

DISTANCE REDUCING MARKOV BASES

OLIVER CLARKE AND DIMITRA KOSTA

ABSTRACT. The distance reducing property for Markov bases is an important property that provides a bound on the mixing time of the associated Markov chain. The goal of this project is to understand properties of distance-reducing Markov bases. We explore the distance reducing property for monomial curves and give a complete characterisation of distance reduction in the case of complete intersection monomial curves. Our characterisation carefully uses the notion of gluings for numerical semigroups. We also characterise the distance reducing property for non-complete intersection monomial curves in small dimensions. We also explore the distance irreducible elements: the moves that appear in all distance reducing Markov bases.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Our results	2
1.2. Paper outline	3
2. Preliminaries	4
2.1. Complete intersections and gluings	6
3. Monomial curves in \mathbb{A}^3	7
3.1. Complete intersections	8
3.2. Non complete intersections	9
4. Monomial curves of the first kind	10
5. Complete intersection monomial curves	15
5.1. A condition for gluings of the first kind	16
5.2. Existence of distinguished circuits	18
5.3. Gluing trees	20
6. Monomial curves in \mathbb{A}^4	24
6.1. Complete intersections	24
6.2. Glued non-complete intersections	25
7. Generalisations of 1-norm results	29
8. Distance irreducible elements	30
9. Discussion	36
9.1. Distance reducing complex	38
References	42

1. INTRODUCTION

In Algebraic Statistics, Markov bases play an important role in sampling contingency tables and approximating Fisher's exact test with a Markov chain Monte Carlo approach. For background on Algebraic Statistics we refer to [15, 6, 3], and for a thorough survey on Markov bases and contingency tables we refer to [1]. When the sample size is large, it becomes infeasible to write down every possible contingency table. As an approximation,

we may use a Markov chain Monte Carlo method outlined by Diaconis and Sturmfels [5]: start with any sample with the correct marginals; repeatedly apply random moves to obtain a random sample. The set of moves is a fixed Markov basis, which is a generating set of the underlying toric ideal. By definition, a Markov basis produces a connected Markov chain on the fiber of the contingency table. So, after a certain number of moves, the sample produced is close to the stationary distribution of the Markov chain. The number of moves required to achieve this is called the *mixing time*.

It is highly desirable to have a Markov basis with a low mixing time. However, computing the mixing time is often very difficult. So, we would like to find Markov bases that tightly and predictably connect the fibers of the contingency table. This motivates the notion of a *distance reducing* Markov basis. See Definition 2.2 and [2]. For distance reducing Markov bases, the minimum number of moves required to connect a pair of points in a fiber is bounded above the distance between them.

There are many known examples of distance reducing Markov bases. For instance, the Graver basis is distance reducing with respect to the 1-norm. For the homogeneous case, see [2], and for the general case we prove the following.

Proposition (Proposition 7.2). *The Graver basis is strongly distance reducing, even if A is inhomogeneous.*

The family of *strongly robust* toric ideals are those that are minimally generated by their Graver basis. While this may seem like a very strong condition, there are a number of families of examples that exhibit a rich combinatorial structure. See [9, 10, 12, 16, 7]. For instance, the family of toric ideals of Lawrence type are strongly robust, see [14, Chapter 7]. For each strongly robust toric ideal, any Markov basis is distance reducing. However, not all distance reducing Markov bases belong to strongly robust toric ideals.

1.1. Our results. Typically the Graver basis is very large and impractical to compute, even for some small examples. So it is useful to find methods to determine whether a Markov basis is distance reducing with very few computational steps. In this paper, we characterise the distance reduction property for complete intersection monomial curves in terms of the *circuits*.

Theorem (Corollary 5.2). *Let $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{1 \times n}$ and assume that I_A is a complete intersection toric ideal. Let $M \subseteq \ker(A)$ be a minimal Markov basis. Then M is distance reducing if and only if M reduces the distance of the circuits of A .*

In the above, a circuit refers to an element $z \in \ker(A)$ of the form

$$z = (0, \dots, 0, z_i, 0, \dots, 0, -z_j, 0, \dots, 0),$$

i.e., an element supported on exactly two coordinates. This classification shows that to check the distance reduction property for monomial curves, it suffices to check that a Markov basis reduces the distance of the circuits. The circuits form a very small subset of the Graver basis, so this result is a significant improvement over checking the entire Graver basis, see Theorem 7.4 below.

For non complete intersection, we give a similar characterisation. For monomial curves in \mathbb{A}^3 , we use Herzog's classification of Markov bases [8] to prove the following.

Theorem (Theorems 3.1, 3.5 and 3.6). *Let $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{1 \times 3}$ and M a minimal Markov basis for A . Then M is distance reducing if and only if M reduces the distance of the circuits of A .*

Similarly for monomial curves in \mathbb{A}^4 , we characterise the distance reduction property whenever the curve admits a *gluing*.

Theorem (Theorem 6.8). *Let $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{1 \times 4}$ and $M \subseteq \ker(A)$ a minimal Markov basis for A . Assume that A admits a gluing. Then M is distance reducing if and only if M reduces the distance of the circuits of A .*

A gluing is a operation that arises in the classification of complete intersection toric ideals [13, 11]. The proofs of the above results carefully use the properties of Markov bases that arise from glued monomial curves.

There are many important families of moves related to Markov bases. For instance: the *indispensables* $S(A)$ are the moves that belong to every Markov basis; the *Graver basis* $G(A)$ is a Markov basis given by the set of *primitive* elements; and the *Universal Markov basis* $M(A)$ is the union of all minimal Markov bases. These sets also admit algebraic descriptions in terms of certain decompositions [4].

The distance-reducing analogue of the indispensables is the set of *distance irreducible elements*, which are the elements that appear in every distance reducing Markov basis. In Section 8, we define and investigate the relationships between the families of moves $S(A)$, $M(A)$, $G(A)$ above, and their distance-reducing analogues: weakly distance irreducibles $D^w(A)$, distance irreducibles $D(A)$, universal strongly distance reducing Markov basis $\mathcal{D}^s(A)$, and universal distance-reducing Markov basis $\mathcal{D}(A)$.

Proposition (Proposition 8.6). *The following chain of inclusions holds:*

$$S(A) \subseteq D(A) \subseteq D^w(A) \subseteq G(A).$$

If A has a unique minimal Markov basis then we may relate the universal Markov basis to the distance irreducible elements as follows.

Proposition (Proposition 8.13). *If A has a unique distance-reducing minimal Markov basis, then we have*

$$S(A) = D(A) = M(A) = \mathcal{D}(A).$$

We also show that there are always finitely many minimal distance reducing Markov bases.

Theorem (Corollary 8.17). *The sets $\mathcal{D}(A)$ and $\mathcal{D}^s(A)$ are finite.*

1.2. Paper outline. In Section 2 we fix our notation for: Markov bases; distance reduction, see Definition 2.2; and gluings in Section 2.1.

Sections 3-6 are about the distance reduction property for monomial curves. In Section 3, we characterise the distance reduction property of monomial curves in \mathbb{A}^3 . Our main results are Theorem 3.5 for complete intersections and Theorem 3.6 for non complete intersections. In Section 4 we characterise the distance reduction property for a special kind of symmetric complete intersection monomial curves given by Theorem 4.3. In Section 5, we prove Theorem 5.1, which shows that distance reducing Markov bases of complete intersection monomial curves are exactly those in Section 4. In Section 6, we focus on monomial curves in \mathbb{A}^4 . We make explicit the characterisation complete intersections in Corollary 6.2 and characterise the distance reducing Markov bases of glued non complete intersections in Theorem 6.8.

In Section 7 we generalise results from [2] to the inhomogeneous case and prove that a Markov basis is distance reducing if and only if it reduced the distance of the Graver basis. See Theorem 7.4. In Section 8, we report on the *distance irreducible elements*, which are the elements that appear in every distance reducing Markov basis. In Section 9 we discuss possible generalisations of our results and further questions. In particular, in Section 9.1 we introduce the distance reducing complex for studying families of metrics.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Notation. Throughout, we write $\mathbb{N} := \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ for the set of non-negative integers and $[n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ for the integers from 1 to n . For any set S , such as \mathbb{N} , \mathbb{Z} or \mathbb{Q} , we take elements of S^n to be column vectors. Given a set of positive integers $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$, we write $\mathbb{N}X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ for the numerical semigroup generated by X and $\mathbb{Z}X \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ for the subgroup generated by X .

Affine semigroups. Throughout, we consider matrices $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{d \times n}$, which, unless specified otherwise, we assume satisfy $\ker(A) \cap \mathbb{N}^n = \{0\}$. For any vector $u \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ we define u^+ and u^- to be the unique vectors in \mathbb{N}^n such that $u = u^+ - u^-$. We denote by $(u)_i$ is the i -th coordinate of u and $u_i = |(u)_i|$ its absolute value. Let $R = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a polynomial ring and recall the multi-index notation for monomials $x^u := x_1^{u_1} x_2^{u_2} \cdots x_n^{u_n} \in R$ for any $u = (u_1, \dots, u_n)^T \in \mathbb{N}^n$. The columns a_1, \dots, a_n of A generate the affine semigroup

$$\mathbb{N}A := \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} \lambda_i a_i : \lambda_i \in \mathbb{N} \right\} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d.$$

For each $t \in \mathbb{N}A$, we write $\mathcal{F}_t = \{u \in \mathbb{N}^n : Au = t\}$ for the *fiber* of A . In addition, given any element $v \in \mathbb{N}^n$, we write $\mathcal{F}(v) := \mathcal{F}_{Av}$ for the fiber containing v . We denote by $\mathcal{F}(A) = \{\mathcal{F}_t : t \in \mathbb{N}A\}$ the collection of all fibers of A .

Markov bases. The *toric ideal* of A is defined to be $I_A = \langle x^{u^+} - x^{u^-} : u \in \ker(A) \rangle \subseteq R$. A *Markov basis* is a set $B \subseteq \ker(A)$ such that $I_A = \langle x^{u^+} - x^{u^-} : u \in B \rangle$. A Markov basis is *minimal* if no proper subset is a Markov basis. The union of all minimal Markov bases is the *Universal Markov basis*, denoted $M(A)$. The intersection of all Markov bases $S(A)$ is called the set of indispensable elements. The natural partial ordering on \mathbb{N}^n is given by $u \leq v \iff u_i \leq v_i$ for all $i \in [n]$. An element $z \in \ker(A)$ is called *primitive* if $y \in \ker(A)$ with $y^+ \leq z^+$ and $y^- \leq z^-$ then $y = z$. The set of all primitive elements of $\ker(A)$ is the *Graver basis* $G(A)$ of A .

Decompositions. Let $z \in \ker(A)$. A decomposition of z is an expression for z as a sum of elements of $\ker(A)$. We say that a decomposition is proper if no summands is zero. Below we describe the decompositions that appear throughout the paper.

Conformal decomposition: $z = u + v$ such that $z^+ = u^+ + v^+$ and $z^- = u^- + v^-$.

Semi-conformal decomposition: $z = u + v$ such that $u_i > 0 \implies v_i \geq 0$.

The indispensable elements $S(A)$ and the elements of the Graver basis $G(A)$ are completely characterised by the above decompositions.

Theorem 2.1 ([14], [4, Proposition 1.1]). *We have the following:*

- $z \in G(A)$ if and only if $z \in \ker(A)$ has no proper conformal decomposition,
- $z \in S(A)$ if and only if $z \in \ker(A)$ has no proper semi-conformal decomposition.

Moves inside fibers. Let $u \in \ker(A)$ be a nonzero element. It is convenient to think of u as a *move* in the following sense. Suppose that $x \in \mathbb{N}^n$. We say that u is *applicable* to x if either $x^- \geq u^-$ or $x^+ \geq u^+$. If $x^- \geq u^-$ then we say u sends x to $x + u \in \mathbb{N}^n$, otherwise if $x^+ \geq u^+$ then we say u sends x to $x - u \in \mathbb{N}^n$. Given an element $z \in \ker(A)$, we say that a move u is *applicable to z* if u is applicable to either z^+ or z^- .

Suppose that x and y belong to the same fiber of A . We say that a subset $B \subseteq \ker(A)$ *connects* x and y if there is a sequence of moves $u = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k)$ such that for each $i \in [k]$ we have that with $u_i \in B$ is a move that sends

$$x + u_1 + \cdots + u_{i-1} \quad \text{to} \quad x + u_1 + \cdots + u_i$$

and $x + u_1 + \cdots + u_k = y$. The Fundamental Theorem of Toric Ideals states that a collection of moves $B \subseteq \ker(A)$ is a Markov basis if and only if B connects any pair of points within each fiber of A .

Metrics. Let X be a set. A *metric* on X is a function $d : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ such that for all $x, y, z \in X$:

$$d(x, y) \geq 0, \quad d(x, y) = 0 \iff x = y, \quad d(x, y) = d(y, x), \quad d(x, y) + d(y, z) \geq d(x, z).$$

Throughout this article, we often consider the metric on \mathbb{R}^n induced by the 1-norm $\|\cdot\|$, which is given by $d(x, y) = \|x - y\| = \sum_i |x_i - y_i|$, where $|\cdot|$ is the absolute value on \mathbb{R} .

In their work, Aoki and Takemura identify a special class of Markov bases called *distance reducing Markov bases*.

Definition 2.2. (Distance reducing) Fix a metric d on \mathbb{N}^n and subsets $B, Z \subseteq \ker(A)$. We say that B *reduces the distance of Z* with respect to d (or B *d -reduces Z*) if for each $z \in Z$, there exists $u \in B$ such at least one of the following holds:

- u is applicable to z^+ and either $d(z^+ + u, z^-) < d(z^+, z^-)$ or $d(z^+ - u, z^-) < d(z^+, z^-)$,
- u is applicable to z^- and either $d(z^+, z^- + u) < d(z^+, z^-)$ or $d(z^+, z^- - u) < d(z^+, z^-)$.

We say that B *strongly reduces the distance of Z* with respect to d if for each $z \in Z$ each of the above conditions is satisfied by some, possibly different, $u \in B$. We say that B is [*strongly*] *distance reducing* with respect to d if B [*strongly*] reduces the distance of $\ker(A)$ with respect to d . We say that B [*strongly*] *reduces the distance of Z* if B [*strongly*] reduces the distance of Z with respect to the metric induced by the 1-norm. We say that B is [*strongly*] *distance reducing* if B [*strongly*] reduces the distance of $\ker(A)$ with respect to the metric induced by the 1-norm.

In other words, a set of moves B is distance reducing if for any x, y in the same fiber of A there exists a move $u \in B$ that reduces the distance between them. For the 1-norm, this means that u is applicable to at least one of x and y either

$$\|x - y - u\| < \|x - y\| \quad \text{or} \quad \|x - y + u\| < \|x - y\|. \tag{1}$$

And B is strongly distance reducing if there exist moves $u, u' \in B$ applicable to x, y respectively that satisfy (1).

Proposition 2.3 (Aoki-Takemura Proposition 1). *If B is distance reducing with respect to some metric then B is a Markov basis.*

To illustrate the proof of this proposition we provide the following illuminating sketch. Take x and y in the same fiber of A and consider the task of finding a sequence of moves in B that connects x and y . Since B is distance reducing, we can find a move u , which is applicable to x or y and reduces the distance between them. We can continue in this way to find a move at each subsequent step that reduces the distance. Since there are only finitely elements in the fiber, we will eventually obtain a finite sequence of moves in B that connects x and y . Hence B is a Markov basis.

Remark 2.4. We note an important difference between our setup and that of Aoki-Takemura. We do not assume that A is homogeneous, i.e., we do not assume that the all 1's row-vector is not a linear combination of the rows of A . In Section 7, we generalise some results about the homogeneous to the inhomogeneous case.

Minimal sets. A *minimal Markov basis* is a Markov basis such that any proper subset is not a Markov basis. Similarly, a set is *minimally distance reducing* if no proper subset is distance reducing. By Proposition 2.3, any minimally distance reducing set is a Markov basis

so we often call such a set a *minimally distance reducing Markov basis*. If a minimal Markov basis is distance reducing then we call it a *distance-reducing minimal Markov basis*. Note any that distance-reducing minimal Markov bases are minimally distance reducing Markov bases. However, a minimally distance reducing Markov basis need not be a minimal Markov basis.

2.1. Complete intersections and gluings. Let $A = (a_1 \ a_2 \ \dots \ a_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^{d \times n}$ be a matrix of positive integers such that $\ker(A) \cap \mathbb{N}^n = \{0\}$. We say that A is a *complete intersection* if the ideal I_A is a complete intersection, i.e., I_A is generated by nullity(A) elements.

The complete intersection matrices A are characterised by *gluings*. More precisely, the matrix A is a complete intersection if and only if the columns of A can be partitioned into two parts $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\} = \{b_1, \dots, b_p\} \sqcup \{c_1, \dots, c_q\}$ such that the matrices $B = (b_1 \ \dots \ b_p)$ and $C = (c_1 \ \dots \ c_q)$ are both complete intersections and satisfy the gluing property:

$$\text{there exists } x \in \mathbb{N}B \cap \mathbb{N}C \text{ such that } x\mathbb{Z} = \mathbb{Z}B \cap \mathbb{Z}C.$$

Equivalently, there exists $z \in \ker([B \mid C])$ with $\text{Supp}(z^+) \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\}$ and $\text{Supp}(z^-) \subseteq \{p+1, \dots, p+q\}$ such that

$$\ker([B \mid C]) = (\ker(B) \times \{0\}) \oplus (\{0\} \times \ker(C)) \oplus \langle z \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}}.$$

If $B \in \mathbb{Z}^{d \times p}$ and $C \in \mathbb{Z}^{d \times q}$ are matrices that satisfy the gluing property, then we write $B \circ C = [B \mid C]$ for the juxtaposition of B and C .

The equivalence in the above definition is proved originally in [13, Theorem 1.4] and, more generally in the setting of p -gluings, in [11, Theorem 2.6]. The definitions are related as follows. If $x \in \mathbb{N}B \cap \mathbb{N}C$, then $x = \sum_{i \in [p]} \lambda_i b_i = \sum_{j \in [q]} \mu_j c_j$ for some non-negative integers λ_i and μ_j , as in the first definition. Then the element $z = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p, -\mu_1, \dots, -\mu_q) \in \ker([B \mid C])$ satisfies the second definition. Similarly, if $z = (z_1, \dots, z_p, -z_{p+1}, \dots, -z_{p+q}) \in \ker([B \mid C])$ satisfied the second definition, then $x = b_1 z_1 + \dots + b_p z_p = c_1 z_{p+1} + \dots + c_q z_{p+q} \in \mathbb{N}A \cap \mathbb{N}B$ satisfies the first definition.

Gluing notation. We introduce the following notation to keep track of gluings for monomial curves. Assume that $A = (a_1 \ a_2 \ \dots \ a_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^{1 \times n}$ is a complete intersection. The *gluing type* of A is defined recursively. The base case is $n = 1$, which has gluing type a_1 . If A is the gluing of two complete intersections B and C with gluing types T_B and T_C respectively, then the type of A is denoted $(T_B \circ T_C)$. For extra detail, we may also record the value $x \in \mathbb{N}B \cap \mathbb{N}C$ for the gluing and write the gluing type of A as $(T_B \circ_x T_C)$. So, for example, all complete intersection monomial curves in \mathbb{A}^3 have gluing type $((a_1 \circ a_2) \circ a_3)$ for an appropriate ordering of the coordinates. By a slight abuse of notation we identify A with its gluing type.

Example 2.5. Some matrices admit different gluing types. Let $A = (3 \ 5 \ 9)$ then we have

$$A = ((3 \circ_{15} 5) \circ_9 9) \quad \text{and} \quad A = ((3 \circ_9 9) \circ_{15} 5).$$

There are two distinct minimal Markov bases for A given by

$$M_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 5 & -3 & 0 \\ 3 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad M_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -3 & 1 \\ 3 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We observe that M_1 is not distance reducing as it fails to reduce the distance of the circuit $(0, 9, -5)$. On the other hand, it turns out that M_2 is distance reducing, which follows from Theorem 3.5.

