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#### Abstract

Let $G$ be a simple graph on the vertex set $\left\{v_{1}, \ldots, v_{n}\right\}$. An algebraic object attached to $G$ is the toric ideal $I_{G}$. We say that $I_{G}$ is subgraph splittable if there exist subgraphs $G_{1}$ and $G_{2}$ of $G$ such that $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$, where both $I_{G_{1}}$ and $I_{G_{2}}$ are not equal to $I_{G}$. We show that $I_{G}$ is subgraph splittable if and only if it is edge splittable. We also prove that the toric ideal of a complete bipartite graph is not subgraph splittable. In contrast, we show that the toric ideal of a complete graph $K_{n}$ is always subgraph splittable when $n \geq 4$. Additionally, we show that the toric ideal of $K_{n}$ has a minimal splitting if and only if $4 \leq n \leq 5$. Finally, we prove that any minimal splitting of $I_{G}$ is also a reduced splitting.


## 1. Introduction

Let $A=\left\{\mathbf{a}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{a}_{m}\right\}$ be a subset of $\mathbb{N}^{n}$ such that $A$ does not contain the zero vector. Consider the polynomial ring $K\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}\right]$ over any field $K$. We grade $K\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}\right]$ by the semigroup $\mathbb{N} A=\left\{l_{1} \mathbf{a}_{1}+\cdots+l_{m} \mathbf{a}_{m}\right\}$ setting $\operatorname{deg}_{A}\left(x_{i}\right)=\mathbf{a}_{i}$ for $i=1, \ldots, m$. The $A$ degree of a monomial $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}=x_{1}^{u_{1}} \cdots x_{m}^{u_{m}}$ is defined by $\operatorname{deg}_{A}\left(\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}\right)=u_{1} \mathbf{a}_{1}+\cdots+u_{m} \mathbf{a}_{m} \in \mathbb{N} A$. The $A$-fiber of a vector $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$ is the set of all monomials in $K\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}\right]$ with $A$-degree equal to $\mathbf{b}$. The toric ideal $I_{A}$ is the prime ideal generated by all the binomials $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}-\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}}$ such that $\operatorname{deg}_{A}\left(\mathrm{x}^{\mathbf{u}}\right)=\operatorname{deg}_{A}\left(\mathrm{x}^{\mathbf{v}}\right)$.

A recent direction in the theory of toric ideals is to decide when $I_{A}$ is splittable, see [5, 6, 7, The toric ideal $I_{A}$ is splittable if it has a toric splitting i.e. if there exist toric ideals $I_{A_{1}}, I_{A_{2}}$ such that $I_{A}=I_{A_{1}}+I_{A_{2}}$ and $I_{A_{i}} \neq I_{A}$, for all $1 \leq i \leq 2$. To every simple graph $G$ one can associate the toric ideal $I_{G}$. In [5] G. Favacchio, J. Hofscheier, G. Keiper, and A. Van Tuyl consider the aforementioned problem for the toric ideal $I_{G}$, namely they study when $I_{G}$ has a toric splitting of the form $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$, where $I_{G_{i}}, 1 \leq i \leq 2$, is the toric ideal of a subgraph $G_{i}$ of $G$. More precisely, given a graph $G$ and an even cycle $C$, they consider the graph $H$ which is formed by identifying any edge of $G$ with an edge of $C$. They show [5, Theorem 3.7] that $I_{H}=I_{G}+I_{C}$ is a splitting of $I_{H}$. They also prove [5. Corollary 4.8] that if $G_{1}$ and $G_{2}$ form a splitting of $G$ along an edge $e$ and at least one of $G_{1}$ or $G_{2}$ is bipartite, then $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ is a splitting of $I_{G}$. Moreover, when $I_{G}$ has such a splitting, they show [5, Theorem 4.11] how the graded Betti numbers of $I_{G}$ are related with those of $I_{G_{1}}$ and $I_{G_{2}}$. P. Gimenez and H. Srinivasan showed [6, Theorem 3.4] that if $G_{1}$ and $G_{2}$ form a splitting of $G$ along an edge $e$, then $I_{G}$ splits into $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ if and only if at least one of $G_{1}$ or $G_{2}$ is bipartite.

