneq K_n \setminus a$ and $G_2 \subsetneq K_n \setminus b$. Then there exists an edge c of $K_n \setminus a$ and an edge d of $K_n \setminus b$ such that c is not an edge of G_1 and d is not an edge of G_2 . By Proposition 3.7, the edges a, c do not share a common vertex and they are adjacent to both b, d . Additionally G_1 contains all edges of K_n except at most two. By the same proposition, the edges b, d do not share a common vertex and they are adjacent to both a, c . Furthermore G_2 contains all edges of K_n except at most two. Thus $w = (a, b, c, d)$ is a cycle in K_n , $G_1 = K_n \setminus \{a, c\}$ and $G_2 = K_n \setminus \{b, d\}$. \square

Theorem 3.10. *Let $n \geq 4$ be an integer. Then I_{K_n} has a minimal splitting if and only if $4 \leq n \leq 5$.*

Proof. Suppose first that $n = 4$. Then $I_{K_4} = I_{K_4 \setminus \{\varepsilon_{12}, \varepsilon_{34}\}} + I_{K_4 \setminus \{\varepsilon_{14}, \varepsilon_{23}\}}$ is a minimal splitting of I_{K_4} by Example 3.4. Suppose now that $n = 5$ and let $\{v_1, \dots, v_5\}$ be the vertex set of K_5 . Let $G_1 = K_5 \setminus \{\{v_1, v_2\}, \{v_3, v_4\}\}$ and $G_2 = K_5 \setminus \{\{v_1, v_4\}, \{v_2, v_3\}\}$ be subgraphs of K_5 . Then $S = \{\varepsilon_{13}\varepsilon_{24} - \varepsilon_{14}\varepsilon_{23}, \varepsilon_{14}\varepsilon_{25} - \varepsilon_{15}\varepsilon_{24}, \varepsilon_{23}\varepsilon_{45} - \varepsilon_{24}\varepsilon_{35}, \varepsilon_{13}\varepsilon_{25} - \varepsilon_{15}\varepsilon_{23}, \varepsilon_{13}\varepsilon_{45} - \varepsilon_{14}\varepsilon_{35}\}$ is a minimal generating set of I_{G_1} and $T = \{\varepsilon_{12}\varepsilon_{34} - \varepsilon_{13}\varepsilon_{24}, \varepsilon_{24}\varepsilon_{35} - \varepsilon_{25}\varepsilon_{34}, \varepsilon_{13}\varepsilon_{45} - \varepsilon_{15}\varepsilon_{34}, \varepsilon_{12}\varepsilon_{45} - \varepsilon_{15}\varepsilon_{24}, \varepsilon_{12}\varepsilon_{35} - \varepsilon_{13}\varepsilon_{25}\}$ is a minimal generating set of I_{G_2} . Also for any binomial $B \in S$ we have that neither B nor $-B$ belongs to T , while for any

binomial $B' \in T$ we have that neither B' nor $-B'$ belongs to S . Moreover $S \cup T$ is a minimal generating set of I_{K_5} , and therefore $I_{K_5} = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$ is a minimal splitting of I_{K_5} .

Finally assume that $n \geq 6$ and let $I_{K_n} = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$ be a minimal splitting of I_{K_n} . Then there exists a cycle $w = (a, b, c, d)$ of K_n such that G_1 and G_2 are of one of the four types of Proposition 3.9. Without loss of generality we can assume that $a = \{v_1, v_2\}$, $b = \{v_2, v_3\}$, $c = \{v_3, v_4\}$ and $d = \{v_1, v_4\}$. Since $n \geq 6$, the graph K_n has at least two more vertices, say v_5 and v_6 . Notice that the complete subgraph of K_n on the vertex set $\{v_1, v_3, v_5, v_6\}$ is also a subgraph of both G_1 and G_2 . Let S be a minimal system of binomial generators of I_{G_1} and T be a minimal system of binomial generators of I_{G_2} . Both S and T must contain exactly two of the binomials $\varepsilon_{13}\varepsilon_{56} - \varepsilon_{15}\varepsilon_{36}$, $\varepsilon_{13}\varepsilon_{56} - \varepsilon_{16}\varepsilon_{35}$, $\varepsilon_{15}\varepsilon_{36} - \varepsilon_{16}\varepsilon_{35}$. Thus S and T have at least one minimal generator in common which contradicts the fact that $I_{K_n} = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$ is a minimal splitting of I_{K_n} . Consequently, for $n \geq 6$ the ideal I_{K_n} has no minimal splitting. \square

