

GAPFREE GRAPHS AND POWERS OF EDGE IDEALS WITH LINEAR QUOTIENTS

NURSEL EREY, SARA FARIDI, TÀI HUY HÀ, TAKAYUKI HIBI, SELVI KARA,
AND SUSAN MOREY

ABSTRACT. Let $I(G)$ be the edge ideal of a gapfree graph G . An open conjecture of Nevo and Peeva states that $I(G)^q$ has linear resolution for $q \gg 0$. We present a promising approach to this challenging conjecture by investigating the stronger property of linear quotients. Specifically, we make the conjecture that if $I(G)^q$ has linear quotients for some integer $q \geq 1$, then $I(G)^s$ has linear quotients for all $s \geq q$. We give a partial solution to this conjecture, and identify conditions under which only finitely many powers need to be checked. It is known that if G does not contain a cricket, a diamond, or a C_4 , then $I(G)^q$ has linear resolution for $q \geq 2$. We construct a family of gapfree graphs G containing cricket, diamond, C_4 together with C_5 as induced subgraphs of G for which $I(G)^q$ has linear quotients for $q \geq 2$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let G be a finite *simple* graph, i.e., a graph that does not contain loops or multiple edges, with vertex set $V(G) = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and edge set $E(G)$. Let $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ denote the polynomial ring in n variables over a field K . The *edge ideal* of G , denoted by $I(G)$, is the ideal of S generated by squarefree quadratic monomials $x_i x_j$ for all $\{i, j\} \in E(G)$ (cf. [24]). The study of edge ideals has become a central topic in combinatorial commutative algebra, showcasing the deep interplay between combinatorial methods and algebraic structures; see, for instance, [3, 7, 8, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23] for various recent aspects of this study. The present paper builds upon this rich foundation, advancing the understanding of powers of edge ideals and their algebraic properties.

A fundamental question in examining homogeneous ideals is when these ideals have linear resolution. In 2004, Herzog, Hibi and Zheng [14] showed that if $I(G)$ has linear resolution then all powers of $I(G)$ also have linear resolution. By a result of Fröberg [12], this condition is equivalent to the complementary graph of G being chordal. A finite simple graph is called *chordal* if every cycle of length at least 4 has a *chord*, i.e., an edge connecting two non-consecutive vertices on the cycle. The proof of Herzog, Hibi and Zheng relies on Dirac's theorem on chordal graphs, a cornerstone of classical graph theory, and leverages Gröbner bases techniques.

Furthermore, Francisco, Hà and Van Tuyl (see [18]) observed in unpublished work that if $I(G)^q$ has linear resolution for some $q \in \mathbb{N}$ then G must be gapfree. A finite simple graph

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05E40, 13D02.

Key words and phrases. edge ideal, gapfree graph, linear resolution, linear quotients, regularity.

G is *gapfree* if, for any two edges e and e' with $e \cap e' = \emptyset$, there is $f \in E(G)$ with $e \cap f \neq \emptyset$ and $e' \cap f \neq \emptyset$. This led to the natural question:

“Is G being gapfree both a necessary and sufficient condition for $I(G)^q$ to have linear resolution for all $q \geq 2$?”

In 2013, Nevo and Peeva [18] answered this question negatively by constructing a gapfree graph G for which $I(G)^2$ does not have linear resolution. In light of this investigation, Nevo and Peeva [18] raised the following conjecture:

Conjecture 1.1. If G is gapfree, then $I(G)^q$ has linear resolution for all $q \gg 0$.

Conjecture 1.1 has garnered significant interest (cf. [2, 6, 9, 10, 17] and references therein), but remains unresolved in general. While it has been verified for $q = 2, 3$ when $I(G)$ has small regularity (see [17]) and for *random* graphs with restricted edge probability (see [4]), progress has been limited. A promising approach to this challenging conjecture is to explore the stronger property of having *linear quotients*. This property has also been widely studied and, in particular, if a monomial ideal generated in a single degree has linear quotients then it has linear resolution (cf. [13]). Thus, as observed before, if $I(G)^q$ has linear quotients, for some $q \in \mathbb{N}$, then G is necessarily a gapfree graph. We make the following conjecture:

Conjecture 1.2. If $I(G)^q$ has linear quotients for some $q \in \mathbb{N}$, then $I(G)^s$ has linear quotients for all $s \geq q$.

For a subset $W \subset V(G)$, the *induced subgraph* G_W is the graph with vertex set W consisting of all edges $\{i, j\} \in E(G)$ where $i, j \in W$. It was shown in [1, 9, 10] that $I(G)^q$ have linear resolution for all $q \geq 2$ if G is gapfree and contains no induced subgraph isomorphic to: (i) cricket; (ii) diamond; (iii) C_4 (see Figure 1).




FIGURE 1. Cricket; Diamond; C_4

For instance, the pentagon C_5 is gapfree, but its complementary graph is not chordal. Consequently, $I(C_5)$ does not have linear resolution. However, C_5 does not contain any induced subgraph that is isomorphic to a cricket (or a diamond, or C_4), so $I(C_5)^q$ has linear resolution for all $q \geq 2$. On the other hand, it was shown (cf. [13, Corollary 10.1.7 and Theorems 10.1.9 and 10.2.5]) that if the complementary graph of G is chordal then all powers of $I(G)$ have linear quotients. Beside the anticycles, as exhibited in a recent preprint [5] which appears after the first draft of this paper was written, there are currently no other known examples of a gapfree graph G whose complementary graph is not chordal, yet for which all powers $I(G)^q$ with $q \geq 2$ have linear quotients. This motivates the search for natural classes of such graphs.

In this paper, we establish a framework for addressing Conjecture 1.2. In Section 2, we examine the duplication technique, which when applied to graphs uses duplication of vertices in G to produce new graphs G^x . This construction is standard in graph theory and has been used to obtain interesting algebraic results (cf. [11]). We show that for a general squarefree monomial ideal I if a power I^q has linear quotients, then so does $(I^x)^q$ (Proposition 2.3). In Section 3, we show similar result holds for graphs when vertex duplication is replaced by graph expansion, where a vertex is replaced by a clique, as long as the resulting graph is still gapfree (Theorem 3.4).

Section 4 studies Conjecture 4.1, which presents a strong case for Conjecture 1.2 by explicitly describing a possible linear quotient ordering for $I(G)^s$, for $s \geq q$, from that of $I(G)^q$. Particularly, Proposition 4.2 shows that Conjecture 4.1 holds for the pentagon C_5 . In other words, all powers $I(C_5)^q$ with $q \geq 2$ have linear quotients. Section 5 extends the study in Section 4 to a special class of graphs which are gapfree but may contain critical induced subgraphs such as crickets, diamonds and C_4 . In Propositions 5.2 and 5.4, it is shown that, for these graphs, all powers $I(G)^q$ with $q \geq 2$ have linear quotients. The main result of the section (Theorem 5.7) extends the aforementioned result to an infinite family of graphs.

Finally, Section 6 presents a refined analysis of modified versions of Conjectures 4.1 and 1.2, culminating in Theorem 6.4, which exhibits that if $I(G)^2, \dots, I(G)^7$ have linear quotients with a special ordering of their generators, then $I(G)^q$, for all $q \geq 2$, have linear quotients. This result reduces the verification of Conjectures 4.1 and 1.2 to finitely many powers and, therefore, suggests that resolving these conjectures may be within reach.

2. DUPLICATING A VARIABLE AND LINEAR QUOTIENTS OF POWERS

Let I be an ideal of S which is generated by monomials of the same degree and let $\{u_1, \dots, u_r\}$ be the unique minimal monomial generators of I . We then call u_1, \dots, u_r the generators of I and use the notation $\mathcal{G}(I)$ to denote the set $\{u_1, \dots, u_r\}$. We say that I has *linear quotients* if there is an ordering $u_1 > \dots > u_r$ of the generators of I for which the colon ideal $(u_1, \dots, u_i) : u_{i+1}$ is generated by a subset of $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ for each $1 \leq i < r$. If I has linear quotients for $u_1 > \dots > u_r$, we call this ordering a *linear quotients order* for I . If I has linear quotients, then I has linear resolution ([13, Proposition 8.2.1]).

When showing an ideal has a linear quotients order, we will frequently examine individual monomial pairs. For simplicity, we will use the following notation below for two monomials M and N

$$M : N = \frac{M}{\gcd(M, N)}.$$

In particular, $M \mid (M : N)N$ and $M : N$ is the minimal monomial under inclusion for which this property holds.

The following statement is an equivalent version of the definition of an ideal with linear quotients. The proof follows immediately from the definitions and so is not included.

Lemma 2.1 (Linear quotients). *Let I be a monomial ideal, and fix an order $u_1 > u_2 > \dots > u_r$ on the minimal generating set of I . Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) I has linear quotients with respect to the order above;
- (2) if $\deg(u_\alpha : u_\beta) > 1$ for some indices $\alpha < \beta$, then there is some index $\gamma < \beta$ such that $u_\gamma : u_\beta = z$ where z is a variable and $z \mid (u_\alpha : u_\beta)$.

The equivalence of items (1) and (2) will be used throughout the paper when showing an ideal has linear quotients. The first result we show is that linear quotients are preserved under variable duplication. Since there are multiple ways to duplicate a variable, we establish a definition and notation.

Definition 2.2 (Duplicating a variable). Let I be a squarefree monomial ideal, suppose x is a variable, and suppose m_1, \dots, m_q are all the monomials in $\mathcal{G}(I)$ that are divisible by x . Let y be a new variable that does not divide any generator of I . The *duplicate ideal of I by x* is the ideal

$$I^x = I + \left(\frac{m_1}{x} \cdot y, \dots, \frac{m_q}{x} \cdot y \right).$$

If x does not divide any generator of I , then $I^x = I$.

We next show that linear quotients of squarefree monomial ideals are preserved under variable duplication. For a monomial M and a variable x , we use the notation $\deg_x(M)$ to denote the maximum value of i such that $x^i \mid M$.

Proposition 2.3. *Let I be an equigenerated squarefree monomial ideal, x a variable, and s a positive integer. If I^s has linear quotients, then $(I^x)^s$ has linear quotients.*

Proof. Fix a variable x . If x does not appear in $\mathcal{G}(I)$ then $I^x = I$ and we are done by assumption, so we assume x divides a generator of I . Let y be the duplicate of x in I^x . Note that, for each $u \in \mathcal{G}(I^s)$ with $\deg_x(u) = d > 0$, the following d monomials obtained from u

$$(1) \quad \frac{u}{x} \cdot y, \frac{u}{x^2} \cdot y^2, \dots, \frac{u}{x^d} \cdot y^d$$

are the elements of $\mathcal{G}((I^x)^s)$ which are not in $\mathcal{G}(I^s)$. Order the generators of $(I^x)^s$ by extending a linear quotients order of I^s in the following way: If $u \in \mathcal{G}(I^s)$ with $\deg_x(u) > 0$, insert the new generators obtained from u immediately following u in the order they appear in (1).

Let $w_1 > \dots > w_q$ denote the generators of $(I^x)^s$ in this order. We claim that this is a linear quotients order of $(I^x)^s$. Let $t \geq 2$ and

$$J := (w_1, \dots, w_{t-1}) : w_t.$$

Consider $w_\ell : w_t$ for $\ell < t$.

CASE 1: Suppose $w_t \in \mathcal{G}(I^s)$, i.e., w_t is not divisible by y .

- If $w_\ell \in \mathcal{G}(I^s)$, we are done since I^s has linear quotients.
- If $w_\ell \notin \mathcal{G}(I^s)$, then w_ℓ is divisible by y , which implies that $w_\ell : w_t \in (y)$.
 - If $x \in \mathcal{G}(J)$, there exists $w_j \in \mathcal{G}(I^s)$ with $j < t$ such that $w_j : w_t = x$. Let $w_k = w_j y / x$. Notice that $j < k < t$ by the definition of the order on $\mathcal{G}((I^x)^s)$. Thus, we have $w_k : w_t = y \in \mathcal{G}(J)$, as desired.

- If $x \notin \mathcal{G}(J)$, then let $\deg_x(w_\ell) = \alpha_x \geq 0$ and $\deg_y(w_\ell) = \alpha_y \geq 1$. Then $w_\ell = x^{\alpha_x} y^{\alpha_y} M$ for a monomial M . Consider the monomial $w_k = x^{\alpha_x + \alpha_y} M \in \mathcal{G}(I^s)$ and notice that $k < \ell$ by the definition of the order. Since I^s has linear quotients, there exists $w_j \in \mathcal{G}(I^s)$ with $j < t$ and a variable z such that $z = (w_j : w_t)$ and $z \mid (w_k : w_t)$. Note that $z \neq x$ since $x \notin \mathcal{G}(J)$, and $z \neq y$ since $w_j, w_t \in \mathcal{G}(I^s)$. Therefore, $w_\ell : w_t$ is divisible by z , and hence J is linear.

