

TWO LOWER BOUNDS FOR THE STANLEY DEPTH OF MONOMIAL IDEALS

L. KATTHÄN AND S. A. SEYED FAKHARI

ABSTRACT. Let $J \subsetneq I$ be two monomial ideals of the polynomial ring $S = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. In this paper, we provide two lower bounds for the Stanley depth of I/J . On the one hand, we introduce the notion of lcm number of I/J , denoted by $l(I/J)$, and prove that the inequality $\text{sdepth}(I/J) \geq n - l(I/J) + 1$ hold. On the other hand, we show that $\text{sdepth}(I/J) \geq n - \dim L_{I/J}$, where $\dim L_{I/J}$ denotes the order dimension of the lcm lattice of I/J . We show that I and S/I satisfy Stanley's conjecture, if either the lcm number of I or the order dimension of the lcm lattice of I is small enough. Among other results, we also prove that the Stanley–Reisner ideal of a vertex decomposable simplicial complex satisfies Stanley's conjecture.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let \mathbb{K} be a field and $S = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be the polynomial ring in n variables over the field \mathbb{K} . Let M be a nonzero finitely generated \mathbb{Z}^n -graded S -module. Let $u \in M$ be a homogeneous element and $Z \subseteq \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$. The \mathbb{K} -subspace $u\mathbb{K}[Z]$ generated by all elements uv with $v \in \mathbb{K}[Z]$ is called a *Stanley space* of dimension $|Z|$, if it is a free $\mathbb{K}[Z]$ -module. Here, as usual, $|Z|$ denotes the number of elements of Z . A decomposition \mathcal{D} of M as a finite direct sum of Stanley spaces is called a *Stanley decomposition* of M . The minimum dimension of a Stanley space in \mathcal{D} is called *Stanley depth* of \mathcal{D} and is denoted by $\text{sdepth}(\mathcal{D})$. The quantity

$$\text{sdepth}(M) := \max \{ \text{sdepth}(\mathcal{D}) \mid \mathcal{D} \text{ is a Stanley decomposition of } M \}$$

is called *Stanley depth* of M . Stanley [19] conjectured that

$$\text{depth}(M) \leq \text{sdepth}(M)$$

for all \mathbb{Z}^n -graded S -modules M . For a reader friendly introduction to Stanley decomposition, we refer to [15] and for a nice survey on this topic we refer to [5]. In this paper we prove Stanley's conjecture for some classes of monomial ideals.

Before stating the main results of this paper, we mention that for the monomials $u_1, \dots, u_k \in S$, we denote their least common multiple by $\text{lcm}(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k)$. Also,

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 13C15, 05E99; Secondary: 13C13.

Key words and phrases. Monomial ideal, Stanley depth, lcm number, lcm lattice, Order dimension, Simplicial complex.

The first author was partially supported by the German Research Council DFG-GRK 1916. The second author was in part supported by a grant from IPM (No. 93130422).

for a monomial ideal I , we denote by $G(I)$ the set of minimal monomial generators of I .

Definition 1.1. Let $J \subsetneq I \subseteq S = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be monomial ideals. The *lcm number* of I/J , denoted by $l(I/J)$ is the maximum integer t , for which there exist monomials $u_1, \dots, u_t \in G(I) \cup G(J)$ such that

$$u_1 \neq \text{lcm}(u_1, u_2) \neq \dots \neq \text{lcm}(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_t).$$

Remark 1.2. We mention that the lcm number of monomial ideals was first considered by Terai to determine an upper bound for the arithmetical rank of squarefree monomial ideals (see [11, Corollary 4]).

Let $J \subsetneq I$ be two monomial ideals. In Section 2, we determine lower bounds for the Stanley depth of I/J . More explicit, we prove that $\text{sdepth}(I/J) \geq n - l(I/J) + 1$. This, in particular, implies that

$$\text{sdepth}(I) \geq n - l(I) + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{sdepth}(S/I) \geq n - l(I).$$

Definition 1.3. Let $J \subsetneq I \subseteq S = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be monomial ideals. The *lcm lattice* of I/J , denoted by $L_{I/J}$, is the set of all least common multiples of non-empty subsets of $G(I) \cup G(J)$, ordered by divisibility and augmented with an additional minimal element $\hat{0}$. Moreover, we set $L_I := L_{I/0}$.

Remark 1.4. The lcm-lattice of a monomial ideal was introduced by Gasharov, Peeva and Welker in [3]. Note that the lcm number $l(I/J)$ is *length* of $L_{I/J}$, i.e. one less than the maximal number of elements of a maximal chain in $L_{I/J}$.

Definitions 1.5. (1) Let P and P' be finite posets. An *embedding* is a map $j : P \rightarrow P'$ between two posets such that $p \leq q$ if and only if $j(p) \leq j(q)$ for $p, q \in P$.
 (2) The *order dimension* of a poset, $\dim P$, is the minimal $d \in \mathbb{N}$, such that there exists an embedding $P \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^d$.

Note that an embedding is necessarily injective and monotonic. Even if P and P' are lattices we do not require an embedding to respect the join. We refer the reader to [20] for background information about the dimension of posets.

Let $J \subsetneq I$ be two monomial ideals. In Section 3, we give a lower bound for the Stanley depth of I/J . Namely, we prove that $\text{sdepth}(I/J) \geq n - \dim L_{I/J}$ and that $\text{sdepth}(I) \geq n - \dim L_I + 1$.