This paper aims to partially answer [5, Question 5.1], namely for what graphs $G$ can we find $G_{1}$ and $G_{2}$ so that their respective toric ideals satisfy $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ ? More generally, can we classify when $I_{G}$ is a splittable toric ideal in terms of $G$ ? We give a complete answer to the latter question in the case that both $G_{1}, G_{2}$ are subgraphs of $G$. We call splittings

[^0]like that subgraph splittings and the ideal $I_{G}$ is called subgraph splittable. Note that there may be splittings of graphs $G$ which are not subgraph splittings, see Remark 4.9. Our approach is based on the graphs $G \backslash e$ and $G_{S}^{e}$ introduced in section 2, where $e$ is an edge of $G$ and $S$ is a minimal system of binomial generators of $I_{G}$. We show that $I_{G}$ is subgraph splittable if and only if there is an edge $e$ of $G$ and a minimal generating set of binomials $S$ of $I_{G}$ such that $I_{G}=I_{G_{S}^{e}}+I_{G \backslash e}$ is a splitting, see Theorem 2.10. As an application of our results, we prove that the toric ideal of a complete bipartite graph is not subgraph splittable (see Corollary 2.13) and the toric ideal of the suspension of a cycle of length $n \geq 3$ is subgraph splittable if and only if either $n=4$ or $n$ is odd, see Theorem 2.14. In section 3 we study the case that $G$ coincides with the complete graph $K_{n}$ on $n$ vertices. We show that $I_{K_{n}}$ is subgraph splittable if and only if $n \geq 4$, see Theorem 3.1. Moreover, we introduce minimal splittings and show (Theorem 3.10) that $I_{K_{n}}$ does not have a minimal splitting for $n \geq 6$. In section 4 we define reduced splittings of toric ideals and prove that every minimal splitting of $I_{G}$ is also reduced, see Theorem 4.7.

## 2. Edge Splittings

In this section, we first collect important notations and definitions used in the paper. For unexplained terminology in graph theory, we refer to [10]. Let $G$ be a finite, connected and undirected graph having no loops and no multiple edges on the vertex set $V(G)=$ $\left\{v_{1}, \ldots, v_{n}\right\}$, and let $E(G)=\left\{e_{1}, \ldots, e_{m}\right\}$ be the set of edges of $G$. Two edges of $G$ are called adjacent if they share a common vertex. To each edge $e=\left\{v_{i}, v_{j}\right\} \in E(G)$, we associate the vector $\mathbf{a}_{e} \in\{0,1\}^{n}$ defined as follows: the $i$ th entry is 1 , the $j$ th entry is 1 , and the remaining entries are zero. By $I_{G}$ we denote the toric ideal $I_{A_{G}}$ in $K\left[e_{1}, \ldots, e_{m}\right]$, where $A_{G}=\left\{\mathbf{a}_{e} \mid e \in E(G)\right\} \subset \mathbb{N}^{n}$.

A walk of length $q$ of $G$ connecting $v_{1} \in V(G)$ with $v_{q+1}$ is a finite sequence of the form $w=\left(\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}\right\},\left\{v_{2}, v_{3}\right\}, \ldots,\left\{v_{q-1}, v_{q}\right\},\left\{v_{q}, v_{q+1}\right\}\right)$ with each $\left\{v_{i}, v_{i+1}\right\} \in E(G), 1 \leq i \leq q$. An even (respectively, odd) walk is a walk of even (respectively, odd) length. The walk $w$ is called closed if $v_{q+1}=v_{1}$. A cycle is a closed walk

$$
w=\left(\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}\right\},\left\{v_{2}, v_{3}\right\}, \ldots,\left\{v_{q-1}, v_{q}\right\},\left\{v_{q}, v_{1}\right\}\right)
$$

with $q \geq 3$ and $v_{i} \neq v_{j}$, for every $1 \leq i<j \leq q$. A cut vertex is a vertex of $G$ whose removal increases the number of connected components of the remaining subgraph. A graph is called biconnected if it is connected and does not contain a cut vertex. A block is a maximal biconnected subgraph of $G$.

Given an even closed walk $w=\left(e_{i_{1}}, e_{i_{2}}, \ldots, e_{i_{2 q}}\right)$ of $G$, we write $B_{w}$ for the binomial $B_{w}=\prod_{k=1}^{q} e_{i_{2 k-1}}-\prod_{k=1}^{q} e_{i_{2 k}} \in I_{G}$. By [13, Proposition 10.1.5] the ideal $I_{G}$ is generated by all the binomials $B_{w}$, where $w$ is an even closed walk of $G$. We say that $w$ is a primitive walk if the corresponding binomial $B_{w}$ is primitive. Recall that given a set of vectors $A \subset \mathbb{N}^{n}$, the binomial $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}-\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}}$ in $I_{A}$ is called primitive if there exists no other binomial $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{w}}-\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{z}} \in I_{A}$ such that $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{w}}$ divides $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}$ and $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{z}}$ divides $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}}$. Every minimal binomial generator of $I_{A}$ is primitive, see [11].