CASE 2: Suppose $w_t \notin \mathcal{G}(I^s)$, i.e., w_t is divisible by y .

Our first goal is to show $x \in \mathcal{G}(J)$. Set $w_j = w_t x / y$. Then $j < t$ by the definition of the order. Thus, $w_j : w_t = x \in \mathcal{G}(J)$.

Let $w_\ell = x^{\alpha_x} y^{\alpha_y} M$ for a monomial M where $\alpha_x = \deg_x(w_\ell)$ and $\alpha_y = \deg_y(w_\ell)$. Similarly, let $w_t = x^{\beta_x} y^{\beta_y} N$ for a monomial N where $\beta_x = \deg_x(w_t)$ and $\beta_y = \deg_y(w_t) \geq 1$. Consider the monomials $w_L = x^{\alpha_x + \alpha_y} M$ and $w_T = x^{\beta_x + \beta_y} N$ in $\mathcal{G}(I^s)$ where $L \leq \ell$ and $T < t$ by the definition of the order.

If $\alpha_x > \beta_x$, then $x \in \mathcal{G}(J)$ divides $w_\ell : w_t$, and we are done. Suppose $\alpha_x \leq \beta_x$. This implies that $\ell < T$ by the definition of the order. Since I^s has linear quotients and $L < T$, there exists $w_j \in \mathcal{G}(I^s)$ with $j < T$ such that $w_j : w_T = z$ for some variable z dividing $w_L : w_T$. Note that $z \neq y$. Let $\alpha = \alpha_x + \alpha_y$ and $\beta = \beta_x + \beta_y$.

Case 2.1: Suppose $\alpha \leq \beta$. In this case, $w_L : w_T = M : N$ which implies that $w_\ell : w_t$ is divisible by z . It remains to show $z \in \mathcal{G}(J)$. Since $w_j : w_T = z$, the monomial w_j has one of the following forms:

- (a) $w_j = x^{\beta-1} z N$ or
- (b) $w_j = x^\beta N z / z'$ for a variable z' dividing N where $z' \neq z$.

If (a) holds, let $w_k = x^{\beta_x} y^{\beta_y-1} z N$ where $j \leq k < T < t$ by the definition of the order. Thus, $w_k : w_t = z \in \mathcal{G}(J)$, as desired. Similarly, if (b) holds, let $w_k = x^{\beta_x} y^{\beta_y} N z / z'$ where $j < k < T < t$ by the definition of the order. Hence, $w_k : w_t = z \in \mathcal{G}(J)$.

Case 2.2: Suppose $\alpha > \beta$. It then follows from the assumption $\alpha_x \leq \beta_x$ that $\alpha_y > \beta_y$. In this case, $w_\ell : w_t = y^{\alpha_y - \beta_y} (M : N)$ and $w_L : w_T = x^{\alpha - \beta} (M : N)$. So, $w_\ell : w_t$ is divisible by both y and z . It remains to show either $y \in \mathcal{G}(J)$ or $z \in \mathcal{G}(J)$. Notice that it is possible to have $z = x$.

Suppose $z = x$. Then $w_j = x^{\beta+1} N / z'$ for some variable z' dividing N since $w_j : w_T = z$. Let $w_k = x^{\beta_x} y^{\beta_y+1} N / z'$. Note that $j < k < T < t$ by the definition of the order and $w_k : w_t = y \in \mathcal{G}(J)$.

Suppose $z \neq x$. This implies that z divides $M : N$. In this case, w_j is in one of the forms described in (a) or (b) from Case 2.1. The remainder of the proof follows similarly and it results with $z \in \mathcal{G}(J)$. \square

3. EXPANSION, AND LINEAR QUOTIENTS OF POWERS OF EDGE IDEALS

For the remainder of the paper, we focus our attention on edge ideals of graphs. Let G be a finite graph on $V(G) = \{1, \dots, n\}$ with $E(G) = \{e_1, \dots, e_s\}$, and let $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be the polynomial ring in n variables over a field K . For an edge $e = \{i, j\} \in E(G)$, we define

$u_e = x_i x_j \in S$. Recall that the edge ideal of G is the ideal $I(G)$ of S which is generated by those monomials u_e with $e \in E(G)$. To simplify the notation, unless misleading, we write e instead of u_e . For example, $e_1^3, e_1 e_2^2 \in I(G)^3$. In addition, we may write $ij \in E(G)$ instead of $\{i, j\} \in E(G)$. Lastly, we may refer to and use the variables x_1, \dots, x_n as vertices of G .

Definition 3.1. Let G be a finite graph and fix a vertex x of G .

- The graph G^x , called the *duplication* of G at x , is a finite graph obtained by adding a new vertex y to G with

$$E(G^x) = E(G) \cup \{yb : xb \in E(G)\}.$$

We say that G^x is obtained from G by *duplicating* the vertex x of G . Note that $xy \notin E(G^x)$, and also $I(G^x) = I(G)^x$ in the sense of Definition 2.2. We call the new vertex y the *duplicate* of x in G^x .

- The graph $G^{[x]}$, called the *expansion* of G at x , is the graph with vertex set $V(G^{[x]}) = V(G^x)$ and $E(G^{[x]}) = E(G^x) \cup \{xy\}$.
- For any $W \subseteq V(G^{[x]}) = V$ and any monomial $m \in I(G^{[x]})^s$, define m_W to be the monomial formed by localizing m at W . That is, if $m = \prod_{v_i \in V} v_i^{s_i}$, then $m_W = \prod_{v_i \in W} v_i^{s_i}$.

The following example illustrates the definitions above.

Example 3.2. Let G be the graph C_4 labeled as in the left hand graph below. Then G^x is the central graph and $G^{[x]}$ is the graph on the right. Consider the monomial $m = (xy)^2(xa)(bc) \in I(G^{[x]})^4$. If $W = \{x, c\}$, then $m_W = x^3c$.




FIGURE 2. Graph G , G^x and $G^{[x]}$

We state some useful facts regarding the duplicated vertex x and its duplication y . The proofs are straightforward from the definitions and so are not included. First, recall that

$$N_G(x) = \{z \in V(G) : xz \in E(G)\} \quad \text{and} \quad N_G[x] = N_G(x) \cup \{x\}.$$

Lemma 3.3. Let G be a gapfree graph. Using the notation of Definition 3.1,

- $N_{G^x}(x) = N_{G^x}(y) = N_G(x) = N_{G^{[x]}} \setminus \{y\}$.
- $N_{G^{[x]}}[x] = N_{G^{[x]}}[y]$.
- $G^{[x]}$ is gapfree if and only if $V(G) \setminus N_G[x]$ is an independent set.

We are now ready to prove the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 3.4. Let G be a graph such that $I(G)^s$ has linear quotients for some $s \geq 1$. Fix $x \in V(G)$. Then $I(G^{[x]})^s$ has linear quotients if and only if $G^{[x]}$ is gapfree.

Proof. First note that if $I(G^{[x]})^s$ has linear quotients for some $s \geq 1$ then $G^{[x]}$ is gapfree, thus we focus on the converse.

For any monomial generator w of $I(G^{[x]})^s$ define

$$\mu(w) = \min \left\{ i : \frac{w}{(xy)^i} \in \mathcal{G}(I(G^x)^{s-i}) \right\}.$$

Note that $\mu(w) = 0$ if and only if w is a minimal generator of $I(G^x)^s$. Set $V = V(G^{[x]})$. Partition V into sets:

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \{x, y\} \\ A &= N_G(x) \\ B &= V(G^{[x]}) \setminus N_{G^{[x]}}[x] \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.3, B is an independent set. Fix an order $>_B$ on the elements of B . By Proposition 2.3, there is a linear quotients order w_1, w_2, \dots, w_q for $I(G^x)^s$. We extend this order to a linear quotients order $w_1, \dots, w_q, w_{q+1}, \dots, w_r$ for $I(G^{[x]})^s$. To simplify the notation, we adopt the convention that $w_1 > w_2 > \dots > w_r$. For generators w and w' of $I(G^{[x]})^s$ not belonging to $I(G^x)^s$, set $w > w'$ if:

- (1) $\mu(w) < \mu(w')$, or
- (2) $\mu(w) = \mu(w')$ and $\deg(w_Z) < \deg(w'_Z)$, or
- (3) $\mu(w) = \mu(w')$, $\deg(w_Z) = \deg(w'_Z)$, and $|\deg_x(w) - \deg_y(w)| < |\deg_x(w') - \deg_y(w')|$,
or
- (4) $\mu(w) = \mu(w')$, $\deg(w_Z) = \deg(w'_Z)$, $|\deg_x(w) - \deg_y(w)| = |\deg_x(w') - \deg_y(w')|$,
and $w_B > w'_B$ in the lexicographic ordering on B , using the order $>_B$ on the elements of B fixed above.

Let $w = w_i$ for some $i \geq 2$. We show that $J = (w_1, \dots, w_{i-1}) : w_i$ is generated by variables. We may assume that $\mu(w) \neq 0$ by the definition of the order and Proposition 2.3. Since B is an independent set, the edges of $G^{[x]}$ can be partitioned as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &= \{xy\} \\ E_2 &= \{ab \mid a \in A, b \in B\} \\ E_3 &= \{az \mid a \in A, z \in Z\} \\ E_4 &= \{aa' \mid a, a' \in A\}. \end{aligned}$$

We make two observations which will be used in the proofs.

- (i) Let w be a generator of $I(G^{[x]})^s$ with $\mu(w) \neq 0$. For any representation

$$w = (xy)^{\mu(w)} e_1 \dots e_{s-\mu(w)}$$

where $e_1, \dots, e_{s-\mu(w)}$ are in $E(G^x)$, we have $e_j \notin E_4$ for all $j = 1, \dots, s - \mu(w)$.

- (ii) A is a subset of the set of generators of J .

Proof of (i). Assume to the contrary that $e_1 = a_1 a_2$ for some $a_1, a_2 \in A$. Then we can write

$$w = (xy)^{\mu(w)-1} (xa_1)(ya_2) e_2 \dots e_{s-\mu(w)}$$

which is a contradiction to the minimality of $\mu(w)$.

Proof of (ii). Let $a \in A$. Then $u := \frac{w}{xy}(xa)$ is a minimal generator of $I(G^{[x]})^s$ with $\mu(u) \leq \mu(w) - 1$. Therefore $u > w$ and $u : w = a \in J$, proving the claim.

Let $v > w$. We show that there is a variable generator of J dividing $v : w$.

CASE 1: Suppose that $\mu(v) < \mu(w)$. Using observation (i), each e_i in the representation of w either has precisely one endpoint in A or is in E_1 . It follows that

$$\deg(v_A) \geq s - \mu(v) > s - \mu(w) = \deg(w_A).$$

Therefore, there is an $a \in A$ such that a divides $v_A : w_A$. Since $v_A : w_A$ divides $v : w$, the proof follows from observation (ii).

CASE 2: Suppose that $1 \leq \mu(v) = \mu(w)$. As above, from observation (i) it follows that

$$\deg(v_A) = s - \mu(v) = s - \mu(w) = \deg(w_A).$$

Now by observation (ii), we may assume for every $a \in A$ we have $\deg_a(v) \leq \deg_a(w)$. However, since

$$\deg(v_A) = \sum_{a \in A} \deg_a(v) \leq \sum_{a \in A} \deg_a(w) = \deg(w_A)$$

the inequality cannot be strict for any $a \in A$. Thus for the remainder of the proof, we assume that $v_A = w_A$.

Case 2.1: Suppose that $\deg(v_Z) < \deg(w_Z)$. Let $\gamma = \mu(v) = \mu(w)$. By observation (i) we may represent $v = (xy)^\gamma e_1 \dots e_m f_1 \dots f_k$ and $w = (xy)^\gamma g_1 \dots g_{m'} h_1 \dots h_{k'}$ with $e_j, g_j \in E_3$ and $f_j, h_j \in E_2$ for all j . Note that

$$2\gamma + m = \deg(v_Z) < \deg(w_Z) = 2\gamma + m'.$$

On the other hand, since $m + k = m' + k'$, it follows that $k > k'$. Therefore

$$\deg((f_1 \dots f_k)_A) = k > k' = \deg((h_1 \dots h_{k'})_A).$$

Then since $v_A = w_A$, there exists $a \mid (f_1 \dots f_k)_A$ such that $a \mid (g_1 \dots g_{m'})_A$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $f_1 = ab$ for some $b \in B$ and $g_1 = az$ for some $z \in Z$. If $b \mid (v : w)$, set $w' := \frac{w}{g_1} f_1 = \frac{w}{z} b$. Then $w' > w$ with $w' : w = b$, which completes the proof.