Remark 1.6. Both lower bounds for the Stanley depth are known to be bounds for the usual depth, in the case $I = S$. Indeed, let $J \subset S$ be a monomial ideal. By [3] the projective dimension of S/J can be computed from the homology of the order complex of lower intervals in L_J . It is easy to see that the dimension of these order complexes is bound above by the lcm number $l(S/J)$. Hence [3, Theorem 2.1] implies that

$$\text{depth}(S/J) \geq n - l(S/J)$$

Moreover, it follows easily from Theorem 1 of [17] that

$$\text{depth}(S/J) \geq n - \dim L_J.$$

We provide proofs of both bounds on the general case below.

In Section 4, we show that the Stanley–Reisner ideal of a vertex decomposable simplicial complex satisfies Stanley’s conjecture (see Theorem 4.2). Using this result and the above inequalities, we prove that I and S/I satisfy Stanley’s conjecture provided that $l(I) \leq 3$ or $\dim L_I \leq 3$. (see Theorem 4.4).

2. A LOWER BOUND FOR THE STANLEY DEPTH

Let $J \subsetneq I$ be two monomial ideals. In this section, we prove the first main result of this paper. Indeed, in Theorem 2.4, we determine a lower bound for the Stanley depth of I/J . In [18], the author provides linear algebraic lower bounds for the Stanley depth of I and the Stanley depth of S/I , where I is squarefree monomial ideal. The bound which will be proven in Theorem 2.4 is stronger than these mentioned lower bounds, given in [18]. On the other hand, we do not focus on squarefree monomial ideals and consider a general monomial ideal.

To prove the main result, we need a couple of lemmas. The following lemma shows that the lcm number of a monomial ideal does not increase under the colon operation with respect to an arbitrary variable.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $J \subsetneq I$ be two monomial ideals of S . Then for every $1 \leq i \leq n$, we have $l((I : x_i)/(J : x_i)) \leq l(I/J)$.*

Proof. Assume without loss of generality that $i = 1$. We note that

$$(I : x_1) = \left\langle \frac{u}{\gcd(u, x_1)} : u \in G(I) \right\rangle$$

and

$$(J : x_1) = \left\langle \frac{u}{\gcd(u, x_1)} : u \in G(J) \right\rangle,$$

where $\gcd(u, x_1)$ denotes the greatest common divisor of u and x_1 . Set $l((I : x_1)/(J : x_1)) = t$ and suppose that v_1, \dots, v_t are monomials in $G((I : x_1)) \cup G((J : x_1))$ such that

$$v_1 \neq \text{lcm}(v_1, v_2) \neq \dots \neq \text{lcm}(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_t).$$

For every $1 \leq j \leq t$, set $u_j = v_j$, if $v_j \in G(I) \cup G(J)$ and $u_j = x_1 v_j$ if $v_j \notin G(I) \cup G(J)$. It is clear that in both cases $u_j \in G(I) \cup G(J)$. We claim that for every $1 \leq k \leq t - 1$,

$$\text{lcm}(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k) \neq \text{lcm}(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{k+1}).$$

Indeed, if $v_j \in G(I) \cup G(J)$, for every $1 \leq j \leq k$, then $v_j = u_j$, for every $1 \leq j \leq k$ and thus

$$\text{lcm}(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k) = \text{lcm}(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k) \neq \text{lcm}(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{k+1})$$

and since $\text{lcm}(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{k+1})$ divides $\text{lcm}(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{k+1})$, it follows that

$$\text{lcm}(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k) \neq \text{lcm}(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{k+1}).$$

Now assume that $v_j \notin G(I) \cup G(J)$, for some $1 \leq j \leq k$. Then $u_j = x_1 v_j$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \text{lcm}(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k) &= x_1 \text{lcm}(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k) \neq \\ x_1 \text{lcm}(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{k+1}) &= \text{lcm}(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{k+1}). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim and shows that

$$u_1 \neq \text{lcm}(u_1, u_2) \neq \dots \neq \text{lcm}(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_t).$$

Therefore, $l(I) \geq t$. □

In the following lemma, we consider the behavior of the lcm number of monomial ideals under the elimination of a variable. As usual, for every monomial u , the *support* of u , denoted by $\text{Supp}(u)$, is the set of variables which divide u .

Lemma 2.2. *Let $J \subsetneq I$ be two monomial ideals of $S = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, such that*

$$x_1 \in \bigcup_{u \in G(I) \cup G(J)} \text{Supp}(u).$$

Let $S' = \mathbb{K}[x_2, \dots, x_n]$ be the polynomial ring obtained from S by deleting the variable x_1 and consider the ideals $I' = I \cap S'$ and $J' = J \cap S'$. Then $l(I'/J') + 1 \leq l(I/J)$.

Proof. Assume that $l(I'/J') = t$. Suppose that u_1, \dots, u_t are monomials in $G(I') \cup G(J')$ such that

$$u_1 \neq \text{lcm}(u_1, u_2) \neq \dots \neq \text{lcm}(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_t).$$

It is obvious that $u_j \in G(I) \cup G(J)$, for every $1 \leq j \leq t$. By assumption, there exists a monomial, say $u_{t+1} \in G(I) \cup G(J)$, such that x_1 divides u_{t+1} . Since u_1, \dots, u_t do not divide x_1 , it follows that for every $1 \leq j \leq t$, $u_{t+1} \neq u_j$ and

$$u_1 \neq \text{lcm}(u_1, u_2) \neq \dots \neq \text{lcm}(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_t) \neq \text{lcm}(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_t, u_{t+1}).$$

This shows that $l(I/J) \geq t + 1$. □

Remark 2.3. It is completely clear from the proof of the Lemma 2.2, that one can consider any arbitrary variable instead of x_1 .