4. REDUCED SPLITTINGS

In this section, we introduce reduced splittings of toric ideals and show that every minimal splitting of the toric ideal of a graph is also a reduced splitting.

Definition 4.1. *We say that the splitting $I_A = I_{A_1} + I_{A_2}$ of I_A is reduced if for any toric ideals $I_{B_1} \subset I_{A_1}$ and $I_{B_2} \subset I_{A_2}$ with $I_A = I_{B_1} + I_{B_2}$ it holds that $I_{B_1} = I_{A_1}$ and $I_{B_2} = I_{A_2}$.*

A basic step towards determining all splittings of the toric ideal of a graph is to find its reduced splittings. All other splittings are found from a reduced splitting $I_G = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$ by adding edges to one of G_1 , G_2 or both to get graphs G'_1, G'_2 , as long as $I_G = I_{G'_1} + I_{G'_2}$ is a splitting.

Remark 4.2. The reduced splittings of I_{K_n} are those of the last type in Proposition 3.9, namely $I_{K_n} = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$ where $G_1 = K_n \setminus \{a, c\}$ and $G_2 = K_n \setminus \{b, d\}$. The other two types in Proposition 3.9 can be taken from the reduced splittings, by adding edges.

Proposition 4.3. *If I_G is splittable, then it has at least one reduced splitting.*

Proof. Any splitting $I_G = I_{G'_1} + I_{G'_2}$ of I_G is either reduced or there exist a splitting $I_G = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$ such that $I_{G_1} \subset I_{G'_1}$ and $I_{G_2} \subset I_{G'_2}$, where G_1 is a proper subgraph of G'_1 or/and G_2 is a proper subgraph of G'_2 . In the latter case, G_1 has fewer edges than G'_1 or/and G_2 has fewer edges than G'_2 . This procedure cannot be repeated indefinitely, since the number of edges of G is finite. \square

To understand the structure of reduced splittings one has to generalize first the notion of edge splitting by replacing the edge with a set of edges.

Let $S = \{B_{w_1}, B_{w_2}, \dots, B_{w_r}\}$ be a minimal system of binomial generators of I_G . Given a set $F \subset E(G)$, we define $G_S^F = \bigcup_{e \in F} G_S^e$ and get $I_G = I_{G_S^F} + I_{G \setminus F}$, by using similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem 2.4.

Of particular interest is the case that F is the set of all edges of G having a common vertex v . Given a vertex v of G , we let $G - v$ be the subgraph of G obtained by deleting the vertex v . We denote by G_S^v the subgraph of G with edges

$$E(G_S^v) = \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq r \text{ and } v \in V(w_i)} E(w_i).$$

It holds that $I_G = I_{G_S^v} + I_{G-v}$.

The next theorem asserts that the reduced splittings of I_G are always in the form $I_G = I_{G_S^F} + I_{G \setminus F}$, for suitable sets S and F .

Theorem 4.4. *Let $I_G = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$ be a reduced splitting of I_G . Then there exist a set $F \subset E(G)$ and a minimal system of binomial generators S of I_G such that $I_{G_1} = I_{G_S^F}$ and $I_{G_2} = I_{G \setminus F}$.*