Assume that $b \nmid (v : w)$. Then, without loss of generality, we may assume that $h_1 = a'b$ for some $a' \in A$. Then we can re-write w as follows:

$$w = (xy)^\gamma (a'z) g_2 \dots g_{m'} (ab) h_2 \dots h_{k'}.$$

Then, the same argument can be applied recursively to $v/(ab)$ and $w/(ab)$.

Case 2.2: Suppose that $\deg(v_Z) = \deg(w_Z)$.

Case 2.2-(i): Suppose that $|\deg_x(v) - \deg_y(v)| < |\deg_x(w) - \deg_y(w)|$. Since the right side of the inequality cannot be 0, without loss of generality, assume that $\deg_x(w) > \deg_y(w)$. Then since $\deg(v_Z) = \deg(w_Z)$, we have $\deg_y(v) > \deg_y(w)$ and y divides $v : w$.

Since $\deg_x(w) > \deg_y(w)$ there is an $a \in A$ with $e_1 = ax$ in the representation of w . By the definition of $G^{[x]}$, $a \in N_{G^{[x]}}(y)$ also. Set $w' := \frac{w}{ax} ay$. If $|\deg_x(w') - \deg_y(w')| = |\deg_x(w) - \deg_y(w)|$, then $|\deg_x(w) - \deg_y(w)| = 1$ and $|\deg_x(v) - \deg_y(v)| = 0$. In this

case, $\deg(w_Z)$ is odd and $\deg(v_Z)$ is even, which contradicts $\deg(v_Z) = \deg(w_Z)$. Thus $|\deg_x(w') - \deg_y(w')| < |\deg_x(w) - \deg_y(w)|$, so $w' > w$ and $w' : w = y$.

Case 2.2-(ii): Suppose that $|\deg_x(v) - \deg_y(v)| = |\deg_x(w) - \deg_y(w)|$. Assume first that $v_Z \neq w_Z$. Then without loss of generality, we may write

$$\begin{aligned}\deg_x(v) &= r_1 = \deg_y(w) \\ \deg_x(w) &= r_2 = \deg_y(v)\end{aligned}$$

for some integers $r_1 > r_2$. Then there exists an $e = ay \in E_3$ in the representation of w . Set $w' := \frac{w}{ay}ax = \frac{w}{y}x$. Then $w' > w$ and $x = w' : w$ divides $v : w$. Therefore, we may assume $v_Z = w_Z$. Recall that the following statements are now assumed:

- $1 \leq \mu(v) = \mu(w) = \gamma$,
- $v_A = w_A$,
- $v_Z = w_Z$.

Fix presentations $v = (xy)^\gamma f_1 f_2 \cdots f_t$ and $w = (xy)^\gamma g_1 g_2 \cdots g_t$. For simplicity, we assume that $f_{i_1} \cdots f_{i_m} \neq g_{j_1} \cdots g_{j_m}$ for all m -fold products with $1 \leq m \leq t$ since the argument below remains valid recursively after removing the common factors.

Fix p be the greatest in the ordering fixed on B such that $p \mid (v : w)$. We claim that there is $u > w$ such that $u : w = p$. After rearranging the indices, we may write $f_1 = a_1 p$ for some $a_1 \in A$.

Step 1: If there exists $\delta_1 \in Z$ or $\delta_1 \in B$ with $p >_B \delta_1$ such that $g_1 = a_1 \delta_1$ after rearrangement of indices, set

$$u = \frac{w}{g_1} f_1 = \frac{w}{(a_1 \delta_1)} (a_1 p)$$

Then $u > w$ in the ordering since $\deg(u_Z) < \deg(w_Z)$ in the first case and $u_B > w_B$ in the latter one, and $u : w = p$. Therefore, we may assume that $g_1 = a_1 \delta_1$ for some $\delta_1 \in B$ with $\delta_1 >_B p$.

Step 2: By the choice of p , we may set $f_2 = a_2 \delta_1$ for some $a_2 \in A$. As before, if, up to reordering, $g_2 = a_2 \delta_2$ for some $\delta_2 \in Z$ or $\delta_2 \in B$ with $p >_B \delta_2$ we form the monomial

$$u = \frac{w}{g_1 g_2} f_1 f_2 = \frac{w}{(a_1 \delta_1)(a_2 \delta_2)} (a_1 p)(a_2 \delta_1).$$

which satisfies the desired property. Therefore, we may assume that $\delta_2 \in B$ and $\delta_2 >_B p$.

Step 3: By the choice of p , we may set $f_3 = a_3 \delta_2$ for some $a_3 \in A$. As before, if, up to reordering, $g_3 = a_3 \delta_3$ for some $\delta_3 \in Z$ or $\delta_3 \in B$ with $p >_B \delta_3$ we form the monomial

$$u = \frac{w}{g_1 g_2 g_3} f_1 f_2 f_3 = \frac{w}{(a_1 \delta_1)(a_2 \delta_2)(a_3 \delta_3)} (a_1 p)(a_2 \delta_1)(a_3 \delta_2).$$

which satisfies the desired property. Therefore, we may assume $\delta_3 \in B$ and $\delta_3 >_B p$. The process must stop after $k \leq t$ steps when there is no $\delta_k \in B$ left with $\delta_k >_B p$. When the process stops, we have $u > w$ and $u : w = p$ as desired. \square

Corollary 3.5. *Let G be a graph and assume $I(G)^s$ has linear quotients for some s . Let x be a vertex of G such that $V(G) \setminus N_G[x]$ is an independent set. Let H be the graph obtained from G by replacing x with a clique. Then $(I(H))^s$ has linear quotients.*

Remark 3.6. If G is a (gapfree) graph and x, y are vertices such that $N_G(x) \setminus \{y\} = N_G(y) \setminus \{x\}$, then Proposition 2.3 or Theorem 3.4 can be used to simplify G by identifying x and y prior to determining whether $I(G)^s$ has linear quotients for some s , potentially significantly reducing the number of generators that need to be ordered.

In the next two sections, we provide examples of gapfree graphs for which powers of their edge ideals have linear quotients starting from the second power. Applying the main results of this section to these graphs yields many additional examples of graphs whose powers have linear quotients.

4. ORDERING OF PURE POWERS

Let G be a graph with $E(G) = \{e_1, \dots, e_s\}$ and suppose that a power $I(G)^q$ of the edge ideal $I(G)$ has linear quotients (which particularly implies that G is gapfree) with an ordering

$$\mathcal{N}^{(q)} : u_1 > \dots > u_r$$

of the generators of $I(G)^q$, where pure powers appear in the ordering with

$$e_1^q > \dots > e_s^q.$$

Then the ordering

$$\mathcal{N}^{(q+1)} : u_1 e_1 > \dots > u_r e_1 > u_1 e_2 > \dots > u_r e_2 > \dots > u_r e_s$$

of the generators of $I(G)^{q+1}$, where $u_i e_j$ is omitted if $u_i e_j = u_k e_\ell$ with $\ell < j$, is called the *efficient ordering* constructed from the ordering $\mathcal{N}^{(q)}$. Recursively, we define the efficient ordering $\mathcal{N}^{(s)}$, constructed from the ordering $\mathcal{N}^{(q)}$, of the generators of $I(G)^s$ for $s \geq q$.

The following is a refinement of Conjecture 1.2 by explicitly describing the potential linear quotient ordering for higher powers of $I(G)$ coming from that of a given power. It provides a strong means of approaching Conjecture 1.2

Conjecture 4.1. Let G be a graph and suppose that $I(G)^q$, for some $q \in \mathbb{N}$, has linear quotients with an ordering $\mathcal{N}^{(q)} : u_1 > \dots > u_r$ of its generators. Then, $I(G)^s$ has linear quotients with the efficient ordering $\mathcal{N}^{(s)}$, constructed from $\mathcal{N}^{(q)}$, of its generators for all $s \geq q$.

Let C_5 be the pentagon on the vertex set $\{a, b, c, d, e\}$ with the edges

$$e_1 = ab, e_2 = bc, e_3 = cd, e_4 = de, e_5 = ea.$$

One can easily prove directly that $I(C_5)^2$ has linear quotient with the following ordering, with omitting $>$, of its 15 generators:

$$a^2 b^2, ab^2 c, b^2 c^2, abcd, bc^2 d, c^2 d^2, abce, a^2 be, abde, bcde, cd^2 e, acde, ade^2, a^2 e^2, d^2 e^2.$$

By using e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, e_5 , the above ordering is

$$(2) \quad e_1^2, e_1 e_2, e_2^2, e_1 e_3, e_2 e_3, e_3^2, e_2 e_5, e_1 e_5, e_1 e_4, e_2 e_4, e_3 e_4, e_3 e_5, e_4 e_5, e_5^2, e_4^2.$$

The ordering of pure powers is

$$e_1^2 > e_2^2 > e_3^2 > e_5^2 > e_4^2.$$

We show that Conjecture 4.1 is true for the pentagon with $q_0 = 2$.

Proposition 4.2. *All powers $I(C_5)^q$ with $q \geq 2$ have linear quotients.*

Proof. Starting from the linear quotient ordering (2) of $I(C_5)^2$, we prove that Conjecture 4.1 is true for $q \geq 2$ by using induction on q . Note that $e_1 = ab, e_2 = bc, e_3 = cd, e_4 = de$ and $e_5 = ea$ are algebraically independent in $S = K[a, b, c, d, e]$.

Let $q > 3$ and suppose that $I(C_5)^{q-1}$ has linear quotients with the ordering $u_1 > \dots > u_{\binom{5+(q-1)-1}{q-1}}$ coming from Conjecture 4.1. In particular $u_1 = e_1^{q-1}$ and $u_{\binom{5+(q-1)-1}{q-1}} = e_4^{q-1}$. Let $w_1 > \dots > w_{\binom{5+q-1}{q}}$ denote the ordering of $I(C_5)^q$ coming from Conjecture 4.1.

Let $\mathcal{A}(e_1)$ denote the set of w_i which can be written as a product of q edges, one of which is e_1 . In this case, we say w_i has a presentation using e_1 . Let $\mathcal{A}(e_2)$ denote the set of $w_i \notin \mathcal{A}(e_1)$ which have a presentation using e_2 , $\mathcal{A}(e_3)$ the set of $w_i \notin \mathcal{A}(e_1) \cup \mathcal{A}(e_2)$ which have a presentation using e_3 and $\mathcal{A}(e_5)$ the set of $w_i \notin \mathcal{A}(e_1) \cup \mathcal{A}(e_2) \cup \mathcal{A}(e_3)$ which have a presentation using e_5 . Finally, $\mathcal{A}(e_4) = \{e_4^q\}$.

We claim that for any $2 \leq p \leq \binom{5+q-1}{q}$, the colon ideal $(w_1, \dots, w_{p-1}) : w_p$ is generated by a subset of $\{a, b, c, d, e\}$. If $w_p \in \mathcal{A}(e_1)$, then the claim follows from the induction hypothesis.

CASE 1: Let $w_p \in \mathcal{A}(e_2)$ and $w_i \in \mathcal{A}(e_2)$ with $i < p$. Let $w_i = u_\ell e_2$ and $w_p = u_t e_2$ with $s < t$. Then there is u_ℓ with $\ell < t$ for which $u_\ell : u_t$ is a variable and $(u_\ell : u_t) | (u_\ell : u_t)$. Set $w_j = u_\ell e_2$ and notice that $j < p$. Note that w_j may belong to $\mathcal{A}(e_1)$. Then $w_j : w_p$ is a variable and $(w_j : w_p) | (w_i : w_p)$, as desired.

CASE 2: Let $w_p \in \mathcal{A}(e_2)$ and $w_i \in \mathcal{A}(e_1)$. If a does not divide w_p , then $w_i : w_p$ is divisible by $a = (e_1 w_p / e_2) : w_p$. If $e_5 = ae$ appears in the presentation of w_p , then both $(e_1 w_p / e_5) : w_p = b$ and $(e_1 e_3 w_p / e_2 e_5) : w_p = d$ belong to $(w_1, \dots, w_{p-1}) : w_p$. Let $w_i = e_1^{f_1} e_2^{f_2} e_3^{f_3} e_4^{f_4} e_5^{f_5}$ and $w_p = e_2^{f'_2} e_3^{f'_3} e_4^{f'_4} e_5^{f'_5}$. If one of the inequalities

$$f_1 + f_5 > f'_5, \quad f_1 + f_2 > f'_2, \quad f_3 + f_4 > f'_3 + f'_4$$

holds, then $w_i : w_p \in (a, b, d)$. If none of the above inequalities is satisfied, then

$$2f_1 + f_2 + f_3 + f_4 + f_5 \leq f'_2 + f'_3 + f'_4 + f'_5,$$

which is impossible, since $\sum_{i=1}^5 f_i = \sum_{i=2}^5 f'_i$ and $f_1 > 0$.