3. MONOMIAL CURVES IN \mathbb{A}^3

In this section we characterise the distance-reducing minimal Markov bases of monomial curves in \mathbb{A}^3 . Throughout this section, we consider a matrix $A = (a_1 \ a_2 \ a_3)$ with distinct entries.

Theorem 3.1. *Let M be a minimal Markov basis for A . Then M is distance reducing if and only if M reduces the distance of the circuits of A .*

Proof. If A is a complete intersection then the result follows from Theorem 3.5. Otherwise, A is not a complete intersection and the result follows from Theorem 3.6. \square

To prove Theorems 3.5 and 3.6, we use the explicit characterisation of the minimal Markov bases for monomial curves in \mathbb{A}^3 . Let us begin by recalling from [8] the following terminology for elements of $\ker(A)$.

Notation. Let $z \in \ker(A)$. If z is nonzero, then there is a coordinate of z of a different sign to the other coordinates, i.e., for some $i \in [3]$ we have that either

1. $z_i > 0$ and $z_j \leq 0$ for each $j \neq i$,
2. $z_i < 0$ and $z_j \geq 0$ for each $j \neq i$.

In this case, we say that z has *type i* . Note, if z is a circuit, then z has two types. Suppose that z has type i and for any other element $z' \in \ker(A)$ of type i we have $|z_i| \leq |z'_i|$, then we say that z is *minimal type i* , or *minimal* when the context is clear.

In [8], Herzog shows that the ideal I_A is minimally generated by the binomials corresponding to minimal elements of $\ker(A)$. Moreover, these generating sets directly determine whether A is a complete intersection. The following theorem summarises the important results that we use throughout this section.

Theorem 3.2 ([8, Propositions 3.3 and 3.5 and Theorem 3.8]). *The minimal Markov bases of A fall into one of two cases.*

- (1) *If no minimal element of $\ker(A)$ is a circuit, then, up to sign, there are unique minimal elements of $\ker(A)$:*

$$g_1 = (-c_1, v_{12}, v_{13}), \quad g_2 = (v_{21}, -c_2, v_{23}), \quad g_3 = (v_{31}, v_{32}, -c_3)$$

of types 1, 2, 3, respectively, with c_i and $v_{i,j}$ positive for all i, j . Up to sign, A has a unique minimal Markov basis that consists of the three minimal elements. In this case, A is not a complete intersection.

- (2) *If a circuit is a minimal element of $\ker(A)$, then, up to sign and permutation of the coordinates, two minimal elements of $\ker(A)$ are*

$$b = (b_1, -b_2, 0) \text{ and } c = (c_1, c_2, -c_3)$$

where b is the unique minimal type 1 and 2 element, and c is a minimal type 3 element, with $b_1, b_2, c_3 > 0$ and $c_1, c_2 \geq 0$. The other minimal elements of $\ker(A)$ are $c + \lambda b$ for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $c + \lambda b$ has type 3. The minimal Markov bases are given by $\{b, c + \lambda b\}$ for each λ as above. In this case, A is a complete intersection.

If A is not a complete intersection, then the unique minimal Markov basis described above satisfies the following relation.

Proposition 3.3 ([8, Proposition 3.2]). *If A is not a complete intersection, then its unique minimal Markov basis $\{g_1, g_2, g_3\}$ satisfies $g_1 + g_2 + g_3 = 0$.*

By Theorem 3.1, the distance reduction property is characterised by circuits. We use this to observe that a unique minimal Markov basis does not imply that it is distance reducing.

Example 3.4. Let $A = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 5 & 11 \end{pmatrix}$. Then A has a unique minimal Markov basis

$$M = \{b := (5, -3, 0), c := (2, 1, -1)\},$$

which is evident from the observation that b is not applicable to c . Hence, there is not nonzero $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $c + \lambda b$ has type 3. Consider the circuit $z = (0, 11, -5) \in \ker(A)$. The elements b and c are applicable to z . However, neither reduces the distance of z as

$$\|z + b\| = \|(5, 8, -5)\| = 18 \not\leq \|z\| \text{ and } \|z - c\| = \|(-2, 10, -4)\| = 16 \not\leq \|z\|.$$

3.1. Complete intersections. By Theorem 3.2-(2), the complete intersection monomial curves in $A = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_2 & a_3 \end{pmatrix}$ have a minimal Markov basis consisting of a circuit $b = (b_1, -b_2, 0)$ and another element $c = (c_1, c_2, -c_3)$. By swapping the first and second column of A , we may assume that $b_1 > b_2$ or, equivalently, that $a_1 < a_2$.

Theorem 3.5. *Suppose A is a complete intersection and let*

$$M = \{b := (b_1, -b_2, 0), c := (c_1, c_2, -c_3)\}$$

be a minimal Markov basis for A , as in Theorem 3.2, with $b_1 > b_2$. Then the following are equivalent:

- (1) M is distance reducing,
- (2) M reduces the distance of the circuit $z = \gamma(0, a_3, -a_2)$ where $\gamma = 1/\gcd(a_2, a_3)$,
- (3) $c_1 < c_2 + c_3$.

Proof. (1) \implies (2) Immediate from the definition.

(2) \implies (3) Assume that M reduces the distance of the circuit $z = (0, z_2, -z_3)$. If b is applicable to z then it does not reduce the distance of z because $b_1 > b_2$. So c reduces the distance of z . Since $z \in \ker(A)$ and M is a Markov basis, we have $z = -\alpha b + \beta c$ for some integers α, β . So

$$z = (0, z_2, -z_3) = (-\alpha b_1 + \beta c_1, \alpha b_2 + \beta c_2, -\beta c_3).$$

Since the third coordinate of b is zero, it follows that $\beta > 0$. By the first coordinate, we have $-\alpha b_1 + \beta c_1 = 0$, so it follows that $\alpha \geq 0$. Hence $z_2 = \alpha b_2 + \beta c_2 \geq c_2$. Also note that z is type 3 and c is minimal type 3, so we have $c_3 \leq z_3$. Since c reduces the distance of z , we have $\|z\| > \|z - c\|$, hence

$$\|z\| > \|z - c\| = | -c_1 | + |z_2 - c_2| + | -z_3 + c_3 | = \|z\| + c_1 - c_2 - c_3.$$

So we have $c_1 < c_2 + c_3$.

(3) \implies (1) Assume that $c_1 < c_2 + c_3$. Let $z \in \ker(A)$ by any element. We show that M reduces the distance of z . We write $z = \alpha b + \beta c = (\alpha b_1 + \beta c_1, -\alpha b_2 + \beta c_2, -\beta c_3)$ for some integers α, β . If either $\alpha = 0$ or $\beta = 0$, then z is a multiple of c or b , respectively, so c or b is applicable to z and reduces the distance. So, from now on, we assume $\alpha \neq 0$ and $\beta \neq 0$. If $\beta < 0$ then we replace z with $-z$. So without loss of generality, we may assume that $\beta > 0$.

If $\alpha > 0$ then $z_1 = \alpha b_1 + \beta c_1 \geq b_1$, hence b is applicable to z . So we have

$$\|z - b\| = \|(z_1 - b_1, \pm z_2 + b_2, -z_3)\| \leq z_1 - b_1 + z_2 + b_2 + z_3 = \|z\| - b_1 + b_2 < \|z\|.$$

Hence b reduces the distance of z and we are done.

If $\alpha < 0$, then we have $z_2 = (-\alpha)b_2 + \beta c_2 \geq c_2$. Since $z_3 = \beta c_3 \geq c_3$, so c is applicable to z . Hence

$$\|z - c\| = \|(\pm z_1 - c_1, z_2 - c_2, -z_3 + c_3)\| = |z_1 \pm c_1| + z_2 - c_2 + z_3 - c_3 \leq \|z\| + c_1 - c_2 - c_3 < \|z\|,$$

where the final inequality follows from the assumption that $c_1 < c_2 + c_3$. \square

3.2. Non complete intersections. The minimal Markov basis for a non complete intersection monomial curves in \mathbb{A}^3 is explicitly described in Theorem 3.2-(1). With this description, we classify when the Markov basis is distance reducing as follows.

Theorem 3.6. *Let $A = (a_1 \ a_2 \ a_3)$ be a matrix with $a_1 < a_2 < a_3$ that is not a complete intersection. Let*

$$M = \{g_1 := (-c_1, v_{12}, v_{13}), g_2 := (v_{21}, -c_2, v_{23}), g_3 := (v_{31}, v_{32}, -c_3)\}$$

be a minimal Markov basis for A , as in Theorem 3.2. Then the following are equivalent:

- (1) M is distance reducing,
- (2) M reduces the distance of the circuit $z = \gamma(0, a_3, -a_2)$ where $\gamma = 1/\gcd(a_2, a_3)$,
- (3) at least one of $v_{21} < c_2 + v_{23}$ or $v_{31} < v_{32} + c_3$ holds.

Proof. (1) \implies (2). Follows immediately from the definition.

(2) \implies (3). Assume that M reduces the distance of the circuit $z = (0, z_2, -z_3)$. We have that $z = \alpha g_1 + \beta g_2 + \gamma g_3$ for some $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}$. By Proposition 3.3, we have that $g_1 + g_2 + g_3 = 0$. Therefore $z = (\beta - \alpha)g_2 + (\gamma - \alpha)g_3$. So, without loss of generality, we may assume that $\alpha = 0$. We have

$$z = \beta g_2 + \gamma g_3 = (\beta v_{21} + \gamma v_{31}, -\beta c_2 + \gamma v_{32}, \beta v_{23} - \gamma c_3).$$

By comparing the sign patterns, we deduce that $\beta < 0$ and $\gamma > 0$. By assumption, M reduces the distance of z . However, the move g_1 is not applicable to z . So we proceed by taking cases on whether g_2 or g_3 reduces the distance of z .

Case 1. Assume that g_2 reduces the distance of z . Then we have that g_2 is applicable to z and so $c_2 \leq z_2$. Observe that $z_3 = (-\beta)v_{23} + \gamma c_3 \geq v_{23}$. Since g_2 reduces the distance of z , we have $\|z\| > \|z + g_2\|$ and so

$$\|z\| > \|z + g_2\| = \|(v_{21}, z_2 - c_2, -z_3 + v_{23})\| = v_{21} + z_2 - c_2 + z_3 - v_{23} = \|z\| + v_{21} - c_2 - v_{23}.$$

So we have that $v_{21} < c_2 + v_{23}$ and we are done.

Case 2. Assume that g_3 reduces the distance of z . Then we have that g_3 is applicable to z and so $c_3 \leq z_3$. Observe that $z_2 = (-\beta)c_2 + \gamma v_{32} \geq v_{32}$. Since g_3 reduces the distance of z , we have $\|z\| > \|z - g_3\|$ and so

$$\|z\| > \|z - g_3\| = \|(-v_{31}, z_2 - v_{32}, -z_3 + c_3)\| = v_{31} + z_2 - v_{32} + z_3 - c_3 = \|z\| + v_{31} - v_{32} - c_3.$$

So we have that $v_{31} < v_{32} + c_3$ and this concludes the proof of the forward direction.

(3) \implies (1). Assume that either $v_{21} < c_2 + v_{23}$ or $v_{31} < v_{32} + c_3$ holds. Let $z \in \ker(A)$ be any element. We show that M reduces the distance of z . Since $z \in \ker(A)$, we have that $z = \alpha g_1 + \beta g_2 + \gamma g_3$ for some integers α, β, γ . By Proposition 3.3, we have $g_1 + g_2 + g_3 = 0$ and so we may assume that $\alpha = 0$. So we have

$$z = \beta g_2 + \gamma g_3 = (\beta v_{21} + \gamma v_{31}, -\beta c_2 + \gamma v_{32}, \beta v_{23} - \gamma c_3).$$

Note that if either $\beta = 0$ or $\gamma = 0$, then we have that z is multiple of g_3 or g_2 , respectively, so that element reduces the distance of z . So, from now on, we assume that $\beta \neq 0$ and $\gamma \neq 0$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\beta > 0$.

If $\gamma > 0$ then we have $z_1 = \beta v_{21} + \gamma v_{31} \geq v_{21} + v_{31} = c_1$, where the final equality follows from Proposition 3.3. So g_1 is applicable to z . Since $a_1 < a_2 < a_3$, we have that

$$c_1 = \frac{a_2}{a_1}v_{12} + \frac{a_3}{a_1}v_{13} > v_{12} + v_{13}.$$

So we have

$$\|z + g_1\| = \|(z_1 - c_1, \pm z_2 + v_{12}, \pm z_3 + v_{13})\| \leq \|z\| - c_1 + v_{12} + v_{13} < \|z\|.$$

Hence g_1 reduces the distance of z and we are done.

It remains to consider the case when $\gamma < 0$. We proceed by taking cases based on which assumption, either $v_{21} < c_2 + v_{23}$ or $v_{31} < v_{32} + c_3$, holds.

Case 1. Assume $v_{21} < c_2 + v_{23}$. Then we have $z_2 = \beta c_2 + (-\gamma)v_{32} \geq c_2$, hence g_2 is applicable to z . Note that $z_3 = \beta v_{23} + (-\gamma)c_3 \geq v_{23}$. So we have

$$\|z - g_2\| = \|(\pm z_1 - v_{21}, -z_2 + c_2, z_3 - v_{23})\| \leq \|z\| + v_{21} - c_2 - v_{23} < \|z\|.$$

Hence g_2 reduces the distance of z and we are done.

Case 2. Assume $v_{31} < v_{32} + c_3$. Then we have $z_3 = \beta v_{23} + (-\gamma)c_3 \geq c_3$, hence g_3 is applicable to z . Note that $z_2 = \beta c_2 + (-\gamma)v_{32} \geq v_{32}$. So we have

$$\|z + g_3\| = \|(\pm z_1 + v_{31}, -z_2 + v_{32}, z_3 - c_3)\| \leq \|z\| + v_{31} - v_{32} - c_3 < \|z\|.$$

Hence g_3 reduces the distance of z , which concludes the proof. \square

4. MONOMIAL CURVES OF THE FIRST KIND

Throughout this section, we consider a complete intersection monomial curve in \mathbb{A}^n given by the matrix $A = (a_1 \ a_2 \ \dots \ a_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^{1 \times n}$ such that $\ker(A) \cap \mathbb{N}^n = \{0\}$. We assume that A admits a *gluing of the first kind*:

$$A = ((\dots((a_1 \circ a_2) \circ a_3) \dots) \circ a_n).$$

We call these *monomial curves of the first kind*. For each $k \in [n]$ we define the submatrix $A_k = (a_1 \ \dots \ a_k)$. Note that A_k admits a gluing of the first kind

$$A_k = ((\dots((a_1 \circ a_2) \circ a_3) \dots) \circ a_k).$$

If $n > 1$, then $A_n = (A_{n-1} \circ a_n)$, hence any minimal Markov basis for A_n is built from a Minimal Markov basis of A_{n-1} as follows. Let M_n be a minimal Markov basis for A_n then there exists a minimal Markov basis M_{n-1} for A_{n-1} such that

$$M_n = (M_{n-1} \times \{0\}) \cup \{u_n := (u_{n,1} \ u_{n,2} \ \dots \ u_{n,n-1} \ -u_{n,n})\}$$

for some non-negative integers u_1, \dots, u_n . So, inductively, we may identify a minimal Markov basis M_n for A_n with the rows of a matrix

$$M_n = \begin{bmatrix} u_{2,1} & -u_{2,2} & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ u_{3,1} & u_{3,2} & -u_{3,3} & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ u_{4,1} & u_{4,2} & u_{4,3} & -u_{4,4} & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ u_{n-1,1} & u_{n-1,2} & u_{n-1,3} & u_{n-1,4} & \dots & -u_{n-1,n-1} & 0 \\ u_{n,1} & u_{n,2} & u_{n,3} & u_{n,4} & \dots & u_{n,n-1} & -u_{n,n} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $a_1 < a_2$.

Remark 4.1. For any matrix $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{1 \times n}$, we say that the numerical semigroup $\mathbb{N}A$ is *symmetric* if there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x \in \mathbb{N}A$ if and only if $m - x \notin S$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}$. Note that this definition does not depend on a choice of generators of $\mathbb{N}A$ or an ordering on them. We say that A is *specialy symmetric* if for each $k \in [n-1]$ we have $\text{lcm}(\text{gcd}(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k), a_{k+1}) \in \mathbb{N}A_k$. By [8, Proposition 2.1], it follows that if A is specialy symmetric then $\mathbb{N}A$ is symmetric.

Observe that $\text{lcm}(\text{gcd}(a_1, \dots, a_k), a_{k+1})$ is the generator of the group $\mathbb{Z}A_k \cap \mathbb{Z}\{a_{k+1}\}$. By the definition of gluing, we have that $\text{lcm}(\text{gcd}(a_1, \dots, a_k), a_{k+1}) \in \mathbb{N}A_k$ is satisfied if and only if there is a gluing $A_{k+1} = (A_k \circ a_k)$. So monomial curves of the first kind correspond to a special kind of symmetric numerical semigroup.

We now define a set of inequalities, which we use to completely characterise whether M is distance reducing. In the following definition, we define conditions on the entries $u_{i,j}$ of M .

Definition 4.2. Fix $2 \leq i < j \leq n$. We say M satisfies condition $R_{i,j}$ if at least one of the following conditions holds:

- (i) $u_{i,1} + u_{i,2} + \dots + u_{i,i-1} < u_{i,i}$,
- (ii) There exists $\ell \in \{i+1, i+2, \dots, j-1\}$ such that $u_{\ell,m} = 0$ for all $m \in [\ell-1] \setminus \{i\}$, i.e. u_ℓ is a circuit supported on coordinates i and ℓ , and $u_{\ell,i} > u_{\ell,\ell}$,
- (iii) $\sum_{k \in [j]} u_{j,k} < 2(u_{j,i} + u_{j,j})$,

If M satisfies condition (s) for some $s \in \{\text{i, ii, iii}\}$ but i, j are not clear from context then we write M satisfies condition (i, j) -(s).

We now state the main result of this section, which characterises the distance-reducing minimal Markov bases for monomial curves of the first kind.

Theorem 4.3. *Let M be a minimal Markov basis for A . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) M is distance reducing,
- (2) M is distance reducing for the circuits of A ,
- (3) M satisfies $R_{i,j}$ for every $2 \leq i < j \leq n$.

Proof. By definition it follows that (1) \implies (2). By Theorem 4.4 we have that (2) \implies (3). By Theorem 4.5 we have (3) \implies (1), which concludes the proof. \square

Theorem 4.4. *If M reduces the distance of the circuits of A then M satisfies $R_{i,j}$ for every $2 \leq i < j \leq n$.*

Proof. Throughout the proof, we write

$$z_{a,b} = (0, \dots, 0, z_a, 0, \dots, 0, -z_b, 0, \dots, 0)$$

for the circuit of A supported on $a, b \in [n]$, with $a < b$. Fix $2 \leq i < j \leq n$. We show that M satisfies $R_{i,j}$. In addition, we prove that the circuit

$$z := z_{i,j} = (0, \dots, 0, z_i, 0, \dots, -z_j, 0, \dots, 0)$$

is distance reduced by some element u_r with $r \leq j$. We do this by reverse induction on j . The base case with $j = n$ is trivial.

For the induction step, for each $m > j$ and for all $i' < m$, we assume that there exists some $i' \leq r \leq m$ such that u_r reduces the distance of $z_{i',m}$. We call this the first induction hypothesis. By assumption, M reduces the distance of z , so there exists u_ℓ that reduces the distance of z . Note that if $\ell < i$, then u_ℓ is not applicable to z , so we must have $\ell \geq i$. If $\ell \leq j$ then we are done. So let us assume that $\ell > j$.