Every even primitive walk $w=\left(e_{i_{1}}, e_{i_{2}}, \ldots, e_{i_{2 q}}\right)$ partitions the set of edges of $w$ in the two sets $E_{1}=\left\{e_{i_{j}} \mid j\right.$ odd $\}$ and $E_{2}=\left\{e_{i_{j}} \mid j\right.$ even $\}$. The edges of $E_{1}$ are called odd edges of $w$ and those of $E_{2}$ even. A sink of a block $B$ is a common vertex of two odd or two even edges of the primitive walk $w$ which belongs to $B$. The primitive walk $w$ is called strongly primitive if it has no two sinks with distance one in any cyclic block.

Let $w=\left(e_{1}, e_{2}, \ldots, e_{2 q}\right)$ be an even primitive walk and $f=\left\{v_{i}, v_{j}\right\}$ be a chord of $w$ with $i<j$, namely an edge $f=\left\{v_{i}, v_{j}\right\}$ of $G$ such that $f \notin E(w)$. Then $f$ breaks $w$ in two
walks: $w_{1}=\left(e_{1}, \ldots, e_{i-1}, f, e_{j}, \ldots, e_{2 q}\right)$ and $w_{2}=\left(e_{i}, \ldots, e_{j-1}, f\right)$. The chord $f$ is called bridge of $w$ if there exist two different blocks $B_{i}, B_{j}$ of $w$ such that $v_{i} \in B_{i}$ and $v_{j} \in B_{j}$. The chord $f$ is called even (respectively odd) if it is not a bridge and breaks $w$ in two even walks (respectively odd).

Let $f=\left\{v_{i}, v_{j}\right\}$ be an odd chord of $w$ with $i<j$ and $f^{\prime}=\left\{v_{k}, v_{l}\right\}$ be another odd chord of $w$ with $k<l$. We say that the odd chords $f$ and $f^{\prime}$ cross effectively in $w$ if $k-i$ is odd and either $i<k<j<l$ or $k<i<l<j$. We call an $F_{4}$ of the walk $w$ a cycle $\left(e, f, e^{\prime}, f^{\prime}\right)$ of length four which consists of two edges $e, e^{\prime}$ of the walk $w$ both odd or both even, and two odd chords $f$ and $f^{\prime}$ which cross effectively in $w$. We say that the odd chords $f, f^{\prime}$ cross strongly effectively in $w$ if they cross effectively and they do not form an $F_{4}$ in $w$.

A binomial $B_{w} \in I_{G}$ is called minimal if it belongs to a minimal system of binomial generators of $I_{G}$. Since $I_{G}$ is homogeneous, the graded version of Nakayama's Lemma implies that every minimal system of generators of $I_{G}$ has the same cardinality.

The next theorem provides a characterization for the minimal binomials of $I_{G}$.
Theorem 2.1. (10, Theorem 4.13]) Let $w$ be an even closed walk of $G$. Then $B_{w}$ is a minimal binomial if and only if
(1) $w$ is strongly primitive,
(2) all the chords of $w$ are odd and there are not two of them which cross strongly effectively and
(3) no odd chord crosses an $F_{4}$ of the walk $w$.

A binomial $B_{w} \in I_{G}$ is called indispensable if every system of binomial generators of $I_{G}$ contains $B_{w}$ or $-B_{w}$. The next theorem provides a characterization for the indispensable binomials of $I_{G}$.

Theorem 2.2. (10, Theorem 4.14]) Let $w$ be an even closed walk of $G$. Then $B_{w}$ is an indispensable binomial if and only if $w$ is a strongly primitive walk, all the chords of $w$ are odd and there are not two of them that cross effectively.

It follows from Theorems 2.1, 2.2 that the binomial $B_{w}$ is not indispensable due to the existence of $F_{4}$ 's in the walk $w$. Moreover, a minimal binomial $B_{w}$ of $I_{G}$ is indispensable if and only if the walk $w$ does not have any $F_{4}$.

