

ON THE LINEARITY OF THE SYZYGIES OF HIBI RINGS

DHARM VEER

In memory of Prof. C. S. Seshadri

ABSTRACT. In this article, we prove necessary conditions for Hibi rings to satisfy Green-Lazarsfeld property N_p for $p = 2$ and 3 . We also show that if a Hibi ring satisfies property N_4 , then it is a polynomial ring or it has a linear resolution. Therefore, it satisfies property N_p for all $p \geq 4$ as well. As a consequence, we characterize distributive lattices whose comparability graph is chordal in terms of the subposet of join-irreducibles of the distributive lattice. Moreover, we characterize complete intersection Hibi rings.

1. INTRODUCTION

A classical problem in commutative algebra is to study graded minimal free resolutions of graded modules over polynomial rings. Let S be a standard graded polynomial ring in finitely many variables over a field K and I be a graded S -ideal generated by quadratics. To study the graded minimal free resolution of S/I , Green-Lazarsfeld [GL86] defined property N_p for $p \in \mathbb{N}$. The ring S/I satisfies property N_p if S/I is normal and the graded minimal free resolution of S/I over S is linear upto p^{th} position. In this article, we study Green-Lazarsfeld property N_p for Hibi rings. We also characterize complete intersection Hibi rings.

Let L be a finite distributive lattice and $P = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ be the subposet of join-irreducible elements of L . Let K be a field and let $R = K[t, z_1, \dots, z_n]$ be a polynomial ring over K . The Hibi ring associated with L , denoted by $R[L]$, is the subring of R generated by the monomials $u_\alpha = t \prod_{p_i \in \alpha} z_i$ where $\alpha \in L$. Hibi [Hib87] showed that $R[L]$ is a normal Cohen–Macaulay domain of dimension $\#P + 1$, where $\#P$ is the cardinality of P . See [Ene15] for a survey on Hibi rings. If we set $\deg(t) = 1$ and $\deg(z_i) = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, then $R[L]$ may be viewed as a standard graded algebra over K . Let $K[L] = K[\{x_\alpha : \alpha \in L\}]$ be the polynomial ring over K and $\pi : K[L] \rightarrow R[L]$ be the K -algebra homomorphism with $x_\alpha \mapsto u_\alpha$. The ideal $I_L = (x_\alpha x_\beta - x_{\alpha \wedge \beta} x_{\alpha \vee \beta} : \alpha, \beta \in L \text{ and } \alpha, \beta \text{ incomparable})$ is the kernel of the map π . It is called the Hibi ideal associated to L .

In past, various authors have studied minimal free resolution of Hibi rings [DM17, EHH15, EHS15, Ene15]. In Section 4 and 5, we establish some results about property N_p of Hibi rings [Theorem 4.8, 4.11, 5.3 and 5.7]. In [EHH15], the authors have classified all Hibi rings which have linear resolution. In [EHS15], the authors have given a combinatorial description of regularity of Hibi rings in terms of poset of join-irreducibles. Ene [Ene15] characterizes all simple planar distributive lattices for which the associated Hibi ring satisfies property N_2 [Theorem 2.7]. The Segre product of polynomial rings may be viewed as a Hibi ring. Property N_p for Segre product of polynomial rings has

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05E40, 13C05, 13D02.

Key words and phrases. Distributive lattices, Hibi rings, Green-Lazarsfeld property N_p , Comparability graph, Complete intersection rings.

The author was partly supported by the grant CRG/2018/001592 (Manoj Kummini) from Science and Engineering Research Board, India and by an Infosys Foundation fellowship.

been completely studied for all p , see [Vee22] for chronological developments. In [Vee22], the author has proved that if a Hibi ring satisfies property N_2 , then its Segre product with a polynomial ring in finitely many variables also satisfies property N_2 . When the polynomial ring is in two variables, the above statement was proved for N_3 . The author has also studied minimal Koszul syzygies of Hibi ideals and initial Hibi ideals in [Vee22].

Let P be a poset. The comparability graph G_P of P is a graph on the underlying set of P such that $\{x, y\}$ is an edge of G_P if and only if x and y are comparable in P . Hibi and Ohsugi [HO17] characterized chordal comparability graph of posets using toric ideals associated with multichains of poset. Using one of our results and [Frö90, Theorem 1], we characterize chordal comparability graph of distributive lattices in terms of the subposet of join-irreducibles of the distributive lattice [Corollary 5.8].

The article is organised as follows. In Section 2, we recall some basic notions of algebra and combinatorics. In [EHH15], the authors have introduced the notion of homologically pure subsemigroup of an affine semigroup, and proved that if H' is a homologically pure subsemigroup of an affine semigroup H , then the Betti numbers of the semigroup ring $K[H]$ are greater than equal to those of $K[H']$ [Proposition 2.10]. In Section 3, we identify two kinds of homologically pure subsemigroups of an affine semigroup associated to a Hibi ring. Using these, we prove some sufficient conditions for Hibi rings to not satisfy property N_2 in Section 4 [Theorem 4.8, 4.11].

In Section 5, we study property N_p of Hibi rings for $p \geq 3$. First, we prove that if a poset is connected and it has atleast two minimal and atleast two maximal elements, then the associated Hibi ring does not satisfy property N_3 [Theorem 5.3]. The second main result of this section is that a Hibi ring satisfies property N_4 if and only if either it is a polynomial ring or it has a linear resolution if and only if it is a polynomial ring or its initial ideal has a linear resolution [Theorem 5.7]. We also characterize all such Hibi rings combinatorially which gives a different proof of [EQR13, Corollary 10]. The last section of the article is devoted to combinatorial characterization of complete intersection Hibi rings [Theorem 6.3].

Acknowledgements. I am extremely grateful to Manoj Kummini for his guidance and various insightful discussions throughout the preparation of this article. The computer algebra systems Macaulay2 [M2] and SageMath [Sage] provided valuable assistance in studying examples.

2. PRELIMINARIES

We start by defining some notions of posets and distributive lattices. For more details and examples, we refer the reader to [Sta12, Chapter 3]. Throughout this article, all posets and distributive lattices will be finite.

Let P be a poset. We say that two elements x and y of P are *comparable* if $x \leq y$ or $y \leq x$; otherwise x and y are *incomparable*. For $x, y \in P$, we say that y *covers* x if $x < y$ and there is no $z \in P$ with $x < z < y$. We denote it by $x < y$. A poset is completely determined by its cover relations. The *Hasse diagram* of poset P is the graph whose vertices are elements of P , whose edges are cover relations, and such that if $x < y$ then y is “above” x (i.e. with a higher vertical coordinate). In this article, we use the Hasse diagrams to represent posets.

A *chain* C of P is a totally ordered subset of P . The *length* of a chain C of P is $\#C - 1$. The *rank* of P , denoted by $\text{rank}(P)$, is the maximum of the lengths of chains in P . A poset is called *pure* if its all maximal chains have the same length. A subset α of P is called an *order ideal* of P if it satisfies the following condition: for any $x \in \alpha$ and $y \in P$,

if $y \leq x$, then $y \in \alpha$. Define $\mathcal{I}(P) := \{\alpha \subseteq P : \alpha \text{ is an order ideal of } P\}$. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{I}(P)$, ordered by inclusion, is a distributive lattice under union and intersection. $\mathcal{I}(P)$ is called the *ideal lattice* of the poset P . Let L be a lattice. An element $x \in L$ is called *join-irreducible* if x is not the minimal element of L and whenever $x = y \vee z$ for some $y, z \in L$, we have either $x = y$ or $x = z$.

Definition 2.1. Let P and Q be two posets.

- (a) A nonempty subset S of P is an *antichain* in P if any two distinct elements of S are incomparable. An antichain with n elements is said to have *width* n . Define $\text{width}(P) := \max\{\#S : S \subseteq P, S \text{ is an antichain in } P\}$.
- (b) A poset P is called *simple* if there is no $p \in P$ with the property that all elements of P are comparable to p .
- (c) The *ordinal sum* $P \oplus Q$ of the disjoint posets P and Q is the poset on the set $P \cup Q$ with the following order: if $x, y \in P \oplus Q$, then $x \leq y$ if either $x, y \in P$ and $x \leq y$ in P or $x, y \in Q$ and $x \leq y$ in Q or $x \in P$ and $y \in Q$.
- (d) Let P, Q be two posets on disjoint sets. The *disjoint union* of posets P and Q is the poset $P + Q$ on the set $P \cup Q$ with the following order: if $x, y \in P + Q$, then $x \leq y$ if either $x, y \in P$ and $x \leq y$ in P or $x, y \in Q$ and $x \leq y$ in Q . A poset which can be written as disjoint union of two posets is called *disconnected*. Otherwise, P is *connected*.
- (e) P and Q are said to be *isomorphic*, denoted by $P \cong Q$, if there exists an order-preserving bijection $\varphi : P \rightarrow Q$ whose inverse is order preserving.
- (f) A subposet P' of P is said to be a *cover-preserving subposet* of P if for every $x, y \in P'$ with $x < y$ in P' , we have $x < y$ in P .

Example 2.2. Let P be the poset as shown in Figure 1a. Let P' and P'' be the subposets of P as shown in Figure 1b and Figure 1c respectively. It is easy to see that P' is a cover-preserving subposet of P but P'' is not a cover-preserving subposet of P since $p_3 < p_7$ in P'' but not in P .




FIGURE 1

2.1. Hibi rings. Let L be a distributive lattice and let P be the subposet of join-irreducible elements of L . By Birkhoff's fundamental structure theorem [Sta12, Theorem 3.4.1], L is isomorphic to the ideal lattice $\mathcal{I}(P)$. Write $P = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ and let $R = K[t, z_1, \dots, z_n]$ be a polynomial ring in $n + 1$ variables over a field K . The *Hibi ring* associated with L , denoted by $R[L]$, is the subring of R generated by the monomials $u_\alpha = t \prod_{p_i \in \alpha} z_i$ where $\alpha \in L$. If we set $\deg(t) = 1$ and $\deg(z_i) = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, then $R[L]$ may be viewed as a standard graded algebra over K .

Let $K[L] = K[\{x_\alpha : \alpha \in L\}]$ be the polynomial ring over K and $\pi : K[L] \rightarrow R[L]$ be the K -algebra homomorphism with $x_\alpha \mapsto u_\alpha$. Let

$$I_L = (x_\alpha x_\beta - x_{\alpha \wedge \beta} x_{\alpha \vee \beta} : \alpha, \beta \in L \text{ and } \alpha, \beta \text{ incomparable})$$

be an $K[L]$ -ideal. Let $<$ be a total order on the variables of $K[L]$ with the property that one has $x_\alpha < x_\beta$ if $\alpha < \beta$ in L . Consider the graded reverse lexicographic order $<$ on $K[L]$ induced by this order of the variables. The generators of I_L described above forms a Gröbner basis of $\ker(\pi)$ with respect to $<$ [HHO18, Theorem 6.19]. In particular, $\ker(\pi) = I_L$. The ideal I_L is called the *Hibi ideal* of L . The *initial Hibi ideal* is

$$\text{in}_<(I_L) = (x_\alpha x_\beta : \alpha, \beta \in L \text{ and } \alpha, \beta \text{ incomparable}).$$

We now discuss how Hibi rings behave under the ordinal sum of posets. An another result about ordinal sum of two posets will be proved in Lemma 6.1.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $P_1, \{p\}$ and P_2 be posets. Let P be the ordinal sum $P_1 \oplus \{p\} \oplus P_2$. Then*

$$R[\mathcal{I}(P)] \cong R[\mathcal{I}(P_1 \oplus P_2)] \otimes_K K[y] \cong R[\mathcal{I}(P_1)] \otimes_K R[\mathcal{I}(P_2)],$$

where $K[y]$ is a polynomial ring.