In the following theorem we determine a lower bound for the Stanley depth of I/J . We believe this bound is known to be a lower bound for depth also. But we did not find a reference and hence for the sake of completeness we provide a proof.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $J \subsetneq I$ be two monomial ideals of $S = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Then $\text{depth}(I/J) \geq n - l(I/J) + 1$ and $\text{sdepth}(I/J) \geq n - l(I/J) + 1$.*

Proof. We prove the assertions by induction on n and

$$\sum_{u \in G(I) \cup G(J)} \text{deg}(u).$$

The assertion can be checked easily, when $n = 1$ or

$$\sum_{u \in G(I) \cup G(J)} \text{deg}(u) = 1.$$

We now assume that $n \geq 2$ and

$$\sum_{u \in G(I) \cup G(J)} \deg(u) \geq 2.$$

Let $S' = \mathbb{K}[x_2, \dots, x_n]$ be the polynomial ring obtained from S by deleting the variable x_1 and consider the ideals $I' = I \cap S'$, $J' = J \cap S'$, $I'' = (I : x_1)$ and $J'' = (J : x_1)$. If

$$x_1 \notin \bigcup_{u \in G(I) \cup G(J)} \text{Supp}(u),$$

then trivially $\text{depth}(I/J) = \text{depth}_{S'}(I'/J') + 1$ and by [8, Lemma 3.6], we conclude that $\text{sdepth}(I/J) = \text{sdepth}_{S'}(I'/J') + 1$. On the other hand it is clear that $l(I/J) = l(I'/J')$. Therefore, using the induction hypothesis on n we conclude that $\text{depth}(I/J) \geq n - l(I/J) + 1$ and $\text{sdepth}(I/J) \geq n - l(I/J) + 1$. Therefore, we may assume that

$$x_1 \in \bigcup_{u \in G(I) \cup G(J)} \text{Supp}(u).$$

Now $I/J = (I'S'/J'S') \oplus x_1(I''S'/J''S)$ and therefore by definition of the Stanley depth we have

$$(1) \quad \text{sdepth}(I/J) \geq \min\{\text{sdepth}_{S'}(I'S'/J'S), \text{sdepth}_S(I''/J'')\},$$

On the other hand, by applying the depth lemma on the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow I''/J'' \xrightarrow{x_1} I/J \longrightarrow I/(x_1I'' + J) \longrightarrow 0$$

we conclude that

$$(2) \quad \text{depth}(I/J) \geq \min\{\text{depth}_S(I''/J''), \text{depth}_S(I/(x_1I'' + J))\}.$$

We note that every $I'S'/J'S'$ -regular sequence in S' is also a regular sequence for $I/(x_1I'' + J)$. This shows that $\text{depth}_S(I/(x_1I'' + J)) \geq \text{sdepth}_{S'}(I'S'/J'S)$. Hence it follows from inequality (2) that

$$(3) \quad \text{sdepth}(I/J) \geq \min\{\text{sdepth}_{S'}(I'S'/J'S), \text{sdepth}_S(I''/J'')\},$$

Using Lemma 2.1 we conclude that that $l(I''/J'') \leq l(I/J)$. Hence our induction hypothesis on

$$\sum_{u \in G(I) \cup G(J)} \deg(u)$$

implies that

$$\text{sdepth}_S(I''/J'') \geq n - l(I''/J'') + 1 \geq n - l(I) + 1$$

and similarly $\text{depth}_S(I''/J'') \geq n - l(I) + 1$.

On the other hand, since

$$x_1 \in \bigcup_{u \in G(I) \cup G(J)} \text{Supp}(u),$$

using Lemma 2.2 we conclude that $l(I'S'/J'S) \leq l(I/J) - 1$ and therefore by the induction hypothesis on n we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sdepth}_{S'}(I'S'/J'S) &\geq (n-1) - l(I'S'/J'S) + 1 \geq (n-1) - (l(I/J) - 1) + 1 \\ &= n - l(I/J) + 1 \end{aligned}$$

and similarly $\text{depth}_{S'}(I'S'/J'S) \geq n - l(I/J) + 1$. Now the assertions follow from inequalities (1) and (3). \square

As an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.4 we obtain the following result.

Corollary 2.5. *Let I be a monomial ideal of $S = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Then $\text{sdepth}(I) \geq n - l(I) + 1$ and $\text{sdepth}(S/I) \geq n - l(I)$.*

For every vector $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ of non-negative integers, we denote the monomial $x_1^{a_1} \dots x_n^{a_n}$ by $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}}$. Let $I \subseteq S$ be a monomial ideal and $G(I) = \{\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}_1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}_m}\}$ be the set of minimal monomial generators of I . The *rank* of I , denoted by $\text{rank}(I)$ is the cardinality of the largest \mathbb{Q} -linearly independent subset of $\{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m\}$, where \mathbb{Q} is the set of rational numbers. In [18], the author proves that for every squarefree monomial ideal of S the inequalities $\text{sdepth}(I) \geq n - \text{rank}(I) + 1$ and $\text{sdepth}(S/I) \geq n - \text{rank}(I)$ hold. We note that Corollary 2.5 implies this result.