Note that there may exist a subgraph $H$ of the graph $G$ such that $I_{H}=I_{G}$. This can happen when there are edges in $G$ that are not used in any walk $w$ such that $B_{w}$ is a minimal binomial of $I_{G}$.

Given an edge $e$ of $G$, we denote by $G \backslash e$ the graph with the same vertex set as $G$ and whose edge set consists of all edges of $G$ except $e$. For any set $F \subset E(G)$ of edges of $G$, we use $G \backslash F$ to denote the subgraph of $G$ containing the same vertices as $G$ but with all the edges of $F$ removed.

Let $S=\left\{B_{w_{1}}, B_{w_{2}}, \ldots, B_{w_{r}}\right\}$ be a minimal generating set of $I_{G}$. Given an edge $e$ of $G$, we define $G_{S}^{e}$ to be the subgraph of $G$ on the vertex set

$$
V\left(G_{S}^{e}\right)=\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq r \text { and } e \in E\left(w_{i}\right)} V\left(w_{i}\right)
$$

with edges

$$
E\left(G_{S}^{e}\right)=\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq r} \text { and } e \in E\left(w_{i}\right) \quad E\left(w_{i}\right) .
$$

Thus to form the graph $G_{S}^{e}$ one needs first to find all binomials $B_{w_{i}} \in S, 1 \leq i \leq r$, such that $e$ is an edge of the walk $w_{i}$. Then we take all vertices and edges of such walks.

We use the symbol $G_{S}^{e}$ to emphasize that the graph depends not only on the edge $e$ but also on the minimal system of binomial generators $S$, see Example 2.3. For a toric ideal $I_{G}$ with a unique minimal system of binomial generators $S$, we will simply write $G^{e}$ instead of $G_{S}^{e}$.
Example 2.3. Recall that the complete graph $K_{n}$ is the graph with $n$ vertices in which each vertex is connected to every other vertex. Let $G=K_{4}$ be the complete graph on the vertex set $\left\{v_{1}, \ldots, v_{4}\right\}$. Let $w_{1}=\left(\varepsilon_{12}, \varepsilon_{23}, \varepsilon_{34}, \varepsilon_{14}\right)$, $w_{2}=\left(\varepsilon_{12}, \varepsilon_{24}, \varepsilon_{34}, \varepsilon_{13}\right)$ and $w_{3}=\left(\varepsilon_{23}, \varepsilon_{13}, \varepsilon_{14}, \varepsilon_{24}\right)$, where $\varepsilon_{i j}=\left\{v_{i}, v_{j}\right\}$ for $1 \leq i<j \leq 4$. Then $S=\left\{B_{w_{1}}=\right.$ $\left.\varepsilon_{12} \varepsilon_{34}-\varepsilon_{23} \varepsilon_{14}, B_{w_{2}}=\varepsilon_{12} \varepsilon_{34}-\varepsilon_{24} \varepsilon_{13}\right\}$ and $T=\left\{B_{w_{1}}, B_{w_{3}}=\varepsilon_{23} \varepsilon_{14}-\varepsilon_{13} \varepsilon_{24}\right\}$ are minimal generating sets of $I_{G}$. Let $e=\varepsilon_{23}$, then $G_{S}^{e}$ is the cycle given by the walk $w_{1}$ while $G_{T}^{e}$ is the whole graph $G$.

Theorem 2.4. Let $G$ be a graph and $e$ be an edge of $G$. Let $S=\left\{B_{w_{1}}, B_{w_{2}}, \ldots, B_{w_{r}}\right\}$ be a minimal generating set of $I_{G}$, then $I_{G}=I_{G_{S}^{e}}+I_{G \backslash e}$.
Proof. We have that $G \backslash e \subset G$ and $G_{S}^{e} \subset G$, so $I_{G \backslash e} \subset I_{G}$ and $I_{G_{S}^{e}} \subset I_{G}$. Thus $I_{G_{S}^{e}}+I_{G \backslash e} \subset$ $I_{G}$. Let $B_{w_{i}}, 1 \leq i \leq r$, be a minimal binomial in $S$. Then there are two cases:
(1) $e \in E\left(w_{i}\right)$. Then $B_{w_{i}}$ belongs to the ideal $I_{G_{S}^{e}}$.
(2) $e \notin E\left(w_{i}\right)$. Then $B_{w_{i}}$ belongs to the ideal $I_{G \backslash e}$.