Since u_ℓ is applicable to z , it follows that $\text{Supp}(u_\ell^+) = \{i\}$ or $\text{Supp}(u_\ell^+) = \{j\}$. Hence u_ℓ is a circuit

$$u_\ell = (0, \dots, 0, u_{\ell,k}, 0, \dots, 0, -u_{\ell,\ell}, 0, \dots, 0)$$

for some $k \in \{i, j\}$. Since u_ℓ reduces the distance of z , it follows that $u_{\ell,k} > u_{\ell,\ell}$.

Claim 1. For each $k < m < \ell$, we have (m, ℓ) -(i) holds.

Proof. We now prove the claim by reverse induction on m . For the base case, let $m = \ell - 1$ and consider the circuit

$$z_{\ell-1,\ell} = (0, \dots, 0, z_{\ell-1}, -z_\ell, 0, \dots, 0).$$

By the first induction hypothesis, we have that either u_ℓ or $u_{\ell-1}$ reduces the distance of $z_{\ell-1,\ell}$. Since u_ℓ is a circuit with $u_{\ell,k} > u_{\ell,\ell}$, it follows that u_ℓ does not reduce the distance of $z_{\ell-1,\ell}$. So $u_{\ell-1}$ reduces the distance of $z_{\ell-1,\ell}$. It follows that

$$u_{\ell-1,1} + u_{\ell-1,2} + \dots + u_{\ell-1,\ell-2} < u_{\ell-1,\ell-1}$$

hence $(\ell-1, \ell)$ -(i) holds.

For the induction step, fix $k < m < \ell-1$ and assume that (p, ℓ) -(i) holds for every $p \in \{m+1, \dots, \ell-1\}$. We call this the second induction hypothesis. By assumption M reduces the distance of the circuit

$$z_{m,\ell} = (0, \dots, 0, z_m, 0, \dots, 0, -z_\ell, 0, \dots, 0).$$

By the first induction hypothesis, there exists there exists $r \in \{m, m+1, \dots, \ell\}$ such that u_r reduces the distance of $z_{m,\ell}$. Since u_ℓ is a circuit with $u_{\ell,k} > u_{\ell,\ell}$, it follows that $r \neq \ell$. Suppose by contradiction that $r > m$. Since u_r is applicable to $z_{m,\ell}$, it follows that u_r is a circuit

$$u_r = (0, \dots, 0, u_{r,m}, 0, \dots, 0, -u_{r,r}, 0, \dots, 0)$$

with $u_{r,m} > u_{r,r}$. However, by the second induction hypothesis, we have $u_{r,m} < u_{r,r}$, which is a contradiction. So it follows that $r = m$. Since u_m reduces the distance of $z_{m,\ell}$, it follows that

$$u_{m,1} + u_{m,2} + \dots + u_{m,m-1} < u_{m,m}.$$

Hence (m, ℓ) -(i) holds. This concludes the proof of the claim. \square

We proceed by taking cases on $k \in \{i, j\}$.

Case 1. Assume $k = i$. Since $k+1 \leq j$, by Claim 1, we have that (j, ℓ) -(i) holds. So $u_{j,1} + u_{j,2} + \dots + u_{j,j-1} < u_{j,j}$. We now show that (i, j) -(iii) holds by contradiction. Assume that

$$u_{j,1} + \dots + u_{j,i-1} + u_{j,i+1} + \dots + u_{j,j-1} \geq u_{j,i} + u_{j,j}.$$

So we have

$$2u_{j,i} + u_{j,j} \leq u_{j,1} + \dots + u_{j,j-1} < u_{j,j}.$$

Hence $2u_{j,i} < 0$, which is a contradiction. So we have shown that (i, j) -(iii) holds. Hence M satisfies $R_{i,j}$. It follows easily that u_j reduces the distance of z , which proves the induction step.

Case 2. Assume $k = j$. We show the following claim.

Claim 2. For each $m \in \{i, i+1, \dots, j-1\}$ either: there exists a circuit u_s for some $m < s \leq j$ with

$$u_s = (0, \dots, 0, u_{s,m}, 0, \dots, 0, -u_{s,s}, 0, \dots, 0)$$

such that if $(m, s) \neq (i, j)$ then $u_{s,m} > u_{s,s}$; or (m, j) -(i) holds.

Proof. We proceed by reverse induction on m . For the base case let $m = j-1$ and consider the circuit

$$z_{j-1,\ell} = (0, \dots, 0, z_{j-1}, 0, \dots, 0, -z_\ell, 0, \dots, 0).$$

By the first inductive hypothesis, we have that $z_{j-1,\ell}$ is distance reduced by some element u_r with $j-1 \leq r \leq \ell$. Since u_ℓ is a circuit with $u_{\ell,j} > u_{\ell,\ell}$, it follows that u_ℓ does not reduce the distance of $z_{j-1,\ell}$. Assume by contradiction that $j+1 \leq r < \ell$, then we have that u_r is a circuit

$$u_r = (0, \dots, 0, u_{r,j-1}, 0, \dots, 0, -u_{r,r}, 0, \dots, 0)$$

with $u_{r,j-1} > u_{r,r}$. However, by Claim 1, we have (r, ℓ) -(i) holds, which gives us $u_{r,j-1} < u_{r,r}$, which is a contradiction. So we have that $r \in \{j-1, j\}$. If $r = j$, then u_j is a circuit

$$u_j = (0, \dots, 0, u_{j,j-1}, -u_{j,j}, 0, \dots, 0).$$

Since u_r reduces the distance of $z_{j-1,\ell}$, if $i < j-1$, then it follows that $u_{j,j-1} > u_{j,j}$, as desired. Otherwise, if $r = j-1$, then it immediately follows that $(j-1, j)$ -(i) holds. This concludes the proof of the base case.

For the induction step, fix $i \leq m < j-1$ and assume that the claim holds for all $p \in \{m+1, \dots, j-1\}$. Consider the circuit

$$z_{m,\ell} = (0, \dots, 0, z_m, 0, \dots, 0, -z_\ell, 0, \dots, 0).$$

By assumption, M reduces the distance of the circuit $z_{m,\ell}$. By the first inductive hypothesis $z_{m,\ell}$ is distance reduced by u_r for some $m \leq r \leq \ell$. Recall that u_ℓ is a circuit with $u_{\ell,j} > u_{\ell,\ell}$, so u_ℓ does not reduce the distance of $z_{m,\ell}$, hence $r \neq \ell$.

Let $P = \{p \in \{m+1, \dots, j-1\} : (p, j)$ -(i) holds $\}$ and $P^c = \{m+1, \dots, j-1\} \setminus P$ be its complement. By Claim 1, we have that (p, ℓ) -(i) holds for all $p \in \{j+1, \dots, \ell-1\}$. Suppose that for some $p \in P \cup \{j+1, \dots, \ell-1\}$, the move u_p is applicable to $z_{m,\ell}$. Then it follows that u_p is a circuit

$$u_p = (0, \dots, 0, u_{p,m}, 0, \dots, 0, -u_{p,p}, 0, \dots, 0).$$

Since one of (p, j) -(i) or (p, ℓ) -(i) holds, it follows that $u_{p,m} < u_{p,p}$. So u_p does not reduce the distance of $z_{m,\ell}$. Hence $r \neq p$. So we have that $r \in P^c \cup \{m, j\}$.

If $r = j$, then it follows that u_j is a circuit

$$u_j = (0, \dots, 0, u_{j,m}, 0, \dots, 0, -u_{j,j}, 0, \dots, 0).$$

Since u_j reduces the distance of $z_{m,\ell}$, if $m > i$ then we have $u_{j,m} > u_{j,j}$, so the claim holds.

If $r = m$ then it follows that (m, j) -(i) holds.

Suppose that $r \in P^c$. Then it follows that u_r is a circuit

$$u_r = (0, \dots, 0, u_{r,m}, 0, \dots, 0, -u_{r,r}, 0, \dots, 0).$$

Since u_r reduces the distance, we must have that $u_{r,m} > u_{r,r}$, which concludes the proof of the claim. \square

So by Claim 2, with $m = i$, either: there exists a circuit u_s for some $i < s \leq j$ with

$$u_s = (0, \dots, 0, u_{s,i}, 0, \dots, 0, -u_{s,s}, 0, \dots, 0),$$

such that if $s \neq j$ then $u_{s,i} > u_{s,s}$; or (i, j) -(i) holds. In the latter case, we have that M satisfies $R_{i,j}$ and u_i reduces the distance of z and we are done. In the former case, it follows that (i, j) -(ii) holds, so M satisfies $R_{i,j}$. In this case, we have that u_s reduces the distance of z . This concludes the proof of the result. \square

Theorem 4.5. *Suppose that M satisfies $R_{i,j}$ for all $2 \leq i < j \leq n$ then M is distance reducing.*

Proof. We prove the result by induction on n . For the base case, take $n = 2$, and observe that the result holds trivially because $\ker(A)$ is generated by a single element. Fix $n > 2$. Assume that $R_{i,j}$ holds for all $2 \leq i < j \leq n$ and fix some $z \in \ker(A)$. We prove that there exists a move in M that reduces the distance of z . We recall our convention that for each $i \in [n]$, the notation $(z)_i$ is the i th coordinate of z and $z_i = |(z)_i|$ is its absolute value.

Suppose $z_n = 0$. Let $A' = (a_1 \ \dots \ a_{n-1})$ and $M' = \{u'_2, \dots, u'_{n-1}\}$ where

$$u'_i = (u_{i,1}, u_{i,2}, \dots, u_{i,i-1}, -u_{i,i}, 0, \dots, 0) \in \ker(A')$$

for each $i \in \{2, \dots, n-1\}$. By the gluing of A , we have that M' is a Markov basis for A' . Observe that M' satisfies $R_{i,j}$ for all $2 \leq i < j \leq n-1$, so by the inductive hypothesis, M' is distance reducing for $\ker(A')$. In particular, M' reduces the distance of the move

$$z' = ((z)_1, \dots, (z)_{n-1}) \in \ker(A').$$

Hence, there exists $u'_i \in M'$ such that u'_i reduces the distance of z' . It follows immediately that $u_i \in M$ reduces the distance of z .

So we may assume that $z_n \neq 0$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $(z)_n < 0$. Since M is a Markov basis and $z \in \ker(A)$, we may write

$$z = \sum_{i=2}^n \lambda_i u_i$$

for some integers λ_i . Since $(z)_n < 0$, it follows that $\lambda_n > 0$. Consider the set $N = \{i \in \{2, \dots, n-1\} : \lambda_i < 0\}$. We take cases on whether N is the empty set.

Case 1. Assume that $N \neq \emptyset$. Let $i = \max(N)$. So for all $i < j < n$, we have that $\lambda_j \geq 0$ and $\lambda_i < 0$. Now consider the i th coordinate of z :

$$(z)_i = (-\lambda_i)u_{i,i} + \lambda_{i+1}u_{i+1,i} + \dots + \lambda_{n-1}u_{n-1,i} + \lambda_n u_{n,i}.$$

Since M satisfies $R_{i,n}$, we have that one of the conditions (i,n) -(i), (i,n) -(ii), or (i,n) -(iii) holds. If (i,n) -(i) holds then $u_{i,1} + \dots + u_{i,i-1} < u_{i,i} \leq z_i$ and so u_i reduces the distance of z . If (i,n) -(iii) holds then we have

$$u_{n,1} + \dots + u_{n,i-1} + u_{n,i+1} + \dots + u_{n,n-1} < u_{n,i} + u_{n,n}.$$

Since $z_n \geq u_{n,n}$ and $z_{n,i} \geq u_{n,i}$, it follows immediately that u_n is applicable to and reduces the distance of z . So it remains to consider the case when condition (i,n) -(ii) holds.

Suppose that (i,n) -(ii) holds. Then there exists $j \in \{i+1, \dots, n-1\}$ such that u_j is a circuit

$$u_j = (0, \dots, 0, u_{j,i}, 0, \dots, 0, -u_{j,j}, 0, \dots, 0)$$

with $u_{j,i} > u_{j,j}$. Clearly if $u_{j,i} \geq z_i$, then u_j is applicable to and reduces the distance of z . We now show that if $u_{j,i} < z_i$, then z is distance reduced by u_n or a circuit $u_{j'}$ for some $j' > j$. Assume that $u_{j,i} < z_i$. Since $\lambda_j \geq 0$, it follows that $\lambda_j = 0$. We mark this point in the proof with (*). Next, we consider the j th coordinate of z :

$$(z)_j = \lambda_{j+1}u_{j+1,j} + \dots + \lambda_n u_{n,j}.$$

By assumption, M satisfies $R_{j,n}$ so one of (j,n) -(i), (j,n) -(ii), or (j,n) -(iii) holds. Since u_j is a circuit with $u_{j,i} > u_{j,j}$, it follows that (j,n) -(i) does not hold. If (j,n) -(iii) holds then it follows that u_n reduces the distance of z . However, if (j,n) -(ii) holds then there exists $j' \in \{j+1, \dots, n-1\}$ such that the move $u_{j'}$ is a circuit

$$u_{j'} = (0, \dots, 0, u_{j',j}, 0, \dots, 0, -u_{j',j'}, 0, \dots, 0)$$

where $u_{j',j} > u_{j',j'}$. If $u_{j',j} \geq z_j$, then $u_{j'}$ is applicable and reduces the distance of z and we are done. Otherwise, if $u_{j',j} < z_j$, then recall that $\lambda_{j'} \geq 0$, so we deduce that $\lambda_{j'} = 0$. We have now reached a point in the proof with exactly the same premises as (*) except i, j are replaced with the strictly larger values j, j' . Note that $j' < n$, so if we repeatedly apply this argument, then there are only finitely many steps until either z is reduced by u_n or a circuit $u_{j'}$. This concludes the proof for this case.

Case 2. Assume that $N = \emptyset$. So we have $\lambda_i \geq 0$ for each $i \in \{2, \dots, n-1\}$. Consider the first coordinate z_1 of z and the coefficient $\lambda_2 \geq 0$. If $\lambda_2 > 0$ then it follows that u_2 is

applicable to z because $u_{2,1} \leq z_1$. By assumption $u_{2,1} > u_{2,2}$, so u_2 reduces the distance of z and we are done.

We proceed to show that z is either distance reduced by u_n or a circuit u_j for some $j < n$. So let us assume that $u_{2,1} > z_1$, and so $\lambda_2 = 0$. Therefore $z_2 = \lambda_3 u_{3,2} + \dots + \lambda_n u_{n,2} \geq u_{n,2}$. By our original assumption, M satisfies $R_{2,n}$ so one of $(2, n)$ -(i), $(2, n)$ -(ii), or $(2, n)$ -(iii) holds. Since $u_{2,1} > u_{2,2}$, it follows that $(2, n)$ -(i) does not hold. If $(2, n)$ -(iii) holds then we have

$$u_{n,1} + u_{n,3} + u_{n,4} + \dots + u_{n,n-1} < u_{n,2} + u_{n,n}.$$

Since $u_{n,1} \leq z_2$ and $u_{n,n} \leq z_n$, it follows that u_n reduces the distance of z . So it remains to consider the case when $(n, 2)$ -(ii) holds. In this case, there exists $i \in \{3, \dots, n-1\}$ such that u_i is a circuit

$$u_i = (0, u_{i,2}, 0, \dots, 0, -u_{i,i}, 0, \dots, 0)$$

with $u_{i,2} > u_{i,i}$. If $u_{i,2} \leq z_2$, then u_i is applicable and reduces the distance of z . Otherwise if $u_{i,2} > z_2$, then it follows that $\lambda_i = 0$. We mark this point in the proof with $(*)$. In this case, we have that M satisfies $R_{i,n}$ so one of (i, n) -(i), (i, n) -(ii), or (i, n) -(iii) holds. Since u_i is a circuit with $u_{2,i} > u_{i,i}$, it follows that (i, n) -(i) does not hold. If (i, n) -(iii) holds then u_n is applicable and reduces the distance of z . It remains to consider the case when (i, n) -(ii) holds. So there exists $j \in \{i+1, \dots, n-1\}$ such that u_j is a circuit

$$u_j = (0, \dots, 0, u_{j,i}, 0, \dots, 0, -u_{j,j}, 0, \dots, 0)$$

with $u_{j,i} > u_{j,j}$. If $u_{j,i} \leq z_i$, then u_j is applicable and reduces the distance of z . Otherwise if $u_{j,i} > z_i$, then it follows that $\lambda_j = 0$. We have now reached a point in the proof with the same premises as $(*)$ except $2, i$ is replaced with the strictly larger values i, j . Note that $j < n$, so if we repeatedly apply the same argument, then there are only finitely many steps until z is distance reduced by either u_n or a circuit u_j . This concludes the proof of this case.

So, in each case, we have shown that z is distance reduced by some element $u_i \in M$. Since z was arbitrary, M is distance reducing. \square

5. COMPLETE INTERSECTION MONOMIAL CURVES

In this section we prove that the distance reduction property governs the pattern of gluings for complete intersection monomial curves.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{1 \times n}$ be a complete intersection. If a minimal Markov basis reduces the distance of the circuits of A , then A admits a gluing of the first kind.*

So, the distance reduction property for complete intersection monomial curves is characterised by the inequalities in Theorem 4.3 and Definition 4.2. In particular, the circuits completely determine whether a minimal Markov basis is distance reducing.

Corollary 5.2. *Let $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{1 \times n}$ be a complete intersection and M a minimal Markov basis for A . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) M is distance reducing,
- (2) M reduces the distance of the circuits of A .

Proof. By definition we have (1) \implies (2). To prove (2) \implies (1), by Theorem 5.1 we have that A admits a gluing of the first kind. So by Theorem 4.3, we have that M is distance reducing for A . \square

We develop tools and give a proof of Theorem 5.1 in the following sections. In Section 5.1, we show that gluings of the first kind may be detected with a combinatorial game. In Section 5.2, we set up the main notation for the proof and prove Lemma 5.8, which allows us

to use an inductive argument in the proof of the theorem. In Section 5.3, we introduce gluing trees and their decorations, which are combinatorial objects that track the sign patterns of the Markov basis elements. Section 5.3 concludes with a proof of Theorem 5.1.

5.1. A condition for gluings of the first kind. In this section we give a combinatorial condition on the sign pattern of a Markov basis M so that the matrix A admits a gluing of the first kind.

Definition 5.3. Let $M = (m_{i,j})$ be a Markov basis for a matrix A . The *sign matrix* of M is the matrix $\text{sgn}(M) = (\text{sgn}(m_{i,j}))$ whose entries are from the set $\{-, 0, +\}$. For ease of notation we notation, we write (\cdot) for the zero entries of the sign matrix.

Sign Game. Let $S \in \{-, 0, +\}^{k \times n}$ be a matrix of signs. A *move* is given by selecting an entry $s_{i,j}$ and deleting the i th row and j th column of S . This move is *valid* if:

- the entry $s_{i,j}$ is the only nonzero entry of the j th column of S and
- the entry $s_{i,j}$ is different from all other entries in the i th row of S .

We say S is *winnable* if there is a sequence of valid moves that deletes every element of S ; resulting in the empty matrix. If there is no sequence of valid moves that deletes every entry of S , then we say that S is not winnable.

Example 5.4. The following shows a sequence of valid moves in the sign game:

$$\begin{bmatrix} + & - & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & [+] & - & \cdot & \cdot \\ + & + & \cdot & - & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & - & \cdot & \cdot & + & - \\ \cdot & + & \cdot & \cdot & - & - \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} + & - & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ + & + & [-] & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & - & \cdot & + & - \\ \cdot & + & \cdot & - & - \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} [+] & - & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & - & + & - \\ \cdot & + & - & - \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} - & + & - \\ + & - & - \end{bmatrix}.$$

Each move is given by removing the row and column of the bracketed entry. The final matrix in the sequence admits no valid moves so none of these matrices is winnable.