Corollary 2.6. ([18, Theorem 3.3]) *Let I be a squarefree monomial ideal of $S = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Then $\text{sdepth}(I) \geq n - \text{rank}(I) + 1$ and $\text{sdepth}(S/I) \geq n - \text{rank}(I)$.*

Proof. Assume that $l(I) = t$. Suppose that u_1, \dots, u_t are monomials in the set of minimal monomial generators of I such that

$$(*) \quad u_1 \neq \text{lcm}(u_1, u_2) \neq \dots \neq \text{lcm}(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_t).$$

Since u_1, \dots, u_t are squarefree, inequalities $(*)$ imply that

$$\text{Supp}(u_1) \subsetneq \bigcup_{i=1}^2 \text{Supp}(u_i) \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \bigcup_{i=1}^t \text{Supp}(u_i).$$

This shows that u_1, \dots, u_t are \mathbb{Q} -linearly independent and thus $\text{rank}(I) \geq t$. Now Corollary 2.5 completes the proof. \square

Let I be a monomial ideal and assume that $G(I)$ is the set of minimal monomial generators of I . The *initial degree* of I , denote by $\text{indeg}(I)$ is the minimum degree of the monomials belonging to $G(I)$. The following proposition provides an upper bound for the lcm number of a squarefree monomial ideal in terms of its initial degree.

Proposition 2.7. *Let I be a squarefree monomial ideal of $S = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Then $l(I) \leq n - \text{indeg}(I) + 1$.*

Proof. Similar to the proof of Corollary 2.6, one can see that if u_1, \dots, u_t are monomials in the set of minimal monomial generators of I such that

$$u_1 \neq \text{lcm}(u_1, u_2) \neq \dots \neq \text{lcm}(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_t),$$

then

$$(**) \quad \text{Supp}(u_1) \subsetneq \bigcup_{i=1}^2 \text{Supp}(u_i) \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \bigcup_{i=1}^t \text{Supp}(u_i).$$

Since u_1, \dots, u_t are squarefree monomials, the cardinality of $\text{Supp}(u_1)$ is greater than or equal to $\text{indeg}(I)$. On the other hand, the cardinality of $\bigcup_{i=1}^t \text{Supp}(u_i)$ is at most n . Hence, the inclusions $(**)$ show that

$$l(I) \leq \left| \bigcup_{i=1}^t \text{Supp}(u_i) \right| - |\text{Supp}(u_1)| + 1 \leq n - \text{indeg}(I) + 1.$$

□

The following corollary is an immediate consequence of Corollary 2.5 and Corollary 2.7.

Corollary 2.8. *Let I be a squarefree monomial ideal of $S = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Then $\text{sdepth}(I) \geq \text{indeg}(I)$ and $\text{sdepth}(S/I) \geq \text{indeg}(I) - 1$.*

Remark 2.9. Let I be a squarefree monomial ideal. We mention that the inequality $\text{sdepth}(I) \geq \text{indeg}(I)$ was known by [8, Proposition 3.1].

Let I be a monomial ideal of $S = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and $G(I)$ be the set of minimal monomial generators of I . Assume that $|G(I)| = m$. Cimpoeaş [2] proves that $\text{sdepth}(S/I) \geq n - m$ (see [2, Proposition 1.2]). It is completely clear that the bound given in Corollary 2.5 for the Stanley depth of S/I is better than the bound given by Cimpoeaş. Indeed, there are examples (see Example 2.10), for which $m - l(I)$ is large enough and the inequality $\text{sdepth}(S/I) \geq n - l(I)$ is sharp for them, i.e., $\text{sdepth}(S/I) = n - l(I)$.

Example 2.10. Let

$$I = (x_i x_j : 1 \leq i < j \leq n)$$

be a monomial ideal of $S = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Then $l(I) = n - 1$ and thus

$$m - l(I) = \frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{2},$$

where m is the cardinality of the set of minimal monomial generators of I . This shows that by choosing a suitable n , the number $m - l(I)$ can be larger than any given integer. On the other hand, the height of every associated prime of I is equal to $n - 1$. Thus, it follows from [8, Proposition 1.3] and Corollary 2.5 that $\text{sdepth}(S/I) = 1 = n - l(I)$.

3. STANLEY DEPTH AND ORDER DIMENSION

In this section, we give the proof of our second main result. Let us recall some definitions of lattice theory. For a comprehensive treatment of this subject we refer the reader to [4]. Recall that a join-semilattice is a poset in which every two elements have a least upper bound, called their join. We call a subset L' of a finite join-semilattice L a *join-subsemilattice* if it is a join-semilattice with the induced join-operation from L . It is well-known that every finite join-semilattice with a minimal

element is in fact a lattice. However, as we will never consider the meet, it is more convenient to work in the category of join-semilattices. An element $m \in L$ is called *join-irreducible* if it cannot be written as the join of two elements different from m . Note that every element m in a finite join-semilattice is the join of the set of all join-irreducible elements less than or equal to m .

The following is a convenient characterization of the dimension of a finite join-semilattice.

Lemma 3.1. *Let L be a finite join-semilattice and let $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) *There exists a surjective join-preserving map $\phi : L' \rightarrow L$ for a finite join-subsemilattice L' of \mathbb{N}^d .*
- (2) $\dim L \leq d$.

Proof. 1) \Rightarrow 2): Consider the map $\phi^\dagger : L \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^d$ defined by $\phi^\dagger(a) := \bigvee \phi^{-1}(a)$. It is an embedding of L into \mathbb{N}^d by [10, Lemma 4.1], hence $\dim L \leq d$.

2) \Rightarrow 1): Let $j : L \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^d$ be an embedding and set $L' \subset \mathbb{N}^d$ to be the join-subsemilattice of \mathbb{N}^d generated by the image of j , i.e. the set of all joins of subsets of the image of L . Define $\phi : L' \rightarrow L$ by $\phi(x') := \bigvee \{x \in L : j(x) \leq x'\}$. This map is clearly monotonic. Moreover, monotonicity implies that $j(x \vee y) \geq j(x) \vee j(y)$ and $\phi(x' \vee y') \geq \phi(x') \vee \phi(y')$. So it remains to show that ϕ is surjective and that $\phi(x' \vee y') \leq \phi(x') \vee \phi(y')$ for $x', y' \in L'$.