CASE 3: Let $w_p \in \mathcal{A}(e_3)$. Since $e_2(w_p/e_3) \in \mathcal{A}(e_2)$, it follows that $(e_2 w_p / e_3) : w_p = b$ belongs to $(w_1, \dots, w_{p-1}) : w_p$. Since b does not divide e_p , if $w_i \in \mathcal{A}(e_1) \cup \mathcal{A}(e_2)$, then b divides $w_i : w_p$. If $w_i \in \mathcal{A}(e_3)$, then a similar argument as in Case 1 is valid without modification.

CASE 4: Let $w_p \in \mathcal{A}(e_5)$. Since $e_1(w_p/e_5) \in \mathcal{A}(e_1)$, it follows that $(e_1 w_p / e_5) : w_p = b$ belongs to $(w_1, \dots, w_{p-1}) : w_p$. Since b does not divide e_p , if $w_i \in \mathcal{A}(e_1) \cup \mathcal{A}(e_2)$, then b divides $w_i : w_p$. If e_4 appears in the presentation of w_p , then $e_3(w_p/e_4) \in \mathcal{A}(e_3)$ and $(e_3 w_p / e_4) : w_p = c$ belongs to $(w_1, \dots, w_{p-1}) : w_p$. Since c does not divide e_p , if $w_i \in \mathcal{A}(e_3)$, then c divides $w_i : w_p$. Let $w_p = e_5^q$. Since $e_4 e_5^{q-1} > e_5^q$ and $e_4 e_5^{q-1} : e_5^q = d$, then d belongs

$(w_1, \dots, w_{p-1}) : w_p$. Since d does not divide $w_p = e_5^q$, if $e_i \in \mathcal{A}(e_3)$, then d divides $w_i : w_p$. If $e_i \in \mathcal{A}(e_5)$, then a similar argument as in Case 1 is valid without modification.

CASE 5: Finally, if $w_p \in \mathcal{A}(e_4)$, in other words, $e_p = e_4^q$, then a routine computation done as above yields $(w_1, \dots, w_{p-1}) : w_p = (a, c)$. This completes the proof. \square

Remark 4.3. The following ordering

$$a^2b^2, a^2be, ab^2c, abce, a^2e^2, b^2c^2, abcd, abde, bc^2d, ade^2, bcde, acde, cd^2e, c^2d^2, d^2e^2.$$

can also be an ordering for $I(C_5)^2$ to have linear quotients, where the ordering of pure powers is $e_1^2 > e_5^2 > e_2^2 > e_3^2 > e_4^2$.

5. PENTAGON TOGETHER WITH ONE VERTEX

Developing the argument from the proof of Proposition 4.2, we now study finite graphs formed by carefully adding vertices to the pentagon. We first study the case where a single vertex is added with specific connecting edges.

Let G be the finite graph with the vertices $\{a, b, p, q, x, z\}$ and with edges

$$\begin{aligned} e_1 &= \{a, b\}, e_2 = \{a, x\}, e_3 = \{b, x\}, e_4 = \{a, p\}, e_5 = \{b, q\}, \\ e_6 &= \{p, z\}, e_7 = \{x, z\}, e_8 = \{q, z\} \end{aligned}$$

depicted below (Figure 2). The edge ideal $I(G)$ has 8 generators and, since $e_2e_6 = e_4e_7$ and




FIGURE 3. Pentagon together with one vertex

$e_3e_8 = e_5e_7$, it follows that $I(G)^2$ has $\binom{8+1}{2} - 2 = 36 - 2 = 34$ generators. Let $\mathcal{N}^{(2)}$ denote the following order on these generators:

$$\begin{aligned} e_1^2 &= (ab)^2, & e_1e_2 &= (ab)(ax), & e_1e_3 &= (ab)(bx), & e_1e_4 &= (ab)(ap), \\ e_1e_5 &= (ab)(bq), & e_2e_4 &= (ax)(ap), & e_2e_3 &= (ax)(bx), & e_3e_5 &= (bx)(bq), \\ e_3e_4 &= (bx)(ap), & e_2e_5 &= (ax)(bq), & e_4e_5 &= (ap)(bq), & e_1e_6 &= (ab)(pz), \\ e_1e_8 &= (ab)(qz), & e_1e_7 &= (ab)(xz), & e_4e_7 &= (ap)(xz), & e_5e_7 &= (bq)(xz), \\ e_3e_6 &= (bx)(pz), & e_3e_8 &= (ax)(qz), & e_2e_7 &= (ax)(xz), & e_3e_7 &= (bx)(xz), \\ e_4e_6 &= (ap)(pz), & e_5e_8 &= (bq)(qz), & e_4e_8 &= (ap)(qz), & e_5e_6 &= (bq)(pz), \\ e_6e_7 &= (pz)(xz), & e_6e_8 &= (pz)(qz), & e_7e_8 &= (xz)(qz), & e_4^2 &= (ap)^2, \\ e_2^2 &= (ax)^2, & e_3^2 &= (bx)^2, & e_5^2 &= (bq)^2, & e_6^2 &= (pz)^2, \\ e_7^2 &= (xz)^2, & e_8^2 &= (qz)^2. \end{aligned}$$

It is now a direct computation to verify that with the order $\mathcal{N}^{(2)}$, $I(G)^2$ has linear quotients.

Using the ordering $\mathcal{N}^{(2)}$ of the generators of $I(G)^2$ as above, one can inductively show that all powers of $I(G)$ have linear quotients. The following notation will be useful in the proof of Proposition 5.2.

Notation 5.1. Let G be a finite graph and w be one of the generators of $I(G)^s$ for $s \geq 1$. The notation $e_j \mid w$ means that there exists a factorization $w = e_{i_1} \cdots e_{i_N}$ with $e_j = e_{i_k}$ for some $1 \leq k \leq s$.

Note that this notation is intended to convey a notion of division in terms of a factorization into a product of generators, rather than literal division. For instance, if G is as in Figure 3, then $e_1 = ab$ divides $w = e_4 e_5 = abpq$, but $e_1 \nmid w$ since pq is not a generator of $I(G)$.

Proposition 5.2. *Let G be the finite graph in Figure 2. Then all powers $I(G)^s$ with $s \geq 2$ have linear quotients.*

Proof. We prove that Conjecture 4.1 is true for G with $q_0 = 2$. Assume $s \geq 3$ and suppose that $I(G)^{s-1}$ has linear quotients with the ordering $\mathcal{N}^{(s-1)}$: $u_1 > \cdots > u_r$ where $u_1 = e_1^{s-1}$ and $u_r = e_8^{s-1}$. Let $\mathcal{N}^{(s)}$: $w_1 > \cdots > w_t$ denote the efficient ordering of $I(G)^s$ constructed from $\mathcal{N}^{(s-1)}$ as in Conjecture 4.1. For ease of notation, use the following notation to refer to elements in $\mathcal{N}^{(s)}$

$$\mathcal{A}(e_1), \mathcal{A}(e_4), \mathcal{A}(e_2), \mathcal{A}(e_3), \mathcal{A}(e_5), \mathcal{A}(e_6), \mathcal{A}(e_7), \mathcal{A}(e_8)$$

where $w_k \in \mathcal{A}(e_i)$ means $e_i \mid w_k$ and $e_j \nmid w_k$ for j such that $e_j^{s-1} > e_i^{s-1}$ in \mathcal{N} .

We claim that the colon ideal $(w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$ is linear for each w_n . If $w_n \in \mathcal{A}(e_1)$, then the claim follows from the induction hypothesis.

CASE 1: Let $w_n = u_\ell e_4 \in \mathcal{A}(e_4)$ for $\ell \leq r$. First, observe that $(b) \subseteq (w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$ since $(u_\ell e_1 : u_\ell e_4) = (b)$ for $u_\ell e_1 \in \mathcal{A}(e_1)$. Let $w_i = u_t e_4 \in \mathcal{A}(e_4)$ for $t < \ell$. By the induction hypothesis, there exists u_l with $l < \ell$ such that $u_l : u_\ell$ is a variable dividing $u_t : u_\ell$. Let $w_j = u_l e_4$ and notice that $j < n$. Then, $w_j : w_n$ is a variable that divides $w_i : w_n$, as desired. Note that $w_j \in \mathcal{A}(e_1)$ is possible.

Next, let $w_i \in \mathcal{A}(e_1)$. Recall that $b \nmid e_4$. If $b \nmid u_\ell$, then $w_i : w_n \in (b)$ since every element of $\mathcal{A}(e_1)$ is divisible by b . Then, $(u_1 e_1, \dots, u_r e_1) : w_n = (b)$. Hence, $(w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$ is linear in this case. Suppose $b \mid u_\ell$. Then either $e_3 \mid u_\ell$ or $e_5 \mid u_\ell$. If $e_3 \mid u_\ell$, then $u_\ell = w' e_3$ for a generator $w' \in I(G)^{s-2}$. Consider the elements $w_j = w' e_4 e_1$ and $w_k = w' e_7 e_1$ in $\mathcal{A}(e_1)$. Note that $(w_j : w_n) = (a)$ and $(w_k : w_n) = (z)$. If $e_5 \mid u_\ell$, then $u_\ell = w'' e_5$ for a generators $w'' \in I(G)^{s-2}$. Similarly, consider $w_j = w'' e_4 e_1$ and $w_k = w'' e_8 e_1$ in $\mathcal{A}(e_1)$ where $(w_j : w_n) = (a)$ and $(w_k : w_n) = (z)$. So, in either of these scenarios, we have $(a, b, z) \subseteq (w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$. Let $w_i = e_1^{t_1} \cdots e_8^{t_8}$ where $t_1 > 0$ and $w_n = e_2^{t'_2} \cdots e_8^{t'_8}$ since $e_1 \nmid w_n$. If $w_i : w_n \notin (a, b, z)$, then examining the degrees of a, b, z in w_i and w_n , respectively,

results in

$$\begin{aligned} t_1 + t_2 + t_4 &\leq t'_2 + t'_4 \\ t_1 + t_3 + t_5 &\leq t'_3 + t'_5 \\ t_6 + t_7 + t_8 &\leq t'_6 + t'_7 + t'_8 \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $t_1 \leq 0$, a contradiction. Hence, $(w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$ is linear for each $w_n \in \mathcal{A}(e_1) \cup \mathcal{A}(e_4)$.

CASE 3: Let $w_n = u_\ell e_2 \in \mathcal{A}(e_2)$ for some $\ell \leq r$. Note that $e_6 \nmid w_n$ because $e_6 e_2 = e_7 e_4$ and $e_4 \nmid e_n$. Next, observe that $(b, p) \subseteq (w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$ since $(u_\ell e_1 : u_\ell e_2) = (b)$ and $(u_\ell e_4 : u_\ell e_2) = (p)$. Let $w_i \in \mathcal{A}(e_2)$. As in the previous case, by the induction hypothesis, there exists w_j for $j < n$ such that $w_j : w_n$ is a variable that divides $w_i : w_n$, as desired. Let $w_i \in \mathcal{A}(e_1) \cup \mathcal{A}(e_4)$. Observe that $p \nmid u_\ell$; otherwise, $e_4 \mid u_\ell$ or $e_6 \mid u_\ell$ but neither of these cases are possible since $w_n \in \mathcal{A}(e_2)$. If $b \nmid u_\ell$, then $(w_i : w_n) \subseteq (b, p)$ which implies that $(w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$ is generated by variables. So, claim holds for this case. Suppose $b \mid u_\ell$. Then either $e_3 \mid u_\ell$ or $e_5 \mid u_\ell$ since $e_1 \nmid u_\ell$. If $e_3 \mid u_\ell$, then $u_\ell = w' e_3 = w' b x$ for some $w' \in I(G)^{s-2}$. Consider the elements $w_j = w' e_2 e_1$ and $w_k = w' e_7 e_1$ in $\mathcal{A}(e_1)$ where $(w_j : w_n) = (a)$ and $(w_k : w_n) = (z)$. So, $(a, b, p, z) \subseteq (w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$.

Assuming $e_5 \mid u_\ell$ also yields to the above containment. Let $w_i = e_1^{t_1} \cdots e_8^{t_8}$ where $t_1 > 0$ or $t_4 > 0$ and $w_n = e_2^{t'_2} e_3^{t'_3} e_5^{t'_5} e_7^{t'_7} e_8^{t'_8}$ since e_1, e_4, e_6 do not divide $w_n = u_\ell e_2$. If $w_i : w_n \notin (a, b, p, z)$, then examining degrees of a, b, p, z in w_i and w_n results with $t_1 + t_4 + t_6 \leq 0$, a contradiction. So, $(w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$ is linear in this case.

