

MINIMAL GENERATING SETS OF LATTICE IDEALS

HARA CHARALAMBOUS, APOSTOLOS THOMA, AND MARIUS VLADOIU

ABSTRACT. Let $L \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ be a lattice and $I_L = \langle x^{\mathbf{u}} - x^{\mathbf{v}} : \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v} \in L \rangle$ be the corresponding lattice ideal in $\mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, where \mathbb{k} is a field. In this paper we describe minimal binomial generating sets of I_L and their invariants. We use as a main tool a graph construction on equivalence classes of fibers of I_L . As one application of the theory developed we characterize binomial complete intersection lattice ideals, a longstanding open problem in the case of non-positive lattices.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $R = \mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ where \mathbb{k} is a field, and let L be a lattice in \mathbb{Z}^n . The lattice ideal I_L is the ideal:

$$I_L := \langle x^{\mathbf{u}} - x^{\mathbf{v}} : \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v} \in L \rangle.$$

Throughout this paper we call the set S a *minimal generating set* of I_L if S consists of binomials and is a minimal ¹ system of generators of I_L . If the minimal generating set S of I_L is of minimal cardinality, then we say that S is a *cardinality-minimal generating set* and we write $\mu(I_L)$ for $|S|$. ² Lattice ideals were first systematically studied in [13]. We note that toric ideals are lattice ideals I_L for which the lattice L is the kernel of an integer matrix. The study of lattice ideals is a rich subject on its own, see [24, 37] for the general theory and [23] for recent developments. Moreover lattice ideals have applications in various areas of mathematics, such as algebraic statistics [10, 29], integer programming [12], hypergeometric differential equations [11], graph theory [28], etc.

There are two types of lattices in \mathbb{Z}^n , the positive ones and the non-positive ones. We say that L is a *positive* lattice if $L \cap \mathbb{N}^n = \{\mathbf{0}\}$. Otherwise, we say that L is a *non-positive* lattice. Almost all results in the literature deal with positive lattices, with few exceptions like in [5, 13, 15, 17, 21, 22, 27]. We survey below several well known facts for positive lattices, as they pertain to our study. For the proofs we refer to [24] or [37] unless otherwise noted. Let L be a positive lattice. We let $\{\mathbf{e}_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ be the canonical basis of \mathbb{Z}^n and \mathcal{A} be the subsemigroup of \mathbb{Z}^n/L generated by the elements $\{\mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{e}_i + L : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. The semigroup \mathcal{A} is partially ordered:

$$\mathbf{c} \geq \mathbf{d} \iff \text{there is } \mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{A} \text{ such that } \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{d} + \mathbf{e}.$$

For $x^{\mathbf{v}} = x_1^{v_1} \cdots x_n^{v_n}$ we set

$$\deg_{\mathcal{A}}(x^{\mathbf{v}}) := v_1 \mathbf{a}_1 + \cdots + v_n \mathbf{a}_n \in \mathcal{A}.$$

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05E40, 13C40, 14M25, 60J10.

Key words and phrases. Binomial ideals, Markov basis, lattices.

¹The notion of Markov basis was introduced in [10] to denote a generating binomial set of I_L , see [10, Theorem 3.1]. Occasionally in the literature, especially in algebraic statistics, the minimal generating sets are also referred to as minimal Markov bases.

²Even though for positive lattices the notions of minimal generating sets and cardinality-minimal generating sets coincide, this is not true for non-positive lattices.

It follows that I_L is \mathcal{A} -graded and that

$$I_L = \langle x^{\mathbf{u}} - x^{\mathbf{v}} : \deg_{\mathcal{A}}(x^{\mathbf{u}}) = \deg_{\mathcal{A}}(x^{\mathbf{v}}) \rangle .$$

For $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^n$, the I_L -fiber $F_{\mathbf{u}}$ is the set

$$F_{\mathbf{u}} := \{x^{\mathbf{v}} : x^{\mathbf{v}} - x^{\mathbf{u}} \in I_L\} = \{x^{\mathbf{v}} : \deg_{\mathcal{A}}(x^{\mathbf{v}}) = \deg_{\mathcal{A}}(x^{\mathbf{u}})\} .$$

$F_{\mathbf{u}}$ is a finite set for all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^n$. The homogeneous Nakayama Lemma applies and thus all minimal generating sets of I_L have the same cardinality and are cardinality-minimal generating sets. Let S be a minimal generating set of I_L and consider the multiset of the fibers $F_{\mathbf{u}}$, where $x^{\mathbf{u}}$ is a monomial term of a binomial in S . By the results of [4] this multiset is an invariant of I_L . Lastly we note that the union³ of all minimal generating sets of I_L is a finite set, since all minimal generating sets are subsets of a finite set, the Graver basis of I_L , see [37].

How do these facts translate to non-positive lattices? Suppose that L is a non-positive lattice and let A be (as before) the semigroup of \mathbb{Z}^n/L generated by the elements $\{\mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{e}_i + L : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. The ideal I_L is generated by the binomials $x^{\mathbf{u}} - x^{\mathbf{v}}$, with $\deg_{\mathcal{A}}(x^{\mathbf{u}}) = \deg_{\mathcal{A}}(x^{\mathbf{v}})$ and the I_L -fibers are defined in the same way as in the positive case. However, the semigroup \mathcal{A} is no longer partially ordered and the I_L -fibers are no longer finite. There are minimal generating sets which are not cardinality-minimal generating sets. In the nonprincipal case, the multiset of the I_L -fibers that correspond to a given cardinality-minimal generating set is not an invariant of I_L and the union of all cardinality-minimal generating sets of I_L is an infinite set.

Consider, for example, the non-positive lattice L of \mathbb{Z}^2 generated by $(1, 1), (5, 0)$. The ideal I_L is not principal and the sets $\{1 - xy, 1 - x^5\}$, $\{1 - xy, x^3 - y^2\}$ are examples of cardinality-minimal generating sets of I_L . Thus $\mu(I_L) = 2$. However $\{1 - x^2y^2, 1 - x^3y^3, 1 - x^5\}$ is also a minimal generating set of I_L and in fact I_L has a minimal generating set⁴ of cardinality k , $\forall k \geq 2$.⁵ The I_L -fibers that contain 1 and x^3 are distinct and thus the multiset of the fibers for the above cardinality-minimal generating sets of I_L are also distinct, see Example 3.6(b) for a precise description of the I_L -fibers.

The main purpose of this paper is to determine the invariants of the minimal generating sets of I_L , for any lattice $L \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$, and to show how to compute cardinality-minimal generating sets of I_L . To do so, we consider an equivalence relation among the I_L -fibers and order the equivalence classes. We appropriately choose the binomial generators that correspond to the smallest possible equivalence class. Then we apply a graph construction to the equivalence classes and determine trees on these graphs in order to identify the binomials that could be part of a minimal generating set. In the process we identify the invariants of the cardinality-minimal generating sets of I_L . As an application of the theory developed we characterize all binomial complete intersection lattice ideals, a longstanding open problem. In more detail, the structure and the main results of this paper are as follows.

In Section 2 we introduce and study the sublattice L_{pure} of L . This is the sublattice of L generated by $L \cap \mathbb{N}^n$ and in essence it measures the deviation of L from being positive.

³The union of all minimal generating sets of I_L is called the universal Markov basis of I_L , following [19, Definition 3.1].

⁴Let p_1, \dots, p_s be s distinct primes and let $a_i = (p_1 \cdots p_s)/p_i$. Then $\langle 1 - (xy)^{a_1}, \dots, 1 - (xy)^{a_s} \rangle = \langle 1 - xy \rangle$ and $\{1 - x^5, 1 - (xy)^{a_1}, \dots, 1 - (xy)^{a_s}\}$ is a minimal generating set of I_L of cardinality $s + 1$.

⁵There are cardinality-minimal generating sets that are not contained in the Graver basis of I_L , as is the case for $\{1 - x^{2012}y^{2017}, y^4 - x^{2013}y^{2022}\}$. The union of the cardinality-minimal generating sets of I_L is an infinite set.

For example, the fibers of I_L are finite if and only if L_{pure} is the zero lattice. The support σ of L_{pure} is crucial to our study. Here σ is a subset of $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $i \in \sigma$ if and only if there is a $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_n) \in L_{\text{pure}}$ so that $u_i \neq 0$. In Corollary 2.14 we show that a basis of L_{pure} can be chosen so that its elements are in \mathbb{N}^n and have full support σ . This will be needed in Section 4 when computing a basis of $I_{L_{\text{pure}}}$.

In Section 3 we define an equivalence relation among the I_L -fibers. According to Definition 3.2, two I_L -fibers F, G are equivalent if there exist $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^n$ such that $x^{\mathbf{u}}F \subset G$ and $x^{\mathbf{v}}G \subset F$. It is essential in our study that the cardinality of the equivalence classes of the I_L -fibers is a constant determined by σ , as Proposition 3.5 and Lemma 3.3 show. Next we introduce a partial order “ \leq_{I_L} ” on the equivalence classes. This order is compatible with the \mathcal{A} -order in the case of a positive lattice L , and the set of equivalence classes has a smallest element, namely the equivalence class of the fiber that contains 1. In Theorem 3.8 we show that any strictly descending chain of equivalence classes terminates, thus allowing inductive arguments to work. Among all I_L -fibers, we are primarily interested in those whose equivalence classes correspond to elements participating in a cardinality-minimal generating set of I_L . These are called Markov fibers, see Definition 3.9, and in Corollary 3.14 we show that the set of these equivalence classes is an invariant of I_L .

Section 4 is the core of this paper. Its main objective is the characterization of all cardinality-minimal generating sets of I_L . First we attack the case when $L = L_{\text{pure}}$: note that in this case we know that I_L is a binomial complete intersection, see [13, Theorem 2.1]. In the first main result of this section, Theorem 4.1, we describe all cardinality-minimal generating sets of I_L . We remark that if L is not cyclic, then there are infinitely many such bases. Next we make the transition to the general non-positive lattices by taking a closer look to the equivalence classes not containing the fiber of 1. If \overline{F} is such an equivalence class, Definition 4.10 constructs a graph $\Gamma_{\overline{F}}$: the edges of $\Gamma_{\overline{F}}$ determine binomials that belong to minimal generating sets of I_L . We reach the main result of this section in Theorem 4.12 which describes all cardinality-minimal generating sets of I_L , for L an arbitrary lattice. We note that when L is positive, the description specializes to the results of [4], see Remark 4.13 for more details. As a consequence of our main theorem we can compute $\mu(I_L)$. This computation is the point of Theorem 4.14. Next we refine the conclusion of Corollary 3.14 about the invariants of I_L . Let S be a cardinality-minimal generating set of I_L . We show that the multiset, consisting of the equivalence classes of the Markov fibers determined by S , is an invariant of all cardinality-minimal generating sets of I_L , see Corollary 4.15. This is the best result one can expect, as the example of $L = \langle (1, 1), (0, 5) \rangle$ points out. Finally, in Corollary 4.16 we give an invariant of all minimal generating sets of I_L . They all determine the same multiset of equivalence classes of fibers away from the fiber of 1. In the last part of Section 4 we discuss the indispensable binomials and monomials of I_L and show that in the general case of non-positive lattices, the union of the cardinality-minimal generating sets of I_L is an infinite set.

In Section 5 we determine the lattices L for which I_L is a binomial complete intersection ideal, see the beginning of the section for a short history pertaining to the case of positive lattices. We note that this problem was completely solved for positive lattices, see [25, Theorem 3.9]. We refer to [25] for a more comprehensive description of the problem. Even though for positive lattices, the class of complete intersection ideals is the same as the class of complete intersection binomial ideals, this is an open problem for non-positive lattices. In Theorem 5.5 we show that I_L is a binomial complete intersection ideal if and only if I_{L^σ} is a complete intersection ideal, where L^σ is the lattice in the complement of σ . In Corollary 5.6 we show that a necessary and sufficient condition for I_L to be a binomial

complete intersection ideal, is either for L to be equal to L_{pure} or for a basis of L^σ to have vectors giving the rows of a mixed dominating matrix. Thus Corollary 5.6 completely characterizes binomial complete intersection lattice ideals for arbitrary lattices.

In Section 6 we work in detail an example: we use the techniques developed in this paper, in order to compute all cardinality-minimal generating sets of a lattice ideal.

2. FIBERS, THE PURE SUBLATTICE AND BASES OF A LATTICE

Let L be a lattice in \mathbb{Z}^n , $R = \mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be the polynomial ring over a field \mathbb{k} and $I_L \subseteq R$ be the lattice ideal:

$$I_L = \langle x^{\mathbf{u}} - x^{\mathbf{v}} : \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^n, \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v} \in L \rangle.$$

Definition 2.1. We let $\mu(I_L)$ be the minimal cardinality of a minimal generating set of I_L . In other words, $\mu(I_L)$ is the cardinal of a cardinality-minimal generating set of I_L .

We denote by \mathbb{T}^n the set of monomials of R including $1 = x^{\mathbf{0}}$ and by \mathbb{N} the set $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. If J is a monomial ideal of R we denote by $G(J)$ the unique minimal set of monomial generators of J . For $r \in \mathbb{N}$ we let $[r] = \{1, \dots, r\}$. Let $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$, $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. We write $\mathbf{a} \geq \mathbf{0}$ if $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{N}^n$. If either $\mathbf{a} \geq \mathbf{0}$ or $-\mathbf{a} \geq \mathbf{0}$ we say that \mathbf{a} is *pure*. With this terminology, a lattice L is non-positive if and only if it contains a nonzero pure vector, otherwise it is positive. We write $\mathbf{a} \geq \mathbf{b}$ if $a_i \geq b_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, and we say that \mathbf{a} , \mathbf{b} are incomparable if $\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}$ is not pure. In general we let $\text{supp}(\mathbf{a}) = \{i : a_i \neq 0\} \subset [n]$. For any subset X of \mathbb{Z}^n we let

$$\text{supp}(X) := \bigcup_{w \in X} \text{supp}(w).$$

Definition 2.2. We say that $F \subset \mathbb{T}^n$ is an I_L -*fiber* if there exists $x^{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathbb{T}^n$ such that $F = \{x^{\mathbf{v}} \in \mathbb{T}^n : \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u} \in L\}$. If $x^{\mathbf{u}} \in F$, and F is an I_L -fiber we write $F_{\mathbf{u}}$ or $F_{x^{\mathbf{u}}}$ for F . If $B \in I_L$ and $B = x^{\mathbf{u}} - x^{\mathbf{v}}$ we write F_B for $F_{\mathbf{u}}$. When F is an I_L -fiber we let $M_F = \langle x^{\mathbf{u}} : x^{\mathbf{u}} \in F \rangle$ be the monomial ideal generated by the elements of F .