For the first claim, we show that $\phi \circ j = Id_L$. Indeed,

$$\phi(j(x)) = \bigvee \{y \in L : j(y) \leq j(x)\} = \bigvee \{y \in L : y \leq x\} = x$$

for every $x \in L$. Moreover, we claim that for every $x' \in L'$ we have

$$(\dagger) \quad j(\phi(x')) \geq x'.$$

To see this we compute

$$\begin{aligned} j(\phi(x')) &= j\left(\bigvee \{y \in L : j(y) \leq x'\}\right) \geq \bigvee \{j(y) : y \in L, j(y) \leq x'\} \\ &\geq \bigvee \{y' \in L' : y' \text{ join-irreducible, } y' \leq x'\} = x' \end{aligned}$$

Here we used that j is surjective onto the join-irreducible elements of L' . Now \dagger implies that

$$x' \vee y' \leq x' \vee j(\phi(y')) \leq j(\phi(x')) \vee j(\phi(y'))$$

and thus

$$\phi(x' \vee y') \leq \phi(j(\phi(x')) \vee j(\phi(y'))) \leq \phi(j(\phi(x') \vee \phi(y'))) = \phi(x') \vee \phi(y').$$

□

Theorem 3.2. *Let $J \subsetneq I \subset S$ be two monomial ideals. Then*

$$\text{sdepth}_S(I/J) \geq n - \dim L_{I/J}$$

and

$$\text{sdepth}_S(I) \geq n - \dim L_I + 1.$$

Proof. Let $d := \dim L_{I/J}$. Consider the join-semilattice $L' \subset \mathbb{N}^d$ of the preceding lemma and the corresponding surjective join-preserving map $\phi : L' \rightarrow L_{I/J}$. Let moreover $L'' \subset L'$ be the join-subsemilattice corresponding to L_J , i.e. the join-subsemilattice generated by the images of L_J in \mathbb{N}^d . By construction ϕ maps L'' onto L_J . We interpret the elements of L' as exponent vectors to see that L' and L'' are lcm lattices of I'/J' and J' , for two monomial ideals $J' \subsetneq I' \subset S' = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_d]$ in d variables. Now it follows from [10, Theorem 4.9] that $n - \text{sdepth}_S(I/J) \leq d - \text{sdepth}_{S'}(I'/J') \leq d$ and thus

$$\text{sdepth}_S(I/J) \geq n - d.$$

Moreover, by the same argument $n - \text{sdepth}_S(I) \leq d - \text{sdepth}_{S'}(I') \leq d - 1$ and hence

$$\text{sdepth}_S(I) \geq n - d + 1.$$

□

Remark 3.3. It also holds that

$$\text{depth}_S(I/J) \geq n - \dim L_{I/J}$$

and

$$\text{depth}_S(I) \geq n - \dim L_I + 1.$$

This is proven by the same argument, using [10, Theorem 4.11] instead of [10, Theorem 4.9].

We present two examples to show that in general there is no inequality between the lcm number of I and the order dimension of L_I .

Examples 3.4. (1) Consider the ideal $I = (x^2, xy, y^2) \subset S = \mathbb{K}[x, y, z]$. It is easy to see that $l(I) = 3$, so Theorem 2.5 gives the bound $\text{sdepth}_S S/I \geq 3 - 3 = 0$. On the other hand, $\dim L_I = 2$ (the exponent vectors give an embedding into \mathbb{N}^2), so Theorem 3.2 gives the better bound $\text{sdepth}_S S/I \geq 3 - 2 = 1$.

(2) Let $I \subset S = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_5]$ be the ideal generated by all squarefree monomials of degree 3. Again, we have that $l(I) = 3$, so Theorem 2.5 gives the bound $\text{sdepth}_S S/I \geq 5 - 3 = 2$. We computationally verified that $\dim L_I = 4$, so in this case Theorem 3.2 gives the worse bound $\text{sdepth}_S S/I \geq 5 - 4 = 1$.

4. MONOMIAL IDEALS WITH SMALL LCM NUMBER AND ORDER DIMENSION

In this section, we prove that the Stanley–Reisner ideal of a vertex decomposable simplicial complex satisfies Stanley’s Conjecture (see Theorem 4.2). Using this result, Corollary 2.5 and Theorem 3.2, we prove that I and S/I satisfy Stanley’s conjecture if

- (i) $l(I) \leq 3$ or
- (ii) $\dim L_I \leq 3$ or

- (iii) $l(I) \leq 4$ and S/I is Gorenstein or
- (iv) $\dim L_I \leq 4$ and S/I is Gorenstein.

To state and prove the next results, we need to introduce some notation and well-known facts from combinatorial commutative algebra.