Proposition 5.5. *Let A be a complete intersection. Let M be a minimal Markov basis for A . Then A admits a gluing of the first kind if and only if $\text{sgn}(M)$ is winnable.*

Proof. The matrix A admits a gluing of the first kind if and only if, up a permutation of the rows and columns of M and sign of the rows of M , the matrix $\text{sgn}(M) = (s_{i,j})$ is given by

$$\text{sgn}(M) = \begin{bmatrix} + & - & \cdot & \cdot & \cdots & \cdot \\ \oplus & \oplus & - & \cdot & \cdots & \cdot \\ \oplus & \oplus & \oplus & - & \cdots & \cdot \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \oplus & \oplus & \oplus & \cdots & \oplus & - \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

The matrix $\text{sgn}(M)$ is winnable since the sequence of moves: $s_{n-1,n}, s_{n-2,n-1}, \dots, s_{2,3}, s_{1,2}$ deletes the entire matrix. Conversely, every winnable $(n-1) \times n$ matrix $S = (s_{i,j})$ can be transformed into the above matrix with a permutation of the rows and columns of S and negating some of the rows. To see this, suppose that a winning sequence of moves is given by $s_{i_1,j_1}, s_{i_2,j_2}, \dots, s_{i_{n-1},j_{n-1}}$. Consider the first move s_{i_1,j_1} . Without loss of generality, we may assume that s_{i_1,j_1} is $(-)$ because we may change the sign of the row. We move that entry to the bottom-right corner of the matrix to form a new matrix M' with sign matrix $\text{sgn}(M') = (s'_{i,j})$. By the definition of a winnable matrix, the entries above $s'_{n-1,n} = s_{i_1,j_1}$ in $\text{sgn}(M')$ are all zero and the entries to the left are all $(+)$ or (\cdot) . We continue in this way for all subsequent moves and results in matrix as (2). Therefore A admits a gluing of the first kind. \square

To prove Theorem 5.1, the first step is to apply Lemma 5.8, which shows that there exists a distinguished circuit z of A such that the only element of M that reduces the distance of z is w . In particular, since w is applicable to this circuit, we deduce that many of the entries of w are zero. We proceed to examine the circuits not distance reduced by w to find further zeros in the coordinates of the Markov basis. We keep track of the zeros to show that $\text{sgn}(M)$ is winnable.

Example 5.6. Let $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{1 \times 5}$ be a matrix. Suppose that A is a complete intersection that admits the gluing

$$A = (((a_1 \circ a_2) \circ a_3) \circ (a_4 \circ a_5)).$$

Without loss of generality we assume $a_1 < a_2$ and $a_4 < a_5$. Suppose that M is a minimal Markov basis of the form

$$M = \{u_2, u_3, u_4, u_5\} = \begin{bmatrix} u_{2,1} & -u_{2,2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ u_{3,1} & u_{3,2} & -u_{3,3} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & u_{4,4} & -u_{4,5} \\ u_{5,1} & u_{5,2} & u_{5,3} & -u_{5,4} & -u_{5,5} \end{bmatrix}$$

where $u_{i,j} \geq 0$ for all i, j . By Lemma 5.8, we have that u_5 reduces the distance of one of the circuits $z_{2,5}$ or $z_{3,5}$ where $z_{i,j}$ is the circuit supported on $\{i, j\}$. By considering the applicability of u_5 to these circuits, we identify three cases for u_5 : $\text{Supp}(u_5^-) = \{5\}$, $\text{Supp}(u_5^+) = \{2\}$, and $\text{Supp}(u_5^+) = \{3\}$.

Case 1. $u_5 = (u_{5,1}, u_{5,2}, u_{5,3}, 0, -u_{5,5})$. In this case we have

$$\text{sgn}(M) = \begin{bmatrix} + & - & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \oplus & \oplus & - & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & + & - \\ \oplus & \oplus & \oplus & \cdot & - \end{bmatrix},$$

which is winnable and so A admits a gluing of the first kind. For instance, a winning sequence of moves is given by the indices: $(3, 4), (4, 5), (2, 3), (1, 2)$.

Case 2. $u_5 = (0, u_{5,2}, 0, -u_{5,4}, -u_{5,5})$. In this case we have

$$\text{sgn}(M) = \begin{bmatrix} + & - & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \oplus & \oplus & - & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & + & - \\ \cdot & + & \cdot & \ominus & \ominus \end{bmatrix},$$

which is winnable and so A admits a gluing of the first kind. For instance, a winning sequence of moves is given by the indices: $(2, 3), (1, 1), (4, 2), (3, 4)$.

Case 3. $u_5 = (0, 0, u_{5,3}, -u_{5,4}, -u_{5,5})$. In this case we have that u_5 reduces the distance of the circuit $z_{3,5} = (0, 0, z_3, 0, -z_5)$ and u_5 is applicable to the positive part of z . Note that if u_5 also reduces the distance of $z_{2,5}$ then by the above cases, we have that A admits a gluing of the first kind. So, let us assume that u_5 does not reduce the distance of $z_{2,5}$. So we must have that u_2 reduces the distance of $z_{2,5}$. In particular, we have that u_2 is applicable to $z_{2,5}$ and so $u_2 = (0, u_{2,2}, -u_{2,3}, 0, 0)$. Therefore the sign of M is given by

$$\text{sgn}(M) = \begin{bmatrix} + & - & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & + & - & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & + & - \\ \cdot & \cdot & + & \ominus & \ominus \end{bmatrix},$$

which is winnable and so A admits a gluing of the first kind. In this case, a winning sequence of moves is given by the indices: $(1, 1), (2, 2), (4, 3), (3, 4)$.

5.2. Existence of distinguished circuits. In this section we set up the notation for the proof of Theorem 5.1. In Lemma 5.8 we prove that key result that allows us to apply induction.

Setup. Throughout this section and the next, we consider a pair of matrices $A = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and $B = (b_1, \dots, b_m)$ with $n, m \geq 1$ that are complete intersections. We assume there is a gluing $C = A \circ B$. Note that all complete intersection monomial curves arise in this way. We assume that M is a Markov basis for C that has the form $M = \{u_1, \dots, u_{n-1}, v_1, \dots, v_{m-1}, w\}$ where:

- for each $i \in [n-1]$ we have $\text{Supp}(u_i) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$,
- the set of projections of u_i onto the coordinates $\{1, \dots, n\}$ is a Markov basis for A ,
- for each $j \in [m-1]$ we have $\text{Supp}(v_j) \subseteq \{n+1, \dots, n+m\}$,
- the set of projections of v_j onto the coordinates $\{n+1, \dots, n+m\}$ is a Markov basis for B ,
- $\text{Supp}(w^+) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $\text{Supp}(w^-) \subseteq \{n+1, \dots, n+m\}$.

We write $M_A = \{u_1, \dots, u_{n-1}\}$ and $M_B = \{v_1, \dots, v_{m-1}\}$. For each pair of indices $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n+m\}$ with $i < j$, we denote by $z_{i,j}$ the circuit supported on i and j given by

$$z_{i,j} = (0, \dots, 0, (z_{i,j})_i, 0, \dots, 0, -(z_{i,j})_j, 0, \dots, 0)$$

for some positive integers $(z_{i,j})_i$ and $(z_{i,j})_j$. For ease of notation, we define $z_{j,i}$ to be equal to $z_{i,j}$.

Our proof of Theorem 5.1 is by induction on $n+m$. To apply the inductive hypothesis, we must show that either: the set $M_B \cup \{w\}$ does not reduce the distance of any circuit $z_{i,j}$ with $i, j \in [n]$, or the set $M_A \cup \{w\}$ does not reduce the distance of any circuit $z_{n+i, n+j}$ with $i, j \in [m]$. We may then apply induction to either A with Markov basis given by a projection of M_A or B with Markov basis given by a projection M_B , respectively. In the following lemmas, we prove that one of these cases indeed holds. We now show the existence of distinguished circuits of C that are distance reduced by a single element of M .

Lemma 5.7. *Suppose M reduces the distance of the circuits of C . Then at least one of the following holds:*

- (1) *There exists $r \in [n]$ such that for each $j \in [m]$ the circuit $z_{r, n+j}$ is distance reduced by exactly one element $u_j \in M$. Moreover, this unique element lies in the set $M_B \cup \{w\}$. In particular, there is a bijection $u_j \leftrightarrow z_{r, n+j}$ between the set $M_B \cup \{w\}$ and the circuits $\{z_{r, n+j} : j \in [m]\}$ where u_j is the only element of M to distance reduce the circuit $z_{r, n+j}$.*
- (2) *There exists $c \in [m]$ such that for each $i \in [n]$ the circuit $z_{i, n+c}$ is distance reduced by exactly one element $u_i \in M$. Moreover, this unique element lies in the set $M_A \cup \{w\}$. In particular, there is a bijection $u_i \leftrightarrow z_{i, n+c}$ between the set $M_A \cup \{w\}$ and the circuits $\{z_{i, n+c} : i \in [n]\}$ where u_i is the only element of M to distance reduce the circuit $z_{i, n+c}$.*

Proof. Let T be a rectangular grid with n rows and m columns. We fill the (i, j) entry of T with the set

$$T_{i,j} = \{x \in M : x \text{ reduces the distance of } z_{i, n+j}\}.$$

Claim. Each element $u \in M_A$ appears in at most one row of T .

Proof. Suppose that an element $u \in M_A$ reduces the distance of some circuit $z_{i,n+j}$ for some $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [m]$. Since $\text{Supp}(u) \subseteq [n]$ and u is applicable to the circuit $z_{i,n+j}$, it follows that $\text{Supp}(u^+) = \{i\}$ or $\text{Supp}(u^-) = \{i\}$. Since we may freely replace u with $-u$ in M , we may assume without loss of generality that $\text{Supp}(u^+) = \{i\}$. Since u reduces the distance of $z_{i,n+j}$, we have $|z_{i,n+j}| > |z_{i,n+j} - u|$ so

$$(z_{i,n+j})_i + (z_{i,n+j})_j = |z_{i,n+j}| > |z_{i,n+j} - u| = (z_{i,n+j})_i - (u)_i + |u^-| + (z_{i,n+j})_j.$$

Hence $(u)_i > |u^-|$. Assume by contradiction that u reduces the distance of another circuit $z_{i',n+j'}$ with $i' \in [n]$, $i' \neq i$, and $j' \in [m]$. By a similar argument to the above, it follows that $\text{Supp}(u^-) = \{i'\}$ and $(u)_{i'} > |u^+|$. However, we have $|u^+| = (u)_i > |u^-| = (u)_{i'} > |u^+|$, which is a contradiction. This finishes the proof of the claim. \square

Since $|M_A| = n - 1$, it follows that there is a row of T that does not contain any element of M_A . Let $r \in [n]$ denote the index of this row, i.e., for each $j \in [m]$ we have $T_{r,j} \cap M_A = \emptyset$.

The above claim is symmetrical by switching M_A with M_B and switching rows of T with columns of T . So, each element $v \in M_B$ appears in at most one column of T . Since $|M_B| = m - 1$, it follows that there is a column of T that does not contain any element of M_B . Let $c \in [m]$ denote the index of this column.

Since M reduces the distance of the circuits of C , there is an element of M that reduces the distance of the circuit $z_{r,n+c}$. However, by the above, all elements of $M_A \cup M_B$ do not reduce the distance of $z_{r,n+c}$, so it follows that w is the unique element of M that reduces the distance of $z_{r,n+c}$.

To finish the proof of the result, we show that the entries of T containing w are contained in a single row or column. Assume not. Then w reduces the distance of a pair of circuits $z_{i,n+j}$ and $z_{i',n+j'}$ with $i, i' \in [n]$, $j, j' \in [m]$, $i \neq i'$, and $j \neq j'$. Since w is applicable to the circuits $z_{i,n+j}$ and $z_{i',n+j'}$, it is straightforward to show that w is a circuit and $\text{Supp}(w) \subseteq \{i, i', j, j'\}$. Moreover there are two cases: either w is supported on i and $n + j'$, or w is supported on i' and $n + j$. These cases are symmetrical so we may assume that w is supported on i and $n + j'$, i.e., $w = (0, \dots, 0, w_i, 0, \dots, 0, -w_{n+j'}, 0, \dots, 0)$. Since w reduces the distance of $z_{i,n+j}$ it follows that $w_i > w_{n+j'}$. Since w reduces the distance of $z_{i',n+j'}$ it follows that $w_{n+j'} > w_i > w_{n+j'}$, which is a contradiction. This concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 5.8. *If M reduces the distance of the circuits of C , then one of the following holds:*

- (a) $|\text{Supp}(w^-)| = 1$, condition (1) from Lemma 5.7, and for each $i, j \in [n]$ the move w does not reduce the distance of the circuit $z_{i,j}$,
- (b) $|\text{Supp}(w^+)| = 1$, condition (2) from Lemma 5.7, and for each $i, j \in [m]$ the move w does not reduce the distance of the circuit $z_{n+i,n+j}$.

Proof. By Lemma 5.7 we have that w is the unique element of M that reduces the circuit $z_{r,n+c}$ for some $r \in [n]$ and $c \in [m]$. In particular, w is applicable to $z_{r,n+c}$ so either $\text{Supp}(w^+) = \{r\}$ or $\text{Supp}(w^-) = \{n+c\}$. We take cases based on the support of w .

Case 1. Let $\text{Supp}(w^+) = \{r\}$ and $\text{Supp}(w^-) = \{c\}$. We take further cases on a_r and b_c .

If $a_r = b_c$, then the only circuit $z_{i,n+j}$ with $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [m]$ that is reduced by w is exactly $z_{r,n+c}$. Therefore both conditions (1) and (2) hold in Lemma 5.7. In this case we observe that w does not reduce the distance of any other circuit of C . Hence both conditions (a) and (b) hold.

If $a_r > b_c$, then w reduces the distance of all circuits $z_{r,n+j}$ with $j \in [m]$ so condition (1) of Lemma 5.7 does not hold, hence condition (2) holds. Moreover, the move w does not reduce the distance of any circuit $z_{n+i,n+j}$ with $i, j \in [m]$, hence (b) holds.

If $a_r < b_c$, then w reduces the distance of all circuits $z_{i,n+c}$ with $i \in [n]$ so condition (2) of Lemma 5.7 does not hold, hence condition (1) holds. Since w does not reduce the distance of any circuit $z_{i,j}$ with $i, j \in [n]$, we have that (a) holds.

Case 2. Let $\text{Supp}(w^+) = \{r\}$ and $\text{Supp}(w^-) \supsetneq \{c\}$. In this case w is not applicable to any circuit $z_{n+i,n+j}$ with $i, j \in [m]$. In particular, the move w does not reduce the distance of these circuits. To show that (b) holds, it suffices to prove that condition (2) from Lemma 5.7 holds. If not then w reduces the distance of a circuit $z_{i,n+c}$ for some $i \in [n]$ with $i \neq r$. However this is an immediate contradiction because w is not applicable to $z_{i,n+c}$ since $i \neq r$ and $|\text{Supp}(w^-)| \geq 2$. So we have shown (b) holds.

Case 3. Let $\text{Supp}(w^-) = \{c\}$ and $\text{Supp}(w^+) \supsetneq \{r\}$. In this case w is not applicable to any circuit $z_{i,j}$ with $i, j \in [n]$. In particular, the move w does not reduce the distance of these circuits. To show that (a) holds, it suffices to prove that condition (1) from Lemma 5.7 holds. If not then w reduces the distance of a circuit $z_{r,n+j}$ for some $j \in [m]$ with $j \neq c$. However, this is an immediate contradiction because w is not applicable to $z_{r,n+j}$ since $j \neq c$ and $|\text{Supp}(w^+)| \geq 2$. So we have shown (a) holds.

In each case we have shown that either (a) or (b) holds. This concludes the proof. \square

5.3. Gluing trees. Recall that complete intersection monomial curves are completely glued. This means any such curve $C = A \circ B \in \mathbb{N}^{1 \times (n+m)}$ is the gluing of a complete intersection monomial curves $A \in \mathbb{N}^{1 \times 1}$ and $B \in \mathbb{N}^{1 \times m}$. Similarly, both A and B admit gluings and so on until each constituent matrix has size one. We record the data of the sequence of gluing with a rooted binary tree \mathcal{T}_C . The leaves of \mathcal{T}_C are labelled with the entries of C , which we identify with the set $[n+m]$. The graph structure is defined inductively. If $n = 1$ and $A = (a_1)$, then \mathcal{T}_A is the graph with a single vertex a_1 , called the root of \mathcal{T}_A , and no edges. Suppose \mathcal{T}_A and \mathcal{T}_B are the rooted binary trees associated to A and B with roots u and v respectively. Then \mathcal{T}_C is defined to be the graph obtained from the disjoint union $\mathcal{T}_A \sqcup \mathcal{T}_B$ by adding a vertex w adjacent to u and v . The vertex w is defined to be the root of \mathcal{T}_C . We call \mathcal{T}_C the *gluing tree* of C .



Gluing tree notation. There is a canonical embedding of \mathcal{T}_C in \mathbb{R}^2 . The embedding is defined so that: the vertex $i \in [n+m]$ lies at position $(i, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^2$; each edge is a line segment with gradient 1 or -1 ; and each parent has a higher y -coordinate than its children. For example, see the gluing tree in Figure 1. Thus, given a non-leaf vertex v of \mathcal{T}_C , there are two edges incident to v below it: one to the *left* and one to the *right*. The set of leaves of \mathcal{T}_C connected to v by a path whose first edge is the left one is denoted $L(v)$. Similarly, the set of leaves of \mathcal{T}_C connected to v by a path whose first edge is the right one is denoted $R(v)$. We call the set of vertices $L(v) \cup R(v)$ the leaves of \mathcal{T}_C below v .

Given a Markov basis M for C , there is a natural bijection between the elements of M and non-leaf vertices of \mathcal{T}_C . This bijection associates an element $u \in M$ with a non-leaf vertex v so that one of the following holds:

$$(\text{Supp}(u^+) \subseteq L(v) \text{ and } \text{Supp}(u^-) \subseteq R(v)) \text{ or } (\text{Supp}(u^-) \subseteq L(v) \text{ and } \text{Supp}(u^+) \subseteq R(v)).$$

Example 5.9. Let $A = (a_1 \ a_2 \ a_3)$ and $B = (b_1 \ b_2)$. Suppose there is a gluing $C = A \circ B$. Then the gluing tree \mathcal{T}_C is shown in Figure 1. Given a Markov basis M , the element w is the root of \mathcal{T}_C and corresponds to the final row in the sign matrix in the diagram. The non-leaf vertices of the gluing tree are labelled with the corresponding elements of the Markov basis.

Decorated partial gluing trees. Let M be a Markov basis for C and suppose that M reduces the distance of the circuits of C . By swapping A and B in the gluing of C , we may assume that condition (b) of Lemma 5.8 and 5.7 holds. The *partial gluing tree* $\mathcal{T}_C(M)$ is


 FIGURE 1. The gluing tree in \mathbb{A}^5 from Example 5.9

 FIGURE 2. The decorated partial gluing tree in Example 5.10. In the figures of decorated trees, the solid line shows the path s_v and the dotted lines indicate d_v , for each non-leaf v .

the induced subgraph of \mathcal{T}_C obtained by deleting the leaves b_1, \dots, b_m and vertices v that correspond to elements of M_B . Explicitly, these are the non-leaf vertices v of \mathcal{T}_C such that $L(v) \cup R(v) \subseteq \{b_1, \dots, b_m\}$. So, the partial gluing tree $\mathcal{T}_C(M)$ has n leaves and n non-leaves. Its leaves are labelled with the elements $[n]$ corresponding to A and its non-leaves are labelled with the elements of $M_A \cup \{w\}$.