Proof. First, we prove that

$$R[\mathcal{I}(P)] \cong R[\mathcal{I}(P_1 \oplus P_2)] \otimes_K K[y].$$

Let $R[\mathcal{I}(P_1 \oplus P_2)] = K[\{u_\beta : \beta \in \mathcal{I}(P_1 \oplus P_2)\}]/I_{\mathcal{I}(P_1 \oplus P_2)}$ and $R[\mathcal{I}(P)] = K[\{v_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathcal{I}(P)\}]/I_{\mathcal{I}(P)}$. Define a map

$$\varphi : K[\{v_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathcal{I}(P)\}] \rightarrow T := K[y, \{u_\beta : \beta \in \mathcal{I}(P_1 \oplus P_2)\}]$$

by

$$\varphi(v_\gamma) = \begin{cases} u_\gamma & \text{if } \gamma \subseteq P_1, \\ y & \text{if } \gamma = P_1 \cup \{p\}, \\ u_{\gamma'} & \text{if } \gamma = P_1 \cup \{p\} \cup \gamma', \text{ where } \gamma' \subseteq P_2. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that φ is an isomorphism. If $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{I}(P)$ are incomparable, then either $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{I}(P_1)$ or $\alpha = P_1 \cup \{p\} \cup \alpha'$ and $\beta = P_1 \cup \{p\} \cup \beta'$ where $\alpha', \beta' \in \mathcal{I}(P_2)$ and α', β' incomparable. Let $T' = T/(I_{\mathcal{I}(P_1 \oplus P_2)}T)$ and $\pi : T \rightarrow T'$ be the natural surjection. Thus, $\pi \circ \varphi : K[\mathcal{I}(P)] \rightarrow T'$ and $\ker(\pi \circ \varphi) = \varphi^{-1}I_{\mathcal{I}(P_1 \oplus P_2)}T$.

It is sufficient to show that $\varphi(I_{\mathcal{I}(P)}) = I_{\mathcal{I}(P_1 \oplus P_2)}T$. Let α, β be two incomparable elements of $\mathcal{I}(P)$. If $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{I}(P_1)$ then $\varphi(v_\alpha v_\beta - v_{\alpha \wedge \beta} v_{\alpha \vee \beta}) = u_\alpha u_\beta - u_{\alpha \wedge \beta} u_{\alpha \vee \beta} \in I_{\mathcal{I}(P_1)}T$. If $\alpha = P_1 \cup \{p\} \cup \alpha'$ and $\beta = P_1 \cup \{p\} \cup \beta'$ where $\alpha', \beta' \in \mathcal{I}(P_2)$, then $\varphi(v_\alpha v_\beta - v_{\alpha \wedge \beta} v_{\alpha \vee \beta}) = u_{\alpha'} u_{\beta'} - u_{\alpha' \wedge \beta'} u_{\alpha' \vee \beta'} \in I_{\mathcal{I}(P_2)}T$. Hence, $\varphi(I_{\mathcal{I}(P)}) \subseteq I_{\mathcal{I}(P_1)}T + I_{\mathcal{I}(P_2)}T$.

On the other hand, if α, β are two incomparable elements of $\mathcal{I}(P_1)$ then $\varphi(v_\alpha v_\beta - v_{\alpha \wedge \beta} v_{\alpha \vee \beta}) = u_\alpha u_\beta - u_{\alpha \wedge \beta} u_{\alpha \vee \beta}$ while if α', β' are two incomparable elements of $\mathcal{I}(P_2)$ then $\varphi(v_{P_1 \cup \{p\} \cup \alpha'} v_{P_1 \cup \{p\} \cup \beta'} - v_{(P_1 \cup \{p\} \cup \alpha') \wedge (P_1 \cup \{p\} \cup \beta')} v_{(P_1 \cup \{p\} \cup \alpha') \vee (P_1 \cup \{p\} \cup \beta')}) = u_{\alpha'} u_{\beta'} - u_{\alpha' \wedge \beta'} u_{\alpha' \vee \beta'}$. Hence the equality.

The minimal generating set of the Hibi ideal $I_{\mathcal{I}(P)}$ can be partitioned between two disjoint set of variables $\{v_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathcal{I}(P) \text{ and } \alpha \subseteq P_1\}$ and $\{v_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathcal{I}(P) \text{ and } P_1 \cup \{p\} \subseteq \alpha\}$. So the Hibi ring $R[\mathcal{I}(P)]$ admits a tensor product decomposition, where one of the rings is isomorphic to $R[\mathcal{I}(P_1)]$ and the other ring is isomorphic to $R[\mathcal{I}(P_2)]$. \square

In [Hib87], Hibi proved that $R[\mathcal{I}(P_1) \oplus \mathcal{I}(P_2)] \cong R[\mathcal{I}(P_1)] \otimes_K R[\mathcal{I}(P_2)]$. One can immediately check that the poset of join-irreducibles of $\mathcal{I}(P_1) \oplus \mathcal{I}(P_2)$ is isomorphic to $P_1 \oplus \{p\} \oplus P_2$.

Corollary 2.4. *Let P be a poset and $P' = \{p_{i_1}, \dots, p_{i_r}\}$ be the subset of all elements of P which are comparable to every element of P . Let P'' be the induced subposet of P on the set $P \setminus P'$. Then,*

$$R[\mathcal{I}(P)] \cong R[\mathcal{I}(P'')] \otimes_K K[y_1, \dots, y_r],$$

where $K[y_1, \dots, y_r]$ is a polynomial ring.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $p_{i_1} < \dots < p_{i_r}$ in P . Let $P_0 = \{p \in P : p < p_{i_1}\}$, $P_j = \{p \in P : p_{i_j} < p < p_{i_{j+1}}\}$ for $1 < j < r - 1$ and $P_r = \{p \in P : p > p_{i_r}\}$. Then P is the ordinal sum $P_0 \oplus \{p_{i_1}\} \oplus P_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \{p_{i_r}\} \oplus P_r$. Now, the result follows from Lemma 2.3. \square

2.2. Green-Lazarsfeld property. Let $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a standard graded polynomial ring over a field K and I be a graded S -ideal. Let \mathbb{F} be the graded minimal free resolution of S/I over S :

$$\mathbb{F} : 0 \rightarrow \bigoplus_j S(-j)^{\beta_{rj}} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \bigoplus_j S(-j)^{\beta_{1j}} \rightarrow \bigoplus_j S(-j)^{\beta_{0j}}.$$

The numbers β_{ij} are called the minimal graded Betti numbers of S/I over S .

Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Under the notations as above, we say that S/I satisfies *Green-Lazarsfeld property N_p* if S/I is normal and $\beta_{ij}(S/I) = 0$ for all $i \neq j + 1$ and $1 \leq i \leq p$. Therefore, S/I satisfies property N_0 if and only if it is normal; it satisfies property N_1 if and only if it is normal and I is generated by quadratics; it satisfies property N_2 if and only if it satisfies property N_1 and I is linearly presented and so on.

We know that Hibi rings are normal and Hibi ideals are generated by quadratics. Hence, Hibi rings satisfy property N_1 . Hibi rings are algebras with straightening laws (ASL) and straightening relations are quadratic [Hib87, § 2]. ASL with quadratic straightening relations are Koszul [Kem90]. So for a poset P , $\beta_{2j}(R[\mathcal{I}(P)]) = 0$ for all $j \geq 5$ by [Kem90, Lemma 4]. Therefore, $R[\mathcal{I}(P)]$ satisfies property N_2 if and only if $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P)]) = 0$. Also, it follows from [ACI15, Theorem 6.1] that if $R[\mathcal{I}(P)]$ satisfies property N_2 and $\beta_{35}(R[\mathcal{I}(P)]) = 0$, then it satisfies property N_3 .

2.3. Planar distributive lattices. In this subsection, we define the notion of planar distributive lattice. We state a result of Ene which characterizes all simple planar distributive lattices for which the associated Hibi ring satisfies property N_2 .

Definition 2.5. [HHO18, Section 6.4] *A finite distributive lattice $L = \mathcal{I}(P)$ is called planar if P can be decomposed into a disjoint union $P = \{p_1, \dots, p_m\} \cup \{q_1, \dots, q_n\}$, where $m, n \geq 0$ such that $\{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$ and $\{q_1, \dots, q_n\}$ are chains in P .*

Remark 2.6. Let us consider the infinite distributive lattice \mathbb{N}^2 with the partial order defined as $(i, j) \leq (k, l)$ if $i \leq k$ and $j \leq l$. Let $L = \mathcal{I}(P)$ be a finite planar distributive lattice, where $P = \{p_1, \dots, p_m\} \cup \{q_1, \dots, q_n\}$. Assume that $\{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$ and $\{q_1, \dots, q_n\}$ are chains in P with $p_1 \leq \dots \leq p_m$ and $q_1 \leq \dots \leq q_n$. Define a map

$$\varphi : \mathcal{I}(P) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^2$$

by

$$\varphi(\alpha) = \begin{cases} (0, 0) & \text{if } \alpha = \emptyset, \\ (i, 0) & \text{if } \alpha = \{p \in P : p \leq p_i\}, \\ (0, j) & \text{if } \alpha = \{p \in P : p \leq q_j\}, \\ (i, j) & \text{if } \alpha = \{p \in P : \text{either } p \leq p_i \text{ or } p \leq q_j\}. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that φ is an order-preserving injective map. Hence, any finite planar distributive lattice can be embedded into \mathbb{N}^2 . Also, observe that $[(0,0), (m,n)]$ is the smallest interval of \mathbb{N}^2 which contains L .

Let L be a distributive lattice. If the poset of join-irreducibles of L is a simple poset, then sometimes we abuse the notation and say that L is a *simple distributive lattice*.