A *simplicial complex* Δ on the set of vertices $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$ is a collection of subsets of $[n]$ which is closed under taking subsets; that is, if $F \in \Delta$ and $F' \subseteq F$, then also $F' \in \Delta$. Every element $F \in \Delta$ is called a *face* of Δ , the *size* of a face F is defined to be $|F|$ and its *dimension* is defined to be $|F| - 1$. (As usual, for a given finite set X , the number of elements of X is denoted by $|X|$.) The *dimension* of Δ which is denoted by $\dim \Delta$, is defined to be $d - 1$, where $d = \max\{|F| \mid F \in \Delta\}$. A *facet* of Δ is a maximal face of Δ with respect to inclusion. Let $\mathcal{F}(\Delta)$ denote the set of facets of Δ . It is clear that $\mathcal{F}(\Delta)$ determines Δ . When $\mathcal{F}(\Delta) = \{F_1, \dots, F_m\}$, we write $\Delta = \langle F_1, \dots, F_m \rangle$. We say that Δ is *pure* if all facets of Δ have the same cardinality. The *link* of Δ with respect to a face $F \in \Delta$, denoted by $\text{lk}_\Delta(F)$, is the simplicial complex $\text{lk}_\Delta(F) = \{G \subseteq [n] \setminus F \mid G \cup F \in \Delta\}$ and the *deletion* of F , denoted by $\text{del}_\Delta(F)$, is the simplicial complex $\text{del}_\Delta(F) = \{G \subseteq [n] \setminus F \mid G \in \Delta\}$. When $F = \{x\}$ is a single vertex, we abuse notation and write $\text{lk}_\Delta(x)$ and $\text{del}_\Delta(x)$.

Let $S = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and let Δ be a simplicial complex on $[n]$. For every subset $F \subseteq [n]$, we set $x_F = \prod_{i \in F} x_i$. The *Stanley–Reisner ideal of Δ over \mathbb{K}* is the ideal I_Δ of S which is generated by those squarefree monomials x_F with $F \notin \Delta$. In other words, $I_\Delta = \langle x_F \mid F \in \mathcal{N}(\Delta) \rangle$, where $\mathcal{N}(\Delta)$ denotes the set of minimal nonfaces of Δ with respect to inclusion. The *Stanley–Reisner ring of Δ over \mathbb{K}* , denoted by $\mathbb{K}[\Delta]$, is defined to be $\mathbb{K}[\Delta] = S/I_\Delta$. Let $I \subseteq S$ be an arbitrary squarefree monomial ideal. Then there is a unique simplicial complex Δ such that $I = I_\Delta$. A simplicial complex Δ is said to be *Cohen–Macaulay* if $\mathbb{K}[\Delta]$ is Cohen–Macaulay. For every integer $0 \leq i \leq \dim \Delta$ the simplicial complex $\Delta^{[i]} := \langle F \in \Delta \mid \dim F = i \rangle$ is called the *i -pure skeleton* of Δ . A simplicial complex Δ is said to be *sequentially Cohen–Macaulay* if $\Delta^{[i]}$ is Cohen–Macaulay, for every $0 \leq i \leq \dim \Delta$.

Let Δ be a simplicial complex on the vertex set $[n]$. Then we say that Δ is *vertex decomposable* if either

- (1) Δ is a simplex, i.e., a simplicial complex with only one facet or
- (2) there exists $k \in [n]$ such that $\text{del}_\Delta(k)$ and $\text{lk}_\Delta(k)$ are vertex decomposable and every facet of $\text{del}_\Delta(k)$ is a facet of Δ .

It is known that every vertex decomposable simplicial complex is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay (see for example [21]).

Remark 4.1. It follows from [13, Corollary 3.33] that for every vertex decomposable simplicial complex Δ , we have

$$\text{depth}(\mathbb{K}[\Delta]) = \min\{|F| \mid F \text{ is a facet of } \Delta\}.$$

In the next theorem, we prove that the Stanley–Reisner ideal of vertex decomposable simplicial complexes satisfy Stanley’s conjecture.

Theorem 4.2. *Let Δ be a vertex decomposable simplicial complex. Then I_Δ satisfies Stanley's conjecture.*

Proof. We prove the assertion by induction on n . If Δ is a simplex, then $I_\Delta = 0$ and there is nothing to prove. Thus, assume that Δ is not a simplex. Therefore, there exists a vertex $k \in [n]$ such that $\text{del}_\Delta(k)$ and $\text{lk}_\Delta(k)$ are vertex decomposable and every facet of $\text{del}_\Delta(k)$ is a facet of Δ . Let $S' = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n]$ be the polynomial ring obtained from S by deleting the variable x_k and consider the ideals $I' = I \cap S'$ and $I'' = (I : x_k)$. Now $I = I'S' \oplus x_k I''S$ and therefore by definition of the Stanley depth we have

$$(\ddagger) \quad \text{sdepth}(I) \geq \min\{\text{sdepth}_{S'}(I'S'), \text{sdepth}_S(I'')\}.$$

Note that $I'' = (I : x_k)$ is the Stanley–Reisner ideal of $\text{lk}_\Delta(k)$, considered as a simplicial complex on $[n] \setminus \{k\}$. Since $\text{lk}_\Delta(k)$ is a vertex decomposable simplicial complex, it follows from [8, Lemma 3.6], Remark 4.1 and the induction hypothesis that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sdepth}_S(I'') &= \text{sdepth}_{S'}(I'') + 1 \geq \text{depth}_{S'}(I'') + 1 \\ &\geq (\text{depth}_S(I) - 1) + 1 = \text{depth}_S(I). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, $I' = I \cap S'$ is the Stanley–Reisner ideal of $\text{del}_\Delta(k)$, considered as a simplicial complex on $[n] \setminus \{k\}$. Since $\text{del}_\Delta(k)$ is a vertex decomposable simplicial complex, it follows from Remark 4.1 and the induction hypothesis that

$$\text{sdepth}_{S'}(I'S') \geq \text{depth}_{S'}(I'S') \geq \text{depth}_S(I).$$

Now inequality (\ddagger) completes the proof. \square

Let I be a monomial ideal. In [7], the authors prove that S/I satisfies Stanley's conjecture, provided that $\text{depth}(S/I) \geq n - 1$ (see [7, Corollary 2.3]). The following lemma is an extension of this result.