By condition (b) of Lemma 5.7, there exists $c \in [m]$ and a bijection between $[n]$ and $M_A \cup \{w\}$ given by $i \mapsto u_i$, with the property that u_i is the only element of M that reduces the distance of the circuit $z_{i, n+c}$. Fix $u \in M_A \cup \{w\}$ and let $i \in [n]$ be the corresponding element in $[n]$ as above. We define the *decoration* D_u to be the following pair of subgraphs $D_u = (s_u, d_u)$ of $\mathcal{T}_C(M)$. The subgraph s_u is the unique path from the non-leaf vertex u to the leaf i . Let ℓ be edge incident to u along this path. The subgraph d_u is the induced subgraph of $\mathcal{T}_C(M)$ consisting of all vertices below u whose path to u does not involve ℓ . Note that d_w is the empty graph.

We define the *decorated partial gluing tree* $\overline{\mathcal{T}_C(M)}$ to be the pair $(\mathcal{T}_C(M), \mathcal{D})$, where $\mathcal{D} = \{D_u : u \in M_A \cup \{w\}\}$ is the set of decorations. We note that the operation of taking a graph minor of $\mathcal{T}_C(M)$ naturally extends to any subgraph, hence taking graph minors naturally extends to an operation on $\overline{\mathcal{T}_C(M)}$.

Example 5.10. Consider the gluing tree in Example 5.9. Suppose that condition (b) holds for some Markov basis M of C . Let us also assume that the bijection between $\{1, 2, 3\}$ and $M_A \cup \{w\} = \{u', u, w\}$ is given by: $w \leftrightarrow 2$, $u \leftrightarrow 3$, and $u' \leftrightarrow 1$. The decorated partial gluing tree $\overline{\mathcal{T}_C(M)}$ is shown in Figure 2.

Each decoration encodes information about the sign patterns in the Markov basis. For example, the path s_w indicates that $\text{Supp}(w^+) = \{2\}$ and $\text{Supp}(w^-) \subseteq \{n+1, \dots, n+m\}$, which follows from Lemma 5.8. Similarly, the subgraph d_u encodes the fact that $\text{Supp}(u^-) \subseteq \{1, 2\}$.




FIGURE 3. A decoration of an abstract d-tree


Definition 5.11. An *abstract decorated partial gluing tree* (or *abstract d-tree*) is the combinatorial data of a decorated partial gluing tree. Explicitly, an abstract d-tree is a pair $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D})$ where \mathcal{T} is rooted tree such that: the root has degree 1 and every non-root non-leaf vertex has degree 3. Following the notation for gluing trees, we assume that \mathcal{T} is embedded in \mathbb{R}^2 . We write $V(\mathcal{T})$ for the set of non-leaf vertices of \mathcal{T} , which includes the root, and $\ell(\mathcal{T})$ for the set of leaves of \mathcal{T} . The set \mathcal{D} is the set of decorations D_u , with one for each $u \in V(\mathcal{T})$. A decoration $D_u = (s_u, d_u)$ is a pair of subgraphs s_u and d_u . The subgraph s_u is a path in \mathcal{T} connecting u to a leaf ℓ_u . Let ℓ be the first edge of this path. The subgraph d_u is the induced subgraph of \mathcal{T} consisting of all vertices v below u such that the path from v to u avoids ℓ . In addition, we require that the set $\{\ell_u : u \in V(\mathcal{T})\} = \ell(\mathcal{T})$.

Example 5.12. Figure 3 shows the decoration of an abstract d-tree.

Lemma 5.13. Let $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D})$ be an abstract d-tree. Then there exists a non-leaf vertex $u \in V(\mathcal{T})$ such that ℓ_u and u are adjacent and ℓ_u is not contained in the subgraph d_v for each $v \in V(\mathcal{T})$.

Proof. We prove the result for all abstract d-trees $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D})$ by induction on n the number of leaves. If $n = 1$, then the graph \mathcal{T} is the graph with a root w and a single leaf ℓ . The path s_w is the edge that connects w and ℓ and d_w is the empty graph. Thus, the result holds.

Suppose that $n \geq 2$. Then there exists a non-leaf vertex v that is adjacent to two leaves: ℓ_v and ℓ . If ℓ_v is not contained in d_u for all u then we are done. Otherwise assume that ℓ_v is contained in d_u for some $u \in V(\mathcal{T})$. We construct a new abstract d-tree by *pruning* the vertex v and the leaf ℓ_v , defined by the following diagram.




This operation produces an abstract d-tree with one fewer leaf. By induction, this abstract d-tree has a vertex v' that is adjacent to leaf ℓ' such that ℓ' does not belong to d_u for all u . Observe that v' and ℓ' are adjacent in the original abstract d-tree and ℓ' does not belong to d_u for all u in original abstract d-tree. So we are done. \square

Lemma 5.14. Let $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D})$ be an abstract d-tree with n leaves. There exists an ordering (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n) of $V(\mathcal{T})$ such that, for each $i \in [n]$, the leaf ℓ_{u_i} is not contained in d_{u_j} for all $j \geq i$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on n . For $n = 1$ the result is straightforward. Assume $n \geq 2$. By Lemma 5.13, there is a leaf ℓ_1 that does not belong to d_u for all $u \in V(\mathcal{T})$. In particular

the non-leaf vertex $u_1 \in V(\mathcal{T})$ such that $\ell_{u_1} = \ell_1$ is adjacent to ℓ_1 so we may *prune* $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D})$ as follows.



The resulting abstract d-tree has one fewer leaf so by induction there exists a sequence (u_2, \dots, u_n) such that ℓ_{u_i} is not contained in d_{u_j} for all $j \geq i$. So the sequence (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n) satisfies the conditions of the result and we are done. \square

We now use this description together with the decorated partial gluing tree $\overline{\mathcal{T}_C(M)}$ to prove our main result.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. We prove that if M is a distance reducing Markov basis for the matrix $C = A \circ B$, then C admits a gluing of the first kind. The proof is by induction on $m + n$. If $m + n = 2$, then the result is clear.

Assume that $m + n \geq 3$. First we apply Lemma 5.8 where we may assume that (b) holds, since if (a) holds, then we may swap A and B . In particular, w does not reduce the distance of the circuits supported on $\{n + 1, \dots, n + m\}$. Also observe that none of the moves in M_A reduce the distance of these circuits as they are not applicable. So, we may apply the induction hypothesis to the matrix B and Markov basis for B obtained by projecting M_B to the last m coordinates. So the matrix $\text{sgn}(M_B)$ is winnable, so $\text{sgn}(M_B)$ has a winning sequence that we denote by s_B .

We now extend s_B to a winning sequence for M . Consider the decorated partial gluing tree $\overline{\mathcal{T}_C(M)}$. By Lemma 5.14, there is a sequence of vertices (u_1, \dots, u_n) such that for each $i \in [n]$ the leaf ℓ_{u_i} is not contained in d_{u_j} for all $j \in [n]$ with $j \geq i$. We now interpret this sequence in terms of the sign matrix of M . By the construction of $\overline{\mathcal{T}_C(M)}$, for each $i \in [n]$ the move u_i is the unique element of M that reduces the distance of the circuit z that is supported on $\{\ell_{u_i}, n + c\}$ for some $c \in [m]$. In particular, u_i is applicable to z so it follows that $\text{Supp}(u_i^+) = \{\ell_{u_i}\}$ or $\text{Supp}(u_i^-) = \{\ell_{u_i}\}$. Without loss of generality assume $\text{Supp}(u_i^+) = \{\ell_{u_i}\}$ and $\ell_{u_i} \in L(u_i)$, otherwise we may consider $-u_i$ or swap the two subgraphs below u_i in drawing of $\mathcal{T}_C(M)$. By construction, we have that $\text{Supp}(u_i^-) \subseteq R(u_i) = \ell(d_{u_i})$.

Since ℓ_{u_1} is not contained in any subgraph d_v for all $v \in V(\mathcal{T}_C(M))$, it follows that the column of M indexed by ℓ_{u_1} has one nonzero entry in the row indexed by u_1 . By the assumptions above, the sign of this entries is $-$ and is unique in the row. Therefore (u_1, ℓ_{u_1}) gives a valid move for the matrix M . After removing row u_i and column ℓ_{u_i} from M , we similarly follows that (u_2, ℓ_{u_2}) is a valid move. We continue in this way until we are left with the matrix $\text{sgn}(M_B)$ restricted to the last m columns. We may then apply the moves s_B to delete every entry from the matrix. Thus we have shown that the matrix M is winnable by the sequence of moves

$$(u_1, \ell_{u_1}), (u_2, \ell_{u_2}), \dots, (u_n, \ell_{u_n}), s_B.$$

Therefore, by Proposition 5.5, we have C admits a gluing of the first kind. \square

6. MONOMIAL CURVES IN \mathbb{A}^4

In this section we explore monomial curves in \mathbb{A}^4 . Let $A = (a_1 \ a_2 \ a_3 \ a_4)$ be a matrix of positive integers. Let M be a minimal Markov basis for A . If A is a complete intersection, then by Corollary 5.2 we have that M is distance reducing if and only if M reduces the distance of the circuits of A . The next example shows that if A is not a complete intersection then the same result does not necessarily hold.

Example 6.1. Consider the matrix $A = (14 \ 21 \ 23 \ 29)$ and the minimal Markov basis

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & -2 \\ 3 & -2 & 0 & 0 \\ 3 & 1 & -4 & 1 \\ 7 & 0 & -3 & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

It is not difficult to show that M distance reduces the circuits of A . However, M cannot reduce the distance of the element $(1, 4, -3, -1) \in \ker(A)$. We note that the matrix A does not admit any gluing.

In this section we give a complete description of the distance reducing Markov bases for monomial curves in \mathbb{A}^4 and admit a gluing. In particular, we study the glued non-complete intersections and show the circuits characterise the distance reducing property. First we give an explicit description of the complete intersection cases.

6.1. Complete intersections. For monomial curves in \mathbb{A}^4 , there are two types of complete intersections:

$$(((a_1 \circ a_2) \circ a_3) \circ a_4) \quad \text{and} \quad ((a_1 \circ a_2) \circ (a_3 \circ a_4)).$$

In each case, the minimal Markov bases can be characterised by Theorem 4.3 and Theorem 5.1.

Corollary 6.2. *Suppose that $A = (a_1 \ a_2 \ a_3 \ a_4)$ is a complete intersection with type $(((a_1 \circ a_2) \circ a_3) \circ a_4)$. Suppose that M is a minimal Markov basis of A consisting of*

$$b = (b_1, -b_2, 0, 0), \quad c = (c_1, c_2, -c_3, 0), \quad d = (d_1, d_2, d_3, -d_4)$$

where $b_1, b_2, c_2, d_4 > 0$ and $c_1, c_2, d_1, d_2, d_3 \geq 0$. Without loss of generality, we assume $b_1 > b_2$. Then M is distance reducing if and only if each of the following conditions is satisfied:

- (a) $c_1 < c_2 + c_3$,
- (b) $(c_1 = 0 \text{ and } c_3 < c_2)$ or $d_1 + d_3 < d_2 + d_4$,
- (c) $c_1 + c_2 < c_3$ or $d_1 + d_2 < d_3 + d_4$.

Proof. Since A admits a gluing of the first kind, by Theorem 4.3, we have that M is distance reducing if and only if M satisfies conditions $R_{2,3}, R_{2,4}, R_{3,4}$. Let us consider condition $R_{2,3}$. Since $b_1 > b_2$, it follows that (2,3)-(i) does not hold. By definition the condition (2,3)-(ii) does not hold. So M satisfies $R_{2,3}$ if and only if M satisfies condition (2,3)-(iii), which is equivalent to $c_1 < c_2 + c_3$. Similarly, it follows that M satisfies $R_{2,4}$ if and only if condition (b) above holds, and M satisfies $R_{3,4}$ if and only if condition (c) above holds. \square

Example 6.3. Consider the matrix $A = (7 \ 8 \ 22 \ 23)$. This matrix admits a gluing of type $(((7 \circ_{56} 8) \circ_{22} 22) \circ_{23} 23)$ and has a unique minimal Markov basis

$$b = (8, -7, 0, 0), \quad c = (2, 1, -1, 0), \quad d = (1, 2, 0, -1).$$

This Markov basis does not satisfy condition (a) in the above corollary, hence it fails to reduce the distance of the circuit $(0, 11, -4, 0)$.

Corollary 6.4. *Suppose that $A = (a_1 \ a_2 \ a_3 \ a_4)$ is a complete intersection with type $((a_1 \circ a_2) \circ (a_3 \circ a_4))$. Suppose that M is a minimal Markov basis of A consisting of*

$$b = (b_1, -b_2, 0, 0), \quad c = (0, 0, c_3, -c_4), \quad d = (d_1, d_2, -d_3, -d_4)$$

where $b_1, b_2, c_3, c_4 > 0$ and $d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4 \geq 0$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $b_1 > b_2$ and $c_3 > c_4$. Then M is distance reducing if and only if the following conditions hold:

- (i) At least one of d_1 and d_3 is zero,
- (ii) $d_1 + d_3 < d_2 + d_4$.

If $d_1 = 0$, then A admits a gluing of the first kind given by $((a_1 \circ a_2) \circ a_4) \circ a_3$. Otherwise if $d_3 = 0$ then A admits a gluing of the first kind given by $((a_3 \circ a_4) \circ a_2) \circ a_1$.

Example 6.5. Consider the matrix $A = (90 \ 126 \ 350 \ 525)$. This matrix admits a gluing of type $((90 \circ_{630} 126) \circ_{3150} (350 \circ_{1050} 525))$ and a minimal Markov basis

$$b = (7, -5, 0, 0), \quad c = (0, 0, 3, -2), \quad d = (14, 15, -3, -4).$$

Since $d_1 \neq 0$ and $d_3 \neq 0$, it follows that M does not reduce the distance of the circuit $(0, 25, 0, -6)$.

6.2. Glued non-complete intersections. Throughout this section, we consider a matrix A that admits a gluing but is not a non complete intersection. The main result of this section is Theorem 6.8, which shows that a minimal Markov basis for A is distance reducing if and only if it reduces the distance of the circuits of A .

The gluing is given by $A = A' \circ a_4$ where $A' = (a_1 \ a_2 \ a_3)$ is not a complete intersection. By Theorem 3.2, we have that A' has a unique minimal Markov basis, which gives us 3 indispensable elements for any Markov basis of A :

$$g_1 = (-c_1, v_{12}, v_{13}, 0), \quad g_2 = (v_{21}, -c_2, v_{23}, 0), \quad g_3 = (v_{31}, v_{32}, -c_3, 0).$$

By [13, Theorem 1.4] or, more generally, [11, Theorem 2.6], a gluing introduces exactly one new generator. In this case, we have that any Markov basis of A contains exactly one more element $h = (h_1, h_2, h_3, -h_4)$. We denote by M the Markov basis $\{g_1, g_2, g_3, h\}$. We denote by M' the unique minimal Markov basis $\{g'_1, g'_2, g'_3\}$ of A' . This gives us the following.

Proposition 6.6. *Let $A = (a_1 \ a_2 \ a_3 \ a_4)$ be a matrix and $A' = (a_1 \ a_2 \ a_3)$ a submatrix of A . Suppose that A' is not a complete intersection and A' has unique minimal Markov basis*

$$M' = \{g'_1 = (-c_1, v_{12}, v_{13}), \quad g'_2 = (v_{21}, -c_2, v_{23}), \quad g'_3 = (v_{31}, v_{32}, -c_3)\}$$

as in Theorem 3.2. If A admits a gluing, i.e., there exists $x \in \mathbb{N}A' \cap a_4\mathbb{N}$ such that $x\mathbb{Z} = \mathbb{Z}A' \cap a_4\mathbb{Z}$, then any minimal Markov basis M of A is given by

$$M = \{g_1 = (g'_1, 0), \quad g_2 = (g'_2, 0), \quad g_3 = (g'_3, 0), \quad h = (h_1, h_2, h_3, -h_4)\} \subseteq \ker(A),$$

for some $h_1, h_2, h_3 \geq 0$ and $h_4 > 0$.

With the notation as above, we have the following.

Proposition 6.7. *Suppose that M reduces the distance of the circuits of A . Then M' reduces the distance of the circuits of A' .*

Proof. Assume by contradiction that M' does not reduce all circuits of A' . Note that the result is symmetrical with respect to the permutation of the first three columns of A . So without loss of generality, we may assume that the circuit $z' = (z_1, -z_2, 0)$ is not distance reduced by M' . Since A reduces the distance of the circuit $z = (z_1, -z_2, 0, 0)$, and none of g_1, g_2, g_3 reduces the distance of z , it follows that h reduces the distance of z . In particular,

h is applicable to z so we must have that either: $h_1 \leq z_1$ and $h_2 = h_3 = 0$; or $h_2 \leq z_2$ and $h_1 = h_3 = 0$. Without loss of generality, let us assume that $h_1 \leq z_1$ and $h_2 = h_3 = 0$. Since h reduces the distance of z , we must have that $|z| > |z - h|$. So

$$z_1 + z_2 = |z| > |z - h| = |(z_1 - h_1, -z_2, 0, h_4)| = z_1 - h_1 + z_2 + h_4.$$

Hence $h_1 > h_4$.

It is easy to see that h does not reduce the distance of the circuit $y = (0, y_2, 0, -y_4)$. So, by assumption, the distance of y is reduced by at least one of g_1, g_2 , or g_3 . However, the moves g_1 and g_3 are not applicable to y . So the distance of y must be reduced by g_2 . So we have $y_2 \geq c_2$ and $|y| > |y + g_2|$, hence

$$y_2 + y_4 = |y| > |y + g_2| = |(v_{21}, y_2 - c_2, v_{23}, -y_4)| = v_{21} + y_2 - c_2 + v_{23} + y_4.$$

It follows that $c_2 > v_{21} + v_{23}$.

Let us now consider the move $g'_2 = (v_{21}, -c_2, v_{23}) \in M'$. By Theorem 3.2, we have that g'_2 is a minimal element of type 2. Therefore g'_2 is applicable to the circuit $z' = (z_1, -z_2, 0)$, so $c_2 \leq z_2$. Since $c_2 > v_{21} + v_{23}$, it follows that

$$|z' - g'_2| = |(z_1 - v_{21}, -z_2 + c_2, -v_{23})| \leq z_1 + v_{21} + z_2 - c_2 + v_{23} < |z'|.$$

So g'_2 reduces the distance of the circuit z' , which contradicts our original assumption. This completes the proof. \square

Theorem 6.8. *Assume $a_1 < a_2 < a_3$. A minimal Markov basis M is distance reducing if and only if all of the following conditions hold:*

- (i) $v_{21} < c_2 + v_{23}$ or $v_{31} < v_{32} + c_3$,
- (ii) $v_{21} + v_{31} < c_2$ or $h_1 + h_3 < h_2 + h_4$,
- (iii) $h_1 + h_2 < h_3 + h_4$.

Moreover,

- If M reduces the distance of the circuit $(0, z_2, -z_3, 0)$ then condition (i) holds,
- If M reduces the distance of the circuit $(0, z_2, 0, -z_4)$ then condition (ii) holds,
- If M reduces the distance of the circuit $(0, 0, z_3, -z_4)$ then condition (iii) holds.

In particular, M is distance reducing if and only if M reduces the distance of the three circuits listed above.

Proof. On the one hand, if M is distance reducing then by Proposition 6.10, we have that condition (i), (ii), and (iii) hold. Conversely, if conditions (i), (ii), and (iii) hold then by Proposition 6.11, we have that M is distance reducing. \square

We immediately obtain the following corollary from Theorem 6.8.

Corollary 6.9. *Let M be a minimal Markov basis. Then M is distance reducing if and only if M is distance reducing for the circuits of A .*

We now prove Propositions 6.10 and 6.11 that appear in the proof of Theorem 6.8.

Proposition 6.10. *Assume the setup of Theorem 6.8. If M is distance reducing then conditions (i), (ii), and (iii) hold.*

Proof. Condition (i). Suppose that M is distance reducing. Then M reduces the distances of the circuits of A . So by Proposition 6.7 we have that M' reduces the circuits of A' . By Theorem 3.6 it follows that condition (i) holds.