Theorem 2.7. [Ene15, Theorem 3.12] *Let $L = \mathcal{I}(P)$ be a simple planar distributive lattice with $\#P = n + m$, $L \subset [(0,0), (m,n)]$ with $m, n \geq 2$. Then $R[\mathcal{I}(P)]$ satisfies property N_2 if and only if the following conditions hold:*

- (i) *At least one of the vertices $(m,0)$ and $(0,n)$ belongs to L .*
- (ii) *The vertices $(1, n - 1)$ and $(m - 1, 1)$ belong to L .*

Corollary 2.8. *Let $L = \mathcal{I}(P)$ be a simple planar distributive lattice with $P = \{a_1, \dots, a_m, b_1, \dots, b_n\}$. Let $\{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$ and $\{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$ be chains in P with $a_1 \triangleleft a_2 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft a_m$ and $b_1 \triangleleft b_2 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft b_n$. Assume that $\{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$ is an order ideal of P . If $R[\mathcal{I}(P)]$ satisfies property N_2 , then P is one of the posets as shown in Figure 2.*




FIGURE 2

2.4. Graph Theory. Let G be a simple graph on the vertex set $[n]$. The *clique complex* (or *flag complex*) $\Delta(G)$ associated to G is a simplicial complex defined in the following way: $\Delta(G)$ has same vertices as G and the simplices of $\Delta(G)$ are exactly the subsets F of $[n]$ for which every pair in F is an edge of G . A graph G is called *chordal* if every induced cycle in G of length ≥ 4 has a chord, i.e., there is an edge in G connecting two nonconsecutive vertices of the cycle. Let Δ be a simplicial complex. The Stanley-Reisner ideal I_Δ generated by quadratics has linear resolution if and only if $\Delta = \Delta(G)$ for some chordal graph G [Frö90, Theorem 1].

Let P be a poset. The *comparability graph* G_P of P is a graph on the underlying set of P such that $\{x, y\}$ is an edge of G_P if and only if x and y are comparable in P . Let $\Delta(P)$ be the order complex of P . It is known that $\Delta(P) = \Delta(G_P)$.

2.5. Squarefree divisor complexes. Let $H \subset \mathbb{N}^n$ be an affine semigroup and $K[H]$ be the semigroup ring attached to it. Suppose that $h_1, \dots, h_m \in \mathbb{N}^n$ is the unique minimal set of generators of H . We consider the polynomial ring $T = K[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ in n variables. Then $K[H]$ is the subring of T generated by the monomials $u_i = \prod_{j=1}^n t_j^{h_i(j)}$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$, where $h_i(j)$ denotes the j th component of the integer vector h_i . Consider a K -algebra map $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_m] \rightarrow K[H]$ with $x_i \mapsto u_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$. Let I_H be the kernel of this K -algebra map. Set $\deg x_i = h_i$ to assign a \mathbb{Z}^n -graded ring structure to S . Let \mathfrak{m}

be the graded maximal S -ideal. Then $K[H]$ as well as I_H become \mathbb{Z}^n -graded S -modules. Thus, $K[H]$ admits a minimal \mathbb{Z}^n -graded S -resolution \mathbb{F} .

Given $h \in H$, we define the *squarefree divisor complex* Δ_h as follows:

$$\Delta_h := \{F \subseteq [m] : \prod_{i \in F} u_i \text{ divides } t_1^{h(1)} \cdots t_n^{h(n)} \text{ in } K[H]\}.$$

Clearly, Δ_h is a simplicial complex. We denote the i^{th} reduced simplicial homology of a simplicial complex Δ with coefficients in K by $\tilde{H}_i(\Delta, K)$.

Proposition 2.9. [BH97, Proposition 1.1], [Stu96, Theorem 12.12] *With the notation and assumptions introduced one has $\text{Tor}_i(K[H], K)_h \cong \tilde{H}_{i-1}(\Delta_h, K)$. In particular,*

$$\beta_{ih}(K[H]) = \dim_K \tilde{H}_{i-1}(\Delta_h, K).$$

Let $H \subset \mathbb{N}^n$ be an affine semigroup generated by h_1, \dots, h_m . An affine subsemigroup $H' \subset H$ generated by a subset of $\{h_1, \dots, h_m\}$ is called a *homologically pure* subsemigroup of H if for all $h \in H'$ and all h_i with $h - h_i \in H$, it follows that $h_i \in H'$. Let H' be generated by a subset \mathcal{X} of $\{h_1, \dots, h_m\}$, and let $S' = K[\{x_i : h_i \in \mathcal{X}\}] \subseteq S$. Therefore, $K[H']$ has \mathbb{Z}^n -graded minimal free S' -resolution. Let $\text{Syz}_i^S(K[H])$ denotes the i^{th} syzygy module of $K[H]$ over S .

We need the following proposition several times in this paper.

Proposition 2.10. [EHH15, Corollary 3.4] *Let H' be a homologically pure subsemigroup of H . Then, any minimal set of generators of $\text{Syz}_i^{S'}(K[H'])$ is part of a minimal set of generators of $\text{Syz}_i^S(K[H])$ for all i . Moreover, $\beta_{ij}^{S'}(K[H']) \leq \beta_{ij}^S(K[H])$ for all i and j .*

Let $L = \mathcal{I}(P)$ be a distributive lattice with $P = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$. For $\alpha \in L$, define a $(n+1)$ -tuple h_α such that for $1 \leq i \leq n$,

$$\begin{cases} 1 & \text{at } 1^{\text{st}} \text{ position,} \\ 1 & \text{at } (i+1)^{\text{th}} \text{ position if } p_i \in \alpha, \\ 0 & \text{at } (i+1)^{\text{th}} \text{ position if } p_i \notin \alpha. \end{cases}$$

Let H be the affine semigroup generated by $\{h_\alpha : \alpha \in L\}$. Then, we have $K[H] = R[L]$.

3. HOMOLOGICALLY PURE SUBSEMGROUPS

In this section, we identify two kinds of homologically pure subsemigroups of an affine semigroup associated to a Hibi ring and we use them to conclude results about property N_p of Hibi rings. The first one is the following and the second one is in Notation 3.5.

Let $L = \mathcal{I}(P)$ be a distributive lattice. Let $\beta, \gamma \in L$ such that $\beta \leq \gamma$. Define $L_1 = \{\alpha \in L : \beta \leq \alpha \leq \gamma\}$. Clearly, L_1 is a sublattice of L . Let H be the affine semigroup associated to L and let H_1 be the affine subsemigroup of H generated by $\{h_\alpha : \alpha \in L_1\}$.

Proposition 3.1. *Let H and H_1 be as defined above. Then H_1 is a homologically pure subsemigroup of H .*

Proof. We show that if $\alpha \notin L_1$, then $h - h_\alpha \notin H$ for all $h \in H_1$. Suppose $\alpha \notin L_1$ then either $\alpha \not\leq \gamma$ or $\alpha \not\geq \beta$.

If $\alpha \not\leq \gamma$, then there exists a $p_i \in \alpha$ such that $p_i \notin \gamma$. So i^{th} entry of h_α is 1 but for any $\alpha' \in L_1$, i^{th} entry of $h_{\alpha'}$ is 0. Hence, $h - h_\alpha \notin H$ for all $h \in H_1$.

If $\alpha \not\geq \beta$, then there exists a $p_j \in \beta$ such that $p_j \notin \alpha$. So $(j+1)^{\text{th}}$ entry of h_α is 0 but for any $\alpha' \in L_1$, $(j+1)^{\text{th}}$ entry of $h_{\alpha'}$ is 1. Therefore, for any $h \in H_1$, the first and

$(j+1)^{\text{th}}$ entries of h have same value, say r_h . Thus, for all $h \in H_1$, the first entry and $(j+1)^{\text{th}}$ entry of $h - h_\alpha$ are $r_h - 1$ and r_h respectively. Therefore, $h - h_\alpha \notin H$ for all $h \in H_1$. \square

Proposition 3.2. *Let L and L_1 be as above. Let $\beta = \{p_{a_1}, \dots, p_{a_r}\}$ and $\gamma = \{p_{a_1}, \dots, p_{a_r}, p_{b_1}, \dots, p_{b_s}\}$. Then, the induced subposet P_1 of P on the set $\{p_{b_1}, \dots, p_{b_s}\}$ is isomorphic to the poset of join-irreducible elements of L_1 .*

Proof. The idea of the proof is based on the proof of [HHO18, Theorem 6.4]. For any two finite posets Q and Q' , if $\mathcal{I}(Q) \cong \mathcal{I}(Q')$ then $Q \cong Q'$. So it is enough to prove that $\mathcal{I}(P_1) \cong L_1$. Define a map

$$\varphi : \mathcal{I}(P_1) \rightarrow L_1$$

by

$$\varphi(\alpha) = \left(\bigvee_{i=1}^r p_{a_i}\right) \vee \left(\bigvee_{p \in \alpha} p\right).$$

In particular, $\varphi(\emptyset) = \bigvee_{i=1}^r p_{a_i}$. Clearly, φ is order-preserving.

Let α and δ be two order ideals of P_1 with $\alpha \neq \delta$, say $\delta \not\leq \alpha$. Let p_0 be a maximal element of δ with $p_0 \notin \alpha$. We show that $\varphi(\alpha) \neq \varphi(\delta)$. Suppose, on the contrary, $\varphi(\alpha) = \varphi(\delta)$, then

$$\left(\bigvee_{i=1}^r p_{a_i}\right) \vee \left(\bigvee_{p \in \alpha} p\right) = \left(\bigvee_{i=1}^r p_{a_i}\right) \vee \left(\bigvee_{q \in \beta} q\right).$$

Since L_1 is distributive, it follows that

$$\left(\left(\bigvee_{i=1}^r p_{a_i}\right) \vee \left(\bigvee_{p \in \alpha} p\right)\right) \wedge p_0 = \left(\bigvee_{i=1}^r (p_{a_i} \wedge p_0)\right) \vee \left(\bigvee_{p \in \alpha} (p \wedge p_0)\right).$$

Since p_0 is join-irreducible and for any $p \in P$, $p \wedge p_0 \leq p_0$. It follows that $(\bigvee_{i=1}^r p_{a_i} \vee \bigvee_{p \in \alpha} p) \wedge p_0 < p_0$. However, since $p_0 \in \delta$, $(\bigvee_{i=1}^r p_{a_i} \vee \bigvee_{q \in \beta} q) \wedge p_0 = p_0$. This is a contradiction. Hence, φ is injective.

Since each $a \in L_1$ can be the join of the join-irreducible elements p with $p \leq a$ in L_1 , it follows that $\varphi(\alpha) = a$, where α is an order ideal of P_1 consisting of those $p \in P_1$ with $p \leq a$. Thus, φ is surjective.