Consequently $I_{G} \subset I_{G_{S}^{e}}+I_{G \backslash e}$.
Example 2.5. We return to Example 2.3. We have that $I_{G_{S}^{e}}=<B_{w_{1}}>$ and $I_{G_{T}}=I_{G}$. Also $G \backslash e$ is the graph with edges $\varepsilon_{12}, \varepsilon_{34}, \varepsilon_{14}, \varepsilon_{13}, \varepsilon_{24}$, thus $I_{G \backslash e}=<B_{w_{2}}>$. Then $I_{G}=$ $I_{G_{S}^{e}}+I_{G \backslash e}$ is a splitting of $I_{G}$, while $I_{G}=I_{G_{T}^{e}}+I_{G \backslash e}$ is not a splitting of $I_{G}$ since $I_{G_{T}^{e}}=I_{G}$.
Definition 2.6. A subgraph splitting $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ of $I_{G}$ is called edge splitting if there exist an edge $e$ of $G$ and a minimal generating set $S$ of $I_{G}$ such that $G_{1}=G_{S}^{e}$ and $G_{2}=G \backslash e$ or $G_{1}=G \backslash e$ and $G_{2}=G_{S}^{e}$. The toric ideal $I_{G}$ is called edge splittable if there exists an edge splitting of $I_{G}$.

Remark 2.7. It is not necessary for all subgraph splittings (if any) of the toric ideal of a graph to be edge splittings. Consider the complete graph $K_{5}$ on the vertex set $\left\{v_{1}, \ldots, v_{5}\right\}$. Let $\varepsilon_{i j}=\left\{v_{i}, v_{j}\right\}$ for $1 \leq i<j \leq 5$. Consider the subgraphs $G_{1}=$ $K_{5} \backslash\left\{\varepsilon_{12}, \varepsilon_{34}\right\}$ and $G_{2}=K_{5} \backslash\left\{\varepsilon_{14}, \varepsilon_{23}\right\}$ of $K_{5}$. We have that $S=\left\{\varepsilon_{13} \varepsilon_{24}-\varepsilon_{14} \varepsilon_{23}, \varepsilon_{14} \varepsilon_{25}-\right.$ $\left.\varepsilon_{15} \varepsilon_{24}, \varepsilon_{23} \varepsilon_{45}-\varepsilon_{24} \varepsilon_{35}, \varepsilon_{13} \varepsilon_{25}-\varepsilon_{15} \varepsilon_{23}, \varepsilon_{13} \varepsilon_{45}-\varepsilon_{14} \varepsilon_{35}\right\}$ is a generating set of $I_{G_{1}}$ and $T=$ $\left\{\varepsilon_{12} \varepsilon_{34}-\varepsilon_{13} \varepsilon_{24}, \varepsilon_{24} \varepsilon_{35}-\varepsilon_{25} \varepsilon_{34}, \varepsilon_{13} \varepsilon_{45}-\varepsilon_{15} \varepsilon_{34}, \varepsilon_{12} \varepsilon_{45}-\varepsilon_{15} \varepsilon_{24}, \varepsilon_{12} \varepsilon_{35}-\varepsilon_{13} \varepsilon_{25}\right\}$ is a generating set of $I_{G_{2}}$. Also, $S \cup T$ is a generating set of $I_{K_{5}}$ and $I_{G_{i}} \neq I_{K_{5}}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 2$, so $I_{K_{5}}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ is a splitting of $I_{K_{5}}$ which is not an edge splitting. Note that both $G_{1}, G_{2}$ cannot be written in the form $K_{5} \backslash e$.

Next two Theorems provide a necessary and sufficient condition for a toric ideal $I_{G}$ to be subgraph splittable in terms of the graph $G$.