Lemma 4.3. *Let I be a monomial ideal of $S = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and assume that $\text{depth}(S/I) \geq n - 2$. Then I and S/I satisfy Stanley's conjecture.*

Proof. We use induction on $\sum_{u \in G(I)} \deg(u)$, where $G(I)$ is the set of minimal monomial generators of I . If

$$\sum_{u \in G(I)} \deg(u) = 1,$$

then I is a principal ideal. Therefore, it follows from [16, Theorem 1.1] that $\text{sdepth}(S/I) = n - 1$. On the other hand, it is clear that $\text{sdepth}(I) = n$. Thus, I and S/I satisfy Stanley's conjecture. Now, we consider the following cases.

Case 1. $\dim(S/I) = \text{depth}(S/I) = n - 2$. In this case S/I is Cohen–Macaulay and the height of I is equal to 2. Thus S/I satisfies Stanley's conjecture by [7, Proposition 2.4]. To prove that I satisfies Stanley's conjecture, let I^p denote the polarization of I which is considered in a new polynomial ring, say T (see [6] for the definition of polarization). Then by [6, Corollary 1.6.3], we conclude that T/I^p is Cohen–Macaulay and the height of I^p is equal to 2. It follows from [1, Theorem 2.3] (see also [12]) that I^p is

the Stanley–Reisner ideal of a vertex decomposable simplicial complex and therefore, I^p satisfies Stanley’s conjecture by Theorem 4.2. Now [9, Corollary 4.5] implies that I satisfies Stanley’s conjecture.

Case 2. $\dim(S/I) = \text{depth}(S/I) = n - 1$. In this case, the height of every associated prime of I is equal to one. Thus, I is a principal ideal. Therefore, it follows from [16, Theorem 1.1] that $\text{sdepth}(S/I) = n - 1$. On the other hand, it is clear that $\text{sdepth}(I) = n$. Thus, I and S/I satisfy Stanley’s conjecture.

Case 3. $\dim(S/I) = n - 1$ and $\text{depth}(S/I) = n - 2$. In this case, the height of at least one of the associated primes of I is equal to one. Hence, there exists a variable, say x_k , such that $I \subset (x_k)$. Thus, $I = x_k(I : x_k)$. This shows that I and $(I : x_k)$ are isomorphic (as \mathbb{Z}^n -graded S -module). Thus $\text{depth}(I) = \text{depth}((I : x_k))$, which implies that $\text{depth}(S/I) = \text{depth}(S/(I : x_k))$. On the other hand, it follows from [2, Theorem 1.1] that $\text{sdepth}(I) = \text{sdepth}((I : x_k))$ and $\text{sdepth}(S/I) = \text{sdepth}(S/(I : x_k))$. Hence, the induction hypothesis implies

$$\text{sdepth}(I) = \text{sdepth}((I : x_k)) \geq \text{depth}((I : x_k)) = \text{depth}(I).$$

Similarly, $\text{sdepth}(S/I) \geq \text{depth}(S/I)$. Therefore, I and S/I satisfy Stanley’s conjecture. □

Let I be a monomial ideal. In the following theorem, we prove that I and S/I satisfies Stanley’s conjecture, if the lcm number of I or the order dimension of L_I is small.

Theorem 4.4. *Let I be a monomial ideal of $S = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. If $l(I) \leq 3$ or $\dim L_I \leq 3$ holds, then I and S/I satisfy Stanley’s conjecture.*

Proof. It follows from Corollary 2.5 resp. Theorem 3.2 that $\text{sdepth}(S/I) \geq n - 3$ and $\text{sdepth}(I) \geq n - 2$. This implies that if $\text{depth}(S/I) \leq n - 3$, then I and S/I satisfy Stanley’s conjecture. Otherwise, the assertions follow from Lemma 4.3. □

In the following corollary, we consider the Gorenstein monomial ideals with lcm number or order dimension at most four.

Corollary 4.5. *Let I be a monomial ideal of $S = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ such that S/I is Gorenstein. If $l(I) \leq 4$ or $\dim L_I \leq 4$, then I and S/I satisfy Stanley’s conjecture.*

Proof. By Corollary 2.5 resp. Theorem 3.2, we conclude that $\text{sdepth}(S/I) \geq n - 4$ and $\text{sdepth}(I) \geq n - 3$. Thus, there is nothing to prove, if $\text{depth}(S/I) \leq n - 4$. If $\text{depth}(S/I) \geq n - 2$, then the assertions follow from Lemma 4.3. Thus, we assume that $\text{depth}(S/I) = n - 3$. In this case, the height of I is equal to 3 and it follows from [7, Theorem 3.1] that S/I satisfies Stanley’s conjecture. In order to prove that I satisfies Stanley’s conjecture, we use the machinery of Polarization. Let I^p denote the polarization of I which is considered in a new polynomial ring, say T . Then by [6,

Corollary 1.6.3], we conclude that T/I^p is Gorenstein and the height of I^p is equal to 3. Using [1, Theorem 2.5], we conclude that I is the Stanley–Reisner ideal of a vertex decomposable simplicial complex and therefore, I^p satisfies Stanley’s conjecture by Theorem 4.2. Now [9, Corollary 4.5] implies that I satisfies Stanley’s conjecture. \square

As an immediate consequence of Proposition 2.7, Theorem 4.4 and Corollary 4.5 we obtain the following result.