Condition (ii). Consider the circuit $z = (0, z_2, 0, -z_4)$ of A . By assumption M reduces the distance of z . Note that neither g_1 nor g_3 are applicable to z , so either g_2 or h reduces

the distance of z . In both cases, we will show that condition (ii) holds. If g_2 reduces the distance, then we have $z_2 \geq c_2$ and $|z| > |z + g_2|$, hence

$$z_2 + z_4 = |z| > |z + g_2| = |(v_{21}, z_2 - c_2, v_{23}, -z_4)| = v_{21} + z_2 - c_2 + v_{23} + z_4.$$

Therefore, we have $v_{21} + v_{31} < c_2$ and so condition (ii) holds. On the other hand, suppose that h reduces the distance of z . Since the 4th coordinate of g_1, g_2, g_3 are zero, it follows that $h_4 = \alpha z_4$ for some positive integer α . Consider

$$z - \alpha h = (-\alpha h_1, z_2 - \alpha h_2, -\alpha h_3, 0) \in \ker(A).$$

Since $-\alpha h_1, -\alpha h_3 \leq 0$ and $\ker(A) \cap \mathbb{N}^4 = \{0\}$, we have that $z_2 - \alpha h_2 \geq 0$. In particular, we have $z_2 \geq h_2$. Since h is applicable to z we have $z_4 \geq z_4$. Since h reduces the distance of z we have $|z| > |z - h|$. It follows that

$$z_2 + z_4 = |z| > |z - h| = |(-h_1, z_2 - h_2, -h_3, -z_4 + h_4)| = h_1 + z_2 - h_2 + h_3 + z_4 - h_4,$$

and so we have $h_1 + h_3 < h_2 + h_4$. Hence, condition (ii) holds.

Condition (iii). Consider the circuit $z = (0, 0, z_3, -z_4)$. By assumption M reduces the distance of z . However, the moves g_1 and g_2 are not applicable to z . So either g_3 or h reduces the distance of z .

First, we show that g_3 does not reduce the distance of z . Since $a_1 < a_2 < a_3$ and $g_3 \in \ker(A)$, we have

$$c_3 = \frac{a_1}{a_3}v_{31} + \frac{a_2}{a_3}v_{32} < v_{31} + v_{32}.$$

So, if g_3 is applicable to z then $z_3 \geq c_3$, hence we have

$$|z + g_3| = |(v_{31}, v_{32}, z_3 - c_3, -z_4)| = v_{31} + v_{32} + z_3 - c_3 + z_4 > |z|.$$

Therefore g_3 does not reduce the distance of z .

So we have deduced that h reduces the distance of z . By a similar argument to the condition (ii) case, we will show that $z_3 \geq h_3$. Since the 4th coordinate of g_1, g_2, g_3 are zero, it follows that $h_4 = \alpha z_4$ for some positive integer α . Consider

$$z - \alpha h = (-\alpha h_1, -\alpha h_2, z_3 - \alpha h_3, 0) \in \ker(A).$$

Since $-\alpha h_1, -\alpha h_2 \leq 0$ and $\ker(A) \cap \mathbb{N}^4 = \{0\}$, we have that $z_3 - \alpha h_3 \geq 0$. In particular, we have $z_3 \geq h_3$. Since h is applicable to z we have $z_4 \geq z_4$. Since h reduces the distance of z we have $|z| > |z - h|$. It follows that

$$z_3 + z_4 = |z| > |z - h| = |(-h_1, -h_2, z_3 - h_3, -z_4 + h_4)| = h_1 + h_2 + z_3 - h_3 + z_4 - h_4,$$

and so we have $h_1 + h_2 < h_3 + h_4$. Hence, condition (iii) holds. \square

Proposition 6.11. *Assume the setup of Theorem 6.8. If conditions (i), (ii), (iii) holds, then M is distance reducing.*

Proof. Suppose that conditions (i), (ii), (iii) hold and assume by contradiction that there exists $z \in \ker(A)$ whose distance cannot be reduced by M . If $z_4 = 0$, then we may apply Theorem 3.6 as condition (i) holds. So one of g_1, g_2, g_3 reduces the distance of z , which is a contradiction. So we may assume that $z_4 < 0$.

We have $z = \alpha h + \beta g_1 + \gamma g_2 + \delta g_3$ for some integers $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$. Since $z_4 < 0$, it follows that $\alpha > 0$. By Proposition 3.3, we have $g_1 + g_2 + g_3 = 0$. Let $\lambda = \min\{\beta, \gamma, \delta\}$, then we have

$$z = \alpha h + \beta g_1 + \gamma g_2 + \delta g_3 = \alpha h + (\beta - \lambda)g_1 + (\gamma - \lambda)g_2 + (\delta - \lambda)g_3.$$

Among the coefficients for g_1, g_2, g_3 in the right-most expression for z , we have that at least one is zero and the others are non-negative. So, without loss of generality, we may assume that $\beta, \gamma, \delta \geq 0$ and at least one is zero. Note that if $\beta = \gamma = \delta = 0$, then we have $z = \alpha h$,

so h reduces the distance of z , a contradiction. So at least one of β, γ, δ is nonzero. We take cases on whether γ is zero.

Case 1. Assume $\gamma = 0$. So we have $\beta, \delta \geq 0$. It follows that

$$z = \alpha h + \beta g_1 + \delta g_3 = (\alpha h_1 - \beta c_1 + \delta v_{31}, \alpha h_2 + \beta v_{12} + \delta v_{32}, \alpha h_3 + \beta v_{13} - \delta c_3, -\alpha h_4).$$

By condition (ii) either $h_1 + h_3 < h_2 + h_4$ or $c_2 > v_{21} + v_{23}$. If $h_1 + h_3 < h_2 + h_4$, then we have $z_2 = \alpha h_2 + \beta v_{12} + \delta v_{32} \geq h_2$ so

$$|z - h| = |z_1 \pm h_1| + |z_2 - h_2| + |z_3 \pm h_3| + |-z_4 + h_4| \leq |z| + h_1 + h_3 - h_2 - h_4 < |z|.$$

Hence h reduces the distance of z , a contradiction and we are done.

Suppose that $c_2 > v_{21} + v_{23}$. If $\beta > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, then we have $z_2 = \alpha h_2 + \beta v_{12} + \delta v_{32} \geq v_{12} + v_{32} = c_2$. So g_2 is applicable to z and we have

$$|z + g_2| = |z_1 \pm v_{21}| + |z_2 - c_2| + |z_3 \pm v_{32}| + |z_4| \leq |z| + v_{21} - c_2 + v_{32} < |z|.$$

Hence g_2 reduces the distance of z , a contradiction. So either $\beta = 0$ or $\delta = 0$.

Case 1.1. Assume $\beta = 0$ and $\delta > 0$. In this case we have

$$z = \alpha h + \delta g_3 = (\alpha h_1 + \delta v_{31}, \alpha h_2 + \delta v_{32}, \alpha h_3 - \delta c_3, -\alpha h_4).$$

Since $z_1 = \alpha h_1 + \delta v_{31} \geq v_{31}$ and $z_2 = \alpha h_2 + \delta v_{32} \geq v_{31}$, we have that g_3 is applicable to z . Also, since $a_1 < a_2 < a_3$, it follows that $c_3 < v_{31} + v_{32}$. So

$$\begin{aligned} |z - g_3| &= |(\alpha h_1 + (\delta - 1)v_{31}, \alpha h_2 + (\delta - 1)v_{32}, \alpha h_3 - (\delta - 1)c_3, -\alpha h_4)| \\ &= z_1 - v_{31} + z_2 - v_{32} + |z_3 \pm c_3| + z_4 \\ &\leq z_1 + z_2 + z_3 + z_4 - v_{31} - v_{32} + c_3 \\ &< |z|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence g_3 reduces the distance of z , which is a contradiction.

Case 1.2. Assume $\delta = 0$ and $\beta > 0$. In this case we have

$$z = \alpha h + \beta g_1 = (\alpha h_1 - \beta c_1, \alpha h_2 + \beta v_{12}, \alpha h_3 + \beta v_{13}, -\alpha h_4).$$

We have that h is applicable to z , and $z_3 = \alpha h_3 + \beta v_{13} \geq h_3$. So,

$$\begin{aligned} |z - h| &= |((\alpha - 1)h_1 - \beta c_1, (\alpha - 1)h_2 + \beta v_{12}, (\alpha - 1)h_3 + \beta v_{13}, -(\alpha - 1)h_4)| \\ &= |z_1 \pm h_1| + z_2 - h_2 + z_3 - h_3 + z_4 - h_4 \\ &\leq z_1 + z_2 + z_3 + z_4 + h_1 + h_2 - h_3 - h_4 \\ &< |z|, \end{aligned}$$

where the final inequality follows from condition (iii) $h_1 + h_2 < h_3 + h_4$. Hence h reduces the distance of z , which is a contradiction.

Case 2. Assume $\gamma > 0$. So either $\beta = 0$ or $\delta = 0$. We will show that $\delta = 0$. If $\delta > 0$, then $\beta = 0$ and we have $z = \alpha h + \gamma g_2 + \delta g_3$. If $\delta > 0$, then we have $z_1 = \alpha h_1 + \gamma v_{21} + \delta v_{31} \geq v_{21} + v_{31} = c_1$. So g_1 is applicable to z . Since $a_1 < a_2 < a_3$, it follows that $c_1 > v_{12} + v_{13}$. So g_1 reduces the distance of z , a contradiction. So, we must have $\delta = 0$.

Since $z_4 \geq h_4$, it follows that h is applicable to z . Since $\delta = 0$, we have $z_3 = \alpha h_3 + \beta v_{13} + \gamma v_{23} \geq h_3$. Hence, we have

$$|z - h| = |z_1 \pm h_1| + |z_2 \pm h_2| + |z_3 - h_3| + |-z_4 + h_4| \leq |z| + h_1 + h_2 - h_3 - h_4 < |z|,$$

where the final inequality follows from condition (iii) $h_1 + h_2 < h_3 + h_4$. Therefore h reduces the distance of z , a contradiction. \square

7. GENERALISATIONS OF 1-NORM RESULTS

In this section we extend results from [2] to the non-homogeneous case.

Remark 7.1. Colloquially, the result[2, Proposition 3] says: to check whether a set is distance reducing, it suffices to check whether it reduces the distance of the Graver basis. This proof carefully uses the assumption of homogeneity of A and the definition of the 1-norm. To see this clearly, consider the main claim from the proof that $\emptyset \neq \text{Supp}(z^+) \cap \text{Supp}(z_1^-)$. This claim follows from only one key assumption:

- z is a move from z_1^+ that reduces the distance to z_1^- :

$$\|(z_1^+ + z) - z_1^-\| < \|z_1^+ - z_1^-\| = \|z_1\|.$$

Since the move z is applicable to z_1^+ , we have that $\text{Supp}(z_1^+) \subseteq \text{Supp}(z^-)$. If we assume by contradiction that $\text{Supp}(z^+) \cap \text{Supp}(z_1^-) = \emptyset$, then $\text{Supp}(z) \cap \text{Supp}(z_1^-) = \emptyset$ and we deduce the following:

$$\|(z_1^+ + z) - z_1^-\| = \|z_1^+ + z\| + \|z_1^-\| = \|(z_1^+ - z^-) + z^+\| + \|z_1^-\| = \|z_1^+\| + \|z_1^-\| = \|z_1\|.$$

These equalities are immediate using the definition of the 1-norm and the final equality uses the assumption of homogeneity, which means that $\|z^+\| = \|z^-\|$. However, this chain of equalities contradicts the previous strict inequality.

In Theorem 7.4 we show that the condition of homogeneity can be dropped. In particular, this generalises [Proposition 3, Aoki-Takemura] to the inhomogeneous case.

Proposition 7.2. *The Graver basis is strongly distance reducing, even when A is inhomogeneous.*

Proof. The proof is identical to the proof of the homogeneous case by Aoki-Takemura, however we include it here for completeness. Let x, y be two elements of a fiber. If $x - y$ belongs to the Graver basis then we are done. So, let us assume that $x - y$ does not belong to the Graver basis. Then $x - y$ admits a proper conformal decomposition $x - y = u + v$ for some $u, v \in \ker(A)$. If u does not belong to the Graver basis then u admits a proper conformal decomposition $u = u' + v'$. We then have $x - y = u' + (v' + v)$ is a proper conformal decomposition. If we continue in this way, we note that $\|u\| = \|u'\| + \|v'\| > \|u'\|$ so there are only finitely many steps until the first term is an element of the Graver basis. So we may assume that u belongs to the Graver basis.

By conformality of the decomposition, we have $\|x - y\| = \|u\| + \|v\|$. Also by conformality, we have that u is a move that is applicable to both x and y . So it follows that

$$\|(x - u) - y\| = \|x - (y + u)\| = \|v\| < \|x - y\|.$$

Hence the Graver basis is strongly distance reducing. □

The next example shows that the property of distance reduction is not transitive. For instance, if M is a Markov basis and B is distance reducing for M . Then it is not true that B is a Markov basis.

Example 7.3. Let $A = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 3 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$. Consider the Markov basis $M = \{(3, -2, 0), (2, 0, -1)\}$. The singleton $B = \{(2, 0, -1)\}$ is clearly not a Markov basis yet it reduces the distance of both elements of M . To see this, note that $(2, 0, -1)$ is applicable to $(3, -2, 0)$ and

$$\|(3, -2, 0) - (2, 0, -1)\| = \|(1, -2, 1)\| = 4 < 5 = \|(3, -2, 0)\|.$$

The following theorem shows that, to check whether a set is distance reducing, it suffices to check that it distance reduces the Graver basis.

Theorem 7.4. *Let $B \subseteq \ker(A)$ be any subset. Then B is distance reducing if and only if it is distance reducing for the Graver basis $G(A)$. Similarly, B is strongly distance reducing if and only if it is strongly distance reducing for $G(A)$.*

Proof. Clearly if B is distance reducing then it is distance reducing for the Graver basis. On the other hand, suppose that B reduces the distance of the Graver basis. For any $z \in \ker(A) \setminus G(A)$, we have that z admits a proper conformal decomposition $z = g + h$ where $g \in G(A)$. Since B reduces the distance of $G(A)$, there is a move $b \in B$ that distance reduces g . By Lemma 7.7, it follows that the move b also distance reduces z . So B is distance reducing and we are done. \square

Remark 7.5. The above theorem shows that a minimal Markov basis M is distance reducing if and only if M is distance reducing for the Graver basis.

Recall Proposition 2.3, which shows that if a set is distance reducing then it is Markov basis. The following corollary shows that the sets that distance reduces the Graver basis are Markov bases.

Corollary 7.6. *Suppose that a set of moves B is distance reducing for the Graver basis, then B is a Markov basis.*

Proof. By Theorem 7.4, if B is distance reducing for the Graver basis then it is distance reducing. So by Proposition 2.3, it follows that B is a Markov basis. \square

Lemma 7.7. *Suppose that $b \in \ker(A)$ is a move that distance reduces an element $x \in \ker(A)$. Suppose that $z \in \ker(A)$ has a conformal decomposition $z = x + y$ for some $y \in \ker(A)$. Then b distance reduces z .*

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume that $\|x - b\| < \|x\|$ and $x^+ \geq b^+$. Note that the conformal decomposition gives us that $\|z\| = \|x\| + \|y\|$ and $z^+ \geq b^+$ so we have

$$\|z - b\| = \|x - b + y\| \leq \|x - b\| + \|y\| < \|x\| + \|y\| = \|z\|.$$

Hence b reduces the distance of z . \square

8. DISTANCE IRREDUCIBLE ELEMENTS

The distance irreducible elements of $\ker(A)$ are the set of moves that cannot be distance reduced. We compare the distance irreducible elements with the indispensable set and Graver basis by using the notions of semi-conformal decomposition and conformal decomposition.

Definition 8.1. Let $z \in \ker(A)$ and suppose that there exist $u, v \in \ker(A) \setminus \{0\}$ such that $z = u + v$. We recall that:

- $z = u + v$ is a *proper conformal decomposition* and write $z = u +_c v$ if

$$\text{Supp}(u^+) \cup \text{Supp}(v^+) = \text{Supp}(z^+) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Supp}(u^-) \cup \text{Supp}(v^-) = \text{Supp}(z^-)$$
- $z = u + v$ is a *proper semi-conformal decomposition* and write $z = u +_{sc} v$ if

$$\text{Supp}(u^+) \subseteq [n] \setminus \text{Supp}(v^-) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Supp}(v^-) \subseteq [n] \setminus \text{Supp}(u^+)$$

We introduce the following definitions:

- $z = u + v$ is a *positive distance decomposition* and write $z = u +_{pd} v$ if

$$u^+ \leq z^+ \quad \text{and} \quad \|v\| < \|z\|$$
- $z = u + v$ is a *negative distance decomposition* and write $z = u +_{nd} v$ if

$$u^- \leq z^- \quad \text{and} \quad \|v\| < \|z\|$$

We define classes of indecomposable elements of $\ker(A)$ with respect to the above decompositions.

Definition 8.2. We recall the indispensable and primitive moves:

- $S(A) = \{z \in \ker(A) : z \text{ has no semi-conformal decomposition}\}$ *indispensable set*
- $G(A) = \{z \in \ker(A) : z \text{ has no conformal decomposition}\}$ *primitive elements*

We define the following sets of moves:

- $D^+(A) = \{z \in \ker(A) : z \text{ has no positive distance decomposition}\}$
- $D^-(A) = \{z \in \ker(A) : z \text{ has no negative distance decomposition}\}$
- $D^w(A) = D^+(A) \cup D^-(A)$ *weakly distance irreducible elements*
- $D(A) = D^+(A) \cap D^-(A)$ *distance irreducible elements*

Proposition 8.3. *The following hold:*

$$D^+(A) = -D^-(A), \quad D(A) = -D(A), \quad D^w(A) = -D^w(A).$$

Proof. Suppose that $z = u +_{pd} v$ is a positive distance decomposition. Then it follows that $-z = (-u) +_{nd} (-v)$ is a negative distance decomposition since

$$(-u)^- = u^+ \leq z^+ = (-z)^- \text{ and } \|-v\| = \|v\| \leq \|z\| = \|-z\|.$$

By a similar argument, we have that if z admits a negative distance decomposition then $-z$ admits a positive distance decomposition. Therefore $D^+(A) = -D^-(A)$. The remaining equalities follow immediately from the definition. \square

Distance irreducible elements for distance reducing Markov bases are the analogue of indispensable elements for Markov bases.

Proposition 8.4. *Suppose that $B \subseteq \ker(A)$ is distance reducing, then $D(A) \subseteq B$. If B is strongly distance reducing then $D(A)^w \subseteq B$.*

Proof. Fix a distance reducing set $B \subseteq \ker(A)$ and any $z \in D(A)$. Since B is distance reducing, there exists an element $b \in B$ that reduces the distance of z . So we have that b is applicable to z and reduces its distance. So at least one of the following holds:

$$(i) \ b^+ \leq z^+, \quad (ii) \ b^- \leq z^+, \quad (iii) \ b^+ \leq z^-, \quad (iv) \ b^- \leq z^-.$$

Case (i) Suppose that $b^+ \leq z^+$. Since b reduces the distance of z , we have $\|z - b\| < \|z\|$. If $z - b \neq 0$, then we have $z = b +_{pd} (z - b)$ is a positive distance decomposition, which contradicts $z \in D(A) \subseteq D^+(A)$. Hence $z = b \in B$.

Case (ii) Suppose that $b^- \leq z^+$. Since b reduces the distance of z we have $\|z + b\| < \|z\|$. If $z \neq -b$, then we have that $z = (-b) +_{pd} (z + b)$ is a positive distance decomposition, which contradicts $z \in D(A) \subseteq D^+(A)$. So $-z = b \in B$.

Cases (iii) and (iv) These cases follow almost identically to the first two. If $z \neq b$ and $z \neq -b$ respectively then we deduce that $z \in D^-(A)$. So we have that $z \in B$ and $-z \in B$, respectively.