CASE 4: Now, let $w_n = u_\ell e_3 \in \mathcal{A}(e_3)$ for some $u_\ell \in I(G)^{s-1}$. First observe that $(a) \subseteq (w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$ since $(u_\ell e_1 : u_\ell e_3) = (a)$. The case $w_i \in \mathcal{A}(e_3)$ follows from the induction hypothesis as in the previous cases. Let $w_i \in \mathcal{A}(e_1) \cup \mathcal{A}(e_4) \cup \mathcal{A}(e_2)$. Note that this collection contains all generators of $I(G)^s$ that are divisible by a since e_1, e_2 and e_4 are the only edges incident to a and $a \nmid w_n$. This means $w_i : w_n \in (a)$. Hence, $(w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$ is linear in this case.

Next, let $w_n = u_\ell e_5 \in \mathcal{A}(e_5)$ for some $u_\ell \in I(G)^{s-1}$. First observe that $(a, x) \subseteq (w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$ since $(u_\ell e_1 : u_\ell e_5) = (a)$ and $(u_\ell e_3 : u_\ell e_5) = (x)$. The case $w_i \in \mathcal{A}(e_5)$ follows from the induction hypothesis as in the previous cases. Let $w_i \in \mathcal{A}(e_1) \cup \mathcal{A}(e_4) \cup \mathcal{A}(e_2) \cup \mathcal{A}(e_3)$. Note that w_i is divisible by a or x and w_n is not divisible by a . Furthermore, w_n is not divisible by x . Otherwise, if $x \mid u_\ell$, then $u_\ell = w' e_7$ for a generator w' of $I(G)^{s-2}$ and $w_n = w' e_7 e_5 = w' e_6 e_3$ which implies that $e_3 \mid w_n$, a contradiction. So, $w_i : w_n \in (a, x)$. Hence, $(w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$ is linear in this case.

CASE 5: Let $w_n = u_\ell e_6 \in \mathcal{A}(e_6)$ for some $u_\ell \in I(G)^{s-1}$. Observe that $(a) \subseteq (w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$ since $(u_\ell e_4 : u_\ell e_6) = (a)$. The case $w_i \in \mathcal{A}(e_6)$ follows from the induction hypothesis as in the previous cases. Let $w_i \in \mathcal{A}(e_1) \cup \mathcal{A}(e_4) \cup \mathcal{A}(e_2) \cup \mathcal{A}(e_3) \cup \mathcal{A}(e_5)$. Note that w_i is divisible by a or b while $a \nmid w_n$ and $b \nmid w_n$. This implies that $w_i : w_n \in (a, b)$.

Observe that $u_\ell = e_6^{t_6} e_7^{t_7} e_8^{t_8}$ since u_ℓ must be divisible by z . If $t_8 \geq 1$, then $u_\ell = w' e_8$ for a generator $w' \in I(G)^{s-2}$ and $(w' e_6 e_5 : w' e_6 e_8) = (b)$. Similarly, if $t_7 \geq 1$, then $u_\ell = w' e_7$ for a generator $w' \in I(G)^{s-2}$ and $(w' e_6 e_3 : w' e_6 e_7) = (b)$. So, $(w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$ is linear

in these cases. For the remaining case, we have $w_n = e_6^s$. Notice that, for each w_i , we have $w_i : w_n \in (a, x, q)$ since $\{a, x, q\}$ is a vertex cover of $G \setminus \{e_6\}$. Furthermore, note that the generators $w_j = e_6^{s-1}e_7$ and $w_k = e_6^{s-1}e_8$ come before w_n in $\mathcal{A}(e_6)$ from the construction of $\mathcal{N}^{(s)}$. In addition, $(w_j : w_n) = (x)$ and $(w_k : w_n) = (q)$. Thus, the claim holds.

CASE 6: For the final two cases, if $w_n = u_\ell e_7 \in \mathcal{A}(e_7)$ then none of a, b, p divide u_ℓ , but every element of $\mathcal{A}(e_1) \cup \mathcal{A}(e_4) \cup \mathcal{A}(e_2) \cup \mathcal{A}(e_3) \cup \mathcal{A}(e_5) \cup \mathcal{A}(e_6)$ is divisible by one of these three variables. Since $(u_\ell e_2 : u_\ell e_7) = (a)$ and $(u_\ell e_3 : u_\ell e_7) = (b)$ and $(u_\ell e_6 : u_\ell e_7) = (p)$, we are done. For the last case, we have $w_n = e_8^s$. Note that $(e_8^{s-1}e_5 : e_8^s) = (b)$, $(e_8^{s-1}e_6 : e_8^s) = (p)$ and $(e_8^{s-1}e_7 : e_8^s) = (x)$. Since $\{b, p, x\}$ is a vertex cover of $G \setminus \{e_8\}$, we have $w_i : w_n \in (b, p, x)$ for each $w_i \neq w_n$. Therefore, the claim holds. \square

As an example of how Theorem 3.4 can be applied, consider the class of graphs formed by replacing the central vertex x of Figure 3 by a complete graph K_n , with each vertex of K_n connected to a, b, z . We denote such a graph by (C_5, K_n) and label the vertices of K_n by x_1, \dots, x_n . The case $n = 4$ is shown below.




FIGURE 4. (C_5, K_4)

Example 5.3. Let I be the edge ideal of the graph (C_5, K_n) for some $n \geq 1$. Then I^s has linear quotients for all $s \geq 2$. The case $n = 1$ holds by Proposition 5.2. For $n > 1$ the result holds via induction using Proposition 2.3.

Notice that the above argument cannot extend to replace any vertex of the exterior pentagon with an edge. In particular, this would result in a finite graph that is not gapfree. However, the technique can be applied to the central vertex in Figure 5, for instance, which is the base case for a second class of gapfree graphs built from adding a vertex to a pentagon.

Proposition 5.4. Let G be the finite gapfree graph given in Figure 5. Then $I(G)^s$ has linear quotients for all $s \geq 2$.

Proof. Label the edges of G as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} e_1 = \{a, b\}, \quad e_2 = \{a, p\}, \quad e_3 = \{a, x\}, \quad e_4 = \{b, x\}, \quad e_5 = \{b, q\}, \\ e_6 = \{x, p\}, \quad e_7 = \{x, q\}, \quad e_8 = \{p, z\}, \quad e_9 = \{q, z\} \end{aligned}$$




FIGURE 5. Pentagon together with one vertex and multiple inner edges

One can verify that $I(G)^2$ has linear quotients with respect to the following order:

$$\begin{aligned}
e_1^2 &= (ab)^2, & e_1e_3 &= (ab)(ax), & e_1e_4 &= (ab)(bx), & e_1e_2 &= (ab)(ap), \\
e_1e_6 &= (ab)(xp), & e_1e_5 &= (ab)(bq), & e_1e_7 &= (ab)(xq), & e_1e_8 &= (ab)(pz), \\
e_1e_9 &= (ab)(qz), & e_2e_8 &= (ap)(pz), & e_2e_3 &= (ap)(ax), & e_2e_7 &= (ap)(xq), \\
e_2e_9 &= (ap)(qz), & e_2e_5 &= (ap)(bq), & e_2e_6 &= (ap)(xp), & e_3e_8 &= (ax)(pz), \\
e_3e_4 &= (ax)(bx), & e_3e_7 &= (ax)(xq), & e_3e_9 &= (ax)qz, & e_3e_6 &= (ax)(xp), \\
e_4e_8 &= (bx)(pz), & e_4e_7 &= (bx)(xq), & e_4e_9 &= (bx)(qz), & e_4e_5 &= (bx)(bq), \\
e_4e_6 &= (bx)(xp), & e_5e_9 &= (bq)(qz), & e_5e_6 &= (bq)(xp), & e_5e_8 &= (bq)(pz), \\
e_5e_7 &= (bq)(xq), & e_6e_9 &= (xp)(qz), & e_6e_8 &= (xp)(pz), & e_6e_7 &= (xp)(xq), \\
e_7e_9 &= (xq)(qz), & e_8e_9 &= (pz)(qz), & e_2^2 &= (ap)^2, & e_3^2 &= (ax)^2, \\
e_4^2 &= (bx)^2, & e_5^2 &= (bq)^2, & e_6^2 &= (xp)^2, & e_7^2 &= (xq)^2, \\
e_8^2 &= (pz)^2, & e_9^2 &= (qz)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Assume $s \geq 3$. Suppose that $I(G)^{s-1}$ has linear quotients with the ordering $\mathcal{N}^{(s-1)}$: $u_1 > \dots > u_r$ where $u_1 = e_1^{s-1}$ and $u_r = e_9^{s-1}$. Let $\mathcal{N}^{(s)} : w_1 > \dots > w_t$ denote the efficient ordering of $I(G)^s$ constructed from $\mathcal{N}^{(s-1)}$ as in Conjecture 4.1. As before, use the following notation to refer to elements in $\mathcal{N}^{(s)}$

$$\mathcal{A}(e_1), \mathcal{A}(e_2), \mathcal{A}(e_3), \mathcal{A}(e_4), \mathcal{A}(e_5), \mathcal{A}(e_6), \mathcal{A}(e_7), \mathcal{A}(e_8), \mathcal{A}(e_9),$$

where $w_k \in \mathcal{A}(e_i)$ means $e_i \mid w_k$ and $e_j \nmid w_k$ for each $j < i$. We claim that the colon ideal $(w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$ is linear for each w_n . If $w_n \in \mathcal{A}(e_1)$, the claim follows from the induction hypothesis.

CASE 1: Let $w_n = u_\ell e_2 \in \mathcal{A}(e_2)$ for some $\ell \leq r$. Note that $(b) \subseteq (w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$ since $(u_\ell e_1 : u_\ell e_2) = (b)$. If $w_i \in \mathcal{A}(e_2)$, it follows from the induction hypothesis that there exists $j < n$ such that $w_j : w_n$ is a variable dividing $w_i : w_n$, as desired. Let $w_i \in \mathcal{A}(e_1)$. If $b \nmid u_\ell$, then $w_i : w_n \in (b)$ since each element in $\mathcal{A}(e_1)$ is divisible by b . Thus, $(w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$ is linear and we are done. Suppose $b \mid u_\ell$. Then either e_4 or e_5 divides u_ℓ since $e_1 \nmid u_\ell$. Since $e_2e_4 = e_1e_6$, it is not possible to have $e_4 \mid u_\ell$. So, $e_5 \mid u_\ell$ where $u_\ell = w'e_5$ for a generator $w' \in I(G)^{s-2}$. In this case, it is important to note that $e_3 \nmid u_\ell$ as $e_3e_5 = e_1e_7$. Consider the elements $w_j = w'e_2e_1, w_k = w'e_6e_1$ and $w_l = w'e_8e_1$ in $\mathcal{A}(e_1)$ where $(w_j : w_n) = (a), (w_k : w_n) = (x)$ and $(w_l : w_n) = (z)$. This means $(a, b, x, z) \subseteq (w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$.

Set $w_i = e_1^{t_1} \cdots e_9^{t_9}$ where $t_1 > 0$ and $w_n = e_2^{t'_2} e_5^{t'_5} e_6^{t'_6} e_7^{t'_7} e_8^{t'_8} e_9^{t'_9}$. If $w_i : w_n \notin (a, b, x, z)$, we obtain the following inequalities by examining the degrees of these four variables in w_i and w_n

$$\begin{aligned} t_1 + t_2 + t_3 &\leq t'_2 \\ t_1 + t_4 + t_5 &\leq t'_5 \\ t_3 + t_4 + t_6 + t_7 &\leq t'_6 + t'_7 \\ t_8 + t_9 &\leq t'_8 + t'_9 \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $t_1 + t_3 + t_4 \leq 0$, a contradiction. Thus, $(w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$ is linear for each $w_n \in \mathcal{A}(e_1) \cup \mathcal{A}(e_2)$.

CASE 2: Let $w_n = u_\ell e_3 \in \mathcal{A}(e_3)$ for some $\ell \leq r$. First recall that $e_1, e_2 \nmid u_\ell$ and also note that $e_5 \nmid u_\ell$ since $e_3 e_5 = e_1 e_7$. The case $w_i \in \mathcal{A}(e_3)$ follows from the induction hypothesis as in the previous case. Let $w_i \in \mathcal{A}(e_1) \cup \mathcal{A}(e_2)$. Then, $(b, p) \subseteq (w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$ since $(u_\ell e_1 : w_n) = (b)$ and $(u_\ell e_2 : w_n) = (p)$. If $b \nmid u_\ell$ and $p \nmid u_\ell$, then $(w_i : w_n) \subseteq (b, p)$ implies that $(w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$ is linear. So, the claim holds for this case. If $b \mid u_\ell$, then $e_4 \mid u_\ell$. Let $u_\ell = w' e_4$ for a generator $w' \in I(G)^{s-2}$. Consider $w_j = w' e_3 e_1$ and $w_k = e_7 e_1$ in $\mathcal{A}(e_1)$ such that $(w_j : w_n) = (a)$ and $(w_k : w_n) = (q)$. This means $(a, b, p, q) \subseteq (w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$. One can verify that the same containment holds for the remaining case $p \mid u_\ell$ (which is split into two cases: $e_6 \mid u_\ell$ or $e_8 \mid u_\ell$).