From the properties of the lattice and the definition of lattice ideals we get the following:

Proposition 2.3. *If $x^{\mathbf{v}} \in F_{\mathbf{u}}$ then $F_{\mathbf{u}} = F_{\mathbf{v}}$. Moreover $F_{\mathbf{u}} = \{x^{\mathbf{v}} : x^{\mathbf{v}} - x^{\mathbf{u}} \in I_L\}$. If $x^{\mathbf{u}} - x^{\mathbf{v}} \in I_L$ then $\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v} \in L$.*

We remark that $F_{\mathbf{u}}$ is a singleton if and only if there is no binomial $0 \neq B \in I_L$ such that $F_B = F_{\mathbf{u}}$. We note that $F \subset M_F$ and $G(M_F) \subset F$. The following proposition follows also from [24, Theorem 8.6].

Proposition 2.4. *Let $L \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ be a lattice. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *The lattice L is non-positive.*
- (2) *All I_L -fibers are infinite.*
- (3) *There exists an I_L -fiber which is infinite.*

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) : Let F be an I_L -fiber and suppose that $\mathbf{0} \neq \mathbf{u} \in L \cap \mathbb{N}^n$. It is easy to see that if $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^n$ and F is the I_L -fiber such that $x^{\mathbf{v}} \in F$, then $x^{\mathbf{v}+l\mathbf{u}} \in F$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus F is infinite. Implication (2) \Rightarrow (3) is obvious. For (3) \Rightarrow (1) suppose that an I_L -fiber F is infinite. Let $x^{\mathbf{v}} \in F$ be such that $x^{\mathbf{v}} \notin G(M_F)$. Note that since F is infinite such a \mathbf{v} exists. Since $x^{\mathbf{v}} \in M_F$, there exists a monomial $x^{\mathbf{u}} \in G(M_F)$ such that $x^{\mathbf{u}} | x^{\mathbf{v}}$ and thus $x^{\mathbf{v}} = x^{\mathbf{w}} x^{\mathbf{u}}$ for $\mathbf{0} \neq \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}^n$. Since $x^{\mathbf{v}}, x^{\mathbf{u}} \in F$ it follows that $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u} \in L$. Therefore $\mathbf{0} \neq \mathbf{w} \in L \cap \mathbb{N}^n$ and consequently L is non-positive. \square

Corollary 2.5. *Let $L \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ be a lattice. The lattice L is positive if and only if $G(M_F) = F$, where F is any I_L -fiber.*

Proof. Suppose that $L \cap \mathbb{N}^n = \{\mathbf{0}\}$. Since $M_F = \langle F \rangle$ to prove that $G(M_F) = F$, it is enough to show that if $x^{\mathbf{a}} \neq x^{\mathbf{b}} \in F$ then \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} are incomparable. Suppose otherwise. Then $\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b} \in L$ is pure, a contradiction. For the other direction suppose that $G(M_F) = F$. Thus F is finite and the conclusion follows from Proposition 2.4. \square

In the following definition we introduce the induced lattices that appear in our work and the related notation.

Definition 2.6. We let $L^+ = L \cap \mathbb{N}^n$, $\sigma = \text{supp}(L^+)$ and L_{pure} be the subgroup of L generated by L^+ . If $\mathbf{u} = (u_i) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $\sigma = [n]$, then we set $\mathbf{u}^{[n]} = 0$. Otherwise we let \mathbf{u}^σ be the vector $(u_i)_{i \notin \sigma}$. We define L^σ to be the lattice generated by the vectors \mathbf{u}^σ where $\mathbf{u} \in L$. Finally, if $\sigma \neq \emptyset$, we let $\mathbf{u}_\sigma = (u_i)_{i \in \sigma}$ and $(L_{\text{pure}})_\sigma$ to be the lattice generated by the vectors \mathbf{u}_σ , $\mathbf{u} \in L_{\text{pure}}$. If $\mathbf{u} = (u_i) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $\sigma = \emptyset$, then we set $\mathbf{u}_\emptyset = 0$.

In the course of the proof of Proposition 2.4 we proved the following:

Proposition 2.7. *Let $L \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ be a lattice and let F be an I_L -fiber. If $G(M_F) = \{x^{\mathbf{a}_1}, \dots, x^{\mathbf{a}_s}\}$ then*

$$F = \bigcup_{i=1}^s \{x^{\mathbf{a}_i} x^{\mathbf{w}} : \mathbf{w} \in L^+\} .$$

The next proposition considers the support of the elements of L that belong to L_{pure} .

Proposition 2.8. *There exists an element \mathbf{w} in L^+ such that $\text{supp}(\mathbf{w}) = \sigma$. For $\mathbf{u} \in L$ we have that $\text{supp}(\mathbf{u}) \subset \sigma$ if and only if $\mathbf{u} \in L_{\text{pure}}$.*

Proof. The existence of \mathbf{w} follows from the observation that if $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2 \in L^+$ then $\mathbf{w}_1 + \mathbf{w}_2 \in L^+$ and $\text{supp}(\mathbf{w}_1) \cup \text{supp}(\mathbf{w}_2) = \text{supp}(\mathbf{w}_1 + \mathbf{w}_2)$.

Suppose now that $\mathbf{u} \in L$ and $\text{supp}(\mathbf{u}) \subset \sigma$. Let $\mathbf{w} \in L^+$ be such that $\text{supp}(\mathbf{w}) = \sigma$. It is clear that for $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $l \gg 0$, $\mathbf{u} + l\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}' \in \mathbb{N}^n$. Since $\mathbf{u}, l\mathbf{w} \in L$ it follows that $\mathbf{w}' \in L$ and thus $\mathbf{w}' \in L^+$. Therefore $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{w}' - l\mathbf{w} \in L_{\text{pure}}$. \square

The following is an immediate consequence of Proposition 2.8.

Corollary 2.9. *Let $L \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ be a lattice and $\mathbf{u} \in L$. Then $\mathbf{u} \in L_{\text{pure}}$ if and only if $\mathbf{u}^\sigma = \mathbf{0}$.*

We note that since L_{pure} is generated by the elements of L^+ it is clear that

$$\text{supp}(L_{\text{pure}}) = \sigma .$$

Definition 2.10. A nonzero vector $\mathbf{u} \in L$ is called L -primitive if whenever $\lambda\mathbf{u} \in L$ where $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}$ then $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$. In other words, \mathbf{u} is L -primitive if and only if $\mathbb{Q}\mathbf{u} \cap L = \mathbb{Z}\mathbf{u}$.

Equivalently \mathbf{u} is L -primitive if it is the “smallest” element of L in the direction determined by \mathbf{u} .

Proposition 2.11. *Let $\mathbf{0} \neq \mathbf{v} \in L$. There is an L -primitive vector $\mathbf{u} \in L$ such that $\mathbf{v} = \lambda\mathbf{u}$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

Proof. Since $\mathbf{v} \in L \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ it follows that $\mathbb{Q}\mathbf{v} \cap L$ is a nonzero subgroup of L . Hence $\mathbb{Q}\mathbf{v} \cap L$ is a free abelian group of rank 1, whose generator is the desired \mathbf{u} . \square

Consider now any basis of L as a \mathbb{Z} -module. The next theorem states that the elements of such a basis are necessarily L -primitive.

Theorem 2.12. *Let $L \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ be a lattice and let \mathbf{B} be a basis of L as a \mathbb{Z} -module. The elements of \mathbf{B} are L -primitive.*

Proof. Since L is a sublattice of \mathbb{Z}^n , there exists an $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $L \cong \mathbb{Z}^r$, $r = \text{rank}(L)$. Let $\mathbf{B} = \{\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_r\}$. Since \mathbf{B} is a basis then it follows immediately that $\mathbb{Q}\mathbf{u}_i \cap L = \mathbb{Z}\mathbf{u}_i$ for all i . \square

The next theorem shows that given an L -primitive vector, one can find a basis of L that contains it.

Theorem 2.13. *Let L be a lattice and \mathbf{u} an L -primitive vector. There exists a basis \mathbf{B} of L such that $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}$.*

Proof. Since L is a lattice then $L/\mathbb{Z}\mathbf{u}$ is a finitely generated abelian group. If $L/\mathbb{Z}\mathbf{u}$ is not torsion-free then there exists a $\mathbf{v} \in L \setminus \mathbb{Z}\mathbf{u}$ such that $\lambda\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}\mathbf{u}$ for some positive integer $\lambda > 1$. This implies that $\mathbb{Q}\mathbf{u} \cap L \supsetneq \mathbb{Z}\mathbf{u}$, a contradiction to the fact that \mathbf{u} is L -primitive. Thus $L/\mathbb{Z}\mathbf{u}$ is torsion-free and consequently a free abelian group of rank equal to $\text{rank}(L) - 1$. Now lifting the elements of any basis of $L/\mathbb{Z}\mathbf{u}$ to elements of L and adding \mathbf{u} we obtain a basis of L . \square

As the next corollary shows, we can find bases of L_{pure} whose elements are in \mathbb{N}^n having full support σ .

Corollary 2.14. *Let L be a non-positive lattice. There exists a basis of L_{pure} whose elements are in L^+ and have support equal to σ .*

Proof. By Proposition 2.8 and Proposition 2.11 there is an L -primitive vector $\mathbf{u}_1 \in L^+$ such that $\text{supp}(\mathbf{u}_1) = \sigma$. By Theorem 2.13 there exists a basis $\{\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_r\}$ of L_{pure} . It is clear that for $l \gg 0$, $\mathbf{u}'_i = \mathbf{u}_i + l\mathbf{u}_1 \in L^+$ for $i = 2, \dots, r$. The set $\{\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}'_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}'_r\}$ has the desired properties. \square

Bases of the lattice L are clearly important for the study of I_L , even though they do not directly give the elements of the minimal generating sets of I_L . Indeed, it is well known that the following holds:

$$I_L = (x^{\mathbf{u}_1^+} - x^{\mathbf{u}_1^-}, \dots, x^{\mathbf{u}_r^+} - x^{\mathbf{u}_r^-}) : (x_1 \cdots x_n)^\infty,$$

where $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_r$ form a basis of L and $\mathbf{u}_i^+, \mathbf{u}_i^- \in \mathbb{N}^n$ are (for all i) the unique vectors of disjoint support, such that $\mathbf{u}_i = \mathbf{u}_i^+ - \mathbf{u}_i^-$, see [37, Lemma 12.2].

In the next two sections we describe all minimal generating sets of lattice ideals using properties of the I_L -fibers and of the bases of L_{pure} .

3. FIBERS AND MINIMAL GENERATING SETS OF LATTICE IDEALS

Let $L \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ be a lattice and $R = \mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, where \mathbb{k} is a field. If $G \subset \mathbb{T}^n$ and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^n$ we let $x^\mathbf{v}G := \{x^\mathbf{v}x^\mathbf{u} : x^\mathbf{u} \in G\}$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let G, F be I_L -fibers. If there exists $\mathbf{w}_1 \in \mathbb{N}^n$, $x^\mathbf{u} \in G$ such that $x^{\mathbf{w}_1}x^\mathbf{u} \in F$ then $x^{\mathbf{w}_1}G \subset F$. Moreover if $x^{\mathbf{w}_2}F \subset G$ for $\mathbf{w}_2 \in \mathbb{N}^n$ then $\mathbf{w}_1 + \mathbf{w}_2 \in L^+$ and $\text{supp}(\mathbf{w}_i) \subset \sigma$, $i = 1, 2$.*

Proof. Suppose that $x^{\mathbf{w}_1}x^\mathbf{u} = x^\mathbf{v} \in F$ and let $x^{\mathbf{u}'}$ be in G . Since $\mathbf{u}' - \mathbf{u} \in L$ it follows that $(\mathbf{w}_1 + \mathbf{u}') - \mathbf{v} \in L$ and thus $x^{\mathbf{w}_1 + \mathbf{u}'} \in F$.

If in addition $x^{\mathbf{w}_2}F \subset G$ it follows that $x^{\mathbf{w}_1 + \mathbf{w}_2}F \subset F$. Since $x^{\mathbf{w}_1 + \mathbf{w}_2}x^\mathbf{v}$, $x^\mathbf{v} \in F$ it follows that $\mathbf{w}_1 + \mathbf{w}_2 \in L \cap \mathbb{N}^n$. \square

Definition 3.2. Let F, G be I_L -fibers. We say that $F \equiv_{I_L} G$ if there exist $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^n$ such that $x^{\mathbf{u}}F \subset G$ and $x^{\mathbf{v}}G \subset F$.

It is immediate that $F \equiv_{I_L} G$ is an equivalence relation among the I_L -fibers. We denote the equivalence class of F by \overline{F} . Thus

$$\overline{F} = \{G : G \text{ is an } I_L \text{-fiber, } G \equiv_{I_L} F\}.$$

We note that $F \equiv_{I_L} G$ implies that the cardinality of F is equal to the cardinality of G .

Lemma 3.3. *If L is positive and F is an I_L -fiber then $\overline{F} = \{F\}$.*

Proof. By Proposition 2.4, $|F| < \infty$. Let G be an I_L -fiber, $G \equiv_{I_L} F$. There are $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^n$ such that $x^{\mathbf{u}}F \subset G$ and $x^{\mathbf{v}}G \subset F$. Since $|F| = |x^{\mathbf{u}}F| = |G| = |x^{\mathbf{v}}G|$ it follows that $x^{\mathbf{v}}x^{\mathbf{u}}F = F$ and $x^{\mathbf{v}} = x^{\mathbf{u}} = 1$. \square

Next we want to investigate the number of equivalent fibers inside each equivalence class when $L_{\text{pure}} \neq \{\mathbf{0}\}$ and $\sigma \neq \emptyset$. First we note the following:

Lemma 3.4. Let $\sigma \neq \emptyset$, F an I_L -fiber and $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^n$ such that $\text{supp}(\mathbf{u}) \subset \sigma$. If G is an I_L -fiber with the property $x^{\mathbf{u}}F \subset G$ then $G \in \overline{F}$.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{w} \in L^+$ be such that $\text{supp}(\mathbf{w}) = \sigma$. There exists $l \gg 0$ such that $l\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^n$. Since $l\mathbf{w} \in L$ it follows that $x^{l\mathbf{w}}F \subset F$. Let $x^{\mathbf{v}} \in G$ such that $x^{\mathbf{v}} = x^{\mathbf{u}}x^{\mathbf{p}}$ for $x^{\mathbf{p}} \in F$. It follows that $x^{l\mathbf{w}-\mathbf{u}}x^{\mathbf{v}} = x^{l\mathbf{w}}x^{\mathbf{p}} \in F$ and thus $x^{l\mathbf{w}-\mathbf{u}}G \subset F$ by Lemma 3.1. \square

We recall that if $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, then $\mathbf{u}_\sigma = (u_i)_{i \in \sigma}$. Thus, if $s = |\sigma|$, then we can assume that $\mathbf{u}_\sigma \in \mathbb{Z}^s$ and that $(L_{\text{pure}})_\sigma$ is a sublattice of \mathbb{Z}^s .