Now, $\varphi^{-1} : L_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{I}(P_1)$ is defined as follows: for $x \in L_1$,

$$\varphi^{-1}(x) = \{p \in L_1 : p \leq x, p \text{ is a join-irreducible}\} \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^r p_{a_i}.$$

Clearly, φ^{-1} is order-preserving. Hence the proof. \square

We now try to understand how we are going to use the above propositions. Suppose for a distributive lattice \mathcal{L} , we want to prove that $\beta_{ij}(R[\mathcal{L}]) \neq 0$ for some i, j . The idea of the proof is to reduce the lattice \mathcal{L} to a suitably chosen sublattice \mathcal{L}_1 . Proposition 3.2 describes the subposet of join-irreducibles of \mathcal{L}_1 . Then, by Propositions 3.1 and 2.10, if $\beta_{ij}(R[\mathcal{L}_1]) \neq 0$, then $\beta_{ij}(R[\mathcal{L}]) \neq 0$. More precisely,

Discussion 3.3. Let P be a poset. Let B and B' be two antichains of P such that for each $p \in B$ there is a $q \in B'$ such that $p \leq q$ and for each $q' \in B'$ there is a $p' \in B$ such that $p' \leq q'$. Furthermore, let $\gamma = \{p \in P : p \leq q \text{ for some } q \in B'\}$ and $\beta' = \{p \in P : p' \leq p \leq q \text{ for some } p' \in B, q \in B'\}$. Let $\beta = \gamma \setminus \beta'$. Note that β, γ are the order ideals of $\mathcal{I}(P)$ with $\beta < \gamma$. Let $L_1 = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}(P) : \beta \leq \alpha \leq \gamma\}$. Furthermore, let H_1 be the affine subsemigroup of H generated by $\{h_\alpha : \alpha \in L_1\}$. Then, by Proposition 3.1, H_1 is a homologically pure subsemigroup of H . Also, by Proposition 3.2, the induced subposet P_1 of P on the set $\gamma \setminus \beta$ is isomorphic to the poset of join-irreducible elements of L_1 . Furthermore, by Proposition 2.10, $\beta_{ij}(R[L_1]) \leq \beta_{ij}(R[L])$ for all i, j . \square

Example 3.4. In this example, we illustrate the construction in the above discussion. Let P be as shown in Figure 3a. Then, $\mathcal{I}(P)$ is as shown in Figure 3b. Under the notations of Discussion 3.3, let $B = \{p_3, p_4\}$ and $B' = \{p_6, p_7\}$. Then, $\gamma = P \setminus \{p_8\}$ and $\beta' = \{p_3, p_4, p_5, p_6, p_7\}$. Thus, $\beta = \gamma \setminus \beta' = \{p_1, p_2\}$.




FIGURE 3

Notation 3.5. For a poset P , let X_P and Y_P be the sets of minimal and maximal elements of P respectively. Define $X'_P = \{q \in P : p \triangleleft q \text{ for some } p \in X_P\}$ and $Y'_P = \{p \in P : p \triangleleft q \text{ for some } q \in Y_P\}$. When the context is clear, we will omit the subscripts and denote X_P, X'_P, Y_P and Y'_P by X, X', Y and Y' respectively.

Let P be a poset. For $x, y \in P$ with $x < y$, define $L_1 := \{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}(P) : \text{if } x \in \alpha \text{ then } y \in \alpha\}$. It is easy to see that L_1 is a sublattice of $\mathcal{I}(P)$. Let P_1 be the poset on the set $P \setminus \{p \in P : x \leq p < y\}$ defined by the following order relations: if $p, q \in P_1$, then $p \leq q$ in P_1 if either

- (1) $p \in P_1 \setminus \{y\}, q \in P_1$ and $p \leq q$ in P or
- (2) $p = y$ and there is a $p' \in \{a \in P : x \leq a \leq y\}$ such that $p' \leq q$ in P .

Let H be the semigroup corresponding to $\mathcal{I}(P)$ and H' be the subsemigroup of H corresponding to L_1 . \square

Lemma 3.6. Let P, P_1, L_1, H, H' be as in Notation 3.5. Then $L_1 \cong \mathcal{I}(P_1)$ and H' is a homologically pure subsemigroup of H .

Proof. Define a map

$$\varphi : \mathcal{I}(P_1) \rightarrow L_1$$

by

$$\varphi(\alpha) = \begin{cases} \alpha & \text{if } y \notin \alpha, \\ \alpha \cup \{p \in P : x \leq p < y\} & \text{if } y \in \alpha. \end{cases}$$

Clearly, φ is order-preserving. If $\gamma \in L_1$, then $\varphi(\gamma') = \gamma$, where $\gamma' = \gamma \setminus \{p \in P : x \leq p < y\}$. Hence, φ is surjective. Now we claim that for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{I}(P_1)$, $\varphi(\alpha) \cap P_1 = \alpha$. If $y \in \alpha$, then $\varphi(\alpha) \cap P_1 = (\alpha \cup \{p \in P : x \leq p < y\}) \cap P_1 = \alpha$ and if $y \notin \alpha$, then $\varphi(\alpha) = \alpha$. Therefore, if $\varphi(\alpha) = \varphi(\beta)$ for any $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{I}(P_1)$ then $\alpha = \beta$. This proves that φ is injective.

Now, $\varphi^{-1} : L_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{I}(P_1)$ is defined as follows: for $a \in L_1$,

$$\varphi^{-1}(a) = \{p \in L_1 : p \leq a, p \text{ is a join-irreducible}\} \setminus \{p \in P : x \leq p < y\}.$$

Clearly, φ^{-1} is order-preserving. Hence, φ is an isomorphism.

To prove that H' is a homologically pure subsemigroup of H , we show that if $\alpha \notin L_1$ then $h - h_\alpha \notin H$ for all $h \in H'$. Suppose $\alpha \notin L_1$ then $x \in \alpha$ but $y \notin \alpha$. Let $h = \sum_{i=1}^s h_{\beta_i} \in H'$ and let the position corresponding to x of h be r . Then the positions corresponding to x and y of $h - h_\alpha$ are $r - 1$ and r respectively. Hence, $h - h_\alpha \notin H$. \square

Discussion 3.7. For a poset P_0 , let $X_{P_0}, Y_{P_0}, X'_{P_0}$ and Y'_{P_0} be as defined in Notation 3.5. If there is an $x \in X'_{P_0}$ and a $y \in Y'_{P_0}$ with $x < y$, reduce P_0 to P_1 , using the methods in Notation 3.5. Observe that $y \in X'_{P_1} \cap Y'_{P_1}$, $X_{P_0} = X_{P_1}, Y_{P_0} = Y_{P_1}$ and $\#P_1 = \#(P_0 \setminus \{p \in P_0 : x \leq p < y\}) \leq \#P_0 - 1$. Repeating it, we get a sequence of posets P_0, \dots, P_n , where $n \leq \#P_0 - \#X_0 - \#Y_0 - 1$ such that for each $0 \leq i \leq n - 1$, there is an $x \in X'_{P_i}$ and $y \in Y'_{P_i}$ with $x < y$ and P_i is reduced to P_{i+1} as in Notation 3.5. Moreover, there is no $x \in X'_{P_n}$ and $y \in Y'_{P_n}$ with the property $x < y$. Here, P_n is a poset defined on the set $X_{P_0} \cup Y_{P_0} \cup Y'_{P_n}$ and $\text{rank}(P_n) \leq 2$. An example of this reduction is given in Figure 4. By Lemma 3.6 and Proposition 2.10, if $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P_i)]) \neq 0$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n$, then $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P_0)]) \neq 0$. \square




FIGURE 4

Example 3.8. In this example, we show that the converse of the conclusion in Discussion 3.7 may not be true. Let P be a poset as shown in Figure 5a. By Lemma 4.4, $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P)]) \neq 0$. Now, let $x = p_4$ and $y = p_7$. Reduce P to P_1 , using the methods of Notation 3.5. Since $p_4 < p_6$ in P , we have $p_7 < p_6$ in P_1 by the definition of P_1 , and the order relations of P are also order relations of P_1 . Thus, P_1 is as shown in Figure 5b. By Theorem 2.7, $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P_1)]) = 0$.

4. PROPERTY N_2 OF HIBI RINGS

In this section, we prove some sufficient conditions regarding when Hibi rings do not satisfy property N_2 .




FIGURE 5

4.1. Here, we prove Theorem 4.8. It shows how to reduce checking property N_2 to a planar distributive sublattice. We begin by proving some relevant lemmas.

Lemma 4.1. [HHO18, Problem 2.16] *Let K be a field, $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and $T = K[y_1, \dots, y_m]$ be two polynomial rings. Let M be a finitely generated graded S -module and N be a finitely generated graded T -module. Then $M \otimes_K N$ is a finitely generated graded $S \otimes_K T$ -module and*

$$\beta_{pq}(M \otimes_K N) = \sum \beta_{p_1 q_1}(M) \beta_{p_2 q_2}(N),$$

where the sum is taken over all p_1 and p_2 with $p_1 + p_2 = p$, and over all q_1 and q_2 with $q_1 + q_2 = q$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let P be a poset and p be an element of P which is comparable to every element of P . Let $P_1 = \{q \in P : q < p\}$ and $P_2 = \{q \in P : q > p\}$ be induced subposets of P . If P_1 and P_2 are not chains, then $R[\mathcal{I}(P)]$ does not satisfy property N_2 .*

Proof. Since P_1 and P_2 are not chains, $R[\mathcal{I}(P_1)]$ and $R[\mathcal{I}(P_2)]$ are not polynomial rings. Therefore, $\beta_{12}(R[\mathcal{I}(P_i)]) \neq 0$ for $i = 1, 2$. Note that P is the ordinal sum $P_1 \oplus \{p\} \oplus P_2$. By Lemma 2.3, $R[\mathcal{I}(P)] = R[\mathcal{I}(P_1)] \otimes R[\mathcal{I}(P_2)]$. Hence, $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P)]) \neq 0$ by Lemma 4.1. \square

In [Ene15], Ene proved the above lemma for the case when $\mathcal{I}(P)$ is a planar distributive lattice.

Lemma 4.3. *Let P be a simple poset such that $\#P = m + n$. Let $\mathcal{I}(P)$ be a planar distributive lattice such that $\mathcal{I}(P) \subseteq [(0, 0), (m, n)]$ with $m, n \geq 2$. On the underlying set of P , let P' be a poset such that every order relation in P is also an order relation in P' . Assume that the set of minimal (respectively maximal) elements of P' coincide with the set of minimal (respectively maximal) elements of P . If $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P)]) \neq 0$, then $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P')]) \neq 0$.*

Proof. If P' is not simple, then there exists an element $p \in P'$ which is comparable to every element of P' . Since P is simple and $\mathcal{I}(P)$ is a planar distributive lattice, P has exactly two minimal elements and exactly two maximal elements. Since the set of minimal (respectively maximal) elements of P' coincide with the set of minimal (respectively maximal) elements of P , we get that p is neither a minimal element nor a maximal element in P' . Let $P_1 = \{q \in P : q < p\}$ and $P_2 = \{q \in P : q > p\}$. Since P_1 and P_2 are not chains, $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P')]) \neq 0$ by Lemma 4.2. So we may assume that P' is simple. Suppose, on the contrary, $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P')]) = 0$. So the conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 2.7

hold for $\mathcal{I}(P')$. Since $\mathcal{I}(P') \subseteq \mathcal{I}(P)$, the conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 2.7 also hold for $\mathcal{I}(P)$ which is a contradiction. Hence the proof. \square



FIGURE 6

Lemma 4.4. *Let P be a poset such that the poset $P' = \{p_1, \dots, p_4\}$ of Figure 6a is a cover-preserving subposet of P . Then $R[\mathcal{I}(P)]$ does not satisfy property N_2 .*

Proof. Observe that by Theorem 2.7, $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P')]) \neq 0$. Let $B = \{p_1, p_2\}$, $B' = \{p_3, p_4\}$. By Discussion 3.3, we may replace P by P_1 , where P_1 is as defined in Discussion 3.3, and assume that the sets of minimal and maximal elements of P coincide with the sets of minimal and maximal elements of P' respectively.