Corollary 4.6. *Let I be a squarefree monomial ideal of $S = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Then I and S/I satisfy Stanley’s conjecture if*

- (i) $\text{indeg}(I) \geq n - 2$ or
- (ii) S/I is Gorenstein and $\text{indeg}(I) \geq n - 3$

A simplicial complex Δ is called *doubly Cohen–Macaulay* if Δ is Cohen–Macaulay and for every vertex x of Δ , the simplicial complex $\text{del}_\Delta(x)$ is Cohen–Macaulay of the same dimension as Δ . The following corollary shows that I_Δ and S/I_Δ satisfy Stanley’s conjecture if Δ is a doubly Cohen–Macaulay simplicial complex and the initial degree of I_Δ is large enough.

Corollary 4.7. *Let I be the Stanley–Reisner ideal of a doubly Cohen–Macaulay simplicial complex and assume that $\text{indeg}(I_\Delta) \geq n - 3$. Then I and S/I satisfy Stanley’s conjecture.*

Proof. By Corollary 2.5, we conclude that $\text{sdepth}(S/I) \geq n - 4$ and $\text{sdepth}(I) \geq n - 3$. Thus, the assertion is true, if $\text{depth}(S/I) \leq n - 4$. If $\text{depth}(S/I) = n - 3$, then the height of I is equal to 3. In this case, S/I satisfies Stanley’s conjecture by [14, Theorem 4.2]. On the other hand, it follows from [1, Theorem 2.13] that I is the Stanley–Reisner ideal of a vertex decomposable simplicial complex and therefore, I satisfies Stanley’s conjecture by Theorem 4.2. The remaining case ($\text{depth}(S/I) \geq n - 2$) follows from Lemma 4.3. \square

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors wish to thank Christian Bey for pointing out the reference [17] to us.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. M. Ajdani, A. Soleyman Jahan, vertex decomposability of 2–CM and Gorenstein simplicial complexes of codimension 3, *Bull. Malays. Math. Sci. Soc.*, to appear.
- [2] M. Cimpoeaş, Stanley depth of monomial ideals with small number of generators, *Central European Journal of Mathematics*, **7** (2009), 629–634.
- [3] V. Gasharov, I. Peeva, V. Welker, The lcm-lattice in monomial resolutions, *Math. Res. Lett.* **6** (1999), no. 5-6, 521–532.
- [4] G. Grätzer, *Lattice Theory: Foundation*, Birkhäuser-Verlag, 2011.
- [5] J. Herzog, A survey on Stanley depth. In ”Monomial Ideals, Computations and Applications”, A. Bigatti, P. Giménez, E. Sáenz-de-Cabezón (Eds.), Proceedings of MONICA 2011. Lecture Notes in Math. **2083**, Springer (2013).
- [6] J. Herzog, T. Hibi, *Monomial Ideals*, Springer-Verlag, 2011.

- [7] J. Herzog, A. Soleyman Jahan, S. Yassemi, Stanley decompositions and partitionable simplicial complexes, *J. Algebraic Combin.* **27** (2008), 113–125.
- [8] J. Herzog, M. Vladioiu, X. Zheng, How to compute the Stanley depth of a monomial ideal, *J. Algebra* **322** (2009), no. 9, 3151–3169.
- [9] B. Ichim, L. Katthän, J. J. Moyano–Fernández, The behavior of Stanley depth under polarization, preprint.
- [10] B. Ichim, L. Katthän, J. J. Moyano–Fernández, The behavior of depth and Stanley depth under maps of the lcm-lattice, preprint.
- [11] K. Kimura, Lyubeznik resolutions and the arithmetical rank of monomial ideals, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **137** (2009), 3627–3635.
- [12] F. Mohammadi, Powers of the vertex cover ideal of a chordal graph, *Comm. Algebra* **39** (2011), 3753–3764.
- [13] S. Morey, R. H. Villarreal, Edge ideals: Algebraic and combinatorial properties, Francisco, Christopher (ed.) et al., *Progress in commutative algebra 1. Combinatorics and Homology*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. De Gruyter Proceedings in Mathematics, 85–126 (2012)
- [14] U. Nagel, T. Römer, Glicci simplicial complexes, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **212** (2008), 2250–2258.
- [15] M. R. Pournaki, S. A. Seyed Fakhari, M. Tousi, S. Yassemi, What is . . . Stanley depth? *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.* **56** (2009), no. 9, 1106–1108.
- [16] A. Rauf, Stanley decompositions, pretty clean filtrations and reductions modulo regular elements, *Bull. Math. Soc. Sci. Math. Roumanie (N.S.)* **50(98)** (2007), no. 4, 347–354.
- [17] V. Reiner, V. Welker, A homological lower bound for order dimension of lattices, *Order* **16** (1999) no. 2, 165–170.
- [18] S. A. Seyed Fakhari, Stanley depth of weakly polymatroidal ideals and squarefree monomial ideals, *Illinois J. Math.*, to appear.
- [19] R. P. Stanley, Linear Diophantine equations and local cohomology, *Invent. Math.* **68** (1982), no. 2, 175–193.
- [20] W. T. Trotter, *Combinatorics and partially ordered sets: Dimension theory*, Johns Hopkins University press, 1992.
- [21] R. Woodroffe, Vertex decomposable graphs and obstructions to shellability, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **137** (2009), no. 10, 3235–3246.

L. KATTHÄN, UNIVERSITÄT OSNABRÜCK, FB MATHEMATIK/INFORMATIK, 49069 OSNABRÜCK, GERMANY

E-mail address: lkathhaen@uos.de

S. A. SEYED FAKHARI, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH IN FUNDAMENTAL SCIENCES (IPM), P.O. BOX 19395-5746, TEHRAN, IRAN.

E-mail address: fakhari@ipm.ir

URL: <http://math.ipm.ac.ir/fakhari/>