Proposition 3.5. *Let L be a non-positive lattice and F an I_L -fiber. The cardinality of \overline{F} is equal to $|\mathbb{Z}^s / (L_{\text{pure}})_\sigma|$, where $s = |\sigma|$.*

Proof. For every $G \in \overline{F}$ choose $\mathbf{u}_G \in \mathbb{N}^n$ such that $x^{\mathbf{u}_G}F \subset G$. Let

$$\phi : \overline{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^s / (L_{\text{pure}})_\sigma, \quad \phi(G) = (\mathbf{u}_G)_\sigma + (L_{\text{pure}})_\sigma.$$

The definition of ϕ is independent of the choice of \mathbf{u}_G . Indeed suppose that $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^n$ are such that $x^{\mathbf{u}}F \subset G$ and $x^{\mathbf{v}}F \subset G$. This implies that $\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v} \in L$. By Lemma 3.1 it follows that $\mathbf{u}^\sigma = \mathbf{v}^\sigma = \mathbf{0}$ and by Proposition 2.8 we obtain $\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v} \in L_{\text{pure}}$ and $\mathbf{u}_\sigma - \mathbf{v}_\sigma \in (L_{\text{pure}})_\sigma$.

We will show that ϕ is a bijection: the only part needing proof is the surjectivity of ϕ . Let $\mathbf{u}' + (L_{\text{pure}})_\sigma$ be an element of $\mathbb{Z}^s / (L_{\text{pure}})_\sigma$. First we remark that we can assume without loss of generality that $\mathbf{u}' \in \mathbb{N}^s$. Indeed, let $\mathbf{w} \in L^+$ be such that $|\text{supp}(\mathbf{w}_\sigma)| = s$. It is clear that for $l \gg 0$, $l\mathbf{w}_\sigma + \mathbf{u}' \in \mathbb{N}^s$ and thus $\mathbf{u}' + (L_{\text{pure}})_\sigma = (l\mathbf{w} + \mathbf{u}') + (L_{\text{pure}})_\sigma$. Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^n$ be such that $\mathbf{u}^\sigma = \mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{u}_\sigma = \mathbf{u}'$ and let G be the I_L -fiber such that $x^{\mathbf{u}}F \subset G$. By Remark 3.4 it follows that $G \in \overline{F}$, and thus $\phi(G) = \mathbf{u}' + (L_{\text{pure}})_\sigma$. \square

Examples 3.6. (a) We consider the lattice ideal $I_L = \langle 1 - xy \rangle \subset \mathbb{k}[x, y]$ where $L = \langle (1, 1) \rangle \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$. There are infinitely many I_L -fibers: for any $c \in \mathbb{Z}$ the set $F_c = \{x^i y^j : i - j = c\}$ is an I_L -fiber. All I_L -fibers are infinite and belong to the same equivalence class: the cardinality of this equivalence class is $|\mathbb{Z}|$. Indeed $L_{\text{pure}} = L$, and $\mathbb{Z}^2 / L \cong \mathbb{Z}$.

(b) If we consider the lattice ideal $I_L = \langle 1 - xy, 1 - x^5 \rangle \subset \mathbb{k}[x, y]$, where $L = \langle (1, 1), (5, 0) \rangle \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ then there are exactly five infinite I_L -fibers:

$$F_k = \{x^i y^j : i - j \equiv k \pmod{5}\}, \quad 0 \leq k \leq 4,$$

which are all equivalent. Hence we have only one equivalence class $\overline{F_0} = \{F_0, \dots, F_4\}$ which has five equivalent fibers. Indeed $L_{\text{pure}} = L$ and $\mathbb{Z}^2 / L \cong \mathbb{Z}_5$.

We define the relation “ \leq_{I_L} ” among the equivalence classes of I_L -fibers.

Definition 3.7. Let F, G be I_L -fibers. We say that $\overline{F} \leq_{I_L} \overline{G}$ if there exists $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^n$ such that $x^{\mathbf{u}}F \subset G$.

It is immediate that “ \leq_{I_L} ” is well defined and is a partial order among the equivalence classes of I_L -fibers. For simplicity of notation we occasionally write $F \leq_{I_L} G$ if $\overline{F} \leq_{I_L} \overline{G}$ and $F <_{I_L} G$ if $\overline{F} \leq_{I_L} \overline{G}$ and $\overline{F} \neq \overline{G}$. We note that $F_{\{1\}} \leq_{I_L} F$ for any I_L -fiber F . We also remark that if L is positive then $<_{I_L}$ gives the ordering on the fibers of I_L induced by the \mathbb{Z}^n/L -degrees, see [4, Section 2].

Theorem 3.8. *Any strictly descending chain of equivalence classes of I_L -fibers is finite.*

Proof. Assume that

$$\overline{F}_1 >_{I_L} \cdots >_{I_L} \overline{F}_k >_{I_L} \overline{F}_{k+1} >_{I_L} \cdots$$

is a chain of equivalence classes of fibers with no least element. Choose a representative F_i , $i \in \mathbb{N}$ for each class. Next consider the corresponding ascending chain of monomial ideals:

$$M_{F_1} \subset \cdots \subset M_{F_1} + \cdots + M_{F_k} \subset M_{F_1} + \cdots + M_{F_{k+1}} \subset \cdots$$

The chain stabilizes at some step, say s , so that

$$M_{F_1} + \cdots + M_{F_s} = M_{F_1} + \cdots + M_{F_{s+1}}.$$

Let $x^{\mathbf{a}} \in G(M_{F_{s+1}})$. By the above equality it follows that $x^{\mathbf{a}} \in M_{F_i}$ for some $1 \leq i < s+1$ and $x^{\mathbf{a}} = x^{\mathbf{u}}x^{\mathbf{b}}$ where $x^{\mathbf{b}} \in G(M_{F_i})$. Since $x^{\mathbf{u}}x^{\mathbf{b}} \in F_{s+1}$ it follows that $x^{\mathbf{u}}F_i \subset F_{s+1}$. This leads to a contradiction since $\overline{F}_{s+1} <_{I_L} \overline{F}_i$. \square

Definition 3.9. Let F be an I_L -fiber. We say that F is a *Markov fiber* if there exists a cardinality-minimal generating set S of I_L such that $\overline{F} = \overline{F}_B$ for some B in S .

Next, we generalize the constructions of [4, Section 2] to arbitrary lattice ideals. Let F be an I_L -fiber. We let

$$I_{L, < \overline{F}} = \langle B \in I_L : B \text{ binomial, } \overline{F}_B <_{I_L} \overline{F} \rangle$$

and

$$I_{L, \leq \overline{F}} = \langle B \in I_L : B \text{ binomial, } \overline{F}_B \leq_{I_L} \overline{F} \rangle.$$

We note that $I_{L, < \overline{F}} = 0$ if there is no I_L -fiber G such that $\overline{G} <_{I_L} \overline{F}$. It is clear that the definition of these ideals does not depend on the chosen fiber representative. Finally if S is any subset of binomials of I_L we let

$$S_{\overline{F}} = \{B \in S : \overline{F}_B \leq_{I_L} \overline{F}\}.$$

Remark 3.10. We will pay extra attention to the fiber that contains 1, $F_{\{1\}}$. Let S be a set of binomials of I_L . According to the definitions

$$S_{\overline{F}_{\{1\}}} = \{B \in S : F_B \in \overline{F}_{\{1\}}\} \text{ and } I_{L, \text{pure}} = I_{L, \leq \overline{F}_{\{1\}}}.$$

We isolate the following proposition whose proof is within the proof of [17, Lemma A.1].

Proposition 3.11. *Let S be a minimal generating set of I_L , F an I_L -fiber, $x^{\mathbf{w}_1}, x^{\mathbf{w}_2} \in F$. There exists a subset $T \subset S_{\overline{F}}$ such that*

$$x^{\mathbf{w}_1} - x^{\mathbf{w}_2} = \sum_{i,B} \pm x^{\mathbf{a}_{i,B}} B,$$

where $B \in T$, $\mathbf{a}_{i,B} \in \mathbb{N}^n$ and $\mathbf{a}_{i,B} \neq \mathbf{a}_{j,B}$ for $i \neq j$.

We note that in the summation, the binomials $B \in T$ may appear more than once. The emphasis of the above statement is that when summing up and factoring out the binomials $B \in T$, we get an expression

$$x^{\mathbf{w}_1} - x^{\mathbf{w}_2} = \sum f_i B_i$$

where $B_i \neq B_j \in T$, for $i \neq j$, and all nonzero coefficients of the monomial terms of the f_i are ± 1 . Next we describe the ideals $I_{L, < \overline{F}}$ and $I_{L, \leq \overline{F}}$ in terms of the generators of I_L .

Proposition 3.12. *Let S be a generating system of binomials for I_L . The following hold:*

$$I_{L, < \overline{F}} = \langle B : B \in S, \overline{F}_B <_{I_L} \overline{F} \rangle$$

and

$$I_{L, \leq \overline{F}} = \langle B : B \in S, \overline{F}_B \leq_{I_L} \overline{F} \rangle.$$

Proof. We will show the statement for $I_{L, < \overline{F}}$, the other one having a similar proof. Let $J = \langle B : B \in S, \overline{F}_B <_{I_L} \overline{F} \rangle$. We will show that $J = I_{L, < \overline{F}}$. It is clear that $J \subset I_{L, < \overline{F}}$. To show the other containment it is enough to show that if $B = x^{\mathbf{u}} - x^{\mathbf{v}} \in I_{L, < \overline{F}}$ then $B \in J$. Let $B = x^{\mathbf{u}} - x^{\mathbf{v}} \in I_{L, < \overline{F}}$. Since $B \in I_L$, by Proposition 3.11 it follows that $B = \sum_{i=1}^t \pm x^{\mathbf{a}_{i,B}} B_i$ where $B_i \in S$ are not necessarily distinct while $\mathbf{a}_{i,B} \neq \mathbf{a}_{j,B}$ for $B_i = B_j$ and $i \neq j$. We will do induction on t . Without loss of generality we can assume that $B_1 = x^{\mathbf{u}_1} - x^{\mathbf{v}_1}$ and $x^{\mathbf{a}_1} x^{\mathbf{u}_1} = x^{\mathbf{u}}$, the other cases being done similarly. First we show the inductive step. Suppose that $t = 1$. Since $x^{\mathbf{a}_1} x^{\mathbf{u}_1} = x^{\mathbf{u}}$ it follows that $x^{\mathbf{a}_1} F_{B_1} \subset F_B$. Thus $\overline{F}_{B_1} \leq_{I_L} \overline{F}_B$. Since $\overline{F}_B <_{I_L} \overline{F}$ we see that $\overline{F}_{B_1} <_{I_L} \overline{F}$. Assume now that $t > 1$ and consider $B' = B - x^{\mathbf{a}_1} B_1 = x^{\mathbf{a}_1} x^{\mathbf{v}_1} - x^{\mathbf{v}}$. Since $F_{B'} = F_B$, it follows that $B' \in I_{L, < \overline{F}}$ and we are done by induction. \square

We can now determine when the I_L -fiber F is a Markov fiber, in terms of the subideals of I_L , defined earlier.

Theorem 3.13. *Let F be an I_L -fiber. F is a Markov fiber if and only if $I_{L, < \overline{F}} \neq I_{L, \leq \overline{F}}$.*

Proof. Let S be a cardinality-minimal generating set of I_L . If $I_{L, < \overline{F}} \neq I_{L, \leq \overline{F}}$ then by Proposition 3.12 there exists a $B \in S$ such that $F_B \equiv_{I_L} F$. For the converse assume that there exists $B \in S$ such that $\overline{F}_B = \overline{F}$. It follows immediately that $I_{L, < \overline{F}} = I_{L, \leq \overline{F}}$. \square

Corollary 3.14. *The set of equivalence classes of Markov fibers of a lattice ideal I_L is an invariant of I_L .*

In the following section, we will refine this result taking under account the number of times an equivalence class of a Markov fiber appears in a cardinality-minimal generating set of I_L , see Theorem 4.16.

4. GENERATING SETS OF LATTICE IDEALS

4.1. Pure Lattices. First we consider the case of $L \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ being a pure lattice, i.e. when L is generated by its pure elements and show how to obtain all cardinality-minimal generating sets of I_L . Let $S = \{B_1, \dots, B_r\}$ be a set of binomials of I_L . We say that S' is a *rearrangement* of S if there is a bijective function $f : S \rightarrow S'$ such that $f(B_i) = \pm B_j$. Compositions of rearrangements are rearrangements. It is clear that if S is a generating set of I_L then all rearrangements of S are generating sets of I_L . The theorem below generalizes [38, Lemma 2.1].

Theorem 4.1. *Let $L = L_{\text{pure}}$ be a pure lattice of rank r , $\sigma = \text{supp}(L)$ and S a set of r binomials of I_L . The set S generates I_L if and only if there is a rearrangement $\{x^{\mathbf{u}_1} - x^{\mathbf{v}_1}, x^{\mathbf{u}_2} - x^{\mathbf{v}_2}, \dots, x^{\mathbf{u}_r} - x^{\mathbf{v}_r}\}$ of S such that the following three conditions are satisfied:*

- (1) $\{\mathbf{u}_1 - \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_r - \mathbf{v}_r\}$ is a basis of L ,
- (2) for $i \in [r]$, $\text{supp}(\mathbf{u}_i) \cup \text{supp}(\mathbf{v}_i) \subset \sigma$,
- (3) (a) $x^{\mathbf{v}_1} = 1$ and (b) $\text{supp}(\mathbf{v}_i) \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} \text{supp}(\mathbf{u}_j)$ for $2 \leq i \leq r$.