Now, suppose that there exists an element $p \in P$ such that $p \notin P'$. Then, we have $p_i < p < p_j$ for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $j \in \{3, 4\}$. This contradicts that $p_i < p_j$. Therefore, $P = P'$. This completes the proof. \square

Discussion 4.5. Let P be a poset. For $k \geq 1$, let $\mathcal{S} = \cup_{i=1}^k \{p_{i,1}, \dots, p_{i,n_i}\}$ be a subset of the underlying set of P . Assume that $\{p_{1,1}, \dots, p_{k,1}\}$ and $\{p_{1,n_1}, \dots, p_{k,n_k}\}$ are antichains in P . Also, assume that for all $1 \leq i \leq k$, $\{p_{i,1}, \dots, p_{i,n_i}\}$ is a chain in P with $p_{i,1} < \dots < p_{i,n_i}$. For $q \in P \setminus \mathcal{S}$, define $\mathcal{S}_q^P := \{p \in \mathcal{S} : q < p\}$. Let $B = \{p_{1,1}, \dots, p_{k,1}\}$ and $B' = \{p_{1,n_1}, \dots, p_{k,n_k}\}$.

Using Discussion 3.3, reduce P to P_1 , where P_1 is as defined in Discussion 3.3. Let $x, y \in P_1 \setminus \mathcal{S}$ with $x < y$. Reduce P_1 to P_2 , using the methods of Notation 3.5. Observe that $\#P_2 = \#P_1 - 1$, $\mathcal{S} \subset P_2$. Also, B and B' are the sets of minimal and maximal elements of P_2 respectively. Repeating it, we get a sequence P_1, \dots, P_m , where $m \leq \#P - \#\mathcal{S}$ of posets such that for each $1 \leq i \leq m - 1$, there exist $x, y \in P_i \setminus \mathcal{S}$ with $x < y$ and P_i is reduced to P_{i+1} as in Notation 3.5. Moreover, there are no $x, y \in P_m \setminus \mathcal{S}$ with the property $x < y$.

Now, we will do more reductions on P_m . Let $q \in P_m \setminus \mathcal{S}$ be such that $\#\mathcal{S}_q^{P_m} = 1$, say $\mathcal{S}_q^{P_m} = \{p\}$. We have $q < p$ in P_m . Reduce P_m to P_{m+1} , using the methods of Notation 3.5. Under this reduction, $\mathcal{S} \subset P_2$, B and B' are the sets of minimal and maximal elements of P_{m+1} respectively. Repeating it, we get a sequence P_m, P_{m+1}, \dots, P_s of posets such that for each $m \leq i \leq s - 1$, there exists a $q \in P_i \setminus \mathcal{S}$ with $\#\mathcal{S}_q^{P_i} = 1$ and P_i is reduced to P_{i+1} as in Notation 3.5 and there is no $q \in P_s \setminus \mathcal{S}$ with $\#\mathcal{S}_q^{P_s} = 1$. If $\beta_{ij}(R[\mathcal{I}(P_l)]) \neq 0$ for some i, j and $l \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, then by Discussion 3.3, Lemma 3.6 and Proposition 2.10, $\beta_{ij}(R[\mathcal{I}(P)]) \neq 0$. \square

Lemma 4.6. *Let P be a poset and let the poset $P' = \{p_1, \dots, p_4, q_1, \dots, q_n\}$ as shown in Figure 6b be a cover-preserving subposet of P for some $n \geq 1$. Then $R[\mathcal{I}(P)]$ does not satisfy property N_2 .*

Proof. Note that by Lemma 4.2, $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P')]) \neq 0$. Let

$$\mathcal{S} = \{p_1, q_1, \dots, q_n, p_3\} \cup \{p_2, q_1, \dots, q_n, p_4\}.$$

By Discussion 4.5, it suffices to show that $R[\mathcal{I}(P_m)]$ does not satisfy property N_2 , where P_m is as defined in Discussion 4.5. Note that $\{p_1, p_2\}$ and $\{p_3, p_4\}$ are the sets of minimal and maximal elements of P_m respectively. If there exists a cover-preserving subposet of P_m as shown in Figure 6a then $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P_m)]) \neq 0$. So we may assume that P_m does not contain any cover-preserving subposet as shown in Figure 6a. Let \mathcal{S}_q be as defined in Discussion 4.5. There is no $q \in P_m \setminus \mathcal{S}$ with $\mathcal{S}_q = \{p_3, p_4\}$ otherwise P_m will contain a cover-preserving subposet as shown in Figure 6a. So we deduce that $\#\mathcal{S}_q = 1$ for all $q \in P_m \setminus \mathcal{S}$. Now, reduce P_m to P_s as in Discussion 4.5. Then $P_s = P'$. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.7. *Let (P, \leq) be a poset. Then $\mathcal{I}(P) \cong \mathcal{I}(P^\partial)$, where P^∂ is the dual poset of P , that is, (P^∂, \preceq) is the poset with the same underlying set but its order relations are opposite of P i.e. $p \leq q$ if and only if $q \preceq p$. Hence, $R[\mathcal{I}(P)] \cong R[\mathcal{I}(P^\partial)]$.*

Theorem 4.8. *Let P be a poset. Let $\mathcal{S} = \cup_{i=1}^2 \{p_{i,1}, \dots, p_{i,n_i}\}$ be a subset of the underlying set of P such that*

- (1) *for all $1 \leq i \leq 2$, $\{p_{i,1}, \dots, p_{i,n_i}\}$ is a chain in P with $p_{i,1} < \dots < p_{i,n_i}$;*
- (2) *$p_{1,1}$ and $p_{2,1}$ are incomparable in P ;*
- (3) *p_{1,n_1} and p_{2,n_2} are incomparable in P .*

Let P' be the induced subposet of P on the set \mathcal{S} . If $R[\mathcal{I}(P')]$ does not satisfy property N_2 then so does $R[\mathcal{I}(P)]$.

Proof. For P , let $P_1, \dots, P_m, P_{m+1}, \dots, P_s$ be as defined in Discussion 4.5. For $1 \leq i \leq s$, let P'_i be the induced subposet of P_i on the set \mathcal{S} . For $1 \leq i \leq s-1$, every order relation between the elements of \mathcal{S} in P_i is also an order relation in P_{i+1} . Also, $\{p_{1,1}, p_{2,1}\}$ and $\{p_{1,n_1}, p_{2,n_2}\}$ are the sets of minimal and maximal elements of P_i respectively, for all $i = 1, \dots, s$. Therefore, by Lemma 4.3, $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P'_i)]) \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq s$. By Discussion 4.5, it is enough to show that $R[\mathcal{I}(P_s)]$ does not satisfy property N_2 . We may replace P by P_s and P' by P'_s .

Let P^∂ be the dual poset of P . If $q \in P \setminus \mathcal{S}$, then $\#\mathcal{S}_q^P \geq 2$. So if there exists a $q \in P^\partial \setminus \mathcal{S}$ with $\#\mathcal{S}_q^{P^\partial} \geq 2$, then P contains a cover-preserving subposet as shown in Figure 6b. Thus, by Lemma 4.6, $R[\mathcal{I}(P)]$ does not satisfy property N_2 . So we may assume that for all $p \in P^\partial \setminus \mathcal{S}$, $\#\mathcal{S}_p^{P^\partial} = 1$. Repeating the argument of Discussion 4.5 for P^∂ , we obtain a poset Q such that there is no $q \in Q \setminus \mathcal{S}$ with $\#\mathcal{S}_q^Q = 1$. Observe that Q is a poset on the set \mathcal{S} . By Discussion 4.5, it suffices to prove that $R[\mathcal{I}(Q)]$ does not satisfy property N_2 . Note that Q^∂ is a poset on the set \mathcal{S} and all order relations of P' are also the order relations of Q^∂ . So by Lemma 4.3, $R[\mathcal{I}(Q^\partial)]$ does not satisfy property N_2 . Thus, by Lemma 4.7, $R[\mathcal{I}(Q)]$ does not satisfy property N_2 . Hence the proof. \square

Remark 4.9. *Note that in the proof of Theorem 4.8, the reduction from the poset P to the poset Q^∂ is independent of the hypothesis that $\mathcal{I}(P')$ is a planar distributive lattice. In fact, we will also use the reduction from P to Q^∂ in Discussion 4.15 where the distributive lattice is not restricted to be planar.*

We have only used the assumption $\mathcal{I}(P')$ is a planar distributive lattice to conclude that $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(Q^\partial)]) \neq 0$ and $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P'_i)]) \neq 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, s$.

4.2. In this subsection, we prove a result analogous to Ene's result. Suppose that a poset can be decomposed into a union of three chains and it has three maximal and minimal

elements. We prove some necessary conditions regarding when the Hibi ring associated to such poset satisfies property N_2 .

Lemma 4.10. *Let P be a poset on the disjoint union $\cup_{i=1}^3 \{p_{i,1}, p_{i,2}, p_{i,3}\}$ such that*

- (1) *for all $1 \leq i \leq 3$, $\{p_{i,1}, p_{i,2}, p_{i,3}\}$ is a chain in P with $p_{i,1} \prec p_{i,2} \prec p_{i,3}$;*
- (2) *$\{p_{1,1}, p_{2,1}, p_{3,1}\}$ and $\{p_{1,3}, p_{2,3}, p_{3,3}\}$ are the sets of minimal and maximal elements of P respectively.*

If P is pure and connected, then $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P)]) \neq 0$.

Now we prove the main theorem of this subsection.

Theorem 4.11. *Let P be a poset on the set $\cup_{i=1}^3 \{p_{i,1}, \dots, p_{i,n_i}\}$ such that*

- (1) *$p_{1,1}, p_{2,1}, p_{3,1}$ are distinct and $p_{1,n_1}, p_{2,n_2}, p_{3,n_3}$ are distinct;*
- (2) *$\{p_{1,1}, p_{2,1}, p_{3,1}\}$ and $\{p_{1,n_1}, p_{2,n_2}, p_{3,n_3}\}$ are the sets of minimal and maximal elements of P respectively;*
- (3) *for all $1 \leq i \leq 3$, $n_i \geq 3$; $\{p_{i,1}, \dots, p_{i,n_i}\}$ is a chain in P with $p_{i,1} \prec \dots \prec p_{i,n_i}$.*

If P is connected and none of the minimal elements of P is covered by a maximal element, then $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P)]) \neq 0$.

Proof. Reduce P to P_n , where P_n is as defined in Discussion 3.7. Since P is connected, so is P_n . Since none of the minimal elements of P is covered by a maximal element, we obtain that P_n is pure. So by Discussion 3.7, we may replace P by P_n and assume that P is pure and $n_i = 3$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 3$. Let X' be as defined in Notation 3.5. We will prove the result in the following cases:

- (1) If $\#X' = 1$, then the result follows from Lemma 4.2.
- (2) If $\#X' = 2$, then P will contain a cover-preserving subposet as shown in Figure 6b. Hence, the result follows from Lemma 4.6.
- (3) If $\#X' = 3$, then the result follows from Lemma 4.10.

□

Now, we proceed to prove Lemma 4.10. Before that we prove some relevant lemmas.