Proof. Let $I_G = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$ be a reduced splitting of I_G and set $F = G \setminus G_2$. Let $\{f_1, \dots, f_s\}$ be a system of binomial generators of I_{G_1} , $\{g_1, \dots, g_t\}$ be a system of binomial generators of I_{G_2} and $S = \{B_{w_1}, \dots, B_{w_r}\} \subset \{f_1, \dots, f_s, g_1, \dots, g_t\}$ be a minimal system of binomial generators of I_G as in the proof of Theorem 2.10. Then $G \setminus F = G_2$, so $I_{G \setminus F} = I_{G_2}$, and $I_{G_S^F} \subset I_{G_1}$ since $I_{G_S^e} \subset I_{G_1}$ for each $e \in F$ from the proof of Theorem 2.10. But $I_G = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$ is a reduced splitting of I_G and also $I_G = I_{G_S^F} + I_{G_2}$, since $I_G = I_{G_S^F} + I_{G \setminus F}$ and $I_{G \setminus F} = I_{G_2}$, with $I_{G_S^F} \subset I_{G_1}$, therefore $I_{G_S^F} = I_{G_1}$. \square

Remark 4.5. A reduced splitting $I_G = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$ can be also written in the form $I_G = I_{G \setminus F} + I_{G_S^F}$ where $F = G \setminus G_1$, $I_{G_1} = I_{G \setminus F}$ and $I_{G_2} = I_{G_S^F}$.

Example 4.6. Let G be the bipartite graph consisting of four 4-cycles w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4 in a row, i.e. for $i < j$ it holds that $E(w_i) \cap E(w_j) = \emptyset$ except if $j = i + 1$ in which case they have one edge in common. The ideal I_G has a unique minimal system of binomial generators consisting of the binomials $B_{w_1}, B_{w_2}, B_{w_3}, B_{w_4}$. Then there are 19 different splittings. More precisely, four minimal and reduced splittings in the form $I_G = \langle B_{w_i} \rangle + \langle B_{w_j}, B_{w_k}, B_{w_l} \rangle$, where $\{i, j, k, l\} = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Also three minimal and reduced splittings in the form $I_G = \langle B_{w_i}, B_{w_j} \rangle + \langle B_{w_k}, B_{w_l} \rangle$. Finally twelve non-minimal and non-reduced splittings in the form $I_G = \langle B_{w_i}, B_{w_j} \rangle + \langle B_{w_j}, B_{w_k}, B_{w_l} \rangle$.

The next Theorem asserts that minimal splittings are always reduced.

Theorem 4.7. *Every minimal splitting of I_G is also a reduced splitting.*

Proof. Let $I_G = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$ be a minimal splitting which is not reduced. Then there exist $I_{G'_1} \subset I_{G_1}$ and $I_{G'_2} \subset I_{G_2}$ such that $I_G = I_{G'_1} + I_{G'_2}$, where $I_{G'_1}$ is a proper subset of I_{G_1} or/and $I_{G'_2}$ is a proper subset of I_{G_2} . Suppose that for instance $I_{G'_1}$ is a proper subset of I_{G_1} . Let $\{B_{w_1}, \dots, B_{w_s}\}$ and $\{B_{w_{s+1}}, \dots, B_{w_l}\}$ be minimal systems of binomial generators of the ideals I_{G_1} and I_{G_2} , respectively. Since $I_G = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$ is a minimal splitting, the ideal I_G is minimally generated by the set $\{B_{w_1}, \dots, B_{w_s}, B_{w_{s+1}}, \dots, B_{w_l}\}$. Let $\{f_1, \dots, f_t\}$ be a system of binomial generators of $I_{G'_1}$ then from the equality $I_G = I_{G'_1} + I_{G'_2}$ we have that $I_G = I_{G'_1} + I_{G_2}$, since $G'_2 \subset G_2$. Thus there exists a set $\{B_{w'_1}, \dots, B_{w'_s}\} \subset \{f_1, \dots, f_t\}$ such that $\{B_{w'_1}, \dots, B_{w'_s}, B_{w_{s+1}}, \dots, B_{w_l}\}$ is a minimal system of generators of I_G , since toric ideals of graphs are homogeneous and therefore any two minimal systems of generators have the same cardinality. Then, after reordering $B_{w'_1}, \dots, B_{w'_s}$ if necessary, we can assume that $B_{w'_j} = B_{w_j}$ if B_{w_j} is indispensable, and the binomials $B_{w'_j}, B_{w_j}$ are F_4 -equivalent if B_{w_j} is dispensable, namely B_{w_j} is not indispensable, since dispensability of toric ideals of graphs is only caused by F_4 's. Recall that two primitive walks γ, γ' are F_4 -equivalent if either $\gamma = \gamma'$ or there exists a series of walks $\gamma_1 = \gamma, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_{r-1}, \gamma_r = \gamma'$ such that γ_i and γ_{i+1} differ by an F_4 , where $1 \leq i \leq r-1$, see [10, Section 4]. Since G'_1 is a proper subgraph of G_1 , there exists an edge $e \in E(w_i) \subset E(G_1)$ which is not in $E(G'_1)$, but $e \notin E(w'_i)$ for at least one index $1 \leq i \leq s$. Then B_{w_i} is dispensable, thus w_i, w'_i are F_4 -equivalent and e belongs to a common F_4 of both w_i, w'_i . Suppose that the edges of the F_4 belonging to