Theorem 2.8. The ideal $I_{G}$ is edge splittable if and only if there is a minimal system of binomial generators $S=\left\{B_{w_{1}}, \ldots, B_{w_{r}}\right\}$ of $I_{G}$ with $r \geq 2$ and an edge $e \in E\left(w_{i}\right)$, $1 \leq i \leq r$, such that $I_{G_{S}^{e}} \neq I_{G}$.
Proof. $(\Longrightarrow)$ Suppose that the ideal $I_{G}$ is edge splittable, then there exist a minimal system of binomial generators $S=\left\{B_{w_{1}}, \ldots, B_{w_{r}}\right\}$ of $I_{G}$ with $r \geq 2$ and an edge $e$ of $G$ such that $I_{G}=I_{G_{S}^{e}}+I_{G \backslash e}$ is a splitting. Thus $I_{G \backslash e} \neq I_{G}$, so there is $B_{w_{i}} \in I_{G}, 1 \leq i \leq r$, such that $B_{w_{i}} \notin I_{G \backslash e}$ and therefore $e \in E\left(w_{i}\right)$.
$(\Longleftarrow)$ Suppose that there is a minimal system of binomial generators $S=\left\{B_{w_{1}}, \ldots, B_{w_{r}}\right\}$ of $I_{G}$ with $r \geq 2$ and an edge $e \in E\left(w_{i}\right), 1 \leq i \leq r$, such that $I_{G_{S}^{e}} \neq I_{G}$. Then from Theorem 2.4 we have that $I_{G}=I_{G_{S}^{e}}+I_{G \backslash e}$. Since $e \in E\left(w_{i}\right)$, we have that $B_{w_{i}} \notin I_{G \backslash e}$ and therefore $I_{G \backslash e} \neq I_{G}$. From the hypothesis, it holds that $I_{G_{S}^{e}} \neq I_{G}$. Consequently, $I_{G}$ is edge splittable.


Figure 1. The graph $G_{8}$

Example 2.9. Let $P_{n}$ be the graph with $2 n+1$ vertices: the $n$ vertices of a regular $n$-gon, the $n$ midpoints of the edges of the polygon and the center of the polygon. The graph $P_{n}$ has $3 n$ edges: the $n$ radii $R_{i}$ of the inscribed circle in the polygon corresponding to the midpoints of the edges of the polygon and the $2 n$ segments $l_{i}$, $r_{i}$ joining the vertices of the polygon to the two adjacent midpoints. Let $e$ be a new edge attached to the center of the polygon. To each one of the $n$ radii of the inscribed circle in the polygon and the edge $e$ we attach two edges $e_{i}, R_{i}^{\prime}$ to create $n$ cycles ( $e, R_{i}, e_{i}, R_{i}^{\prime}$ ) of length 4. Let $G_{n}$ be the resulting roundabout graph with $3 n+2$ vertices and $5 n+1$ edges.

In Figure 1 we plot the graph $G_{8}$ with 26 vertices and 41 edges. Since $G_{n}$ is bipartite, we have, from [8, Theorem 2.3], that $I_{G_{n}}$ has a unique minimal system of generators consisting of all binomials $B_{w}$, where $w$ is an even cycle with no chords. The graph $G_{n}$ has $n$ cycles with no chords of the form $\left(e, R_{i}, e_{i}, R_{i}^{\prime}\right), n$ cycles of the form $\left(R_{i}, l_{i}, r_{i}, R_{i-1}\right), 1$ cycle of the form $\left(l_{1}, r_{1}, l_{2}, r_{2}, \ldots, l_{n}, r_{n}\right)$ and $2\binom{n}{2}$ cycles of two forms, namely $\left(R_{i}^{\prime}, e_{i}, r_{i}, l_{i}, r_{i-1}, \ldots, e_{j}, R_{j}^{\prime}\right)$ and $\left(R_{i}^{\prime}, e_{i}, l_{i+1}, r_{i+1}, \ldots, e_{j}, R_{j}^{\prime}\right)$, where $i, j \in\{1, \cdots, n\}$, $i-1$ equals $n$ when $i=1$ and $i+1$ equals 1 when $i=n$. Thus $G_{n}$ has exactly $2 n+1+2\binom{n}{2}$ cycles without a chord. Note that $G_{8}$ has exactly 73 cycles with no chords, see Figure 1. We plot in Figure 2 the graph $G_{8} \backslash e$ and in Figure 3 the graph $G_{8}^{e}$. Note that the toric ideal of the graph $G_{8} \backslash e$ has 93 minimal binomials, while the toric ideal of $G_{8}^{e}$ has 8 minimal binomials. In general, $I_{G_{n} \backslash e}$ has $n+3\binom{n}{2}+1$ minimal binomials of the form $B_{w}$, where $w$ are even cycles with no chords of the following form: $n$ cycles of the form $\left(R_{i}, l_{i}, r_{i}, R_{i-1}\right), 1$ cycle of the form $\left(l_{1}, r_{1}, l_{2}, r_{2}, \ldots, l_{n}, r_{n}\right), 2\binom{n}{2}$ cycles of two forms, namely $\left(R_{i}^{\prime}, e_{i}, r_{i}, l_{i}, r_{i-1}, \ldots, e_{j}, R_{j}^{\prime}\right)$ and $\left(R_{i}^{\prime}, e_{i}, l_{i+1}, r_{i+1}, \ldots, e_{j}, R_{j}^{\prime}\right)$, and $\binom{n}{2}$ cycles which correspond to cycles ( $R_{i}, e_{i}, R_{i}^{\prime}, R_{j}^{\prime}, e_{j}, R_{j}$ ) in $G_{n} \backslash e$ of length 6 that in the graph $G_{n}$ had
$e$ as an even chord. The ideal $I_{G_{n}^{e}}$ has $n$ minimal binomials corresponding to the cycles $\left(e, R_{i}, e_{i}, R_{i}^{\prime}\right)$. It follows from Theorem 2.8 that $I_{G_{n}}=I_{G_{n}^{e}}+I_{G \backslash e}$ is an edge splitting.