Proof. Suppose first that $S = \{B_1, \dots, B_r\}$ generates I_L . We let $B_j = x^{\mathbf{b}_j} - x^{\mathbf{c}_j}$ for $j \in [r]$. Let $\mathbf{u} \in L$. According to Proposition 3.11 there is an index set A such that

$$x^{\mathbf{u}^+} - x^{\mathbf{u}^-} = \sum_{l \in A} \pm x^{\mathbf{a}_l} (x^{\mathbf{b}_j} - x^{\mathbf{c}_j}),$$

where $i_l \in [r]$, $\mathbf{a}_l \in \mathbb{N}^n$. Expanding the RHS, equating the exponents of the equal monomial terms, subtracting the expressions for \mathbf{u}^+ and \mathbf{u}^- and substituting \mathbf{a}_l , $l \in A$, one gets that $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{b}_1 - \mathbf{c}_1) + \dots + \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{b}_r - \mathbf{c}_r)$. This shows that $L = \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{b}_1 - \mathbf{c}_1) + \dots + \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{b}_r - \mathbf{c}_r)$. Since $\text{rank}(L) = r$ it follows that $\{\mathbf{b}_1 - \mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_r - \mathbf{c}_r\}$ is a basis of L . Next we remark that $\text{supp}(\mathbf{b}_i) \subset \sigma$ if and only if $\text{supp}(\mathbf{c}_i) \subset \sigma$. Indeed this is immediate since $\text{supp}(\mathbf{b}_i - \mathbf{c}_i) \subset \sigma$. Now suppose that for some $i \in [r]$, $\text{supp}(\mathbf{b}_i) \not\subset \sigma$. We claim that $B_i = x^{\mathbf{b}_i} - x^{\mathbf{c}_i}$ is redundant in S as a generator of I_L . For this we will show that if $\mathbf{u} \in L$ then $x^{\mathbf{u}^+} - x^{\mathbf{u}^-}$ can be written as a linear combination of the elements of $S \setminus \{B_i\}$. Indeed consider again the relation

$$x^{\mathbf{u}^+} - x^{\mathbf{u}^-} = \sum_l \pm x^{\mathbf{a}_l} (B_{j_l})$$

of Proposition 3.11. Substitute the value 0 to any variable x_j where $j \notin \sigma$: the terms in the above relation involving B_i disappear. Thus $S \setminus \{B_i\}$ is a generating set of I_L . This is of course a contradiction by the generalized Krull's Principal Ideal Theorem, since the height of I_L is r , see [13, Theorem 2.1]. To show that there is a rearrangement of S that satisfies the conditions of the theorem we notice that S contains a binomial B_j with 1 as one of its monomial terms. Indeed let $\mathbf{w} \in L^+$ with $\text{supp}(\mathbf{w}) = \sigma$, see Proposition 2.8. Since $x^{\mathbf{w}} - 1 \in I_L$, $x^{\mathbf{w}} - 1 = \sum \pm x^{\mathbf{a}_l} (B_{i_l})$. It is clear that there exists a value of l such that a monomial term of B_{i_l} is equal to 1 (and $\mathbf{a}_l = 0$): otherwise $x^{\mathbf{w}} - 1 \in \langle x_1, \dots, x_n \rangle$, a contradiction. It is immediate that we can rearrange S by a bijective function f_1 so that $f_1(B_{i_l}) = x^{\mathbf{u}_1} - 1$. Next we claim that there is $B = x^{\mathbf{b}} - x^{\mathbf{c}} \in S$ such that $B \neq B_{i_l}$ and $\text{supp}(\mathbf{b})$ or $\text{supp}(\mathbf{c}) \subset \text{supp}(\mathbf{u}_1)$. Indeed, suppose not. Then clearly $\text{supp}(\mathbf{u}_1) \neq \sigma$. Consider again the expression

$$x^{\mathbf{w}} - 1 = \sum_{t \in A, i_t = i_l} x^{\mathbf{a}_t} B_{i_t} + \sum_{t \in A, i_t \neq i_l} \pm x^{\mathbf{a}_t} (B_{i_t}).$$

Substitute the value 1 for all variables whose index is in $\text{supp}(\mathbf{u}_1)$ and the value 0 for all other variables. We obtain a contradiction: $-1 = 0$. To avoid the contradiction there must be $B \in S$ so that $\pm B = x^{\mathbf{u}_2} - x^{\mathbf{v}_2}$ and $\text{supp}(\mathbf{v}_2) \subset \text{supp}(\mathbf{u}_1)$. We rearrange $f_1(S)$ by f_2 which keeps all elements of $f_1(S)$ fixed but B : $f_2(B) = x^{\mathbf{u}_2} - x^{\mathbf{v}_2}$. More generally once f_s has been defined for $s < r$ so that the third condition is satisfied for all $i \leq s$, the same argument produces f_{s+1} with the desired property.

We now prove the converse. Consider a set S of binomials whose rearrangement $\{x^{\mathbf{u}_1} - 1, x^{\mathbf{u}_2} - x^{\mathbf{v}_2}, \dots, x^{\mathbf{u}_r} - x^{\mathbf{v}_r}\}$ satisfies the three conditions of the theorem. Let $J = \langle x^{\mathbf{u}_1} - 1, \dots, x^{\mathbf{u}_r} - x^{\mathbf{v}_r} \rangle$. We will show that $J = I_L$. It is clear that $J \subset I_L$. Since $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_r - \mathbf{v}_r$ is a basis of L and $\bigcup_{i=1}^r (\text{supp}(\mathbf{u}_i) \cup \text{supp}(\mathbf{v}_i)) \subset \sigma$ it is clear that $\bigcup_{i=1}^r (\text{supp}(\mathbf{u}_i) \cup \text{supp}(\mathbf{v}_i)) = \sigma$. By the third condition it follows that

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^r \text{supp}(\mathbf{u}_i) = \sigma .$$

Next we will show that for every $k \in [r]$ there exists $\mathbf{w}_k \in L^+$ such that $x^{\mathbf{w}_k} - 1 \in J$ and $\text{supp}(\mathbf{w}_k) = \bigcup_{j=1}^k \text{supp}(\mathbf{u}_j)$. For $k = 1$ we set $\mathbf{w}_1 = \mathbf{u}_1$. Since $\text{supp}(\mathbf{v}_2) \subset \text{supp}(\mathbf{u}_1)$ there exists $\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda_1 \gg 0$ such that $\lambda_1 \mathbf{w}_1 > \mathbf{v}_2$. We set $\mathbf{w}_2 = (\lambda_1 \mathbf{w}_1 - \mathbf{v}_2) + \mathbf{u}_2$; $\text{supp}(\mathbf{w}_2) = \text{supp}(\mathbf{u}_1) \cup \text{supp}(\mathbf{u}_2)$. Moreover

$$x^{\mathbf{w}_2} - 1 = x^{\lambda_1 \mathbf{w}_1 - \mathbf{v}_2} (x^{\mathbf{u}_2} - x^{\mathbf{v}_2}) + x^{\lambda_1 \mathbf{w}_1} - 1 \in J ,$$

as wanted. It is clear that this construction generalizes for all $k \in [r]$. In particular $\text{supp}(\mathbf{w}_r) = \sigma$.

We will now show that if $\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v} \in L$ then $x^{\mathbf{u}} - x^{\mathbf{v}} \in J$, which ends the proof. Since $J : (x_1 \cdots x_n)^\infty = I_L$ there exists $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}^n$ such that $x^{\mathbf{w}}(x^{\mathbf{u}} - x^{\mathbf{v}}) \in J$. By the second condition it is clear that \mathbf{w} can be chosen so that $\text{supp}(\mathbf{w}) \subset \sigma$. Since $\text{supp}(\mathbf{w}_r) = \sigma$ there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda \gg 0$ such that $\lambda \mathbf{w}_r > \mathbf{w}$. Therefore $x^{\lambda \mathbf{w}_r} (x^{\mathbf{u}} - x^{\mathbf{v}}) \in J$. It follows that

$$x^{\mathbf{u}} - x^{\mathbf{v}} = (x^{\lambda \mathbf{w}_r} - 1)(x^{\mathbf{v}} - x^{\mathbf{u}}) - x^{\lambda \mathbf{w}_r} (x^{\mathbf{u}} - x^{\mathbf{v}}) \in J$$

and consequently $I_L = J$. □

We remark that the binomials of a generating set of I_L when $L = L_{\text{pure}}$ might have a common monomial factor according to Theorem 4.1. Note also that if $E = \{\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_r\}$ is a basis of L such that $\mathbf{u}_1 \in L^+$ and $\text{supp}(\mathbf{u}_1) = \sigma$ then the set $\{1 - x^{\mathbf{u}_1}, x^{\mathbf{u}_2^+} - x^{\mathbf{u}_2^-}, \dots, x^{\mathbf{u}_r^+} - x^{\mathbf{u}_r^-}\}$ is a cardinality-minimal generating set of I_L . On the other hand such a basis E for $L = L_{\text{pure}}$ exists by Corollary 2.14. This implies that if $L = L_{\text{pure}}$, the ideal I_L is always a complete intersection, which follows from [13, Theorem 2.1]. In section 5 we determine when I_L is a binomial complete intersection ideal for arbitrary lattices. In the next example we show that all conditions of Theorem 4.1 are necessary.

Example 4.2. Let $L \subset \mathbb{Z}^3$ be the lattice generated by $(1, 1, 0), (0, 5, 0)$. It is not hard to see that $I_L = \langle 1 - x_1 x_2, 1 - x_1^5 \rangle \subset \mathbb{k}[x_1, x_2, x_3]$. Consider also the following sets: $E_{23} = \{x_1^5 - 1, x_2^5 - 1\}$, $E_{13} = \{x_1 x_2 - 1, x_2^5 x_3 - x_3\}$, $E_{12a} = \{x_1^5 - 1, x_2^2 x_1 - x_2\}$ and $E_{12b} = \{x_1^2 x_2^2 - x_1 x_2, x_1^5 x_2 - x_2\}$. One can show via Gröbner bases computation that these sets do not generate I_L . We note that each of these sets satisfies all except one of the conditions of Theorem 4.1, the missing index indicating which one.

4.2. Minimal generating sets of lattice ideals. Next we characterize the generating sets of lattice ideals starting from the criterion given in [17, Introduction]. Let $L \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ be a lattice and S a subset of I_L consisting of binomials of the form $x^{\mathbf{u}^+} - x^{\mathbf{u}^-}$ where $\mathbf{u} \in L$. Let F be an I_L -fiber. The sequence $(x^{\mathbf{a}^1}, x^{\mathbf{a}^2}, \dots, x^{\mathbf{a}^k})$ is an S -path from $x^{\mathbf{u}}$ to $x^{\mathbf{v}}$ if

- $x^{\mathbf{a}^1} = x^{\mathbf{u}}, x^{\mathbf{a}^k} = x^{\mathbf{v}}$
- for $j = 1, \dots, k$ each $x^{\mathbf{a}^j}$ in the sequence belongs to the fiber F and
- $x^{\mathbf{a}^j} - x^{\mathbf{a}^{j+1}}$ is equal to $x^{\mathbf{w}^j} B_j$ or $-x^{\mathbf{w}^j} B_j$ for some $B_j \in S, \mathbf{w}^j \in \mathbb{N}^n$.

Theorem 4.3 ([17]). *The set S of binomials of I_L is a generating set of I_L if and only if for every I_L -fiber F there is an S -path between any two elements of F .*

Let F be an I_L -fiber and $G(M_F) = \{x^{\mathbf{a}^1}, \dots, x^{\mathbf{a}^s}\}$. We define a relation “ \sim ” among the elements of $G(M_F)$ as follows:

$$x^{\mathbf{a}^i} \sim x^{\mathbf{a}^j} \text{ iff } (\mathbf{a}^i + L^+) \cap (\mathbf{a}^j + L^+) \neq \emptyset.$$

We note that if $L^+ = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ then $x^{\mathbf{a}^i} \sim x^{\mathbf{a}^j}$ only when $x^{\mathbf{a}^i} = x^{\mathbf{a}^j}$.

Lemma 4.4. *“ \sim ” is an equivalence relation among the elements of $G(M_F)$.*

Proof. It is enough to show transitivity. We can assume that $L_{\text{pure}} \neq \{\mathbf{0}\}$, the other case being trivial. Suppose that

$$x^{\mathbf{a}^i} \sim x^{\mathbf{a}^j} \text{ and } x^{\mathbf{a}^j} \sim x^{\mathbf{a}^k} .$$

Thus there exist $\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{v}_j, \mathbf{v}_k \in L^+$ such that

$$\mathbf{a}^i + \mathbf{u}_i = \mathbf{a}^j + \mathbf{u}_j \text{ and } \mathbf{a}^j + \mathbf{v}_j = \mathbf{a}^k + \mathbf{v}_k .$$

Therefore

$$\mathbf{a}^i + (\mathbf{u}_i + \mathbf{v}_j) = \mathbf{a}^k + (\mathbf{u}_j + \mathbf{v}_k),$$

and the proof is complete. \square

For the following lemma, we recall that \mathbf{u}^σ stands for the vector $(u_i)_{i \notin \sigma}$.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $G(M_F) = \{x^{\mathbf{a}^1}, \dots, x^{\mathbf{a}^s}\}$. The following holds for the elements of $G(M_F)$:*

$$x^{\mathbf{a}^i} \sim x^{\mathbf{a}^j} \text{ if and only if } \mathbf{a}_i^\sigma = \mathbf{a}_j^\sigma .$$

Proof. We can assume that $L^+ \neq \{\mathbf{0}\}$, the other case being trivial. Let $\mathbf{w} \in L^+$ such that $\text{supp}(\mathbf{w}) = \sigma$. Suppose that $\mathbf{a}_i^\sigma = \mathbf{a}_j^\sigma$. Since $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{a}_i - \mathbf{a}_j \in L$ it follows that $\mathbf{u}^\sigma = \mathbf{0}$ and thus $\text{supp}(\mathbf{u}) \subset \sigma$. Therefore there exists $\lambda \gg 0$ such that $\mathbf{u} + \lambda \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}^n$. Since $\mathbf{u} + \lambda \mathbf{w} \in L^+$ and $\mathbf{a}_i + \lambda \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{a}_j + (\mathbf{u} + \lambda \mathbf{w})$ it follows that $x^{\mathbf{a}^i} \sim x^{\mathbf{a}^j}$.