Now suppose that $B \subseteq \ker(A)$ is a strongly distance reducing set and let $z \in D^w(A)$ be any element. So there exist two elements $b, b' \in B$ such that: the move b is applicable to z^+ ; the move b' is applicable to z^- ; and both b, b' reduce the distance of z . So, using the above description, we have that b satisfies (i) or (ii), and b' satisfies (iii) or (iv). Since $z \in D^w(A) = D^+(A) \cup D^-(A)$, we have that $z \in D^+(A)$ or $z \in D^-(A)$. If $z \in D^+(A)$, then by cases (i) and (ii) we have that $\pm z = b \in B$. Otherwise, if $z \in D^-(A)$, then by cases (iii) and (iv) we have that $\pm z = b \in B$. \square

Proposition 8.5. *Let \mathcal{B} be the set of minimal distance reducing Markov bases and \mathcal{B}^s the set of minimal strongly distance reducing Markov bases. Then we have*

$$D(A) = \bigcap_{B \in \mathcal{B}} B \quad \text{and} \quad D^w(A) = \bigcap_{B \in \mathcal{B}^s} B.$$

Proof. We begin by showing $D(A) = \bigcap_{B \in \mathcal{B}} B$. For each $B \in \mathcal{B}$ we have that $D(A) \subseteq B$ so $D(A) \subseteq \bigcap_{B \in \mathcal{B}} B$. For the opposite inclusion, it suffices to show that for each $m \in \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}} B$ such that $m \notin D(A)$, there exists $B \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $m \notin B$. To do this, consider the set $\ker(A) \setminus \{m, -m\}$. This set is distance reducing because the only elements it does not contain are m and $-m$, both of which admit either a positive or negative distance reducing decompositions. Let B be a minimal distance reducing subset of $\ker(A) \setminus \{m, -m\}$. We have that $B \in \mathcal{B}$ and $m \notin B$, hence we have shown the opposite inclusion and we are done.

The proof that $D^w(A) = \bigcap_{B \in \mathcal{B}^s} B$ follows similarly. Note that for each $B \in \mathcal{B}^s$ we have that $D^w(A) \subseteq B$ so $D^w(A) \subseteq \bigcap_{B \in \mathcal{B}^s} B$. For the opposite inclusion, it suffices to show that for each $m \in \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}^s} B$ such that $m \notin D^w(A)$, there exists $B \in \mathcal{B}^s$ such that $m \notin B$. To do this, consider the set $\ker(A) \setminus \{m, -m\}$. This set is strongly distance reducing because the only elements it does not contain are m and $-m$, both of which admit positive and negative distance reducing decompositions. Let B be a minimal distance reducing subset of $\ker(A) \setminus \{m, -m\}$. We have that $B \in \mathcal{B}^s$ and $m \notin B$, hence we have shown the opposite inclusion. This concludes the proof. \square

Proposition 8.6. *The following chain of inclusions holds:*

$$S(A) \subseteq D(A) \subseteq D^w(A) \subseteq G(A).$$

Proof. Throughout the proof, for a set $B \subseteq \ker(A)$, we write $\overline{B} := \ker(A) \setminus B$ for its complement in $\ker(A)$. We first show $D^w(A) \subseteq G(A)$ by proving that $\overline{G(A)} \subseteq \overline{D^w(A)}$. Suppose that $z \in \ker(A)$ does not belong to $G(A)$. Then we have that $z = u +_c v$ admits a proper conformal decomposition, hence $v^+ \leq z^+$ and $v^- \leq z^-$. In addition, we have that $u \neq 0$ and so it follows that $\|v\| < \|z\|$. By the conformal decomposition, we have $u^+ \leq z^+$ and $u^- \leq z^-$, which gives us $z = u +_{pd} v$ and $z = u +_{nd} v$ respectively. Therefore $z \in \overline{D^+(A)} \cap \overline{D^-(A)} = \overline{D^w(A)}$ and we have shown $D^w(A) \subseteq G(A)$.

Note that the inclusion $D(A) \subseteq D^w(A)$ follows immediately from the definition. So it remains to show that $S(A) \subseteq D(A)$. To do this, we show that $\overline{D(A)} \subseteq \overline{S(A)}$. Suppose that $z \in \overline{D^+(A)}$, then z admits a positive distance decomposition $z = u +_{pd} v$. In particular, we have $u^+ \leq z^+$. Assume, by contradiction, that $z = u + v$ is not a proper semi-conformal decomposition. Then there exists an index $i \in [n]$ such that $u_i > 0$ and $v_i < 0$. But, this gives us $z_i = u_i + v_i < u_i$, hence $u^+ \not\leq z^+$, a contradiction. So $z = u +_{sc} v$ is a semi-conformal decomposition, hence $\overline{D^+(A)} \subseteq \overline{S(A)}$. Similarly, if $z \in \overline{D^-(A)}$ then there exists a negative distance decomposition $z = u +_{nd} v$. In particular, we have $u^- \leq z^-$. Assume by contradiction that $z = v + u$ is not a semi-conformal decomposition. Then, as above, there exists an index $i \in [n]$ such that $u_i < 0$ and $v_i > 0$. But, we have $-z_i = -u_i - v_i < -u_i$, hence $u^- \not\leq z^-$, a contradiction. So $z = v +_{sc} u$ is a semi-conformal decomposition, hence $\overline{D^-(A)} \subseteq \overline{S(A)}$. So we have that $\overline{D(A)} = \overline{D^+(A)} \cup \overline{D^-(A)} \subseteq \overline{S(A)}$, which concludes the proof. \square

Note that for each minimal Markov basis M we have the following chain of inclusions:

$$S(A) \subseteq M \subseteq M(A) \subseteq G(A)$$

where $M(A)$ is the universal Markov basis. The following examples show that there is little connection between $D^w(A)$ and $M(A)$ or between $D(A)$ and $M(A)$.

Example 8.7. Consider the matrix $A = (2 \ 3 \ 4)$. In this case we have

$$D^+(A) = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & -2 & 1 \\ -2 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } D^-(A) = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 & -1 \\ -2 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 2 & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

So we have

$$D(A) = \pm [2 \ 0 \ -1] \text{ and } D^w(A) = D(A) \cup \pm [1 \ -2 \ 1].$$

On the other hand there are two minimal Markov bases

$$M_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & -2 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } M_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 & -1 \\ 3 & -2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

So in this example we have $D^w(A) \subsetneq M(A)$

Example 8.8. Consider the matrix $A = (8 \ 14 \ 15 \ 20)$. We have

$$D^+(A) = \begin{bmatrix} 5 & 0 & 0 & -2 \\ 2 & 1 & -2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 4 & -3 \\ 1 & -2 & 0 & 1 \\ -5 & 0 & 0 & 2 \\ -2 & -1 & 2 & 0 \\ -1 & 2 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } D^-(A) = \begin{bmatrix} 5 & 0 & 0 & -2 \\ 2 & 1 & -2 & 0 \\ 1 & -2 & 0 & 1 \\ -5 & 0 & 0 & 2 \\ -2 & -1 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -4 & 3 \\ -1 & 2 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Hence

$$D(A) = \pm \begin{bmatrix} 5 & 0 & 0 & -2 \\ 2 & 1 & -2 & 0 \\ 1 & -2 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } D^w(A) = D(A) \cup \pm [0 \ 0 \ 4 \ -3].$$

Note that A is a complete intersection with gluing type $((8 \circ 20) \circ 14) \circ 15$. We have that A has a unique minimal Markov basis so

$$S(A) = M(A) = \pm \begin{bmatrix} 5 & 0 & 0 & -2 \\ 1 & -2 & 0 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 & -2 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = D(A) \subsetneq D^w(A)$$

Let us consider the submatrix $A' = (8 \ 14 \ 20)$. We have

$$D^-(A') = D^+(A') = \pm \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -2 & 1 \\ 5 & 0 & -2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Moreover, we have that A' has a unique minimal Markov basis that coincides with the above. So $S(A) = M(A) = D(A) = D^w(A)$.

Example 8.9. Let $A = (8 \ 31 \ 33 \ 53)$. Its minimal Markov bases are

$$M_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -2 & 3 & -1 \\ 3 & 2 & -1 & -1 \\ 5 & -3 & 0 & 1 \\ 5 & 0 & 2 & -2 \\ 6 & 1 & -4 & 1 \\ 8 & -1 & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } M_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 4 & -4 & 0 \\ 2 & -2 & 3 & -1 \\ 3 & 2 & -1 & -1 \\ 5 & -3 & 0 & 1 \\ 5 & 0 & 2 & -2 \\ 8 & -1 & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The distance irreducible elements are given by

$$D(A) = D^w(A) = \pm \begin{bmatrix} 8 & -1 & -1 & 0 \\ 5 & 0 & 2 & -2 \\ 3 & 2 & -1 & -1 \\ 2 & -2 & 3 & -1 \\ 5 & -3 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 4 & -4 & 0 \\ 3 & -1 & -3 & 2 \\ 0 & 3 & 2 & -3 \end{bmatrix}.$$

In particular we see that $(3, -1, -3, 2) \in D(A) \setminus M(A)$.

To show that $D^w(A) \subseteq G(A)$, we use the characterisation of the Graver basis $G(A)$ in terms of conformal decompositions. It may be tempting to use the characterisation of the universal Markov basis $M(A)$ in terms of *strongly semi-conformal decompositions* to investigate its connections with $D(A)$ and $D^w(A)$. However, the following example shows that such comparisons are not always possible.

Example 8.10. Consider the complete intersection $A = (3 \ 5 \ 8 \ 11)$, which has two distinct minimal Markov bases:

$$M_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 5 & -3 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } M_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 5 & -3 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

In this case we have

$$D^+(A) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 5 & -3 & 0 & 0 \\ 3 & -4 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & -5 & 0 & 2 \\ -1 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ -5 & 3 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } D^-(A) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 5 & -3 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ -1 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ -5 & 3 & 0 & 0 \\ -3 & 4 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & -1 & 1 \\ -1 & 5 & 0 & -2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

And so

$$D(A) = \pm \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 5 & -3 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } D^w(A) = D(A) \cup \pm \begin{bmatrix} 3 & -4 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & -5 & 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We observe that the sets $D^w(A)$ and $M(A)$ are incomparable with respect to inclusion. In particular we have $(3, -4, 0, 2)$ and $(1, -5, 0, 2)$ lie in $D^w(A) \setminus M(A)$.

A *strongly semi-conformal decomposition* for $(3, -4, 0, 2)$ is given by

$$(3, -4, 0, 2) = (-1, 0, -1, 1) + (4, -4, 1, 0) = (-1, 0, -1, 1) + (-1, -1, 1, 0) + (5, -3, 0, 0).$$

Note that neither of these strongly semi-conformal decompositions give rise to a positive distance decomposition.

We now consider the properties of elements of $\ker(A)$ that cannot be distance reduced by elements of $D(A)$.

Proposition 8.11. *Let $I(A) \subseteq G(A)$ be the set of moves that cannot be distance reduced by $D(A)$. If $z \in \ker(A) \setminus G(A)$ cannot be distance reduced by any element of $D(A)$, then for any conformal decomposition $z = g_1 + \dots + g_k$ where $g_i \in G(A)$ for each $i \in [k]$, then we have that $g_i \in I(A)$ for each $i \in [k]$.*

Proof. Follows directly from Lemma 7.7, i.e., if there exists a conformal decomposition $z = g + h$ where $g \in I(A)$ then, by the lemma, we have that z is distance reduced by $D(A)$. \square

Analogously to the universal Markov basis $M(A)$, we define the universal distance-reducing Markov basis.

Definition 8.12. The *universal distance-reducing Markov basis* $\mathcal{D}(A)$ is the union of all minimal distance reducing Markov bases. The *universal strongly distance-reducing Markov basis* $\mathcal{D}^s(A)$ is the union of all minimal strongly distance reducing Markov bases.

From the definition, we have $D(A) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(A)$ and $D^w(A) \subseteq \mathcal{D}^s(A)$.

Proposition 8.13. *Suppose that A has a unique minimal Markov basis M . If M is distance reducing, then we have*

$$S(A) = D(A) = M(A) = \mathcal{D}(A).$$

Proof. Since A has a unique minimal Markov basis it follows that $S(A) = M(A) \subseteq D(A) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(A)$. Suppose that B is any minimally distance reducing Markov basis. Then it follows that $S(A) \subseteq D(A) \subseteq B$. By assumption $S(A) = M(A)$ is a minimal Markov basis that is distance reducing, hence any element of $B \setminus S(A)$ is redundant for the purpose of distance reduction. Hence $B = S(A)$. We have shown that there is a unique minimally distance reducing Markov basis, hence $\mathcal{D}(A) = S(A)$ and we are done. \square

In the next example, we show how to compute the universal distance-reducing Markov basis.

Example 8.14. Consider the matrix $A = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 5 & 11 \end{pmatrix}$ from Example 3.4. We compute the universal distance reducing Markov basis as follows. First, we have that

$$D(A) = M(A) = \pm \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 & -1 \\ 5 & -3 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } D^w(A) = D(A) \cup \pm \begin{bmatrix} 3 & -4 & 1 \\ 1 & -5 & 2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

So, every distance reducing Markov basis contains $D(A)$. By Theorem 7.4 we have that $D(A)$ is not distance reducing because it fails to distance reduce $(1, -5, 2)$ and $(0, 11, -5)$.

The only elements of $\ker(A)$ that distance reduce $(1, -5, 2)$ are $(1, -5, 2)$ and $(3, -4, 1)$. Each of these elements distance reduce $(0, 11, -5)$. So, by Theorem 7.4, the minimally distance reducing Markov bases are

$$\begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 & -1 \\ 5 & -3 & 0 \\ 1 & -5 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 & -1 \\ 5 & -3 & 0 \\ 3 & -4 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \text{ hence } \mathcal{D}(A) = D^w(A) = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 & -1 \\ 5 & -3 & 0 \\ 1 & -5 & 2 \\ 3 & -4 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \subseteq G(A).$$

The following example shows that the universal distance reducing Markov basis need not lie inside the Graver basis.

Example 8.15. Consider the matrix $A = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 5 & 8 & 11 \end{pmatrix}$ from Example 8.10. The elements of the Graver basis that cannot be distance reduced by $D(A)$ are given by the set $I = \{(1, -5, 0, 2), (0, 11, 0, -5)\}$. To extend $D(A)$ to a minimally distance reducing Markov basis, we must add either one or two elements to distance reduce I .

The only moves in $\ker(A)$ that simultaneously distance reduce both elements of I are

$$T_0 = \pm \begin{bmatrix} 3 & -4 & 0 & 1 \\ 2 & -5 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -5 & 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \subseteq G(A).$$

So, there are three minimally distance reducing Markov bases given by $D(A)$ together with one element from T_0 .

The remaining minimally distance reducing Markov bases are those that consist of $D(A)$ together with a pair of elements z_1 and z_2 such that: z_1 reduces the distance of $(1, -5, 0, 2)$ and does not reduce the distance of $(0, 11, 0, -5)$; and z_2 reduces the distance of $(0, 11, 0, -5)$ and does not reduce the distance of $(1, -5, 0, 2)$. Let T_1 and T_2 denote the set of such z_1 and z_2 respectively. These sets are given by

$$T_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 4 & -4 & 1 & 0 \\ 2 & -5 & 2 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } T_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 6 & -1 & -2 \\ 1 & -6 & 2 & 1 \\ 2 & -6 & 3 & 0 \\ 1 & 6 & 0 & -3 \\ 0 & 5 & 1 & -3 \\ 0 & 7 & -3 & -1 \\ 1 & -7 & 4 & 0 \\ 0 & 8 & -5 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \cup \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 11 & 0 & -5 \\ 0 & 4 & 3 & -4 \\ 0 & 3 & 5 & -5 \\ 1 & 5 & 2 & -4 \\ 2 & 6 & 1 & -4 \\ 1 & 4 & 4 & -5 \\ 3 & 7 & 0 & -4 \\ 2 & 5 & 3 & -5 \end{bmatrix} \cup \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -10 & 0 & 4 \\ 4 & -9 & 0 & 3 \\ 3 & 6 & 2 & -5 \\ 6 & -8 & 0 & 2 \\ 1 & -11 & 1 & 4 \\ 3 & -10 & 1 & 3 \\ 5 & -9 & 1 & 2 \\ 4 & 7 & 1 & -5 \\ 7 & -8 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \cup \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -11 & 2 & 3 \\ 4 & -10 & 2 & 2 \\ 6 & -9 & 2 & 1 \\ 5 & 8 & 0 & -5 \\ 3 & -11 & 3 & 2 \\ 5 & -10 & 3 & 1 \\ 4 & -11 & 4 & 1 \\ 5 & -11 & 5 & 0 \\ 11 & -11 & 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

So, there are sixty eight minimally distance reducing Markov bases of this form. In T_2 , the elements: $(1, 5, 2, -4), (2, 6, 1, -4), \dots$ lie outside of the Graver basis. So $\mathcal{D}(A) \not\subseteq G(A)$.




FIGURE 4. The Hasse diagram for a poset of subsets of $\ker(A)$. The dotted lines known incomparable elements in the poset. In particular, the examples are explained in: (1) Examples 8.10 and 8.15, (2) Example 8.9, and (3) Example 8.7.

Remark 8.16. The subsets $G(A)$, $M(A)$, $S(A)$, $D(A)$, $D^w(A)$, $\mathcal{D}(A)$, $\mathcal{D}^s(A)$ and Markov basis M for A , are naturally ordered by inclusion into a poset any matrix A . The Hasse diagram for this poset is shown in Figure 4. The dotted lines indicate pairs of sets that are incomparable for certain matrices A .

Note that some of the inclusions are not clear. For instance, to prove that $\mathcal{D}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{D}^s(A)$, it suffices to show that any minimal distance reducing set can be extended to a minimal strongly distance reducing set. But this is not immediate. If B is minimal distance reducing, then it may be impossible to extend it to a minimal strongly distance reducing Markov basis. There may exist an element $b \in B$ such that for every strongly distance reducing set $\overline{B} \supseteq B$ containing B , we may have $\overline{B} \setminus \{b\}$ is strongly distance reducing. In such a case, we cannot conclude that $b \in \mathcal{D}^s(A)$.

Corollary 8.17. *The sets $\mathcal{D}(A)$ and $\mathcal{D}^s(A)$ are finite.*

Proof. We show that there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{D}(A), \mathcal{D}^s(A) \subseteq \{z \in \ker(A) : \|z\| \leq N\}$. Let G be the Graver basis of A and define $\max(G) := \max\{\|g\| : g \in G\}$. Let $N = 2 \max(G)$. For any $z \in \ker(A)$ with $\|z\| > N$ and $g \in G$, we have

$$\min\{\|g + z\|, \|g - z\|\} \geq \left| \|g\| - \|z\| \right| > |2 \max(G) - \max(G)| = \max(G) \geq \|g\|.$$

Therefore z does not distance reduce any element of the Graver basis. So, by Theorem 7.4, we have that z does not belong to $\mathcal{D}(A)$ or $\mathcal{D}^s(A)$. Hence $\mathcal{D}(A)$ and $\mathcal{D}^s(A)$ are finite. \square

9. DISCUSSION

For monomial curves in \mathbb{A}^3 and \mathbb{A}^4 , and complete intersections we have seen that the distance reducing property is characterised by the circuits. In particular, the characterisation of the distance reducing property by circuits is preserved by gluing, see Sections 2.1, 3, 5, and 6.

Notation. We say that a matrix is *irreducible* if it does not admit a gluing. Every non-irreducible matrix A admits a gluing into two *components* $A = A_1 \circ A_2$. Given a sequence of gluings $((A_1 \circ A_2) \circ A_3) \circ \dots$, the matrices A_1, \dots, A_n are called its *components*. A sequence of gluings is *maximal* if each component is irreducible. The *size* of a component is the number of columns of the component.