Figure 2. The graph $G_{8} \backslash e$


Figure 3. The graph $G_{8}^{e}$

Next we state and prove the main result of this article, namely if the toric ideal of a graph has a subgraph splitting then it has also an edge splitting.

Theorem 2.10. The toric ideal $I_{G}$ is subgraph splittable if and only if it is edge splittable.
Proof. $(\Longleftarrow)$ If $I_{G}$ is edge splittable, then $I_{G}=I_{G_{S}^{e}}+I_{G \backslash e}$ is a splitting of $I_{G}$, and therefore it is subgraph splittable.
$(\Longrightarrow)$ Suppose that $I_{G}$ is subgraph splittable and let $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ be a subgraph splitting of $I_{G}$. Notice that $I_{G_{1}} \varsubsetneqq I_{G}$ and $I_{G_{2}} \varsubsetneqq I_{G}$. Let $\left\{f_{1}, \ldots, f_{s}\right\}$ be a binomial generating set
of $I_{G_{1}}$ and $\left\{g_{1}, \ldots, g_{t}\right\}$ be a binomial generating set of $I_{G_{2}}$. Then $\left\{f_{1}, \ldots, f_{s}, g_{1}, \ldots, g_{t}\right\}$ is a generating set of $I_{G}$, therefore it contains a minimal binomial generating set $S=$ $\left\{B_{w_{1}}, \ldots, B_{w_{r}}\right\}$ of $I_{G}$, since toric ideals of graphs are homogeneous. Note that $r \geq 2$, since $I_{G_{1}}$ and $I_{G_{2}}$ are nonzero ideals. But $S \subset\left\{f_{1}, \ldots, f_{s}, g_{1}, \ldots, g_{t}\right\}$, so each $B_{w_{i}}, 1 \leq i \leq r$, belongs to at least one of $I_{G_{1}}, I_{G_{2}}$. If for every $1 \leq i \leq r$ it holds that $B_{w_{i}} \in I_{G_{2}}$, then $I_{G_{2}}=I_{G}$ a contradiction. Thus there exists $1 \leq i \leq r$ such that $B_{w_{i}} \in I_{G_{1}}$ and $B_{w_{i}} \notin I_{G_{2}}$, so there is $e \in E\left(w_{i}\right)$ such that $e \notin E\left(G_{2}\right)$. For every even closed walk $w_{j}$ such that $e \in E\left(w_{j}\right)$ we have that $B_{w_{j}} \in I_{G_{1}}$, thus $I_{G_{S}^{e}} \subset I_{G_{1}}$ and therefore $I_{G_{S}^{e}} \neq I_{G}$ since $I_{G_{1}} \varsubsetneqq I_{G}$. By Theorem 2.8 the toric ideal $I_{G}$ is edge splittable.
Example 2.11. Consider the graph $G$ on the vertex set $\left\{v_{1}, \ldots, v_{10}\right\}$ with edges $e_{1}=$ $\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}\right\}, e_{2}=\left\{v_{2}, v_{3}\right\}, e_{3}=\left\{v_{3}, v_{4}\right\}, e_{4}=\left\{v_{4}, v_{5}\right\}, e_{5}=\left\{v_{5}, v_{6}\right\}, e_{6}=\left\{v_{6}, v_{7}\right\}, e_{7}=$ $\left\{v_{7}, v_{8}\right\}, e_{8}=\left\{v_{8}, v_{9}\right\}, e_{9}=\left\{v_{9}, v_{10}\right\}, e_{10}=\left\{v_{1}, v_{10}\right\}, e_{11}=\left\{v_{1}, v_{5}\right\}, e_{12}=\left\{v_{2}, v_{6}\right\}$ and $e_{13}=\left\{v_{6}, v_{8}\right\}$. Then $S=\left\{e_{1} e_{5}-e_{11} e_{12}, e_{1} e_{9} e_{13}-e_{8} e_{10} e_{12}, e_{5} e_{8} e_{10}-e_{9} e_{11} e_{13}, e_{2} e_{4} e_{6} e_{13}-\right.