As in the previous case, let $w_i = e_1^{t_1} \cdots e_9^{t_9}$ where either $t_1 > 0$ or $t_2 > 0$ and $w_n = e_3^{t'_3} e_4^{t'_4} e_6^{t'_6} e_7^{t'_7} e_8^{t'_8} e_9^{t'_9}$. If $w_i : w_n \notin (a, b, p, q)$, as before, considering degrees of these variables results with $t_1 + t_2 + t_5 \leq 0$, a contradiction. Thus, $(w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$ is linear in this case as well.

CASE 3: Let $w_n = u_\ell e_4 \in \mathcal{A}(e_4)$ for some $\ell \leq r$. First observe that $(a) \subseteq (w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$ since $(u_\ell e_1 : u_\ell e_4) = (a)$. The case $w_i \in \mathcal{A}(e_4)$ follows from the induction hypothesis. Let $w_i \in \mathcal{A}(e_1) \cup \mathcal{A}(e_2) \cup \mathcal{A}(e_3)$. Note that this collection contains all generators of $I(G)^q$ that are divisible by a and also $a \nmid w_n$. This means $w_i : w_n \in (a)$. Hence, $(w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$ is linear in this case.

CASE 4: Let $w_n = u_\ell e_5 \in \mathcal{A}(e_5)$ for some $\ell \leq r$. Note that $(a, x) \subseteq (w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$ since $(u_\ell e_1 : u_\ell e_5) = (a)$ and $(u_\ell e_4 : u_\ell e_5) = (x)$. The case $w_i \in \mathcal{A}(e_5)$ follows from the induction hypothesis. If $w_i \in \mathcal{A}(e_1) \cup \mathcal{A}(e_2) \cup \mathcal{A}(e_3)$, then $w_i : w_n \in (a)$ as in the previous case since each such w_i is divisible by a and also $a \nmid w_n$. Let $w_i \in \mathcal{A}(e_4)$. If $x \nmid w_n$, then $w_i : w_n \in (x)$ and the claim holds. If $x \mid w_n$, then either $e_6 \mid u_\ell$ or $e_7 \mid u_\ell$. We consider the case $e_6 \mid u_\ell$ and note that the other case follows similarly. Let $u_\ell = w' e_6$ for a generator $w' \in I(G)^{s-2}$. Consider the elements $w_j = w' e_4 e_5$ and $w_k = w' e_4 e_9$. Note that $j, k < n$ and $(w_j : w_n) = (b)$ and $(w_k : w_n) = (z)$. This means $(a, b, x, z) \subseteq (w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$. As in the previous cases, let $w_i = e_4^{t_4} e_5^{t_5} \cdots e_9^{t_9}$ where $t_4 > 0$ and $w_n = e_5^{t'_5} \cdots e_9^{t'_9}$. If $w_i : w_n \notin (b, x, z)$, then considering degrees of these variables results with $t_4 \leq 0$, a contradiction. Thus, $(w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$ is linear.

CASE 5: Let $w_n = u_\ell e_6 \in \mathcal{A}(e_6)$ for some $\ell \leq r$. Observe that $(a, b) \subseteq (w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$ since $(u_\ell e_2 : u_\ell e_6) = (a)$ and $(u_\ell e_4 : u_\ell e_6) = (b)$. The case $w_i \in \mathcal{A}(e_6)$ follows from the induction hypothesis. For the remaining case, note that each w_i is divisible by a or b while w_n is not divisible by neither a nor b . This means $w_i : w_n \in (a, b)$. Thus, $(w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$ is linear in this case.

CASE 6: Let $w_n = u_\ell e_7 \in \mathcal{A}(e_7)$ for some $\ell \leq r$. Notice that $(a, b, p) \subseteq (w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$ since $(u_\ell e_3 : u_\ell e_7) = (a)$, $(u_\ell e_4 : u_\ell e_7) = (b)$ and $(u_\ell e_6 : u_\ell e_7) = (p)$. The case $w_i \in \mathcal{A}(e_7)$ follows from the induction hypothesis. For the remaining case, note that w_i is divisible by either a or b or p while w_n is not divisible by neither a or b . Furthermore, w_n is not divisible by p because if $p \mid w_n$, then $e_8 \mid u_\ell$ which implies that $e_7 e_8 = e_6 e_9$ divides w_n , a contradiction. Thus, $w_i : w_n \in (a, b, p)$ and $(w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$ is linear. Hence, the claim holds for this case.

CASE 7: Let $w_n = u_\ell e_8 \in \mathcal{A}(e_8)$ for some $\ell \leq r$. Notice that $(a, x) \subseteq (w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) : w_n$ since $(u_\ell e_2 : u_\ell e_8) = (a)$ and $(u_\ell e_6 : u_\ell e_8) = (x)$. The case $w_i \in \mathcal{A}(e_8)$ follows from the induction hypothesis. For the remaining case, notice that each w_i is divisible by either a, b or x while w_n is not divisible by any of these three variables. Observe that $u_\ell = e_8^{t_8} e_9^{t_9}$. If $t_9 \geq 1$, then $u_\ell = w' e_9$ for a generator $w' \in I(G)^{s-2}$ and $(w' e_8 e_5 : w' e_8 e_9) = (b)$. If $t_9 = 0$, then $w_n = e_8^s$. Notice that, for each w_i , we have $w_i : w_n \in (a, x, q)$ since $\{a, x, q\}$ is a vertex cover of $G \setminus \{e_8\}$. Consider the monomial $w_j = e_8^{s-1} e_9$ where $j < n$ by the definition of the order $\mathcal{N}^{(s)}$. Since $(w_j : w_n) = (q)$, the claim holds.

CASE 8: For the final case, we have $w_n = e_9^s$. Observe that $(e_9^{s-1} e_8 : e_9^s) = (p)$ and $(e_9^{s-1} e_5 : e_9^s) = (b)$ and $(e_9^{s-1} e_7 : e_9^s) = (x)$. Since $\{b, p, x\}$ is a vertex cover of $G \setminus \{e_9\}$, we have $w_i : w_n \in (b, p, x)$ for each $w_i \neq w_n$. \square

Now, we introduce a particular new class of finite graphs.

Definition 5.5. A finite graph Γ is called *CDCC graph* if Γ satisfies the following conditions:

- Γ is gapfree;
- Γ contains (i) **cricket**, (ii) **diamond**, (iii) \mathbf{C}_4 and (iv) \mathbf{C}_5 as induced subgraphs.

Let Γ be a CDCC graph. Since Γ contains \mathbf{C}_5 , it follows that the edge ideal $I(\Gamma)$ does not have linear resolution. Furthermore, since Γ contains cricket, diamond and \mathbf{C}_4 , it is unclear if all powers $I(\Gamma)^t$ with $t \geq 2$ have linear resolution.




FIGURE 6. A CDCC graph with minimum number of vertices

Example 5.6. It is not difficult to see that no graph on 6 vertices can satisfy all of the conditions in Definition 5.5. The graph Γ displayed in Figure 6 is obtained from the graph in Figure 5 by duplicating the vertex z . It is an example of a CDCC graph with smallest number of vertices.

We now come to the next main theorem in the present paper.

Theorem 5.7. *Given $n \geq 7$, there exists a CDCC graph Γ_n with n vertices for which all powers $I(\Gamma_n)^s$ with $s \geq 2$ have linear quotients.*

Proof. Let Γ_7 denote the CDCC graph of Figure 6. Since a finite graph obtained by duplicating a vertex from a CDCC graph is again CDCC graph, the desired result follows from Propositions 2.3 and 5.4. \square

While the matching number of the graph in Figure 6 is 3, in general, the matching number of a CDCC graph can be arbitrarily large. Indeed, duplicating both endpoints of an edge increases the matching number without changing the existing induced subgraphs and gapfreeness.

6. A PARTIAL ANSWER TO CONJECTURE 4.1

In the present section, we consider a slightly modified version of Conjecture 4.1. We show that under an additional assumption on the ordering, if I^2 , I^5 , I^6 and I^7 have linear quotients, then I^q has linear quotients for all $q \geq 2$. Before stating the result, we introduce the concept of an admissible order.

Definition 6.1. Let G be a finite graph on the vertex set $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ the set of its edges. An *admissible* edge ordering of G is a total order \succ of the edges in G with following property: for any $\{a, b\}, \{c, d\} \in E(G)$ such that $\{a, b\} \cap \{c, d\} = \emptyset$ and $\{a, b\} \succ \{c, d\}$, either all edges incident to a are larger than $\{c, d\}$ or all edges incident to b are larger than $\{c, d\}$.

Recall that, unless there is a misunderstanding, we use the notation ab instead of $\{a, b\}$ for an edge of a finite graph. While not every order is admissible, such orders are ubiquitous in that every graph has one.

Lemma 6.2. *Every finite graph possesses an admissible ordering of the edges.*

Proof. We shall use induction on $n = |V(G)|$, the number of vertices in G . The assertion is trivial if $n = 1$ or $n = 2$. Suppose that $n \geq 3$ and the assertion is known to hold for any graph with fewer than n vertices. Let $x \in V(G)$ be any vertex in G , and set $G' = G \setminus \{x\}$. Suppose that the edges incident to x in G are xx_1, \dots, xx_s .

By the induction hypothesis, there exists an admissible ordering of the edges in G' . We shall order the edges in G by $xx_1 \succ \dots \succ xx_s \succ$ edges in G' . We show that this is an admissible ordering of the edges in G . Consider any two edges $ab \succ cd$ with $ab \cap cd = \emptyset$ in this ordering. Clearly, cd cannot be incident to x .

Consider the case that ab is not incident to x . Then, both ab and cd are edges in G' . Thus, we can suppose that all edges incident to a in G' are larger than cd . If $a \notin \{x_1, \dots, x_s\}$, then edges incident to a in G and G' are the same, and we have the required property. If $a \in \{x_1, \dots, x_s\}$, then the only additional edge incident to a in G would be xa , which is larger than cd , by the edge ordering.

Consider the remaining case that ab is incident to x . Without loss of generality, we may assume that $a = x$. In this case, it is clear that all edges incident to a are larger than cd . \square

From now on, for a finite graph G , fix an admissible order of its edges:

$$(*) \quad e_1 \succ \dots \succ e_s$$

The existence of this ordering is due to Lemma 6.2.

Definition 6.3. Let G be a finite graph with edge ideal $I = I(G)$. Let

$$(\diamond) \quad g_1 > \dots > g_k$$

be an order of the generators of I^2 . We recursively construct the following orders for the generators of powers of I : if, for $q \geq 2$,

$$\mathcal{M}^{(q)} : u_1 > \dots > u_r$$

denotes the constructed (or known) order of the generators of $I(G)^q$, then the order of the generators of $I(G)^{q+1}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{M}^{(q+1)} : u_1 e_1 > \dots > u_r e_1 > u_1 e_2 > \dots > u_r e_2 > \dots > u_r e_s,$$

where a generator $u_i e_j$ is omitted (*redundant*) if it has already appeared before in the ordering. We call these orders $\mathcal{M}^{(q)}$ of the generators of I^q for $q = 3, 4, 5, \dots$ are the $(\diamond)-(*)$ compatible orders.

Note that the orders $\mathcal{M}^{(k)}$ given in Definitions 6.3 look similar to the orders $\mathcal{N}^{(k)}$ described in Section 4, but are different in nature. We now come to the last main result of the paper.

Theorem 6.4. *Let G be a finite graph on the vertex set $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ the set of its edges. Let $I = I(G)$ be the edge ideal of G . Suppose that I^2 has linear quotients with an order of the generators written in the form of (\diamond) . Suppose also that, for some integer $q \geq 7$, I^2, \dots, I^q have linear quotients with the $(\diamond)-(*)$ compatible orders of their generators. Then, I^{q+1} also has linear quotients with the $(\diamond)-(*)$ compatible order of its generators.*

Proof. Consider any two generators $A = u_i e_j > u_k e_\ell = B$ of I^{q+1} in $\mathcal{M}^{(q+1)}$, and assume that they appear in the ordering $\mathcal{M}^{(q+1)}$ the first time in this representation; that is, e_j and e_ℓ are the largest among all edges in the decomposition of A and B , respectively. Set

$$Q = A : B.$$

We need to show that there exists a generator C of I^{q+1} such that $C > B$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q+1)}$, and $C : B$ is a variable that divides Q .