Suppose now that $x^{\mathbf{a}^i} \sim x^{\mathbf{a}^j}$. There exist $\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j \in L^+$ such that $\mathbf{a}_i + \mathbf{u}_i = \mathbf{a}_j + \mathbf{u}_j$. Therefore

$$\mathbf{a}_i^\sigma = (\mathbf{a}_i + \mathbf{u}_i)^\sigma = (\mathbf{a}_j + \mathbf{u}_j)^\sigma = \mathbf{a}_j^\sigma ,$$

and we are done. \square

Lemma 4.6. *Let $G(M_F) = \{x^{\mathbf{a}^1}, \dots, x^{\mathbf{a}^s}\}$. The following holds for the elements of $G(M_F)$:*

$$x^{\mathbf{a}^i} \not\sim x^{\mathbf{a}^j} \text{ if and only if } \mathbf{a}_i^\sigma, \mathbf{a}_j^\sigma \text{ are incomparable.}$$

Proof. We will show that $x^{\mathbf{a}_i} \not\sim x^{\mathbf{a}_j}$ implies that \mathbf{a}_i^σ and \mathbf{a}_j^σ are incomparable. Suppose otherwise. Without loss of generality we can assume that $\mathbf{a}_i^\sigma - \mathbf{a}_j^\sigma > \mathbf{0}$. Let $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{a}_i - \mathbf{a}_j$. Let $\mathbf{w} \in L^+$ such that $\text{supp}(\mathbf{w}) = \sigma$. We can find $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough so that all coordinates $(u + \lambda w)_i > 0$ for $i \in \sigma$. Since $\lambda \mathbf{w}^\sigma = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{u}^\sigma > \mathbf{0}$ it follows that $\mathbf{u} + \lambda \mathbf{w} > \mathbf{0}$ and thus $\mathbf{u} + \lambda \mathbf{w} \in L^+$. Since $\mathbf{a}_i + \lambda \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{a}_j + (\mathbf{u} + \lambda \mathbf{w})$ and $\lambda \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{u} + \lambda \mathbf{w} \in L^+$ it follows that $x^{\mathbf{a}_i} \sim x^{\mathbf{a}_j}$, a contradiction. The other implication follows immediately from the previous lemma. \square

Lemmas 4.5 and 4.6 imply that there are only two possibilities for $\mathbf{a}_i^\sigma, \mathbf{a}_j^\sigma$, when $x^{\mathbf{a}_i}, x^{\mathbf{a}_j}$ are minimal generators of M_F : either $\mathbf{a}_i^\sigma = \mathbf{a}_j^\sigma$ or $\mathbf{a}_i^\sigma, \mathbf{a}_j^\sigma$ are incomparable. If $X \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ by X^σ we mean the set whose elements are the vectors \mathbf{u}^σ where $\mathbf{u} \in X$. In particular

$$G(M_F)^\sigma = \{x^{\mathbf{u}^\sigma} : x^{\mathbf{u}} \in G(M_F)\}.$$

Note that the cardinality of $G(M_F)^\sigma$ might be less than the cardinality of $G(M_F)$.

Lemma 4.7. *If F, F' are two equivalent I_L fibers, then $G(M_F)^\sigma = G(M_{F'})^\sigma$.*

Proof. Since F, F' are equivalent I_L -fibers, there exist monomials $x^{\mathbf{u}}, x^{\mathbf{v}}$ such that $x^{\mathbf{u}}F \subset F'$ and $x^{\mathbf{v}}F' \subset F$. Therefore $x^{\mathbf{u}+\mathbf{v}}F \subset F$ and $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v} \in L^+$. Since $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^n$ it follows that $\text{supp}(\mathbf{u}), \text{supp}(\mathbf{v}) \subset \sigma$. Let $G(M_F) = \{x^{\mathbf{a}_1}, \dots, x^{\mathbf{a}_s}\}$, $G(M_{F'}) = \{x^{\mathbf{b}_1}, \dots, x^{\mathbf{b}_r}\}$. To show the desired equality it suffices to show that for any $i \in [s]$ there is $j \in [r]$ so that $\mathbf{a}_i^\sigma = \mathbf{b}_j^\sigma$, the other inclusion being taken care by symmetry.

Since $x^{\mathbf{a}_i}x^{\mathbf{u}}$ is in F' there exists $j \in [r]$ such that $x^{\mathbf{b}_j}$ divides $x^{\mathbf{a}_i}x^{\mathbf{u}}$. Therefore $\mathbf{a}_i + \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{b}_j \in \mathbb{N}^n$. Since $\text{supp}(\mathbf{u}) \subset \sigma$ it follows that

$$(\mathbf{a}_i + \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{b}_j)^\sigma = \mathbf{a}_i^\sigma - \mathbf{b}_j^\sigma \geq \mathbf{0}$$

and $\mathbf{a}_i^\sigma \geq \mathbf{b}_j^\sigma$. Similarly there exists $k \in [s]$ such that $\mathbf{b}_j^\sigma \geq \mathbf{a}_k^\sigma$. Therefore $\mathbf{a}_i^\sigma \geq \mathbf{b}_j^\sigma \geq \mathbf{a}_k^\sigma$ and $\mathbf{a}_i^\sigma \geq \mathbf{a}_k^\sigma$. It follows that $\mathbf{a}_i^\sigma = \mathbf{a}_k^\sigma$ and thus $\mathbf{a}_i^\sigma = \mathbf{b}_j^\sigma$. \square

Let F be any I_L -fiber. We construct a graph $G_{\overline{F}}$ and then we build on $G_{\overline{F}}$ to construct a graph $\Gamma_{\overline{F}}$, that will be crucial in determining when a set of binomials of I_L generates $I_{L, \leq \overline{F}}$.

Definition 4.8. Let F be an I_L -fiber, $G(M_F)^\sigma = \{x^{\mathbf{a}_1}, \dots, x^{\mathbf{a}_k}\}$ where $x^{\mathbf{a}_i} \in G(M_F)$ for $i \in [k]$. We define $G_{\overline{F}} = (V(G), E(G))$ to be the graph with $V(G) = [k]$, and

$$E(G) = \{\{i, j\} : \exists x^{\mathbf{u}_i}, x^{\mathbf{u}_j} \in F \text{ such that } \mathbf{u}_i^\sigma = \mathbf{a}_i^\sigma, \mathbf{u}_j^\sigma = \mathbf{a}_j^\sigma, x^{\mathbf{u}_i} - x^{\mathbf{u}_j} \in I_{L, < \overline{F}}\}.$$

The graph $G_{\overline{F}}$ is independent of the fiber representative F , up to reordering of the vertices. This is immediate for $V(G)$, by Lemma 4.7. Next we show the independence of $E(G)$. Suppose that $x^{\mathbf{u}_i} - x^{\mathbf{u}_j} \in I_{L, < \overline{F}}$ where $x^{\mathbf{u}_i}, x^{\mathbf{u}_j} \in F$ and $\mathbf{u}_i^\sigma = \mathbf{a}_i^\sigma, \mathbf{u}_j^\sigma = \mathbf{a}_j^\sigma$. Let $F' \in \overline{F}$ and let $x^{\mathbf{u}}, x^{\mathbf{v}}$ be such that $x^{\mathbf{u}}F \subset F'$ and $x^{\mathbf{v}}F' \subset F$. By Lemma 3.1, $\text{supp}(\mathbf{u}) \cup \text{supp}(\mathbf{v}) \subset \sigma$ and thus $\mathbf{u}^\sigma = \mathbf{v}^\sigma = \mathbf{0}$. Moreover $x^{\mathbf{u}}x^{\mathbf{u}_i} - x^{\mathbf{u}}x^{\mathbf{u}_j} \in I_{L, < \overline{F}}$, $(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}_i)^\sigma = \mathbf{u}^\sigma + \mathbf{u}_i^\sigma = \mathbf{u}_i^\sigma = \mathbf{a}_i^\sigma$, $(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}_j)^\sigma = \mathbf{a}_j^\sigma$ and thus $E(G)$ is independent on the choice of the fiber representative F .

Example 4.9. Let L be the sublattice of \mathbb{Z}^5 , generated by $\mathbf{v}_1 = (3, 0, 1, -1, 0)$, $\mathbf{v}_2 = (0, 1, 6, 0, -1)$, $\mathbf{v}_3 = (1, 1, 0, 0, 0)$ and $\mathbf{v}_4 = (5, 0, 0, 0, 0)$. It is easy to see that $L_{\text{pure}} = \mathbb{Z}\mathbf{v}_3 + \mathbb{Z}\mathbf{v}_4$ and thus $\sigma = \{1, 2\}$. Since $\overline{F_{x_5}} = \overline{F_{x_4}}$, the I_L -fiber $F = F_{x_5}$ is a Markov fiber⁶. A straightforward computation shows that

$$G(M_F) = \{x_5, x_1^4 x_3^6, x_1 x_3^5 x_4, x_1^3 x_3^4 x_4^2, x_3^3 x_4^3, x_1^2 x_3^2 x_4^4, x_1^4 x_3 x_4^5, x_1 x_4^6, x_2 x_3^6, x_2^4 x_3^5 x_4, x_2^2 x_3^4 x_4^2\},$$

⁶This is proved in detail in the last section.

$$x_2^3 x_3^2 x_4^4, x_2 x_3 x_4^5, x_2^4 x_4^6\}.$$

Indeed, if one solves the system that results from the observation that $x_1^{v_1} \cdots x_5^{v_5} \in F$ and only if

$$(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5 - 1) = \beta_1 \mathbf{v}_1 + \cdots + \beta_4 \mathbf{v}_4 = (3\beta_1 + \beta_3 + 5\beta_4, \beta_2 + \beta_3, \beta_1 + 6\beta_2, -\beta_1, -\beta_2),$$

for some $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_4) \in \mathbb{Z}^4$, then obtains the above displayed monomials. Therefore

$$G(M_F)^\sigma = \{x_5, x_3^6, x_3^5 x_4, x_3^4 x_4^2, x_3^3 x_4^3, x_3^2 x_4^4, x_3 x_4^5, x_4^6\} = \{x_5\} \cup \{x_3^{6-k} x_4^k : k = 0, \dots, 6\}.$$

Thus the graph $G_{\overline{F}}$ consists of 8 vertices. One can show that the vertex that corresponds to x_5 is isolated. If x_5 was not isolated, there would be $x^{\mathbf{u}}, x^{\mathbf{v}} \in F$, such that $x^{\mathbf{u}^\sigma} = x_5$, $x^{\mathbf{v}^\sigma} = x_3^{6-k} x_4^k$ and $x^{\mathbf{u}} - x^{\mathbf{v}} \in I_{<\overline{F}}$. But this means that there would be a $\mathbf{w} \in L^+$, so that $x^{\mathbf{u}} = x^{\mathbf{w}} x_5$. Thus, since $x_5(x^{\mathbf{w}} - 1) \in I_{<\overline{F}}$, we get that $x_5 - x^{\mathbf{v}} = (x^{\mathbf{u}} - x^{\mathbf{v}}) - x_5(x^{\mathbf{w}} - 1) \in I_{<\overline{F}}$. This leads to a contradiction, by Theorem 3.13, since F_{x_5} is a Markov fiber. It is also relatively easy to show that any other two vertices of $G_{\overline{F}}$ are connected by an edge. Consider for example the vertices that correspond to the monomials x_3^6 and $x_3^5 x_4$. They are connected via an edge since $(x_1^4 x_3^6)^\sigma = x_3^6$, $(x_1 x_3^5 x_4)^\sigma = x_3^5 x_4$, $x_1^4 x_3^6 - x_1 x_3^5 x_4 = x_1 x_3^5 (x_1^3 x_3 - x_4)$ and $\overline{F}_{x_4} <_{I_L} \overline{F}_{x_5}$, implying that $x_1^4 x_3^6 - x_1 x_3^5 x_4 \in I_{<\overline{F}}$. Therefore $G_{\overline{F}}$ has two connected components: an isolated vertex corresponding to x_5 and the complete graph on the remaining seven vertices.

Definition 4.10. We let $\Gamma_{\overline{F}}$ to be the complete graph whose vertices are the connected components of $G_{\overline{F}}$. Let $B = x^{\mathbf{u}} - x^{\mathbf{v}} \in I_L$ such that $F_B \in \overline{F}$. We identify B with an edge of $\Gamma_{\overline{F}}$ if $x^{\mathbf{u}^\sigma} \neq x^{\mathbf{v}^\sigma}$, $B \in I_{L, \leq \overline{F}}$ and $B \notin I_{L, < \overline{F}}$. For a subset S of binomials of I_L we denote by $\Gamma_{\overline{F}}(S)$ the subgraph of $\Gamma_{\overline{F}}$ induced by the binomials $B \in S$ such that $F_B \in \overline{F}$.

We note that different binomials might correspond to the same edge of $\Gamma_{\overline{F}}$.

Lemma 4.11. *Let $L \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ be a lattice and S a subset of I_L consisting of binomials such that $I_{L_{\text{pure}}} = \langle S_{\overline{F}_{\{1\}}} \rangle$ and $\Gamma_{\overline{F}}(S)$ is a spanning tree of $\Gamma_{\overline{F}}$ for every I_L -fiber F . Then the set S is a generating set of I_L .*

Proof. If $L = L_{\text{pure}}$ then the conclusion is straightforward since $G_{\overline{F}_{\{1\}}}$ is an isolated vertex, and so is $\Gamma_{\overline{F}_{\{1\}}}$. Thus we may assume that the lattice L is non-pure or equivalently that there exists a fiber F such that $F \notin \overline{F}_{\{1\}}$. We will show that for any I_L -fiber F and any $x^{\mathbf{u}}, x^{\mathbf{v}} \in F$ there is an S -path between $x^{\mathbf{u}}, x^{\mathbf{v}}$. This was already noticed if $F \in \overline{F}_{\{1\}}$. By Theorem 3.8 we can assume that there is an S -path between any two elements of G for all G such that $\overline{G} <_{I_L} \overline{F}$. We note that $\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v} \in L$. Suppose that $G(M_F)^\sigma = \{x^{\mathbf{a}_1^\sigma}, \dots, x^{\mathbf{a}_k^\sigma}\}$ where $x^{\mathbf{a}_1}, \dots, x^{\mathbf{a}_k} \in G(M_F)$. We examine three cases.