Lemma 4.12. *Let P be as defined in Lemma 4.10. If there exists an element in P such that either it cover three elements or it is covered by three elements and P is not as shown in figure 7a, then $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P)]) \neq 0$.*

Proof. By Theorem 4.8, we may assume that there is no subposet P' of P , as defined in Theorem 4.8, with $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P')]) \neq 0$. Let $p \in P$ be the element such that either it cover three elements or it is covered by three elements. Note that p is either a maximal element or a minimal element or $p \in \{p_{1,2}, p_{2,2}, p_{3,2}\}$. If p is a maximal element of P , then in P^∂ , p is a minimal element and it is covered by three elements. In this case by Lemma 4.7, replace P by P^∂ and we may assume that p is a minimal element of P . So we only have to consider the cases when either p is a minimal element or $p \in \{p_{1,2}, p_{2,2}, p_{3,2}\}$. In most of the subcases of these two cases, we show that there exist $\delta, \gamma \in \mathcal{I}(P)$ such that $\beta_{24}(R[L']) \neq 0$, where L' is the sublattice $\{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}(P) : \delta \leq \alpha \leq \gamma\}$. Hence, by Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 2.10, we conclude that $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P)]) \neq 0$.

Case 1 Assume that p is a minimal element of P . Possibly by relabelling the elements of P , we may assume that $p = p_{1,1}$. We consider the following two subcases:

- (a) Consider the subcase when $p_{1,1}$ is covered by $\{p_{1,2}, p_{2,2}, p_{3,2}\}$. If either $p_{3,3}$ covers $p_{2,2}$ or $p_{1,3}$ covers any element other than $p_{1,2}$, then exists a subposet P' of P , as defined in Theorem 4.8, with $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P')]) \neq 0$. So we may assume that $p_{3,3}$ does not cover $p_{2,2}$ and $p_{1,3}$ covers $p_{1,2}$ only. We proceed in the following two

subsubcases:

(i) Assume that $p_{3,3}$ is only covering $p_{1,2}$ and $p_{3,2}$. Observe that $\delta = \emptyset$ and $\gamma = P \setminus \{p_{2,3}\}$ are the order ideals of P . By Proposition 3.2, $L' \cong \mathcal{I}(P')$, where P' is the poset as shown in Figure 7d. One can use a computer to check that $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P')]) \neq 0$.

(ii) Now, assume that either $p_{3,3}$ is covering $p_{3,2}$ only or $p_{3,3}$ is covering at least $p_{2,1}$ and $p_{3,2}$. Let $\delta = \emptyset$ and $\gamma = P \setminus \{p_{1,3}, p_{2,3}\}$. By Proposition 3.2, $L' \cong \mathcal{I}(P')$, where P' is one of the posets as shown in Figure 7e-7g. Again, it can be checked by a computer that $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P')]) \neq 0$ for all P' .

- (b) Consider the subcase when $p_{1,1}$ is not covered by $\{p_{1,2}, p_{2,2}, p_{3,2}\}$. So $p_{1,1}$ is either covered by $\{p_{1,2}, p_{2,3}, p_{3,2}\}$ or $\{p_{1,2}, p_{2,2}, p_{3,3}\}$ or $\{p_{1,2}, p_{2,3}, p_{3,3}\}$. By symmetry, it is enough to consider one of the cases from $\{p_{1,2}, p_{2,3}, p_{3,2}\}$ and $\{p_{1,2}, p_{2,2}, p_{3,3}\}$.

First, consider the subsubcase when $p_{1,1}$ is covered by $\{p_{1,2}, p_{2,3}, p_{3,2}\}$. We have $p_{2,1} \prec p_{2,2}$, reduce P to P_1 using the methods of Discussion 3.5. If $p_{2,1}$ is covered by $p_{1,2}$ or $p_{3,2}$ in P , then P_1 will contain a cover-preserving subposet as shown in Figure 6a. So we may assume that $p_{2,1}$ is not covered by $p_{1,2}$ and $p_{3,2}$. Observe that P_1 is a poset on the underlying set $P \setminus \{p_{2,1}\}$. Also, $\{p_{1,1}, p_{2,2}, p_{3,1}\}$ and $\{p_{1,3}, p_{2,3}, p_{3,3}\}$ are the sets of minimal and maximal elements of P_1 respectively. Also, $p_{1,1}$ is covered by $\{p_{1,2}, p_{2,3}, p_{3,2}\}$ in P_1 . Repeating the argument of the subcase (a), we deduce that the result holds in this subsubcase.

Now, we consider the subsubcase when $p_{1,1}$ is covered by $\{p_{1,2}, p_{2,3}, p_{3,3}\}$. Again, we have $p_{2,1} \prec p_{2,2}$, reduce P to P_1 using the methods of Discussion 3.5. If $p_{2,1}$ is covered by $p_{1,2}$ in P , then P_1 will contain a cover-preserving subposet as shown in Figure 6a. So we may assume that $p_{2,1}$ is not covered by $p_{1,2}$ in P . Similarly, we may assume that $p_{3,1}$ is not covered by $p_{1,2}$. If either $p_{2,2}$ or $p_{3,2}$ is covered by $p_{1,3}$, then P will contain a subposet P' , as defined in Theorem 4.8, with $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P')]) \neq 0$. If either $p_{2,2}$ is covered by $p_{3,3}$ or $p_{3,2}$ is covered by $p_{2,3}$, then we are done by the previous subsubcase. Since P is not as shown in figure 7a, the only possibility for P is that P is isomorphic to one of the posets as shown in Figure 7h-7i. One can use a computer to check that $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P)]) \neq 0$.

Case 2 Assume that $p \in \{p_{1,2}, p_{2,2}, p_{3,2}\}$. Possibly by replacing P with P^∂ , we may assume that p is covering all the minimal elements. Possibly by relabelling the elements of P , we may assume that $p = p_{1,2}$. If $p_{2,2}$ and $p_{3,2}$ are covered by $p_{1,3}$, then we are done by Case 1. So we may assume that both $p_{2,2}$ and $p_{3,2}$ are not covered by $p_{1,3}$. Let $\delta = \emptyset$ and $\gamma = P \setminus \{p_{2,3}, p_{3,3}\}$. By Proposition 3.2, $L' \cong \mathcal{I}(P')$, where P' is one of the posets as shown in Figure 7b-7c. Again, one can use a computer to check that $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P')]) \neq 0$.

□

Lemma 4.13. *Let P be as defined in Lemma 4.10. If the induced subposet of P , defined on the underlying set $P \setminus \{p_{1,1}, p_{2,1}, p_{3,1}\}$ or $P \setminus \{p_{1,3}, p_{2,3}, p_{3,3}\}$, is connected. Then $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P)]) \neq 0$.*

Proof. By Theorem 4.8, we may assume that there is no subposet P' of P , as defined in Theorem 4.8, with $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P')]) \neq 0$. Possibly by replacing P with P^∂ , we may assume that the subposet P' of P defined on the underlying set $P \setminus \{p_{1,3}, p_{2,3}, p_{3,3}\}$ is connected. Observe that P' is isomorphic to one of the posets as shown in Figure 8a-8b. If P' is as shown in Figure 8b, then we are done by Lemma 4.12.

Now, consider the case when P' is as shown in Figure 8a. Possibly by relabelling the elements of P , we may assume that $p_{1,2}$ is covering exactly one minimal element of P . If




FIGURE 7




FIGURE 8

either $p_{1,1} \prec p_{3,3}$ or $p_{3,1} \prec p_{2,3}$ or $p_{2,2} \prec p_{3,3}$ or $p_{3,2} \prec p_{2,3}$, then there exists a subposet P' of P , as defined in Theorem 4.8, with $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P')]) \neq 0$. Let $\delta = \emptyset$ and $\gamma = P \setminus \{p_{1,2}, p_{1,3}\}$. Let also $L' = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}(P) : \delta \leq \alpha \leq \gamma\}$. By Proposition 3.2, $L' \cong \mathcal{I}(P_1)$, where P_1 is as shown in Figure 8c. One can use a computer to check that $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P_1)]) \neq 0$. Hence, by Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 2.10, $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P)]) \neq 0$. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.10. By Theorem 4.8, we may assume that there is no subposet P' of P , as defined in Theorem 4.8, with $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P')]) \neq 0$. By Lemma 4.12, we may assume that there is no element in P such that either it cover three elements or it is covered by three elements. By Lemma 4.13, we may assume that the subposets of P defined on the




FIGURE 9

underlying sets $P \setminus \{p_{1,1}, p_{2,1}, p_{3,1}\}$ and $P \setminus \{p_{1,3}, p_{2,3}, p_{3,3}\}$ are not connected. Then P is isomorphic to one of the posets as shown in Figure 9. One can use a computer to check that $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P)]) \neq 0$. This concludes the proof. \square

Discussion 4.14. Here we answer the following question: what happens if we weaken the hypothesis of Theorem 4.11? Let P be a poset as defined in Theorem 4.11. When P is disconnected, it follows from [Vee22, Corollary 3.2, Theorem 3.13] that $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P)]) = 0$ if and only if P is a disjoint union of two posets P_1 and P_2 such that $\mathcal{I}(P_1)$ is a planar distributive lattice with $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P_1)]) = 0$ and P_2 is a chain..

On the other hand, suppose that P is connected and there exists a minimal element of P which is covered by a maximal element. Using the proof of Theorem 4.11, we may replace the poset P by P_n and assume that $n_i = 3$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 3$. Let X' be as defined in Notation 3.5. Observe that $\#X' \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. If $\#X' = 1$ or 2 , then $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P)]) \neq 0$ by the argument of the proof of Theorem 4.11.

Now, consider the case when $\#X' = 3$. We know that if P is as shown in figure 7a, then $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P)]) = 0$. So we may assume that P is not as shown in figure 7a. By Theorem 4.8, we may assume that there is no subposet P' of P , as defined in Theorem 4.8, with $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P')]) \neq 0$. By Lemma 4.12, we may assume that there is no element in P such that either it cover three elements or it is covered by three elements. By Lemma 4.13, we may assume that the subposets of P defined on the underlying sets $P \setminus \{p_{1,1}, p_{2,1}, p_{3,1}\}$ and $P \setminus \{p_{1,3}, p_{2,3}, p_{3,3}\}$ are not connected. Then P is isomorphic to one of the posets as shown in Figure 10. One can use a computer to check that if P is isomorphic to one of the posets as shown in Figure 10a-10e, then $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P)]) = 0$ otherwise $\beta_{24}(R[\mathcal{I}(P)]) \neq 0$.

Remark 4.15. Let P be a poset. Let $\mathcal{S} = \cup_{i=1}^3 \{p_{i,1}, \dots, p_{i,n_i}\}$ be a subset of the underlying set of P such that

- (a) $p_{1,1}, p_{2,1}, p_{3,1}$ are distinct and $p_{1,n_1}, p_{2,n_2}, p_{3,n_3}$ are distinct;
- (b) $B := \{p_{1,1}, p_{2,1}, p_{3,1}\}$ and $B' := \{p_{1,n_1}, p_{2,n_2}, p_{3,n_3}\}$ are antichains in P ;
- (c) for all $1 \leq i \leq 3$, $n_i \geq 3$; $\{p_{i,1}, \dots, p_{i,n_i}\}$ is a chain in P with $p_{i,1} < \dots < p_{i,n_i}$.