Since $A > B$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q+1)}$, we can assume that $e_j \succeq e_\ell$; that is, $j \leq \ell$. If $j = \ell$, then $u_i > u_k$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q)}$, so there exists $u_t > u_k$ in I^q such that $u_t : u_k$ is a variable that divides $Q = u_i : u_k$.

Let $C = u_t e_\ell$. Then, $C : u_k e_\ell = u_t : u_k$ is a variable that divides Q . Since B appears in $\mathcal{M}^{(q+1)}$ first as $u_k e_\ell$ and $u_i > u_k$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q)}$, it follows that $C > B$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q+1)}$ and the assertion is proved in this case.

We can assume that $e_j \neq e_\ell$, i.e., $j \neq \ell$. Write $u_i = L_1 \cdots L_q$ and $u_k = M_1 \cdots M_q$, where L_i 's and M_j 's are edges in G , and set $e_j = ab, e_\ell = cd$. As observed before, $ab \succeq L_t$ and $cd \succeq M_t$ for all $t = 1, \dots, q$. Also, $ab \succ cd$. We shall analyze the following two possibilities: $ab \cap cd = \emptyset$ and $ab \cap cd \neq \emptyset$.

CASE 1: $ab \cap cd = \emptyset$. It can be seen that $ab \nmid u_k$. Indeed, if $ab \mid u_k$ then there must exist edges $ae = M_{t'}$ and $bf = M_{t''}$ in u_k , for some t', t'' (it is possible that $M_{t'} = M_{t''} = ab$). However, by the property of an admissible ordering, we must have either $ae \succ cd$ or $bf \succ cd$, which is a contradiction to the assumption that $M_t \preceq cd$ for all $t = 1, \dots, q$.

If $a \mid u_k$ and $b \nmid u_k$ (similarly for the case where $a \nmid u_k$ and $b \mid u_k$), then there exists an edge ae in the presentation of u_k . Without loss of generality, we may assume that $ae = M_q$. Now, set

$$C = (M_1 \cdots M_{q-1} \cdot cd) \cdot ab.$$

It can be seen that, since $ab \succ cd$, $C > B$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q+1)}$. Moreover, $C : B = b$, which divides Q , as desired.

If $a \nmid u_k$ and $b \nmid u_k$ then set

$$u_l = M_1 \cdots M_{q-1} \cdot ab.$$

Since $ab \succ cd \succeq M_q$, $u_l > u_k$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q)}$. Therefore, by the linear quotients of I^q , there exists a generator $u_t > u_k$ of I^q such that $u_t : u_k$ is a variable that divides $u_l : u_k$. Since $u_l : u_k = ab$, we have $u_t : u_k$ is either a or b . Set

$$C = u_t \cdot cd.$$

Since B appears first in $\mathcal{M}^{(q+1)}$ in the form $u_k \cdot cd$, we have $C > B$. Moreover, $C : B$ is either a or b , which divides Q as desired.

CASE 2: $ab \cap cd \neq \emptyset$. Since $ab \neq cd$, we may assume that $a = c$ and $b \neq d$.

If $b \mid Q$, then set

$$C = u_k \cdot ab.$$

Clearly, $C > B$ since $ab \succ ad$, and $C : B = b$ which divides Q .

If $a \mid Q$ and $b \nmid Q$, then there must exist an edge be in u_k . Without loss of generality, assume that $be = M_q$ (particularly, $e \neq a$). Set

$$C = (M_1 \cdots M_{q-1} \cdot ad) \cdot ab.$$

Since $ab \succ ad \succeq be$, we have $C > B$. Also, $C : B = a$, which divides Q .

It remains to consider the case where $a \nmid Q$ and $b \nmid Q$. As before, since $b \nmid Q$, there must exist an edge be in u_k , and we can assume that $be = M_q$.

Suppose that there exists an edge $uv \in E$ such that $uv \mid Q$. Without loss of generality, assume that M_{q-1} is the largest among M_1, \dots, M_{q-1} . Set

$$u_g = (M_1 \cdots M_{q-2}) \cdot uv \cdot ab \quad \text{and} \quad u_h = (M_1 \cdots M_{q-2}) \cdot be \cdot ad.$$

Again, since $ab \succ ad \succeq M_t$ for all t , we have $u_g > u_h \geq u_k$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q)}$. By the linear quotients of I^q , there exists a generator $u_t > u_h$ of I^q such that $u_t : u_h$ is a variable that divides $u_g : u_h = uv : de$ (which is necessarily not 1). Set

$$C = u_t \cdot M_{q-1}.$$

Then, $C : B = u_t : u_h$ is a variable which divides $uv \mid Q$. Hence, we are done in this case by the following Claim.

CLAIM 1. $C > u_h \cdot M_{q-1} = B$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q+1)}$.

PROOF OF CLAIM 1. Since $u_t > u_h$, either u_t contains an edge f of G for which $f \succ ad$ or $u_t = u'_t \cdot ad$, where u'_t is a generator of I^{q-1} and $u'_t > u_h/ad = M_1 \cdots M_{q-2} \cdot be$. In the first case, due to the existence of f , we have $u_t \cdot M_{q-1} > u_h \cdot M_{q-1} = B$. Consider the case when $u_t = u'_t \cdot ad$, where $u'_t > (M_1 \cdots M_{q-2}) \cdot be = N$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q-1)}$.

If $M_{q-1} > be$, then this implies that $u'_t \cdot M_{q-1} > N \cdot M_{q-1}$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q)}$, and so $C = u'_t \cdot M_{q-1} \cdot ad > N \cdot M_{q-1} \cdot ad = u_h \cdot M_{q-1} = B$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q+1)}$. If $M_{q-1} < be$, then either u'_t contains an edge f' of G such that $f' \succ be \succ M_{q-1}$, or $u'_t = be \cdot u''_t$, where $u''_t > M_1 \cdots M_{q-2}$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q-2)}$. The existence of f' gives $u'_t \cdot M_{q-1} > N \cdot M_{q-1}$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q)}$ and, again, implies that $C = u'_t \cdot M_{q-1} \cdot ad > B$. On the other hand, if $u'_t = be \cdot u''_t$ as said, then since $M_{q-1} \succ M_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, q-2$, we have $u''_t \cdot M_{q-1} > (M_1 \cdots M_{q-2}) \cdot M_{q-1}$, which implies that $u'_t \cdot M_{q-1} = u''_t \cdot M_{q-1} \cdot be > N \cdot M_{q-1}$. As before, it follows that $C > B$. The claim is proved.

We proceed by assuming now that an edge uv such that $uv \mid Q$ does not exist. Particularly, it follows that Q is the product of variables (with possibly repetitions) in an independent set of G .

Write $Q = x_1 \dots x_\gamma$, where the x_l 's (with possible repetition) form an independent set in G . By relabeling, if necessary, we may assume that $L_l = x_l y_l$, for $l = 1, \dots, \gamma$ (in particular, $\gamma \leq q$). Since $y_l \nmid Q$, for $l = 1, \dots, \gamma$, we may also assume that $M_l = y_l z_l$, for $l = 1, \dots, \gamma$, or that some of the y_l 's are d or e .

If $x_l d \in E$ (similarly, if $x_l e \in E$) for some $l \in \{1, \dots, \gamma\}$, then set

$$C = (M_1 \cdots M_{q-1}) \cdot x_l d \cdot ab.$$

As observed before, since $ab \succ ad \succeq M_t$ for all t , $C > B$. Also, $C : B = x_l$, which divides Q . Suppose that $x_l d, x_l e \notin E$ for any $l = 1, \dots, \gamma$. This, by considering $\deg A = \deg B$, implies that $\gamma < q$.

Case 2.1. Consider the case where there exists $\theta \in \{\gamma + 1, \dots, q\}$ such that $L_\theta \subseteq Z = \{z_1, \dots, z_\gamma, d, e\}$.

If $L_\theta = de$, then $B = (M_1 \cdots M_{q-1}) \cdot L_\theta \cdot ab$, which already appeared before in $\mathcal{M}^{(q+1)}$, a contradiction. If, for instance, $L_\theta = z_1 d$ (similarly for the case where $L_\theta = z_1 e$), then set

$$C = (M_2 \cdots M_{q-1}) \cdot L_1 \cdot L_\theta \cdot ab.$$

Again, we have $C > B$. Also, $C : B = x_1 : e$, so either $B = C$, which contradicts cd being the largest edge in the decomposition of B , or $C : B = x_1$ divides Q .

If, for example, $L_\theta = \{z_1, z_2\}$, then without loss of generality assume that M_{q-1} is the largest among M_3, \dots, M_{q-1} and set

$$u_g = (M_3 \cdots M_{q-2}) \cdot L_1 \cdot L_2 \cdot L_\theta \cdot ab.$$

Clearly, $u_g > B/M_{q-1}$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q)}$. Furthermore, $u_g : B/M_{q-1} = x_1 x_2 : de$ (which is necessarily not 1). It follows that either $u_g = B/M_{q-1}$, which then implies that $B = u_g M_{q-1}$ which contradicts cd being the largest edge in the decomposition of B , or there exists a generator $u_h > B/M_{q-1}$ of I^q (u_h could be u_g) such that $u_h : B/M_{q-1}$ is either x_1 or x_2 , which then implies that $u_h M_{q-1} : B$ is either x_1 or x_2 that divides Q . This case is completed by showing that $u_h M_{q-1} > B$, which is done in the following Claim.

CLAIM 2. $u_h M_{q-1} > B$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q+1)}$.

PROOF OF CLAIM 2. In Claim 1, we have seen a similar statement for a simpler situation. The proof of this claim goes in the same line of arguments (with more details). Since $u_h > B/M_{q-1}$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q)}$, either u_h contains an edge f of G such that $f \succ ad$ or $u_h = u'_h \cdot ad$, where u'_h is a generator of I^{q-1} and $u'_h > B/(M_{q-1} \cdot ad) = M_1 \cdots M_{q-2} \cdot M_q$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q-1)}$. If u_h contains $f \succ ad$, then $u_h M_{q-1} > B$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q+1)}$ as claimed.

Suppose that $u_h = u'_h \cdot ad$ and $u'_h > M_1 \cdots M_{q-2} \cdot M_q = N$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q-1)}$. To proceed, without loss of generality, we may assume that the relative orders among the edges M_1, M_2 and M_q is $M_1 \succeq M_2 \succeq M_q$.

If $M_{q-1} \succeq M_1$ then $u'_h M_{q-1} > N \cdot M_{q-1}$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q)}$, and so $u_h M_{q-1} = u'_h M_{q-1} \cdot ad > N \cdot M_{q-1} \cdot ad = B$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q+1)}$ as asserted.

If $M_1 \succ M_{q-1} \succeq M_2$, then since $u'_h > N$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q-1)}$, either u'_h contains an edge $f' \succ M_1$ or $u'_h = M_1 \cdot u''_h$, where $u''_h > M_2 \cdots M_{q-2} \cdot M_q = N'$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q-2)}$. In the former case, when u'_h contains an edge $f' \succ M_1$, we have $u'_h M_{q-1} > N M_{q-1}$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q)}$, and so $u_h M_{q-1} = u'_h M_{q-1} \cdot ad > N M_{q-1} \cdot ad = B$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q+1)}$. In the latter scenario, when $u'_h = M_1 \cdot u''_h$ with $u''_h > N'$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q-2)}$, we have $u''_h M_{q-1} > N' M_{q-1}$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q-1)}$, and so $u''_h M_{q-1} M_1 > N' M_{q-1} M_1 = N M_{q-1}$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q)}$. It follows that $u_h M_{q-1} = u'_h \cdot M_{q-1} \cdot ad = u''_h \cdot M_1 \cdot M_{q-1} \cdot ad > N M_{q-1} \cdot ad = B$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q+1)}$ as desired.

If $M_1 \succeq M_2 \succ M_{q-1} \succeq M_q$, then since $u'_h > N$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q-1)}$, either u'_h contains an edge $f' \succ M_1$ or $u'_h = M_1 \cdot u''_h$ with $u''_h > N'$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q-2)}$. As before, if u'_h contains such an f' then the claim is proved. On the other hand, since $u''_h > N'$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q-2)}$, either u''_h contains an edge $f'' \succ M_2$ or $u''_h = M_2 \cdot u'''_h$ with $u'''_h > M_3 \cdots M_{q-2} \cdot M_q = N''$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q-3)}$. If such an edge f'' in u''_h exists, then for the same reason as with f' , we have $u''_h M_{q-1} > N' M_{q-1}$, and so $u'_h M_{q-1} = u''_h M_{q-1} M_1 > N' M_{q-1} M_1 = N M_{q-1}$, which implies that $u_h M_{q-1} = u'_h M_{q-1} \cdot ad > N M_{q-1} \cdot ad = B$, as asserted. If $u''_h = M_2 \cdot u'''_h$ with $u'''_h > N''$, then $u'''_h M_{q-1} > N'' M_{q-1}$, and so $u''_h M_{q-1} = u'''_h M_{q-1} M_2 > N'' M_{q-1} M_2 = N' M_{q-1}$. It follows that $u'_h M_{q-1} = u''_h M_{q-1} M_1 > N' M_{q-1} M_1 = N M_{q-1}$ and, therefore, $u_h M_{q-1} = u'_h M_{q-1} \cdot ad > N M_{q-1} \cdot ad = B$ as claimed.