Case 1. If $\mathbf{u}^\sigma = \mathbf{v}^\sigma$ then $(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v})^\sigma = \mathbf{0}$ and by Corollary 2.9 it follows that $\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v} \in L_{\text{pure}}$. Therefore $x^{\mathbf{u}} - x^{\mathbf{v}} \in I_{L_{\text{pure}}}$ and since $I_{L_{\text{pure}}} = \langle S_{\overline{F}_{\{1\}}} \rangle$ it follows that $x^{\mathbf{u}} - x^{\mathbf{v}} \in \langle S \rangle$.

Case 2. Suppose that $\mathbf{u}^\sigma \neq \mathbf{v}^\sigma$ and that the vertices of $G_{\overline{F}}$ corresponding to \mathbf{u}^σ and \mathbf{v}^σ are in the same connected component of $G_{\overline{F}}$. Assume that $\mathbf{u}^\sigma = \mathbf{a}_i^\sigma$ and $\mathbf{v}^\sigma = \mathbf{a}_j^\sigma$ and that $i = i_1, \dots, i_l = j$ is a path in $G_{\overline{F}}$. By applying induction on l it is enough to prove the statement when $l = 2$ and $\{i, j\}$ is an edge of $G_{\overline{F}}$. It follows from the definition of $G_{\overline{F}}$ that there exists a binomial $x^{\mathbf{w}} - x^{\mathbf{z}} \in I_{L, < \overline{F}}$ such that $\mathbf{w}^\sigma = \mathbf{u}^\sigma$, $\mathbf{z}^\sigma = \mathbf{v}^\sigma$. Moreover $x^{\mathbf{w}}, x^{\mathbf{z}} \in G$ where $\overline{G} <_{I_L} \overline{F}$. Thus there is a monomial $x^{\mathbf{a}}$ such that $x^{\mathbf{a}} G \subset F$. By Case 1 above, there is an S -path from $x^{\mathbf{u}}$ to $x^{\mathbf{w}+\mathbf{a}}$ and an S -path from $x^{\mathbf{v}}$ to $x^{\mathbf{z}+\mathbf{a}}$. By assumption there is an S -path from $x^{\mathbf{w}}$ to $x^{\mathbf{z}}$, and thus also from $x^{\mathbf{w}+\mathbf{a}}$ to $x^{\mathbf{z}+\mathbf{a}}$. Putting the S -paths

together one gets an S -path from $x^{\mathbf{u}}$ to $x^{\mathbf{v}}$. We point out that the above argument shows that $x^{\mathbf{u}} - x^{\mathbf{v}} \in I_{L, < \overline{F}}$.

Case 3. Suppose that $\mathbf{u}^\sigma \neq \mathbf{v}^\sigma$ and that the vertices of $G_{\overline{F}}$ corresponding to \mathbf{u}^σ and \mathbf{v}^σ are in disconnected components of $G_{\overline{F}}$. Since S determines a spanning tree of $\Gamma_{\overline{F}}$ there is a series of edges in $\Gamma_{\overline{F}}$ that leads from the component that corresponds to $x^{\mathbf{u}^\sigma}$ to the component that corresponds to $x^{\mathbf{v}^\sigma}$. As before it is enough to prove the statement when the components are adjacent. This means that there exists a binomial $B = x^{\mathbf{u}'} - x^{\mathbf{v}'} \in (I_{L, \leq \overline{F}} \setminus I_{L, < \overline{F}}) \cap S$ such that $\mathbf{u}'^\sigma, \mathbf{u}^\sigma$ correspond to the same connected component of $G_{\overline{F}}$ and similarly for $\mathbf{v}'^\sigma, \mathbf{v}^\sigma$. The monomials $x^{\mathbf{u}'}, x^{\mathbf{v}'}$ of B , belong to a fiber equivalent to F . It follows that there is $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{N}^n$ such that $x^{\mathbf{u}'+\mathbf{b}}$ and $x^{\mathbf{v}'+\mathbf{b}}$ belong to F and thus the sequence $(x^{\mathbf{u}'+\mathbf{b}}, x^{\mathbf{v}'+\mathbf{b}})$ is an S -path from $x^{\mathbf{u}'+\mathbf{b}}$ to $x^{\mathbf{v}'+\mathbf{b}}$. By Case 2 above, there is an S -path from $x^{\mathbf{u}}$ to $x^{\mathbf{u}'+\mathbf{b}}$ and an S -path from $x^{\mathbf{v}}$ to $x^{\mathbf{v}'+\mathbf{b}}$. Joining these paths one gets an S -path from $x^{\mathbf{u}}$ to $x^{\mathbf{v}}$. \square

We let $t(\overline{F})$ denote the number of vertices of $\Gamma_{\overline{F}}$. Thus

$$t(\overline{F}) := |V(\Gamma_{\overline{F}})|.$$

We note that to construct a spanning tree of $\Gamma_{\overline{F}}$ we need exactly $t(\overline{F}) - 1$ binomials. To prove the next theorem we will use Theorem 4.3.

Theorem 4.12. *Let $L \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ be a lattice and S a subset of I_L consisting of binomials. The set S is a cardinality-minimal generating set of I_L if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:*

- $\Gamma_{\overline{F}}(S)$ is a spanning tree of $\Gamma_{\overline{F}}$ for every I_L -fiber F , and $|S_{\overline{F}}| = t(\overline{F}) - 1$ for every I_L -fiber F such that $F \notin \overline{F}_{\{1\}}$,
- $|S_{\overline{F}_{\{1\}}}| = \text{rank}(L_{\text{pure}})$ and
- $I_{L_{\text{pure}}} = \langle S_{\overline{F}_{\{1\}}} \rangle$.

Proof. Suppose that S is a cardinality-minimal generating set of I_L . We will show that S satisfies the three conditions of the theorem. We note that since S is a generating set of I_L , by Proposition 3.12 and Remark 3.10 it follows that $\langle S_{\overline{F}_{\{1\}}} \rangle = I_{L_{\text{pure}}}$. Moreover if $|S_{\overline{F}_{\{1\}}}| > \text{rank}(L_{\text{pure}})$, then by Theorem 4.1 one can replace the binomials in $S_{\overline{F}_{\{1\}}}$ by a cardinality-minimal generating set of $I_{L_{\text{pure}}}$. The new set thus produced is still a generating set of I_L , according to Lemma 4.11, and has smaller cardinality than S , a contradiction. Next we show that for an arbitrary I_L -fiber F , $\Gamma_{\overline{F}}(S)$ is a spanning tree of $\Gamma_{\overline{F}}$. Indeed, by Theorem 4.3, S induces a spanning graph in F . Since $G_{\overline{F}}$ comes from F by identifying components and similarly for $\Gamma_{\overline{F}}$ from $G_{\overline{F}}$, it follows that $\Gamma_{\overline{F}}(S)$ is a spanning graph of $\Gamma_{\overline{F}}$. We show that $\Gamma_{\overline{F}}(S)$ is a tree of $\Gamma_{\overline{F}}$. If not, $\Gamma_{\overline{F}}(S)$ has a cycle in $\Gamma_{\overline{F}}$. We omit from S the binomial that induces an edge on this cycle. The resulting set still satisfies the conditions of Lemma 4.11 and is thus a generating set of I_L of smaller cardinality, a contradiction. Similarly, if for some fiber F such that $F \notin \overline{F}_{\{1\}}$ we have $|S_{\overline{F}}| > t(\overline{F}) - 1$ then there is a binomial in $S_{\overline{F}}$ that does not correspond to an edge of $\Gamma_{\overline{F}}(S)$ or two binomials that correspond to the same edge. Then one binomial could be omitted from S and the resulting set would still be a generating set of I_L .

Conversely let S be a set that satisfies the three conditions of the theorem. By Lemma 4.11, S is a generating set of I_L . Suppose that there is a cardinality-minimal generating set S' of I_L such that $|S'| < |S|$. Let F be a Markov fiber such that $|S'_F| < |S_F|$. We

note that $F \notin \overline{F}_{\{1\}}$ since $|S'_{\overline{F}_{\{1\}}}| \geq \text{rank}(L_{\text{pure}}) = |S_{\overline{F}_{\{1\}}}|$. Moreover $|S_{\overline{F}}| = t(\overline{F}) - 1 \leq |S'_{\overline{F}}|$, a contradiction. Therefore S is a cardinality-minimal generating set of I_L . \square

Remark 4.13. When $L_{\text{pure}} = \{0\}$ then the construction and conditions on $\Gamma_{\overline{F}}$ coincide with the construction and conditions of $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{b}}$ from [4], since by Proposition 2.4 $G(M_F) = F$. Furthermore, in this case Theorem 4.12 becomes the join of [4, Theorem 2.6] and [4, Theorem 2.7]. To understand better how Theorem 4.12 works to compute all (infinitely many) cardinality-minimal generating sets in the general case of a non-positive lattice, see the example worked in great detail from Section 6.

We remark that for all but finitely many equivalence classes of fibers \overline{F} , $t(\overline{F}) = 1$. Indeed by Corollary 3.14 the set consisting of equivalence classes of Markov fibers is finite. If an I_L -fiber F is not a Markov fiber, then by Theorem 3.13 it follows that $I_{L, \leq \overline{F}} = I_{L, < \overline{F}}$ and hence $G_{\overline{F}}$ consists of only one connected component. The next result is the main theorem of this section. Its proof is an immediate consequence of Theorem 4.12.

Theorem 4.14. *Let $L \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ be a lattice and $\mu(I_L)$ be the cardinal of a cardinality-minimal generating set of I_L . Then*

$$\mu(I_L) = \text{rank}(L_{\text{pure}}) + \sum_{\overline{F} \neq \overline{F}_{\{1\}}} (t(\overline{F}) - 1),$$

where the sum runs over all distinct equivalence classes of Markov fibers.

The next corollary follows from Corollary 3.14 and Theorem 4.12. It generalizes the corresponding result for positive lattices, see [3, Theorem 2.5] and [12, Theorem 1.3.2].

Corollary 4.15. *Let $L \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ be a lattice, $\mu = \mu(I_L)$ and $\{B_1, \dots, B_\mu\}$ a cardinality-minimal generating set of I_L . The multiset*

$$\{\overline{F}_{B_1}, \dots, \overline{F}_{B_\mu}\}$$

is an invariant of I_L .

The following result concerns an arbitrary minimal generating set of I_L : the play in the cardinality of such a set only concerns the pure part of L . Note that if $L_{\text{pure}} \neq 0$ then I_L can be minimally generated by $\mu(I_L) + k$ binomials for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. More precisely, all extra k binomials are given by the fiber $F_{\{1\}}$ with a similar argument as the one given in introduction for the lattice $L = \langle (1, 1), (5, 0) \rangle$. The proof of Corollary 4.16 follows directly from the proof of Theorem 4.12.

Corollary 4.16. *Let L be a lattice and $S = \{B_1, \dots, B_t\}$ a minimal generating set of I_L . The multiset*

$$\{\overline{F}_{B_i} : F_{B_i} \notin \overline{F}_{\{1\}}\}$$

is an invariant of I_L .

4.3. Applications. In the last years, due to applications of minimal generating sets to algebraic statistics, there is an interest in determining the *indispensable binomials* of a lattice ideal, see [28, 29, 4, 1, 30]. Of particular interest is the case when all elements in a minimal generating set of the lattice ideal are indispensable as is the case for generic lattice ideals, see [31].

Definition 4.17. A binomial is called *indispensable* (*weakly indispensable*, respectively) if it appears in every minimal generating set (every cardinality-minimal generating set,

respectively) of I_L up to a constant multiple. A monomial $x^{\mathbf{u}}$ is called *indispensable* (*weakly indispensable*, respectively) if for every minimal generating set (every cardinality-minimal generating set, respectively) S of I_L there is a binomial $B \in S$ so that $x^{\mathbf{u}}$ is a monomial term of B .

Note that an indispensable binomial/monomial is weakly indispensable. If L is positive then the characterization of indispensable binomials is given by [4, Corollary 2.10], see also [4, Theorem 3.4]. Note that in the case of positive lattices the notions of indispensable and weakly indispensable coincide. Recently, a polynomial-time algorithm for computing all indispensable binomials from a given system of binomial generators of an arbitrary binomial ideal was given in [7, Algorithm 1]. Next we complete the classification of indispensable binomials/monomials of lattice ideals in the case of non-positive lattices.

Theorem 4.18. *Let L be a non-positive lattice. Then I_L has no indispensable binomials, but it has one indispensable monomial, $1 = x^{\mathbf{0}}$. If $\text{rank}(L_{\text{pure}}) > 1$ then there are no weakly indispensable binomials and only one weakly indispensable monomial $1 = x^{\mathbf{0}}$. If $\text{rank}(L_{\text{pure}}) = 1$ there exists exactly one weakly indispensable binomial and exactly two weakly indispensable monomials.*

Proof. Let L be a lattice such that $\text{rank}(L_{\text{pure}}) = r \geq 1$ and S a cardinality-minimal generating set of I_L . In order to determine the (weakly) indispensable binomials/monomials of I_L we analyze the two cases of Markov fibers which might contain them: 1) $F \in \overline{F}_{\{1\}}$ and 2) $F \notin \overline{F}_{\{1\}}$.

In the first case, if L_{pure} has rank 1 then $L_{\text{pure}} = \langle \mathbf{u} \rangle$, where $\mathbf{u} \in L^+$ is L -primitive and by Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.12 we have that $S_{\overline{F}_{\{1\}}} = \{x^{\mathbf{u}} - 1\}$. Thus, when $\text{rank}(L_{\text{pure}}) = 1$ we have one weakly indispensable binomial and two weakly indispensable monomials, which correspond to fiber $F_{\{1\}}$. Replacing $x^{\mathbf{u}} - 1$ from a cardinality-minimal generating set with $x^{2\mathbf{u}} - 1, x^{3\mathbf{u}} - 1$ we obtain a minimal generating set of I_L . Hence we have no indispensable binomials corresponding to a fiber $F \in \overline{F}_{\{1\}}$. However, 1 is an indispensable monomial of I_L because otherwise the ideal I_L would be contained in the maximal ideal $\langle x_1, \dots, x_n \rangle$, a contradiction since $\text{rank}(L_{\text{pure}}) > 0$.