We have seen that the circuits characterise the distance reduction property: if all components have size one, see Corollary 5.2; and for monomial curves in \mathbb{A}^4 that are glued non complete intersections, see Theorem 6.8. Below, we formulate generalisations about the distance reduction property.

Conjecture 9.1. *Suppose that A is a $1 \times n$ matrix that admits a gluing with minimal components have size at most 3. Then a minimal Markov basis M for A is distance reducing if and only if M is distance reducing for the circuits of A .*

Definition 9.2. A matrix A has the *circuit reduction property* if, for any minimal Markov basis M of A , we have:

$$M \text{ reduces the distance of the circuits of } A \implies M \text{ is distance reducing.}$$

The set of all matrices with the circuit reduction property is denoted \mathcal{A} .

Conjecture 9.3. *The set \mathcal{A} is closed under gluing, i.e., if $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ admit a gluing then $A \circ B \in \mathcal{A}$.*

Question 9.4. Is it possible to characterise the distance reduction property for non complete intersection monomial curves that do not admit a gluing?

Question 9.5. Is there a connection between $M(A)$ and $\mathcal{D}(A)$ or $M(A)$ and $\mathcal{D}^s(A)$? Is there an algebraic or combinatorial description for the moves in $\mathcal{D}(A)$, which is analogous to strongly semi-conformal for universal Markov basis elements?

Question 9.6. In the definition of positive (resp. negative) distance decompositions $z = u +_{pd} v$, if we assume that $u \in G(A)$ is an element of the Graver basis, then do we obtain the same set of distance irreducible elements?

Just as the distance reducing minimal Markov bases are characterised by certain inequalities, see Theorems 3.5 and 4.3, we expect that a characterisation of when the distance irreducible elements $D(A)$ form a Markov basis is also governed by inequalities.

Conjecture 9.7. *Let $A = (a_1 \ a_2 \ a_3)$ be a complete intersection. Suppose that A has a unique minimal Markov basis*

$$M = \{b := (b_1, -b_2, 0), c := (c_1, c_2, -c_3)\}$$

with $b_1 > b_2$. If M is not distance reducing, then $D(A) = M$ if and only if $2c_1 < b_1 + b_2$.

Example 9.8. Let $A = (4 \ 9 \ 37)$ be a matrix. In this case we have that A is a complete intersection with unique Markov basis

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} 9 & -4 & 0 \\ 7 & 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We define $b = (9, -4, 0)$ and $c = (7, 1, -1)$. Since $c_1 \geq c_2 + c_3$, by Theorem 3.5, we have that M is not distance reducing. Furthermore, we have that $2c_2 \geq b_1 + b_2$ and by an explicit computation we have

$$D(A) = M \cup \pm [2 \ -5 \ 1].$$

So, in particular, a unique minimal Markov basis need not be equal to $D(A)$.

Conjecture 9.9. *Fix a matrix A . Then $\mathcal{D}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{D}^s(A)$.*

9.1. Distance reducing complex. Throughout the paper, we have predominantly focused on the 1-norm and its induced metric. However, the notion of distance reduction applies to all metrics so we ask how the results of this paper generalise to other metrics. In particular, to other metrics derived from norms. In this section, given a Markov basis M , we define the *distance reducing complex*, which is a polyhedral complex whose points correspond to metrics d for which M is distance reducing with respect to d . We begin by exploring a motivating example.

Running example. Fix the matrix $A = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 3 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$, as in Example 8.7. Its Graver basis is:

$$a_1 := \begin{bmatrix} 3 \\ -2 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad a_2 := \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad a_3 := \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -2 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad a_4 := \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ -2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad a_5 := \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 4 \\ -3 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Recall that A has two minimal Markov bases:

$$M_1 = \{a_1, a_2\} \quad \text{and} \quad M_2 = \{a_2, a_3\}.$$

And so its indispensable set and universal Markov basis are:

$$S(A) = \{a_2\} \quad \text{and} \quad M(A) = \{a_1, a_2, a_3\}.$$

We now determine the norm-induced metrics d for which M_1 is a d -reducing Markov basis. First we consider the space of all norm-induced metrics and the possible norms of the elements of the Graver basis.

Metric cone. Given two metrics d_1 and d_2 on \mathbb{Z}^3 and a positive real number λ , we observe that the functions $(\lambda d_1) : (x, y) \mapsto \lambda d_1(x, y)$ and $(d_1 + d_2) : (x, y) \mapsto d_1(x, y) + d_2(x, y)$ define metrics on \mathbb{Z}^3 . So we define the *metric cone* \mathcal{C} to be the space of norm-induced metrics on \mathbb{Z}^3 . We expect that any norm on the Graver basis extends to a norm on \mathbb{Z}^3 .

Conjecture 9.10. *Suppose that $\|\cdot\|$ is a norm on a subset $G \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^3 \setminus \{0\}$. By this we mean that $\|\cdot\| : G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is a function that satisfies:*

- $\|g\| > 0$ for all $g \in G$,
- If $g = \sum_{h \in G} \lambda_h h$ with finitely many nonzero $\lambda_h \in \mathbb{R}$, then $\|g\| \leq \sum_{h \in G} |\lambda_h| \cdot \|h\|$.

Then $\|\cdot\|$ is the restriction of a norm on \mathbb{Z}^3 .

Suppose $\|\cdot\|$ is a norm on \mathbb{Z}^3 . Let $n_i := \|a_i\| \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ for each $i \in [5]$. Consider the vector $n = (n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) \in \mathbb{R}^5$. If the above conjecture holds, then set of possible vectors n naturally forms a rational polyhedral cone defined by the inequalities that arise from the triangle equality. For example

$$a_1 = a_2 + a_3 \implies n_1 \leq n_2 + n_3, \quad n_2 \leq n_1 + n_3, \quad n_3 \leq n_1 + n_2.$$

The set of inequalities is derived from the set of triangles or, more generally, by the set of linear relations among the given vectors a_1, \dots, a_5 . The complete set of triangles is given by

$$123, 12^24, 1^22^35, 13^24, 13^35, 14^35^2, 234, 23^25, 24^25, 345 \quad (3)$$

where $\alpha^i \beta^j \gamma^k$ means a triangle whose edges are ia_α , ja_β and ka_γ .

As a result, we get a projection of the metric cone $\mathcal{C}_5 \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{>0}^5$ whose rays are given by the columns of the following matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 3 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The rows of the above matrix correspond to the values of n_1, n_2, \dots, n_5 respectively.

Triangle	Reduction conditions	
	Reduce by a_1	Reduce by a_2
123	$n_3 > n_2$	$n_3 > n_1$
12^24	$n_4 > 2n_2$	$n_4 > n_3$
1^22^35	$n_5 > n_6$	$n_5 > 2n_3$
12^36	$n_6 > 3n_2$	$n_6 > n_4$

TABLE 1. Triangles and their reduction moves. A distance reducing metric satisfies at least one condition from each row.

Distance reducing property. We now consider the subset of points $c \in \mathcal{C}$ such that for any norm $\|\cdot\|$ in the fiber of c , the Markov basis M_1 is distance reducing with respect to $\|\cdot\|$. This set has a natural polyhedral-complex structure, which we now describe for this example.

Consider the triangle with sides a_1, a_2, a_3 , which appears in suitably large fibers of A . Let x be the vertex where a_1 and a_3 meet and y be the vertex where a_2 and a_3 meet. By assumption, the basis M_1 is distance reducing so either the move from x by a_1 reduces the distance or the move from y by a_2 reduces the distance. Therefore, either $n_3 > n_1$ or $n_3 > n_2$.

Next consider the triangle $a_1, 2a_2, a_4$. Starting with the distance n_4 , we can either reduce it using a_1 or a_2 . If we can reduce it using a_1 then we have $a_4 > 2a_2$. Otherwise, if we can reduce it using a_2 then we have $a_4 > a_3$.

Continuing in this way, we obtain a set of conditions that must be satisfied by the metric whenever M_1 has the distance reducing property. For each triangle: 123, 12^24 and 1^22^35 we reduce a_3, a_4 and a_5 by either moving along a_1 or a_2 . However, for the triangle 1^22^35 , the reduction by move a_1 gives rise to a triangle 12^36 where $a_6 = (3, 2, -3)^T$ does not belong to the Graver basis. The resulting set of conditions are shown in Table 1.

The vector a_6 is assumed to have norm $n_6 := \|a_6\|$. The extended metric cone $\mathcal{C}_6 \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{>0}^6$ is derived from the triangle inequalities given by previous set of triangles (3) together with:

$$12^36, 1^23^36, 14^36^2, 156, 2^236, 246, 2^356^2, 34^26, 3^35^26, 4^356. \tag{4}$$

The metric cone $\mathcal{C}_6 \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{>0}^6$ is given by the cone over the columns of the matrix:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 3 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 3 & 3 \\ 1 & 2 & 1 & 3 & 3 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Remark 9.11. We may avoid adding a_6 into the computation and consider only the projection of the distance-reducing metrics onto \mathcal{C}_5 . If we do this, then stay within the cone defined by (3) and we obtain weaker inequalities derived from the triangle inequality. For instance: $n_5 > |3n_2 - n_1|$, which is derived from the reduction by a_1 , and $n_5 > 2n_3$, which is derived from the reduction by a_2 .

Remark 9.12. The metric cone \mathcal{C}_6 admits a surprising symmetry under a representation of the group S_3 . Let $\sigma_1 = (1, 2)$ and $\sigma_2 = (2, 3)$ be adjacent transpositions that generate S_3 . The action is given by

$$\sigma_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

where $A \oplus B$ denotes the block diagonal matrix $\begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{bmatrix}$. Similarly, there is a permutation action that acts on the coordinates of the cone, which suggests that the roles of a_1, a_5 and a_6 are interchangeable, and whenever we permute their roles there is an induced permutation on a_2, a_3 and a_4 . One reason why this may happen is because the vectors a_1, \dots, a_6 can be partitioned into two triangles a_1, a_5, a_6 and a_2, a_3, a_4 .

Distance reducing complex. Every distance reducing metric for M_1 satisfies at least one of the inequalities in each row in Table 1. For each row in the table, we choose one of the inequalities. For each collection of such choices, we intersect the corresponding open halfspaces and take their intersection with the metric cone \mathcal{C}_6 . This gives a collection of relatively open cones that define the *distance reducing complex*. For example, if we choose the inequalities

$$I_1 = \{n_3 > n_2, n_4 > 2n_2, n_5 > n_6, n_6 > 3n_2\},$$

which is obtained by always reducing by a_1 , then the intersection of the cone defined by I_1 and \mathcal{C}_6 is the cone $\text{Cone}(A_1)$ over the columns of the matrix

$$A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 6 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 5 \\ 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 4 \\ 2 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 5 & 9 \\ 1 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 \end{bmatrix}.$$

On the other hand, if we choose the inequalities

$$I_2 = \{n_3 > n_2, n_4 > 2n_2, n_5 > n_6, n_6 > n_4\},$$

then we obtain the cone $\text{Cone}(A_2)$ over the columns of the matrix

$$A_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 0 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 7 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 5 \\ 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 4 & 4 \\ 2 & 4 & 2 & 5 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 5 & 8 \\ 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 4 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note that, despite choosing different inequalities, the interiors of the cones $\text{Cone}(A_1)$ and $\text{Cone}(A_2)$ intersect. Their intersection $\text{Cone}(A_{12})$ is the cone over the columns of the matrix

$$A_{12} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 9 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 4 & 7 \\ 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 6 \\ 2 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 5 & 6 & 3 & 7 & 12 \\ 1 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 6 \end{bmatrix}.$$

This cone corresponds to the choice of inequalities $I_1 \cup I_2$.

Reduction complex. The natural generalisation of the complex in the above example is constructed as follows.

Definition 9.13 (*B-reduction closed*). Let B be a Markov basis for $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{d \times n}$. We say that a set $S \subseteq \ker(A)$ is *closed under B-reductions* if $B \subseteq S$ and if for any linear relation $\alpha_b b + \sum_{b' \in B \setminus \{b\}} \alpha_{b'} b' = \alpha_s s$ with $b \in B$, $\alpha_b \geq 1$, $s \in S$, α_s nonzero and $\alpha_x \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all x , there exists $s' \in S$ and $\alpha_{s'} \in \mathbb{Z}$ nonzero such that the linear relation $(\alpha_b - 1)b + \sum_{b' \in B \setminus \{b\}} \alpha_{b'} b' = \alpha_{s'} s'$ holds. We call the second linear relation the *reduction* of the first linear relation with respect to b . We say that the reduction is *unique* with respect to b , if s' above is unique.

If a finite set $S \supseteq B$ is not closed under B -reductions, then it can be made closed by adding finitely many elements of $\ker(A)$. If we assume that only primitive elements may be added, then this closure is unique and defines a closure operation in the usual sense. If S contains only primitive elements, then all reductions are unique.

Definition 9.14 (Reduction inequalities). Let B be a Markov basis and fix a finite set $S \subseteq \ker(A)$ closed under B -reductions. For each linear relation $\alpha_b b + \sum_{b' \in B \setminus \{b\}} \alpha_{b'} b' = \alpha_s s$ with $b \in B$, $\alpha_b \geq 1$, $s \in S$, α_s nonzero and $\alpha_x \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all x that admits a reduction to $(\alpha_b - 1)b + \sum_{b' \in B \setminus \{b\}} \alpha_{b'} b' = \alpha_{s'} s'$ with respect to b , we define the *reduction inequality* $|\alpha_s|n_s > |\alpha_{s'}|n_{s'}$, which defines a half-space in \mathbb{R}^S whose coordinates are denoted n_i for each $i \in S$.

Definition 9.15 (Distance reducing complex). Let B be a Markov basis and $S \subseteq \ker(A)$ be a finite set closed under B -reductions. Let $\mathcal{L} = \{\sum_{b \in B} \alpha_b b = \alpha_s s : \alpha_s \neq 0\}$ be the set linear relations that admit reductions. We identify a relation $\sum_{b \in B} \alpha_b b = \alpha_s s$ with its negative $\sum_{b \in B} (-\alpha_b) b = -\alpha_s s$, so we assume that any individual coefficient α_b is non-negative. For each relation $L \in \mathcal{L}$, we obtain the set of reduction inequalities $I_L = \{|\alpha_s|n_s > |\alpha_{s'}|n_{s'}\}$ with one inequality for each $b \in B$ such that $\alpha_b \neq 0$. The *distance reducing complex* $\Delta(B, S) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^S$ is the union $\Delta(B, S) = \bigcup_T \mathcal{C}_T$ where T runs over all *transversals* of $\{I_L : L \in \mathcal{L}\}$ and $\mathcal{C}_T = \bigcap_{t \in T} H_t$ is the intersection of the half-spaces $H_t \subseteq \mathbb{R}^S$ defined by the inequality $t \in T$.

By taking further intersections, and recording the inequalities, it is possible to imbue a natural polyhedral complex structure to $\Delta(B, S)$. Explicitly, the maximal cones are indexed by super-sets of transversals of $\{I_L\}$.

Question 9.16. For which metrics is the Markov basis *minimally distance reducing*?

Remark 9.17. For other matrices, it may be possible for the reduction conditions to be satisfied but the Markov basis to not be distance reducing.

General metric cone. Let $S \subseteq \ker(A)$ be a non-empty collection of vectors. This set realises a matroid $\mathcal{M}(S)$ with circuits $\mathcal{C}(S)$. We define the metric cone in terms of the circuits of this matroid. For example, if $123 \in \mathcal{C}(S)$ is a circuit then it defines a triangle so we get three inequalities:

$$|c_1|n_1 \leq |c_2|n_2 + |c_3|n_3, \quad |c_2|n_2 \leq |c_1|n_1 + |c_3|n_3, \quad |c_3|n_3 \leq |c_1|n_1 + |c_2|n_2.$$

On the other hand if we have a larger circuit, like $1 \dots m$, then we get weaker inequalities:

$$|c_i|n_i \leq |c_1|n_1 + \dots + \widehat{|c_i|n_i} + \dots + |c_m|n_m \text{ for each } i \in [m]$$

The reason why these inequalities are ‘weaker’ is easily seen when $\mathcal{M}(S)$ is a graphic matroid of a chordal graph G . In this case, if $C \in \mathcal{C}(S)$ is a circuit, then it is cycle in G . Since G is chordal, the cycle admits a triangulation. The triangle inequalities arising from the triangles imply the inequalities derived from C .

So we obtain a metric cone $\mathcal{C}_S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^S$ defined by all the circuits of $\mathcal{M}(S)$.

Question 9.18. We ask the following questions about the distance reducing complex.

- When do two sets of vectors S_1 and S_2 define the same metric cone $\mathcal{C}_{S_1} = \mathcal{C}_{S_2}$?
- What is the structure of the distance reducing complex for monomial curve?
- How do the results for the 1-norm, such as Theorems 4.3 and 5.1, generalise to other metrics?

Acknowledgments. D. Kosta gratefully acknowledges funding from the Royal Society Dorothy Hodgkin Research Fellowship DHF\R1\201246. We thank the associated Royal Society Enhancement grant RF\ERE\210256 that supported O. Clarke’s postdoctoral research.

REFERENCES

- [1] Satoshi Aoki, Hisayuki Hara, and Akimichi Takemura. *Markov bases in algebraic statistics*, volume 199. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [2] Satoshi Aoki and Akimichi Takemura. Distance-reducing markov bases for sampling from a discrete sample space. *Bernoulli*, 11(5):793–813, 2005.
- [3] Marta Casanellas, Sonja Petrović, and Caroline Uhler. *Algebraic Statistics in Practice: Applications to Networks*, volume 199. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [4] Hara Charalambous, Apostolos Thoma, and Marius Vladoiu. Markov complexity of monomial curves. *Journal of Algebra*, 417:391–411, 2014.
- [5] Persi Diaconis and Bernd Sturmfels. Algebraic algorithms for sampling from conditional distributions. *The Annals of statistics*, 26(1):363–397, 1998.
- [6] Mathias Drton, Bernd Sturmfels, and Seth Sullivant. *Lectures on Algebraic Statistics*, volume 39. Springer Science & Business Media, 2009.
- [7] Elizabeth Gross and Sonja Petrović. Combinatorial degree bound for toric ideals of hypergraphs. *International Journal of Algebra and Computation*, 23(06):1503–1520, 2013.
- [8] Jürgen Herzog. Generators and relations of abelian semigroups and semigroup rings. *manuscripta mathematica*, 3(2):175–193, Jun 1970.
- [9] Dimitra Kosta, Apostolos Thoma, and Marius Vladoiu. On the strongly robust property of toric ideals. *Journal of Algebra*, 616:1–25, 2023.
- [10] Dimitra Kosta, Apostolos Thoma, and Marius Vladoiu. The strongly robust simplicial complex of monomial curves. *to appear in Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics*, 2024.
- [11] Marcel Morales and Apostolos Thoma. Complete intersection lattice ideals. *Journal of Algebra*, 284(2):755–770, 2005.
- [12] Sonja Petrović, Apostolos Thoma, and Marius Vladoiu. Bouquet algebra of toric ideals. *Journal of Algebra*, 512:493–525, 2018.
- [13] José Carlos Rosales. On presentations of subsemigroups of n -. In *Semigroup Forum*, volume 55, 1997.
- [14] Bernd Sturmfels. *Grobner bases and convex polytopes*, volume 8. American Mathematical Soc., 1996.
- [15] Seth Sullivant. *Algebraic Statistics*, volume 194. American Mathematical Soc., 2018.
- [16] Seth Sullivant. Strongly robust toric ideals in codimension 2. *Journal of Algebraic Statistics*, 10(1):128–136, 2019.

DIMITRA KOSTA, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH AND MAXWELL INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNITED KINGDOM
Email address: D.Kosta@ed.ac.uk

OLIVER CLARKE, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH AND MAXWELL INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNITED KINGDOM
Email address: oliver.clarke@ed.ac.uk