w_i are e, f and to w'_i are a, b , thus $F_4 = (e, a, f, b)$. Consider the binomial $ef - ab \in I_G$, we have that all e, f, a, b are edges of G_1 , since $G'_1 \subset G_1$, and therefore $ef - ab \in I_{G_1}$.

We distinguish the following cases.

- (1) $ef - ab$ is an indispensable binomial of I_G . The set $\{B_{w'_1}, \dots, B_{w'_s}, B_{w_{s+1}}, \dots, B_{w_l}\}$ is a minimal system of generators of I_G and $ef - ab$ is indispensable of I_G , so $ef - ab$ is one of the binomials $B_{w'_k}, 1 \leq k \leq s$ or $B_{w_k}, s+1 \leq k \leq l$. But $ef - ab \notin I_{G'_1}$ since e is not an edge of G'_1 , thus $ef - ab = B_{w_k}$ for an index $s+1 \leq k \leq l$. Since the binomial $ef - ab$ is indispensable of I_G , the A_G -fiber of $\deg_{A_G}(ef)$ has only two elements, namely ef and ab , see [2]. Then the A_{G_1} -fiber of $\deg_{A_{G_1}}(ef)$ has at most two elements; in fact, it has exactly two with no common factor other than 1 since $ef - ab \in I_{G_1}$. Thus $ef - ab$ is indispensable of I_{G_1} , and therefore $ef - ab = B_{w_q}$ for an index $1 \leq q \leq s$ a contradiction to the hypothesis that $I_G = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$ is a minimal splitting.
- (2) $ef - ab$ is not an indispensable binomial of I_G . Then there is a binomial $ef - cd$ in I_G . In this case, the A_G -fiber of $\deg_{A_G}(ef)$ corresponds to a subgraph of G homomorphic to K_4 and it consists of exactly three monomials, namely ef , ab , and cd . Every minimal system of generators of I_G should contain exactly two of the binomials $ef - ab, ef - cd, ab - cd$. There are two subcases.
 - (i) Both edges c, d belong to G_1 . Then all binomials $ef - ab, ef - cd, ab - cd$ belong to I_{G_1} , so any minimal system of binomial generators of I_{G_1} should contain exactly two of them. Since $I_G = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$ is a minimal splitting, the ideal I_{G_2} cannot contain any of the above three binomials. But $I_G = I_{G'_1} + I_{G_2}$ is also a splitting of I_G and e is not an edge of G'_1 , therefore only $ab - cd$ can be an element of $I_{G'_1}$. Then $\{B_{w'_1}, \dots, B_{w'_s}, B_{w_{s+1}}, \dots, B_{w_l}\}$ is a minimal generating set of I_G , which contains at most one of the binomials $ef - ab, ef - cd, ab - cd$, a contradiction.
 - (ii) At least one of c, d does not belong to G_1 . Then the binomial $ef - ab$ is indispensable of I_{G_1} , since the A_{G_1} -fiber of $\deg_{A_{G_1}}(ef)$ has only two elements, namely ef and ab , with no common factor other than 1. Thus the set $\{B_{w_1}, \dots, B_{w_s}\}$ contains the binomial $ef - ab$. The set $\{B_{w_1}, \dots, B_{w_s}, B_{w_{s+1}}, \dots, B_{w_l}\}$ is a minimal system of generators of I_G , so $\{B_{w_{s+1}}, \dots, B_{w_l}\}$ contains exactly one of the binomials $ef - cd$ or $ab - cd$ and does not contain $ef - ab$. But $I_G = I_{G'_1} + I_{G_2}$ is a splitting of I_G and none of the binomials $ef - ab, ef - cd, ab - cd$ belongs to $I_{G'_1}$, since e and at least one of c, d does not belong to $E(G'_1)$. Thus the set $\{B_{w_{s+1}}, \dots, B_{w_l}\}$ contains exactly two of the binomials $ef - ab, ef - cd, ab - cd$, a contradiction.