Suppose now that L_{pure} has rank $r > 1$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $S_{\overline{F}_{\{1\}}} = \{x^{\mathbf{u}_1} - 1, \dots, x^{\mathbf{u}_r} - x^{\mathbf{v}_r}\}$ satisfies the three conditions of Theorem 4.1. For every $i \geq 2$ let $\mathbf{u}'_i = \mathbf{u}_i + \mathbf{u}_1$ and $\mathbf{v}'_i = \mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{u}_1$ and note that $\mathbf{u}'_i - \mathbf{v}'_i = \mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{v}_i$. By Theorem 4.1 it follows that $\{x^{\mathbf{u}_1} - 1, x^{\mathbf{u}'_2} - x^{\mathbf{v}'_2}, \dots, x^{\mathbf{u}'_r} - x^{\mathbf{v}'_r}\}$ is also a cardinality-minimal generating set of $I_{L_{\text{pure}}}$ having only one binomial in common with $S_{\overline{F}_{\{1\}}}$. Since $\text{rank}(L_{\text{pure}}) > 1$ there are infinitely many L -primitive elements of full support and thus infinitely many bases of L_{pure} as in Corollary 2.14. Any of these bases induces a cardinality-minimal generating set of $I_{L_{\text{pure}}}$, see Theorem 4.1. By applying the above trick to any of these cardinality-minimal generating sets we conclude that there are no weakly indispensable binomials for I_L corresponding to a fiber $F \in \overline{F}_{\{1\}}$, but there is one weakly indispensable monomial of I_L belonging to $F_{\{1\}}$ and is $1 = x^{\mathbf{0}}$. Obviously there are no indispensable binomials in this case, but 1 is an indispensable monomial with the same argument as before.

In the second case assume that there exists a Markov fiber F such that $F \notin \overline{F}_{\{1\}}$, that is $\overline{F} >_{I_L} \overline{F}_{\{1\}}$. Then we prove that there are infinitely many distinct choices for the binomials that determine any edge in a spanning tree of $\Gamma_{\overline{F}}$. Since F is a Markov fiber, Theorem 3.13 says that $I_{L, < \overline{F}} \neq I_{L, \leq \overline{F}}$. Thus there exists $B = x^{\mathbf{u}} - x^{\mathbf{v}}$, such that $F_B \in \overline{F}$ and $B \notin I_{< \overline{F}}$. We note that $\mathbf{u}^\sigma \neq \mathbf{v}^\sigma$: otherwise $\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v} \in L_{\text{pure}}$ and

$x^{\mathbf{u}} - x^{\mathbf{v}} \in I_{L_{\text{pure}}} = I_{L, \leq \overline{F}_{\{1\}}} \subset I_{L, < \overline{F}}$, a contradiction. Therefore B produces an edge in $\Gamma_{\overline{F}}$ and can be made part of a cardinality-minimal generating set S of I_L . Since L is non-positive there exist vectors $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2 \in L^+ \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$. Then $B' = x^{\mathbf{u}+\mathbf{w}_1} - x^{\mathbf{v}+\mathbf{w}_2}$ gives exactly the same edge as B and can replace B in S . Hence we obtain that there are no weakly indispensable binomials or monomials of I_L corresponding to a fiber $F \notin \overline{F}_{\{1\}}$. This also implies that in the second case there are no indispensable binomials or monomials of I_L . \square

One nice practical application of Theorem 4.18 is to detect whether a lattice is positive or not. Indeed, given any arbitrary set of vectors which span a lattice L then: 1) apply one of the existing algorithms, for example the one from [2] or [17], to compute a generating set of I_L , and 2) decide that L is positive if and only if 1 is not in the support of any binomial from the computed generating set. The latter is true by Theorem 4.18 since for non-positive lattices the corresponding lattice ideals have 1 as indispensable monomial while for positive lattices the fiber of 1 consists only of 1. Next we present another application following from the proof of Theorem 4.18. First we define the *universal Markov basis* of I_L to be the union of all cardinality-minimal generating sets of I_L , up to a sign.

Theorem 4.19. *Let L be a lattice. If $\text{rank}(L_{\text{pure}}) > 1$ or $\text{rank}(L_{\text{pure}}) = 1$ and $L \neq L_{\text{pure}}$ then the universal Markov basis of I_L is infinite.*

Note that the alternative definition of universal Markov basis as the union of all minimal generating sets would also imply the conclusion of Theorem 4.19 and only under the assumption that the lattice is non-positive, as explained in the Introduction. However, both definitions are identical in the case of positive lattices, since a minimal generating set is automatically a cardinality-minimal generating set, and they match the definition of universal Markov basis introduced in [19, Definition 3.1]. For positive lattices the vectors corresponding to the universal Markov basis have also an useful algebraic description, see [6, Proposition 1.4]. We note that for non-positive lattices L satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 4.19 the universal Markov basis of I_L is not contained in the Graver basis, since the Graver basis is finite (see [37, Algorithm 7.2]). Moreover, Theorem 4.19 was the the starting point for classifying the lattices for which the universal Markov basis is contained either in the Graver basis or the universal Gröbner basis, see [5, Theorem 2.3] or [5, Theorem 2.7].

The Markov complexity of an integer matrix, see [33] for the definition, is another topic of interest in algebraic statistics, related to the universal Markov basis. We note that the results of this paper and in particular Theorems 4.1, 4.12 are used in [5, Section 3] to give necessary and sufficient conditions for the Markov complexity to be finite.

5. BINOMIAL COMPLETE INTERSECTION LATTICE IDEALS

In this section we characterize all binomial complete intersection lattice ideals. This is a problem that engaged mathematicians starting in 1970, see [16]. We recall that a lattice ideal I_L of height r is a *complete intersection* if there exist polynomials P_1, \dots, P_r such that $I_L = \langle P_1, \dots, P_r \rangle$ and I_L is a *binomial complete intersection* if there exist binomials B_1, \dots, B_r such that $I_L = \langle B_1, \dots, B_r \rangle$. In the case of positive lattices Nakayama's lemma applies and then complete intersection lattice ideals are automatically binomial complete intersections. Furthermore, for positive lattices the problem was gradually solved in a series of papers [16, 9, 36, 20, 39, 26, 34, 32, 14, 35, 25]. The final conclusion is that I_L is a complete intersection if and only if the matrix M whose rows correspond to a basis

of L is “mixed dominating”: every row of M has a positive and negative entry and M contains no square submatrix with this property, see [25, Theorem 3.9]. However, when L is non-positive the problem was open and we give a complete answer in Theorem 5.5 and Corollary 5.6.

We recall that σ is the maximum support of an element of $L \cap \mathbb{N}^n$, L_{pure} is the sublattice of L generated by the elements of $L \cap \mathbb{N}^n$, $\mathbf{u}^\sigma = (u_i)_{i \notin \sigma} \in (\mathbb{Z}^n)^\sigma$ and L^σ is the sublattice of $(\mathbb{Z}^n)^\sigma$ generated by the vectors \mathbf{u}^σ , where $\mathbf{u} \in L$.

As an immediate consequence of definitions and Corollary 2.9 we have the following equivalences:

$$\sigma = \emptyset \Leftrightarrow L_{pure} = \{\mathbf{0}\} \Leftrightarrow L \text{ is positive} \Leftrightarrow L^\sigma = L,$$

and

$$L \text{ is pure} \Leftrightarrow L = L_{pure} \Leftrightarrow L^\sigma = \{\mathbf{0}\}.$$

First we have the following:

Remark 5.1. L^σ is a positive lattice.

Proof. The conclusion follows at once when $\sigma = \emptyset$. Assume now that $\sigma \neq \emptyset$ and let $\mathbf{w} \in L \cap \mathbb{N}^n$ be such that $\text{supp}(\mathbf{w}) = \sigma$. If $\mathbf{0} \neq \mathbf{u}^\sigma \in L^\sigma \cap (\mathbb{N}^n)^\sigma$ then there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \gg 0$ such that $\mathbf{u}' = \mathbf{u} + k\mathbf{w} \in L \cap \mathbb{N}^n$. Thus $\sigma \subsetneq \text{supp}(\mathbf{u}')$, a contradiction. \square

Next we show that the rank of L is determined by the ranks of its sublattice L_{pure} and the lattice L^σ .

Proposition 5.2. *Let $L \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ be a lattice. Then $L \cong L^\sigma \oplus L_{pure}$.*

Proof. The following is a split exact sequence of \mathbb{Z} -modules:

$$0 \longrightarrow L_{pure} \hookrightarrow L \xrightarrow{\pi} L^\sigma \longrightarrow 0,$$

where π is the restriction of the canonical projection $\mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow (\mathbb{Z}^n)^\sigma$ given by $\mathbf{u} \rightarrow \pi(\mathbf{u}) = (u_i)_{i \notin \sigma}$. For the exactness, we note that π is a surjective homomorphism of \mathbb{Z} -modules whose kernel is L_{pure} , by Corollary 2.9. \square

We consider the lattice ideal I_{L^σ} in $R^\sigma := \mathbb{k}[x_i : i \notin \sigma]$. We show that in order to compute the I_{L^σ} -fibers, it is enough to consider the generating sets of the corresponding I_L -fibers.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $L \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ be a lattice and $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^n$. Then the I_{L^σ} -fiber of $x^{\mathbf{u}^\sigma}$ is $G(M_{F_{\mathbf{u}}})^\sigma$, where $F_{\mathbf{u}}$ is the I_L -fiber of $x^{\mathbf{u}}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{u}' = \mathbf{u}^\sigma \in (\mathbb{N}^n)^\sigma$ and denote by F' the I_{L^σ} -fiber of $x^{\mathbf{u}'}$. It follows from Remark 5.1 that F' is finite. We will show that $F' = F_{\mathbf{u}}^\sigma$ and thus by Proposition 2.7 we obtain $F' = G(M_{F_{\mathbf{u}}})^\sigma$, since for any vector $\mathbf{t} \in L^+$ we have $\mathbf{t}^\sigma = \mathbf{0}$. To prove this, consider first an element $x^{\mathbf{v}} \in F_{\mathbf{u}}$. Then $\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u} \in L$ and $\mathbf{v}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\sigma \in L^\sigma$. Hence $x^{\mathbf{v}^\sigma} \in F'$ and we obtain the inclusion $F' \supset F_{\mathbf{u}}^\sigma$. For the converse inclusion, let $x^{\mathbf{v}'} \in F'$. Then $\mathbf{u}' - \mathbf{v}' \in L^\sigma$ and it follows that there exists a vector $\mathbf{w} \in L$ such that $\mathbf{u}' - \mathbf{v}' = \mathbf{w}^\sigma$. Therefore $\mathbf{v}' = (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{w})^\sigma$. Since $\mathbf{u} - (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{w} \in L$ we obtain that $x^{\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{w}} \in F_{\mathbf{u}}$ and $x^{\mathbf{v}'} \in F_{\mathbf{u}}^\sigma$, as desired. \square

Next we show that the cardinality $\mu(I_L)$ of a cardinality-minimal generating set of I_L depends on the cardinality $\mu(I_{L^\sigma})$ of a cardinality-minimal generating set of I_{L^σ} .

Theorem 5.4. *Let L be a lattice. Then*

$$\mu(I_L) = \mu(I_{L^\sigma}) + \text{rank}(L_{pure}).$$

Proof. If L is positive then $L_{\text{pure}} = \{\mathbf{0}\}$, $L = L^\sigma$ and the conclusion is obvious. On the other hand, when L is a pure lattice then $L^\sigma = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ and the conclusion follows from Theorem 4.1. Assume now that L is non-positive and non-pure, that is both L_{pure} and L^σ are nonzero. By Theorem 4.14 we have $\mu(I_L) = \text{rank}(L_{\text{pure}}) + \sum_{\overline{F}_{\mathbf{u}} \neq \overline{F}_{\{1\}}} (t(\overline{F}_{\mathbf{u}}) - 1)$. Applying Lemma 5.3 the graphs $\Gamma_{\overline{F}_{\mathbf{u}}}$ and $\Gamma_{\overline{F}_{\mathbf{u}^\sigma}}$ are equal for any fiber $F_{\mathbf{u}} \notin \overline{F}_{\{1\}}$. Thus, applying once more Theorem 4.14 we obtain $\mu(I_{L^\sigma}) = \sum_{\overline{F}_{\mathbf{u}} \neq \overline{F}_{\{1\}}} (t(\overline{F}_{\mathbf{u}}) - 1)$, since L^σ is positive. \square

The following theorem follows directly from Proposition 5.2 and Theorem 5.4 and determines the binomial complete intersection lattice ideals. It is the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 5.5. *Let $L \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ be a lattice. The ideal I_L is binomial complete intersection if and only if I_{L^σ} is complete intersection.*

We can describe the lattices for which I_L is a binomial complete intersection. Recall that a mixed dominating matrix M has the property that every row of M has a positive and negative entry and M contains no square submatrix with this property.

Corollary 5.6. *Let $L \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ be a lattice. The ideal I_L is binomial complete intersection if and only if either $L^\sigma = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ or there exists a basis of L^σ such that its vectors give the rows of a mixed dominating matrix.*

Proof. If the lattice L is pure, or equivalently $L^\sigma = \{\mathbf{0}\}$, then by [13, Theorem 2.1] or Theorem 4.1 the ideal I_L is binomial complete intersection. Assume now that L is non-pure. Since by Remark 5.1 L^σ is positive, the proof follows from Theorem 5.5 and [25, Theorem 3.9]. \square

Remark 5.7. Let $L \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ be a non-pure lattice, $r = \text{rank}(L)$ and $r_+ = \text{rank}(L_{\text{pure}})$. The previous corollary states that I_L is binomial complete intersection if and only if there is a basis of L whose vectors give the rows of

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & M \\ C & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}$$

where $A \in \mathcal{M}_{(r-r_+) \times |\sigma|}(\mathbb{Z})$, the matrix $M \in \mathcal{M}_{(r-r_+) \times (n-|\sigma|)}(\mathbb{Z})$ is mixed dominating, the matrix $C \in \mathcal{M}_{r_+ \times |\sigma|}(\mathbb{Z})$ is a matrix whose rows satisfy the conditions of Theorem 4.1, and $\mathbf{0}$ is the zero matrix. For example, any matrix with entries in \mathbb{N} and linearly independent rows has the desired property for C above, while for a mixed dominating matrix M one can use [25, Remark 3.17] or [14, Theorem 2.2]. By working with the appropriate size matrices one can easily obtain a class of lattice ideals that are binomial complete intersections.