Using Discussion 4.5 and the arguments of the proof of Theorem 4.8, we can reduce P to the poset Q^∂ , where Q^∂ is a poset on the underlying set \mathcal{S} . Note that B and B' are the sets of minimal and maximal elements of Q^∂ respectively. by Discussion 4.5, $R[\mathcal{I}(P)]$ does not satisfy property N_2 if $R[\mathcal{I}(Q^\partial)]$ does not satisfy property N_2 which can be easily checked using Theorem 4.11 and Discussion 4.14.




FIGURE 10

5. PROPERTY N_p OF HIBI RINGS FOR $p \geq 3$

Lemma 5.1. *Let $P_{n,m}$, where $n, m \geq 2$, be the poset as shown in Figure 11. Then $R[\mathcal{I}(P_{n,m})]$ does not satisfy N_3 .*

Proof. Observe that $R[\mathcal{I}(P_{n,m})]$ satisfies property N_2 , by Theorem 2.7. Let $x = p_2$ and $y = p_n$. Reduce $P_{n,m}$ to $P_{2,m}$ using the methods of Notation 3.5. Now in $P_{2,m}$, let $x = q_2$ and $y = q_m$. Reduce $P_{2,m}$ to $P_{2,2}$ using the method discussed in Notation 3.5. For $n, m = 2$, one can use a computer to check that $\beta_{35}(R[\mathcal{I}(P_{n,m})]) \neq 0$. By Lemma 3.6 and Proposition 2.10, we have $\beta_{35}(R[\mathcal{I}(P_{n,m})]) \neq 0$. This completes the proof. \square




FIGURE 11. $P_{n,m}$; $n, m \geq 2$

Lemma 5.2. *Let P be a poset such that $\mathcal{I}(P)$ is a planar distributive lattice. Assume that P has two minimal and maximal elements. If $R(\mathcal{I}(P))$ satisfies property N_3 , then P is a disjoint union of two chains.*

Proof. Suppose that $R(\mathcal{I}(P))$ satisfies property N_3 . Then, it also satisfies property N_2 . So P is simple otherwise there exists an element $p \in P$ which is comparable to every element of P . By hypothesis, p is neither a minimal element nor a maximal element. Let $P_1 = \{q \in P : q < p\}$ and $P_2 = \{q \in P : q > p\}$. Since P_1 and P_2 are not chains, $R(\mathcal{I}(P))$ does not satisfy property N_2 by Lemma 4.2, which is a contradiction. By Corollary 2.8, P is isomorphic to one of the posets as shown in Figure 2. If P is not isomorphic to the poset shown in Figure 2a, then it will contain a cover-preserving subposet as shown in Figure 11, call it P' . Let B and B' be the sets of minimal and maximal elements of P' respectively. Hence, by Discussion 3.3 and Lemma 5.1, $\beta_{35}(R[\mathcal{I}(P)]) \neq 0$. This concludes the proof. \square

Now we prove our main theorem about property N_3 of Hibi rings associated to connected posets.

Theorem 5.3. *Let P be a connected poset. Assume that P has at least two minimal and at least two maximal elements. Then $R[\mathcal{I}(P)]$ does not satisfy property N_3 .*

Proof. Claim : There exist two maximal chains $C_1 = \{p_1, \dots, p_r\}$ and $C_2 = \{q_1, \dots, q_s\}$ of P such that $p_1 < \dots < p_r$, $q_1 < \dots < q_s$, $p_1 \neq q_1$, $p_r \neq q_s$ and $r, s \geq 2$.

Assume the claim. Let $\mathcal{S} = C_1 \cup C_2$. Using Discussion 4.5 and the proof of Theorem 4.8, we can reduce P to the poset Q^∂ , where Q^∂ is a poset on the underlying set \mathcal{S} and it is enough to show that $R[\mathcal{I}(Q^\partial)]$ does not satisfy property N_3 . Observe that Q^∂ is connected, $\{p_1, q_1\}$ and $\{p_r, q_s\}$ are the sets of minimal and maximal elements of Q^∂ respectively. By Lemma 5.2, $R[\mathcal{I}(Q^\partial)]$ does not satisfy property N_3 . This completes the proof.

Now we prove the claim. Let C be a maximal chain in P with the minimal element p and maximal element q . Fix a maximal element $q' \in P$ where $q' \neq q$. If there exists a maximal chain C' with the maximal element q' and the minimal element not equal to p , then we are done. So we may assume that all maximal chains with the maximal element q' have minimal element p . Fix a minimal element $p' \in P$ where $p' \neq p$. If there exists a maximal chain C'' with the minimal element p' and maximal element not equal to q , then we are done. So we may assume that all maximal chains with the minimal element p' have maximal element q . Then, we can take C_1 to be a maximal chain from p to q' and C_2 to be a maximal chain from p' to q . Hence the proof. \square

Definition 5.4. *Let P be a poset and $I_{\mathcal{I}(P)}$ be the Hibi ideal associated to $\mathcal{I}(P)$. Then $I_{\mathcal{I}(P)}$ is said to have a linear resolution if $\beta_{ij}(I_{\mathcal{I}(P)}) = 0$ for $j \neq i + 2$. We say that the Hibi ring $R[\mathcal{I}(P)]$ has a linear resolution if $I_{\mathcal{I}(P)}$ has a linear resolution.*




FIGURE 12. L

Recall the notion of graphs from Subsection 2.4. The following lemma will be needed in the proof of our main theorem about property N_p for $p \geq 4$.

Lemma 5.5. *Let L be a distributive lattice as shown in Figure 12. Then the comparability graph G_L of L is chordal.*

Proof. First break the underlying set of L in two disjoint subsets $A_1 = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ and $A_2 = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$ (see Figure 12 for notational conventions). Let $C = (c_1, \dots, c_r)$ be a induced cycle of G_L of length ≥ 4 . If $\{c_1, \dots, c_r\} \cap A_i \geq 3$ for any $i \in \{1, 2\}$, then C has a chord because every pair in A_i is an edge of G_L . So we may assume that $r = 4$ and $\#\{c_1, \dots, c_r\} \cap A_i = 2$ for all i . Let $\{c_{i_1}, c_{i_2}\} \subseteq A_1$ and $\{c_{i_3}, c_{i_4}\} \subseteq A_2$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $c_1 = c_{i_1}$ and $c_1 < c_{i_2}$ in L . Let $c \in \{c_{i_3}, c_{i_4}\}$ be such that $\{c_1, c\}$ is an edge in C . Therefore, c_1 and c are comparable in L ; therefore $c < c_1$ because $c_1 \in A_1$ and $c \in A_2$. Therefore $c < c_{i_2}$. Hence (c_1, c, c_{i_2}) is a induced chain in G_L . Thus C has a chord. This completes the proof. \square

Example 5.6. Let P_1 be an antichain of cardinality three and P_2 be a poset such that it is a disjoint union of two chains of length 1. By [Hib87, § 3, Corollary], $R[\mathcal{I}(P_i)]$ is a Gorenstein ring for all $i = 1, 2$. For all $i = 1, 2$, the Hibi ring $R[\mathcal{I}(P_i)]$ is Cohen-Macaulay, it is a quotient of a polynomial ring in $\#\mathcal{I}(P_i)$ variables and the Krull-dimension of $R[\mathcal{I}(P_i)]$ is $\#P_i + 1$. So the Auslander-Buchsbaum formula implies that $\text{projdim}(R[\mathcal{I}(P_i)]) = \#\mathcal{I}(P_i) - \#P_i - 1$ for $i = 1, 2$. It is easy to see that $\text{projdim}(R[\mathcal{I}(P_i)]) = 4$ for all $i = 1, 2$. By self-duality of minimal free resolution of Gorenstein rings, we obtain that $\beta_{4j}(R[\mathcal{I}(P_i)]) \neq 0$ for some $j \geq 6$ and for all $i = 1, 2$ irrespective of the characteristic of the field K .

Theorem 5.7. *Let P be a poset and $p \geq 4$. Let $P' = \{p_{i_1}, \dots, p_{i_r}\}$ be the subset of all elements of P which are comparable to every element of P . Let P'' be the induced subposet of P on the set $P \setminus P'$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (a) $R[\mathcal{I}(P)]$ satisfies property N_p .
- (b) $R[\mathcal{I}(P)]$ satisfies property N_4 .
- (c) Either P is a chain or P'' is a disjoint union of a chain and an isolated element.
- (d) Either $R[\mathcal{I}(P)]$ is a polynomial ring or $K[\mathcal{I}(P'')]/\text{in}_{<}(\mathcal{I}(P''))$ has a linear resolution.
- (e) Either $R[\mathcal{I}(P)]$ is a polynomial ring or it has a linear resolution.

Before going to the proof of the theorem, we remark that not all of the equivalent statements are new. For example, (c) \iff (e) was proved in [EQR13, Corollary 10] and (e) \implies (d) follows from [CV20, Corollary 2.7].

Proof. (a) \implies (b) is trivial.

(b) \implies (c) If $\text{width}(P) \geq 3$, then there exists an antichain P_1 in P of cardinality three. By Discussion 3.3, $\beta_{ij}(R[\mathcal{I}(P_1)]) \leq \beta_{ij}(R[\mathcal{I}(P)])$ for all i and j . Since $\beta_{4j}(R[\mathcal{I}(P_1)]) \neq 0$

for some $j \geq 6$ by Example 5.6, $\beta_{4j}(R[\mathcal{I}(P)]) \neq 0$. Thus, $R[\mathcal{I}(P)]$ does not satisfy property N_4 . So we may assume that $\text{width}(P) \leq 2$. If $\text{width}(P) = 1$, then P is a chain. We now consider $\text{width}(P) = 2$. Observe that P'' is simple. Since $R[\mathcal{I}(P'')]$ satisfies property N_4 , it also satisfies property N_3 . By Lemma 5.2, P'' is a disjoint union of two chains. Suppose that P'' is a poset on the set $\cup_{i=1}^2 \{p_{i,1}, \dots, p_{i,n_i}\}$ such that $\{p_{i,1}, \dots, p_{i,n_i}\}$ is a chain in P'' with $p_{i,1} \prec \dots \prec p_{i,n_i}$ for all $i = 1, 2$. We have to show that either $n_1 = 1$ or $n_2 = 1$. Suppose that, on the contrary, $n_i \geq 2$ for all $i = 1, 2$. Let P_2 be the induced subposet of P'' on the set $\cup_{i=1}^2 \{p_{i,1}, p_{i,2}\}$. Let B and B' be the sets of minimal and maximal elements of P_2 respectively. By Example 5.6 and Discussion 3.3, $\beta_{4j}(R[\mathcal{I}(P)]) \neq 0$ for some $j \geq 6$ which is a contradiction. Hence the proof.