Finally, consider the case that $M_q \succ M_{q-1}$. The argument goes similarly as in the previous cases, where we successively write $u_h = u'_h \cdot ad$, $u'_h = u''_h \cdot M_1$, $u''_h = u'''_h \cdot M_2$ and $u'''_h = u''''_h \cdot M_q$ with $u''''_h > M_3 \cdots M_{q-2}$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q-4)}$; note that $q-4 > 2$ since $q \geq 7$. The argument then completes by tracing back as seen before. The claim is established.

Case 2.2. Consider the case where there does not exist such $L_\theta \subseteq Z$. Since $L_{\gamma+1} \cdots L_q$ is contained in $M_{\gamma+1} \cdots M_{q-1} \cdot d \cdot e \cdot z_1 \cdots z_\gamma$, and $\deg(L_{\gamma+1} \cdots L_q) = \deg(M_{\gamma+1} \cdots M_{q-1}) + 2$, there must exist $\theta, \delta \in \{\gamma+1, \dots, q\}$ and $\sigma \in \{\gamma+1, \dots, q-1\}$ such that: $L_\theta \cap Z \neq \emptyset$, $L_\delta \cap Z \neq \emptyset$, and M_σ covers (consists of) two vertices, one from each of the edges L_θ and L_δ . For simplicity of notations, we shall assume that $\sigma = 3$.

Set $L_\theta = uv$ and $L_\delta = u'v'$, where, without loss of generality, $u, u' \in Z$, $v, v' \notin Z$, and $vv' = M_3$. We shall examine the following possibilities.

(a) $u, u' \in \{z_1, \dots, z_\gamma\}$; for instance, $u = z_1$ and $u' = z_2$. Set

$$u_g = (L_1 L_2 L_\theta L_\delta) \cdot (M_4 \cdots M_{q-2}) \cdot ab.$$

Then, $u_g > (M_1 \cdots M_{q-2}) \cdot M_q \cdot ad = B/M_{q-1}$ are generator of I^q . Also, $u_g : B/M_{q-1} = x_1 x_2 : de$ (which is necessarily not 1). Thus, there exists $u_h > B/M_{q-1}$ in $\mathcal{M}^{(q)}$ so that $u_h : B/M_{q-1}$ is a variable that divides $x_1 x_2$. By a similar argument as in the Claim, in which we consider the relative order of M_{q-1} compared to M_1, M_2, M_3 and M_q noting that $q - 5 \geq 2$ since $q \geq 7$, we see that $u_h M_{q-1} > B$. Also, $u_h M_{q-1} : B$ is a variable that divides Q as desired.

(b) $u \in \{z_1, \dots, z_\gamma\}$ and $u' \in \{d, e\}$; for instance, $u = z_1$ and $u' = e$. Set

$$C = (L_1 L_\theta L_\delta M_2) \cdot (M_4 \cdots M_{q-1}) \cdot (ab).$$

Then, $C > B$, and $C : B = x_1 : d$. Thus, either $B = C$ is redundant, or $C : B = x_1$, which divides Q . \square

The next two propositions show that linear quotients are implied from I^2 to I^3 , and from I^3 to I^4 .

Proposition 6.5. *Assume the same setting as in Theorem 6.4. Suppose that I^2 has linear quotients with an order $\mathcal{M}^{(2)}$ of its generators. Then, I^3 has linear quotients with the order $\mathcal{M}^{(3)}$, as constructed as in Definition 6.3, of its generators.*

Proof. We proceed in the same line of arguments as that of Theorem 6.4. We need to prove that $\mathcal{M}^{(3)}$ gives a linear quotient order for I^3 . Again, consider $A = u_i e_j$ and $B = u_k e_\ell$, where $e_i = ab \succ e_\ell = cd$, $u_i = L_1 L_2$, $u_k = M_1 M_2$, and $M_t \preceq cd$ for $t = 1, 2$. Case 1 follows in exactly the same way as that in Theorem 6.4.

In Case 2, if $\gamma < 2$ then Q is a variable and we can choose $C = A$. If $\gamma \geq 2$, then it forces $\gamma = q = 2$. That means

$$A = (x_1 y_1) \cdot (x_2 y_2) \cdot (ab)$$

$$B = (y_1 z_1) \cdot (be) \cdot (ad).$$

For $Q = x_1 x_2$, we must also have that y_2 is d or e . That means, either $x_2 d$ or $x_2 e$ is an edge in G . The same argument for this situation in Theorem 6.4 now applies to complete the proof. \square

Proposition 6.6. *Assume the same setting as in Theorem 6.4. Suppose that I^3 has linear quotients with the order $\mathcal{M}^{(3)}$ of its generators. Then, so does I^4 with the order $\mathcal{M}^{(4)}$ of its generators.*

Proof. Again, we follow the same line of arguments as in Theorem 6.4 and, at the same time, identify the differences or where arguments in Theorem 6.4 are not applicable.

Case 1 follows with exactly the same argument. In Case 2, as noted in Proposition 6.5, we may assume that $\gamma \geq 2$. That means, either $\gamma = 2$ or $\gamma = 3 = q$.

If $\gamma = 2$, then

$$\begin{aligned} A &= (x_1y_1) \cdot (x_2y_2) \cdot L_3 \cdot (ab) \\ B &= (y_1z_1) \cdot (y_2z_2) \cdot (be) \cdot (ad). \end{aligned}$$

Since $Q = x_1x_2$, this forces $L_3 \subseteq \{z_1, z_2, d, e\}$, in which case the same argument in Theorem 6.4 (when there exists θ such that $L_\theta \subseteq Z$) applies.

If $\gamma = 3$, then

$$\begin{aligned} A &= (x_1y_1) \cdot (x_2y_2) \cdot (x_3y_3) \cdot (ab) \\ B &= (y_1z_1) \cdot (y_2z_2) \cdot (be) \cdot (ad), \end{aligned}$$

Since $Q = x_1x_2x_3$, this implies that y_3 is either d or e . That is, either x_3d or x_3e is an edge in G . The same argument of Theorem 6.4 in this case also applies to complete the proof. \square

Remark 6.7. Our proof does not currently work to show that I^k has linear quotients implies I^{k+1} has linear quotients for $k = 4, 5, 6$ in general.

Remark 6.8. For relatively manageable graphs, the techniques from the proof of Theorem 6.4 can be used to show that I^k has linear quotients implies I^{k+1} has linear quotients for $k = 4, 5, 6$; for instance, if G is an *anticycle*, i.e., the complementary graph of a cycle. In particular, by exhibiting a specific linear quotients order for $I(G)^2$, when G is an anticycle, it follows that $I(G)^q$ has linear quotients for all $q \geq 2$. This is a main result of a recent preprint [5].

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research for this paper was initiated during the authors' stay at the American Institute of Mathematics (AIM), as part of the AIM SQuaRE program. We would like to thank AIM for the warm hospitality and providing a stimulating research environment. Faridi is supported by NSERC Discovery Grant 2023-05929. Hà is partially supported by a Simons Foundation grant. Kara is supported by NSF grant DMS-2418805.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Banerjee, The regularity of powers of edge ideals, *J. Algebraic Combinatorics* **41** (2015), 303–321.
- [2] A. Banerjee, S. Kara Beyarslan, and H.T. Hà, Regularity of powers of edge ideals: from local properties to global bounds, *Algebr. Comb.* **3** (2020), no. 4, 839–854.
- [3] A. Banerjee and E. Nevo, Regularity of edge ideals via suspension, *Algebr. Comb.* **6** (2023), no. 6, 1687–1695.
- [4] A. Banerjee and D. Yogeshwaran, Edge ideals of Erdős-Rényi random graphs: linear resolution, unmixedness and regularity, *J. Algebraic Combin.* **58** (2023), no. 4, 1125–1154.
- [5] E. Bassier, R. Diethorn, R. Miranda, and M. Stinson-Maas, Powers of Edge Ideals with Linear Quotients, Preprint (2024), [arXiv:2412.03468](https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.03468).

- [6] M. Bigdeli, Edge ideals with almost maximal finite index and their powers, *J. Algebraic Combin.* **54** (2021), 947–978.
- [7] A. Dochtermann and A. Newman, Random subcomplexes and Betti numbers of random edge ideals, *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* (2023), no. 10, 8832–8871.
- [8] A. Engström and M. Orlich, The regularity of almost all edge ideals, *Adv. Math.* **435** (2023), Paper No. 109355, 34 pp.
- [9] N. Erey, Powers of edge ideals with linear resolutions, *Comm. Algebra* **46** (2018), 4007–4020.
- [10] N. Erey, Powers of ideals associated to $(C_4, 2K_2)$ -free graphs, *J. Pure and Appl. Algebra* **223** (2019), 3071–3080.
- [11] C.A. Francisco, H.T. Hà, and A. Van Tuyl, Colorings of hypergraphs, perfect graphs, and associated primes of powers of monomial ideals, *J. Algebra* **331** (2011), 224–242.
- [12] R. Fröberg, On Stanley-Reisner rings. In *Topics in algebra, Part 2* (Warsaw, 1988), 57–70. Banach Center Publ., 26, Part 2 PWN-Polish Scientific Publishers, Warsaw, 1990
- [13] J. Herzog and T. Hibi, Monomial Ideals, GTM 260, Springer, 2011.
- [14] J. Herzog, T. Hibi and S. Zheng, Monomial ideals whose powers have a linear resolution, *Math. Scand.* **95** (2004), 23–32.
- [15] D.T. Hoang, H.D. Nguyen, and Q.H. Tran, Asymptotic regularity of invariant chains of edge ideals, *J. Algebraic Combin.* **59** (2024), no. 1, 55–94.
- [16] H.M. Lam, N.V. Trung, and T.N. Trung, A general formula for the index of depth stability of edge ideals, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **377** (2024), no. 12, 8633–8657.
- [17] N.C. Minh and T. Vu, Characterization of graphs whose a small power of their edge ideals has a linear free resolution, *Combinatorica* **44** (2024), no. 2, 337–353.
- [18] E. Nevo and I. Peeva, C_4 -free edge ideals, *J. Algebraic Combin.* **37** (2013), 243–248.
- [19] I. Peeva, Binomial edge ideals over an exterior algebra, *Math. Scand.* **129** (2023), no. 2, 161–188.
- [20] I. Peeva, Closed binomial edge ideals, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **803** (2023), 1–33.
- [21] S.A. Seyed Fakhari, Lower bounds for the depth of the second power of edge ideals, *Collect. Math.* **75** (2024), no. 2, 535–544.
- [22] S.A. Seyed Fakhari, On the Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity of squarefree powers of edge ideals, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **228** (2024), no. 3, Paper No. 107488, 12 pp.
- [23] R.H. Villarreal, A duality theorem for the ic-resurgence of edge ideals, *European J. Combin.* **109** (2023), Paper No. 103656, 18 pp.
- [24] R.H. Villarreal, Monomial algebras, Monogr. Textbooks Pure Appl. Math., 238 Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, 2001. x+455 pp.

(NURSEL EREY) GEBZE TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, 41400 GEBZE, KOCAELI, TURKEY

Email address: `nurselerey@gtu.edu.tr`

(SARA FARIDI) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS & STATISTICS, DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY, 6297 CAS-TINE WAY, PO BOX 15000, HALIFAX, NS, CANADA B3H 4R2

Email address: `faridi@dal.ca`

(TÀI HUY HÀ) MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, TULANE UNIVERSITY, 6823 ST. CHARLES AVENUE, NEW ORLEANS, LA 70118, USA

Email address: `tha@tulane.edu`

(TAKAYUKI HIBI) DEPARTMENT OF PURE AND APPLIED MATHEMATICS, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF INFORMATION SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, OSAKA UNIVERSITY, SUIITA, OSAKA 565-0871, JAPAN

Email address: hibi@math.sci.osaka-u.ac.jp

(SELVI KARA) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BRYN MAWR COLLEGE, BRYN MAWR, PA 19010, USA

Email address: skara@brynmawr.edu

(SUSAN MOREY) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY, 601 UNIVERSITY DR., SAN MARCOS, TX 78666, USA

Email address: morey@txstate.edu