6. EXAMPLE

Algorithms for computing a generating set for lattice ideals were given in [18, 2, 17]. In the following example we use the techniques introduced in this paper to show how to obtain all cardinality-minimal generating sets of a lattice ideal. Let L be the lattice of Example 4.9. L is generated by the vectors $\mathbf{v}_1 = (3, 0, 1, -1, 0)$, $\mathbf{v}_2 = (0, 1, 6, 0, -1)$, $\mathbf{v}_3 = (1, 1, 0, 0, 0)$ and $\mathbf{v}_4 = (5, 0, 0, 0, 0)$. We note that $\mathbf{v}_5 = (0, 5, 0, 0, 0) \in L$,

$$L^+ = L \cap \mathbb{N}^5 = \mathbb{N}\mathbf{v}_3 + \mathbb{N}\mathbf{v}_4 + \mathbb{N}\mathbf{v}_5$$

and

$$L_{\text{pure}} = \mathbb{Z}\mathbf{v}_3 + \mathbb{Z}\mathbf{v}_4.$$

Thus $\text{rank}(L_{\text{pure}}) = 2$, $\sigma = \{1, 2\}$. Let F be an I_L -fiber. Since $|\mathbb{Z}^2/(L_{\text{pure}})_\sigma| = 5$ it follows by Proposition 3.5 that \overline{F} consists of five equivalent fibers. In particular, let $F_{\{1\}}$ be the fiber that contains $1 = x^0$. As in Example 3.6(b) we see that

$$\overline{F}_{\{1\}} = \{F_{\{1\}}, F_{x_1}, F_{x_1^2}, F_{x_1^3}, F_{x_1^4}\}$$

where for each $0 \leq k \leq 4$, the fiber $F_{x_1^k}$ consists of the monomials $x_1^i x_2^j$ with $i - j \equiv k \pmod{5}$. Thus if $x^{\mathbf{u}} \in R$ then

$$\overline{F}_{x^{\mathbf{u}}} = \{F_{x^{\mathbf{u}}}, F_{x^{\mathbf{u}}x_1}, F_{x^{\mathbf{u}}x_1^2}, F_{x^{\mathbf{u}}x_1^3}, F_{x^{\mathbf{u}}x_1^4}\}.$$

Note that every equivalence class of fibers is in the form $\overline{F}_{x_4^n}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$(1) \quad \overline{F}_{\{1\}} <_{I_L} \overline{F}_{x_4} <_{I_L} \overline{F}_{x_4^2} <_{I_L} \cdots <_{I_L} \overline{F}_{x_4^n} <_{I_L} \cdots.$$

It is clear that the above equivalence classes of fibers are pairwise distinct: use Lemma 3.1 and notice that there is no $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}^5$ with $\text{supp}(\mathbf{w}) \subset \sigma$ such that $\mathbf{w} + (0, 0, 0, k, 0) \in L$.

To find a generating set of I_L in $R = \mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_5]$ one first computes the ideal

$$\langle x_4 - x_1^3 x_3, x_5 - x_2 x_3^6, 1 - x_1 x_2, 1 - x_1^5 \rangle : (x_1 \cdots x_5)^\infty$$

using for example CoCoA [8]. Computing $I_{L, < \overline{F}_{x_4^i}}$ and $I_{L, \leq \overline{F}_{x_4^i}}$ with the use of Proposition 3.12 we conclude via Theorem 3.13 that $F_{\{1\}}$, F_{x_4} and $F_{x_4^6}$ are the Markov fibers.

Let S be a cardinality-minimal generating set of I_L . According to Theorem 4.12, $|S_{\overline{F}_{\{1\}}}| = \text{rank}(L_{\text{pure}}) = 2$ and $S_{\overline{F}_{\{1\}}}$ must generate $I_{L_{\text{pure}}} = \langle 1 - x_1^5, 1 - x_1 x_2 \rangle$. We note that by Theorem 4.1 there are infinitely many choices for binomials B_1, B_2 that generate $I_{L_{\text{pure}}}$, and one way of constructing infinitely many such binomials is using Theorem 2.13 with Corollary 2.14. We remark that the multiset $\{F_{B_1}, F_{B_2}\}$ equals $\{F_{\{1\}}, F\}$, where F can be any of the five fibers of $\overline{F}_{\{1\}}$.

Consider now the Markov fiber F_{x_4} . It is an easy exercise that

$$G(M_{F_{x_4}}) = \{x_2^2 x_3, x_1^3 x_3, x_4\}.$$

Thus $G(M_{F_{x_4}})^\sigma = \{x_4, x_3\}$. Since $I_{L, < \overline{F}_{x_4}} = I_{L_{\text{pure}}}$ it is immediate that $G_{\overline{F}_{x_4}}$ consists of two isolated vertices. Thus $t(\overline{F}_{x_4}) = 2$ and exactly one binomial is needed to construct a spanning tree of $\Gamma_{\overline{F}_{x_4}}$. To obtain a cardinality-minimal generating set, according to Theorem 4.12, we need to add to $S_{\overline{F}_{\{1\}}}$ a binomial $B_3 = \pm(x^{\mathbf{u}} - x^{\mathbf{v}})$ such that $x^{\mathbf{u}} \in x_3 F_{x_1^{3+i}}$ and $x^{\mathbf{v}} \in x_4 F_{x_1^i}$, where $0 \leq i \leq 4$. For example, any of the binomials $x_1^2 x_4 - x_3$ and $x_2 x_3 - x_1^{2016} x_4$ can be chosen as B_3 .

Next consider the Markov fiber $F' = F_{x_4^6}$, for which $\overline{F}' = \{F_{x_4^6}, F_{x_1 x_4^6}, F_{x_5}\}$. Based on Lemma 4.7 and as in Example 4.9 we have

$$G(M_{F'})^\sigma = \{x_5, x_3^6, x_3^5 x_4, x_3^4 x_4^2, x_3^3 x_4^3, x_3^2 x_4^4, x_3 x_4^5, x_4^6\}.$$

Since the graph $G_{\overline{F}'}$ consists of two connected components (see Example 4.9), we need one more binomial $B_4 = \pm(x^{\mathbf{w}_1} - x^{\mathbf{w}_2})$ so that $x^{\mathbf{w}_1} \in x_5 F_{x_1^i}$ and $x^{\mathbf{w}_2}$ is in the union of the sets $x_3^6 F_{x_1^{4+i}}, x_3^5 x_4 F_{x_1^{1+i}}, x_3^4 x_4^2 F_{x_1^{3+i}}, x_3^3 x_4^3 F_{x_1^i}, x_3^2 x_4^4 F_{x_1^{2+i}}, x_3 x_4^5 F_{x_1^{4+i}}, x_4^6 F_{x_1^{1+i}}$, $0 \leq i \leq 4$. For example any of the binomials $x_3^2 x_4^4 - x_2^2 x_5$ and $x_1^2 x_2^{2015} x_3 x_4^5 - x_1^3 x_5$ can be chosen as B_4 .

According to Theorem 4.12, $S = \{B_1, B_2, B_3, B_4\}$ is a cardinality-minimal generating set of I_L . Thus $\mu(I_L) = 4$ and I_L is a binomial complete intersection. This also follows

immediately from Corollary 5.6, since L^σ is generated by v_1^σ, v_2^σ and the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 6 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$$

is mixed dominating.

Acknowledgment. The authors would like to thank Ezra Miller for useful discussions on binomial fibers, back in 2009, that initiated this work. Also, we thank the anonymous referee for several helpful suggestions on the terminology of this paper and for simplifying the proofs of Propositions 2.11, 5.2 and Theorems 2.12, 2.13. This paper was partially written during the visit of the second and third author at the University of Ioannina. The third author was supported by a Romanian grant awarded by UEFISCDI, project number 83/2010, PNII-RU code TE_46/2010, program Human Resources, “Algebraic modeling of some combinatorial objects and computational applications”.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Aoki, A. Takemura, R. Yoshida, *Indispensable monomials of toric ideals and Markov bases*, J. Symbolic Comput. **43** (2008), 490–507.
- [2] A. Bigatti, R. LaScala, L. Robbiano, *Computing toric ideals*, J. Symbolic Computation **27** (1999), 351–365.
- [3] E. Briales, A. Campillo, C. Marijuán, P. Pisón, *Minimal systems of generators for ideals of semigroups*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **124** (1998), 7–30.
- [4] H. Charalambous, A. Katsabekis, A. Thoma, *Minimal systems of binomial generators and the indispensable complex of a toric ideal*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **135** (2007), 3443–3451.
- [5] H. Charalambous, A. Thoma, M. Vladioiu, *Markov bases and generalized Lawrence liftings*, Annals of Combinatorics **19** (2015), 661–669.
- [6] H. Charalambous, A. Thoma, M. Vladioiu, *Markov complexity of monomial curves*, J. Algebra **417** (2014) 391–411.
- [7] H. Charalambous, A. Thoma, M. Vladioiu, *Binomial fibers and indispensable binomials*, J. Symbolic Computation **74** (2016), 578–591.
- [8] CoCoATeam, CoCoA: a system for doing Computations in Commutative Algebra, available at <http://cocoa.dima.unige.it>
- [9] Ch. Delorme, *Sous monoïdes d’intersection complete de N* , Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **9** (1976), 145–154.
- [10] P. Diaconis, B. Sturmfels, *Algebraic algorithms for sampling from conditional distributions*, Ann. Statist., **26** (1998), 363–397.
- [11] A. Dickenstein, L.F. Matusevich, E. Miller, *Combinatorics of binomial primary decomposition*, Math. Z. **264** (2010), 745–763.
- [12] M. Drton, B. Sturmfels, S. Sullivant, *Lectures on algebraic statistics*, Oberwolfach Seminars, 39. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2009. viii+171 pp.
- [13] D. Eisenbud, B. Sturmfels, *Binomial ideals*, Duke Math. J. **84** (1996), 1–45.
- [14] K. Fischer, W. Morris, J. Shapiro, *Affine semigroup rings that are complete intersections*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **125** (1995), 3137–3145.
- [15] I. Gitler, E. Reyes, J. A. Vega, *Complete intersection toric ideals of oriented graphs and Chorded-Theta subgraphs*, J. Algebr. Comb. **38** (2013), 721–744.
- [16] J. Herzog, *Generators and relations of abelian semigroups and semigroup rings*, Manuscripta Math. **3** (1970), 175–193.
- [17] R. Hemmecke, P. Malkin, *Computing generating sets of lattice ideals and Markov bases of lattices*, J. Symbolic Computation **44** (2009), 1463–1476.
- [18] S. Hoşten, B. Sturmfels, *GRIN: an implementation of Gröbner bases for integer programming*, in Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization (Copenhagen), LNCS **920** Springer Verlag (1995), 267–276.
- [19] S. Hoşten, S. Sullivant, *A finiteness theorem for Markov bases of hierarchical models*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **114** (2007), 311–321.

- [20] M. N. Ishida, *Normal semigroup rings which are complete intersections*, in: Proc. Symposium on Commutative Algebra, Karuizawa, 1978.
- [21] T. Kähle, E. Miller, *Decompositions of commutative monoid congruences and binomial ideals*, Algebra Number Theory **8** (2014) 1297–1364.
- [22] H. López, R. Villarreal, *Complete intersections in binomial and lattice ideals*, Internat. J. Algebra Comput. **23** (2013) 1419–1429.
- [23] E. Miller, *Theory and Applications of lattice point methods for binomial ideals*, in Combinatorial Aspects of Commutative Algebra and Algebraic Geometry, Proceedings of Abel Symposium held at Voss, Norway, 14 June 2009, Abel Symposia, vol. 6, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, (2011), pp. 99–154.
- [24] E. Miller, B. Sturmfels, *Combinatorial Commutative Algebra*, Grad. Texts in Math., vol. 227, Springer-Verlag, New York, (2005).
- [25] M. Morales, A. Thoma, *Complete intersection lattice ideals*, J. Algebra **284** (2005), 755–770.
- [26] H. Nakajima, *Affine torus embeddings which are complete intersections*, Tôhoku Math. J. **38** (1986), 85–98.
- [27] L. O’Carroll, F. Planas–Vilanova, R. Villarreal, *Degree and algebraic properties of lattice and matrix ideals*, SIAM J. Discrete Math. **28** (2014), no. 1, 394–427.
- [28] H. Ohsugi, T. Hibi, *Indispensable binomials of finite graphs*, J. Algebra Appl. **4** (2005), 421–434.
- [29] H. Ohsugi, T. Hibi, *Toric ideals arising from contingency tables*, Proceedings of the Ramanujan Mathematical Society’s Lecture Notes Series, (2006), 87–111.
- [30] I. Ojeda, A. Vigneron-Tenorio, *Indispensable binomials in semigroup ideals*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **138** (2010), 4205–4216.
- [31] I. Peeva, B. Sturmfels, *Generic lattice ideals*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **11** (1998), 363–373.
- [32] J. C. Rosales, P. A. Garcia-Sanchez, *On complete intersection affine semigroups*, Commun. Algebra **23** (1995), 5395–5412.
- [33] F. Santos, B. Sturmfels, *Higher Lawrence configurations*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **103**, 151–164 (2003).
- [34] U. Schäfer, *Der kanonische modul monomialer raumkurven*, Diplomarbeit, Martin-Luther-Universität Halle/Wittenberg, Halle, (1985).
- [35] G. Scheja, O. Scheja, U. Storch, *On regular sequences of binomials*, Manuscripta Math. **98** (1999), 115–132.
- [36] R. P. Stanley, *Relative invariants of finite groups generated by pseudoreflections*, J. Algebra **49** (1977), 134–148.
- [37] B. Sturmfels, *Gröbner Bases and Convex Polytopes*, University Lecture Series, No. 8 American Mathematical Society Providence, R.I. (1995).
- [38] B. Sturmfels, R. Weismantel, G. Ziegler, *Gröbner Bases of Lattices, Corner Polyhedra, and Integer Programming*, Beiträge zur Algebra und Geometrie, Contributions to Algebra and Geometry, **36** (1995), 281–298.
- [39] K. Watanabe, *Invariant subrings which are complete intersections, I (Invariant subrings of finite abelian groups)*, Nagoya Math. **77** (1980), 89–98.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ARISTOTLE UNIVERSITY OF THESSALONIKI, THESSALONIKI, 54124, GREECE

E-mail address: `hara@math.auth.gr`

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

E-mail address: `athoma@uoi.gr`

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF BUCHAREST, STR. ACADEMIEI 14, BUCHAREST, RO-010014, ROMANIA

E-mail address: `vladoiu@fmi.unibuc.ro`