In all cases we reach a contradiction, so every minimal splitting is reduced. \square

Remark 4.8. The converse of Theorem 4.7 is not true. By Theorem 3.10, I_{K_n} does not have a minimal splitting for $n \geq 6$. But from Proposition 3.9 any splitting $I_G = I_{K_n \setminus \{a, c\}} + I_{K_n \setminus \{b, d\}}$ is reduced.

Remark 4.9. In [5, Question 5.2] G. Favacchio, J. Hofscheier, G. Keiper, and A. Van Tuyl pose the following question: Suppose that there exist graphs G, G_1 and G_2 such that $I_G = I_{G_1} + I_{G_2}$. How do the graded Betti numbers of I_G related to those of I_{G_1} and I_{G_2} ? This seems a very difficult question, especially given the existence of examples like the edge splitting in Example 2.9 or the results about the splittings of K_n in section 3.

REFERENCES

- [1] CoCoATeam, CoCoA: A system for doing computations in commutative algebra, available at <http://cocoa.dima.unige.it>.
- [2] H. Charalambous, A. Katsabekis, A. Thoma, Minimal systems of binomial generators and the indispensable complex of a toric ideal, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **135** (2007), 3443-3451.
- [3] J. A. De Loera, B. Sturmfels, R. Thomas, Gröbner bases and triangulations of the second hypersimplex, *Combinatorica* **15** (1995), 409-424.
- [4] M. Drton, B. Sturmfels, S. Sullivant, *Lectures on algebraic statistics*, Oberwolfach Seminars, vol. 39. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2009, viii+171 pp.
- [5] G. Favacchio, J. Hofscheier, G. Keiper, A. Van Tuyl, Splittings of toric ideals, *J. Algebra* **574** (2021), 409-433.
- [6] P. Gimenez, H. Srinivasan, Gluing and splitting of homogeneous toric ideals, *arXiv:2402.17112v1* (2024).
- [7] G. Keiper, Toric Ideals of Finite Simple Graphs, PhD thesis, McMaster University, 2022. <http://hdl.handle.net/11375/27878>
- [8] H. Ohsugi, T. Hibi, Indispensable binomials of finite graphs. *J. Algebra Appl.* **4** (2005), 421-434.
- [9] H. Ohsugi and T. Hibi, Centrally symmetric configurations of integer matrices, *Nagoya Math. J.* **216** (2014), 153-170.
- [10] E. Reyes, C. Tatakis, A. Thoma, Minimal generators of toric ideals of graphs, *Adv. Appl. Math.* **48** (2012), 64-78.
- [11] B. Sturmfels, *Gröbner Bases and Convex Polytopes*, University Lecture Series, vol. 8, MAS, R.I., 1995.
- [12] R. H. Villarreal, *Normality of subrings generated by square free monomials*, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **113** (1996), 91-106.
- [13] R. H. Villarreal, *Monomial Algebras*, 2nd edn. CRC Press, Boca Raton FL, 2015.

ANARGYROS KATSABEKIS, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF IOANNINA, IOANNINA 45110, GREECE

Email address: `katsampekis@uoi.gr`

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

Email address: `athoma@uoi.gr`