(c) \Rightarrow (d) If P is a chain, then $R[\mathcal{I}(P)]$ is a polynomial ring. Observe that the distributive lattice $\mathcal{I}(P'')$ is as shown in Figure 12. The ideal $\text{in}_{<}(I_{\mathcal{I}(P'')})$ is the Stanley-Reisner ideal of the order complex $\Delta(\mathcal{I}(P''))$ of $\mathcal{I}(P'')$ (see [Vee22, Subsection 4.1]). It was observed in Subsection 2.4 that $\Delta(\mathcal{I}(P'')) = \Delta(G_{\mathcal{I}(P'')})$ where $G_{\mathcal{I}(P'')}$ is the comparability graph of $\mathcal{I}(P'')$. Now the result follows from Lemma 5.5 and [Frö90, Theorem 1].

(d) \Rightarrow (e) Since the Betti numbers of $K[\mathcal{I}(P'')]/\text{in}_{<}(I_{\mathcal{I}(P'')})$ over the ring $K[\mathcal{I}(P'')]$ are greater than equal to those of $R[\mathcal{I}(P'')]$ [Pee11, Theorem 22.9], we get that $R[\mathcal{I}(P'')]$ has a linear resolution. Thus, $R[\mathcal{I}(P)]$ has a linear resolution by Corollary 2.4.

(e) \Rightarrow (a) is immediate. \square

We now use Theorem 5.7 and [Frö90, Theorem 1] to characterize comparability graph of distributive lattices which are chordal. It is immediate that for a chain P of length n , G_P is the complete graph on the set $[n + 1]$ which is chordal.

Corollary 5.8. *Let $L = \mathcal{I}(P)$ be a distributive lattice and G_L be the comparability graph of L . For P , let P'' be as defined in Theorem 5.7. Then G_L is chordal if and only if P is a chain or P'' is a disjoint union of a chain and an isolated element.*

6. COMPLETE INTERSECTION HIBI RINGS

In this section, we will combinatorially characterize complete intersection Hibi rings.

Let P_1 and P_2 be two posets and P be the ordinal sum of P_1 and P_2 . Let $R[\mathcal{I}(P_1)] = K[\{x_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathcal{I}(P_1)\}]/I_{\mathcal{I}(P_1)}$, $R[\mathcal{I}(P_2)] = K[\{y_\beta : \beta \in \mathcal{I}(P_2)\}]/I_{\mathcal{I}(P_2)}$ and $R[\mathcal{I}(P)] = K[\{z_\gamma : \gamma \in \mathcal{I}(P)\}]/I_{\mathcal{I}(P)}$.

Lemma 6.1. *Let P_1 , P_2 and P be as above. Then*

$$R[\mathcal{I}(P)] \cong (R[\mathcal{I}(P_1)] \otimes_K R[\mathcal{I}(P_2)])/(x_{P_1} - y_\emptyset).$$

Proof. Let $T = K[\{x_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathcal{I}(P_1)\} \cup \{y_\beta : \beta \in \mathcal{I}(P_2)\}]/(x_{P_1} - y_\emptyset)$ and $T' = T/(I_{\mathcal{I}(P_1)}T + I_{\mathcal{I}(P_2)}T)$. Define a map

$$\varphi : K[\mathcal{I}(P)] \rightarrow T$$

by

$$\varphi(z_\gamma) = \begin{cases} x_\gamma & \text{if } \gamma \subseteq P_1, \\ y_{\gamma'} & \text{if } \gamma = P_1 \cup \gamma', \text{ where } \gamma' \subseteq P_2. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that φ is an isomorphism. If $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{I}(P)$ are incomparable then either $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{I}(P_1)$ or $\alpha = P_1 \cup \alpha'$ and $\beta = P_1 \cup \beta'$ where $\alpha', \beta' \in \mathcal{I}(P_2)$ and α', β' incomparable. Let $\pi : T \rightarrow T'$ be the natural projection. Thus, $\pi \circ \varphi : K[\mathcal{I}(P)] \rightarrow T'$ and $\ker(\pi \circ \varphi) = \varphi^{-1}(I_{\mathcal{I}(P_1)}T + I_{\mathcal{I}(P_2)}T)$.

Thus, it is sufficient to show that $\varphi(I_{\mathcal{I}(P)}) = I_{\mathcal{I}(P_1)}T + I_{\mathcal{I}(P_2)}T$. The proof of this is similar to the proof of Lemma 2.3. \square

Example 6.2. Let P_1 and P_2 be the posets as shown in Figure 13b and Figure 13c respectively. Then the respective graded Betti table of $R[\mathcal{I}(P_1)]$ and $R[\mathcal{I}(P_2)]$ are the following:

	0	1	2	3	4
total:	1	9	16	9	1
0:	1
1:	.	9	16	9	.
2:	1

	0	1	2
total:	1	3	2
0:	1	.	.
1:	.	3	2




FIGURE 13

Now, we prove the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 6.3. Let P be a poset and $P' = \{p_{i_1}, \dots, p_{i_r}\}$ be the subset of all elements of P which are comparable to every element of P . Let P'' be the induced subposet of P on the set $P \setminus P'$. Then the following are equivalent:

- (a) $R[\mathcal{I}(P)]$ is a complete intersection.
- (b) Either P is a chain or P'' is as shown in Figure 13a.

Proof. (a) \Rightarrow (b). Suppose that $R[\mathcal{I}(P)]$ is a complete intersection. Therefore, $\beta_{23}(R[\mathcal{I}(P)]) = 0$. We break the proof by width of the poset. If $\text{width}(P) \geq 3$, then there exists an antichain P_1 of P of cardinality 3. By Discussion 3.3, $\beta_{23}(R[\mathcal{I}(P_1)]) \leq \beta_{23}(R[\mathcal{I}(P)])$. Since $\beta_{23}(R[\mathcal{I}(P_1)]) \neq 0$ by Example 6.2, we obtain that $\beta_{23}(R[\mathcal{I}(P)]) \neq 0$. So we may assume that $\text{width}(P) \leq 2$. If $\text{width}(P) = 1$, then P is a chain. Hence, the only case we need to consider is $\text{width}(P) = 2$. Now if P'' is not as shown in Figure 13a, then P'' contain the poset as shown in Figure 13c as a cover-preserving subposet, call it P_2 . Let B and B' be the sets of minimal and maximal elements of P_2 respectively. From Discussion 3.3 and Example 6.2, $\beta_{23}(R[\mathcal{I}(P)]) \neq 0$. This concludes the proof.

(b) \Rightarrow (a). If P is a chain, then $R[\mathcal{I}(P)]$ is a polynomial ring. So we may assume that P is not a chain. Since $R[\mathcal{I}(P)] \cong R[\mathcal{I}(P'')] \otimes_K K[y_1, \dots, y_r]$, it is enough to show that $R[\mathcal{I}(P'')]$ is a complete intersection. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, let $P_i = \{p_{2i-1}, p_{2i}\}$ and $Q_i = \{a \in P'' : a \leq p_{2i-1}\} \cup \{p_{2i}\}$ be the subposets of P . Observe that $Q_n = P''$. For $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, by Lemma 6.1,

$$R[\mathcal{I}(Q_{i+1})] \cong (R[\mathcal{I}(Q_i)] \otimes_K R[\mathcal{I}(P_{i+1})]) / (x_{Q_i} - y_\emptyset)$$

where \emptyset is the minimal element $\mathcal{I}(P_{i+1})$. We prove the theorem by induction on i . It is easy to see that the result holds for $i = 1$. Now assume that the result holds for i . Since

$R[\mathcal{I}(P_{i+1})] \cong R[\mathcal{I}(Q_1)]$, we get $R[\mathcal{I}(Q_i)] \otimes_K R[\mathcal{I}(P_{i+1})]$ is a complete intersection. Hence, $R[\mathcal{I}(Q_{i+1})]$ is a complete intersection. Hence the proof. \square

REFERENCES

- [ACI15] Luchezar L. Avramov, Aldo Conca, and Srikanth B. Iyengar. Subadditivity of syzygies of Koszul algebras. *Math. Ann.*, 361(1-2):511–534, 2015.
- [BH97] Winfried Bruns and Jürgen Herzog. Semigroup rings and simplicial complexes. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 122(3):185–208, 1997.
- [CV20] Aldo Conca and Matteo Varbaro. Square-free Gröbner degenerations. *Invent. Math.*, 221(3):713–730, 2020.
- [DM17] Priya Das and Himadri Mukherjee. First syzygy of hibi rings associated with planar distributive lattices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.08286*, 2017.
- [EHH15] Viviana Ene, Jürgen Herzog, and Takayuki Hibi. Linearly related polyominoes. *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 41(4):949–968, 2015.
- [EHSM15] Viviana Ene, Jürgen Herzog, and Sara Saeedi Madani. A note on the regularity of Hibi rings. *Manuscripta Math.*, 148(3-4):501–506, 2015.
- [Ene15] Viviana Ene. Syzygies of Hibi rings. *Acta Math. Vietnam.*, 40(3):403–446, 2015.
- [EQR13] Viviana Ene, Ayesha Asloob Qureshi, and Asia Rauf. Regularity of join-meet ideals of distributive lattices. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 20(3):Paper 20, 8, 2013.
- [Frö90] Ralf Fröberg. On Stanley-Reisner rings. In *Topics in algebra, Part 2 (Warsaw, 1988)*, volume 26 of *Banach Center Publ.*, pages 57–70. PWN, Warsaw, 1990.
- [GL86] Mark Green and Robert Lazarsfeld. On the projective normality of complete linear series on an algebraic curve. *Invent. Math.*, 83(1):73–90, 1986.
- [HHO18] Jürgen Herzog, Takayuki Hibi, and Hidefumi Ohsugi. *Binomial ideals*, volume 279 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, Cham, 2018.
- [Hib87] Takayuki Hibi. Distributive lattices, affine semigroup rings and algebras with straightening laws. In *Commutative algebra and combinatorics (Kyoto, 1985)*, volume 11 of *Adv. Stud. Pure Math.*, pages 93–109. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1987.
- [HO17] Takayuki Hibi and Hidefumi Ohsugi. A Gröbner basis characterization for chordal comparability graphs. *Eur. J. Comb.*, 59:122–128, 2017.
- [Kem90] George R. Kempf. Some wonderful rings in algebraic geometry. *J. Algebra*, 134(1):222–224, 1990.
- [M2] Daniel R. Grayson and Michael E. Stillman. Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry. Available at <http://www.math.uiuc.edu/Macaulay2/>.
- [Pee11] Irena Peeva. *Graded syzygies*, volume 14 of *Algebra and Applications*. Springer-Verlag London, Ltd., London, 2011.
- [Sage] The Sage Developers. *SageMath, the Sage Mathematics Software System (Version 9.2)*, 2020. <https://www.sagemath.org>.
- [Sta12] Richard P. Stanley. *Enumerative combinatorics. Volume 1*, volume 49 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 2012.
- [Stu96] Bernd Sturmfels. *Grobner bases and convex polytopes*, volume 8. American Mathematical Soc., 1996.
- [Vee22] Dharm Veer. Green-Lazarsfeld property N_p for Segre product of Hibi rings. *Submitted*, 2022.

CHENNAI MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, SIRUSERI, TAMILNADU 603103, INDIA.
 Email address: dharm@cmi.ac.in