$ $\left.e_{3} e_{5} e_{7} e_{12}, e_{2} e_{4} e_{6} e_{8} e_{10}-e_{3} e_{7} e_{9} e_{11} e_{12}\right\}$ is a minimal generating set of $I_{G}$. For the edge $f=e_{1}$ of $G$ we have that $I_{G \backslash f}=<e_{5} e_{8} e_{10}-e_{9} e_{11} e_{13}, e_{2} e_{4} e_{6} e_{13}-e_{3} e_{5} e_{7} e_{12}, e_{2} e_{4} e_{6} e_{8} e_{10}-$ $e_{3} e_{7} e_{9} e_{11} e_{12}>$. Moreover $E\left(G_{S}^{f}\right)=\left\{e_{1}, e_{5}, e_{8}, e_{9}, e_{10}, e_{11}, e_{12}, e_{13}\right\}$ and also $I_{G_{S}^{f}}=<e_{1} e_{5}-$ $e_{11} e_{12}, e_{1} e_{9} e_{13}-e_{8} e_{10} e_{12}, e_{5} e_{8} e_{10}-e_{9} e_{11} e_{13}>$. Thus $I_{G} \neq I_{G_{S}^{f}}$ and therefore $I_{G}=I_{G_{S}^{f}}+$ $I_{G \backslash f}$ is a splitting of $I_{G}$ by Theorem 2.8.
Example 2.12. In [6, Example 3.5] P. Gimenez and H. Srinivasan provide an example of a graph $G$ obtained by gluing two bow ties $G_{1}$ and $G_{2}$ along an edge. Since neither $G_{1}$ nor $G_{2}$ is bipartite, $I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ is not a splitting of $I_{G}$ by [6, Theorem 3.4(1)]. The ideal $I_{G}$ has a unique minimal system of generators $S$ consisting of five binomials and $I_{G_{S}^{e}}=I_{G}$, for every edge $e$ of $G$. By Theorem 2.8, the ideal $I_{G}$ is not edge splittable, and therefore it is not subgraph splittable by Theorem 2.10. Thus $I_{G}$ does not have a splitting in the form $I_{H_{1}}+I_{H_{2}}$ for any subgraphs $H_{1}, H_{2}$ of $G$. It is worth mentioning that if a graph $G$ is a gluing of two arbitrary disjoint connected graphs $G_{1}$ and $G_{2}$, bipartite or not, along an edge, then from [6, Theorem 3.4(3)] there exists a 3-uniform hypergraph $H$ such that $I_{H}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$.

Theorems 2.8 and 2.10 are easier to apply when $I_{G}$ has a unique minimal system of binomial generators. In particular, this is true for the toric ideal of a bipartite graph since it is minimally generated by all binomials of the form $B_{w}$, where $w$ is an even cycle with no chords, see [8, Theorem 2.3].

A graph $G$ is called a complete bipartite graph if its vertex set can be partitioned into two subsets $V_{1}$ and $V_{2}$ such that each edge of $G$ connects a vertex of $V_{1}$ to a vertex of $V_{2}$. It is denoted by $K_{m, n}$, where $m$ and $n$ are the numbers of vertices in $V_{1}$ and $V_{2}$ respectively. The next corollary shows that toric ideals of complete bipartite graphs do not admit a subgraph splitting.
Corollary 2.13. The toric ideal of $K_{m, n}$ is not subgraph splittable.
Proof. Let $V_{1}=\left\{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}\right\}, V_{2}=\left\{y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n}\right\}$ be the bipartition of the complete bipartite graph $K_{m, n}$ and $E\left(K_{m, n}\right)=\left\{b_{i j} \mid 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n\right\}$, where $b_{i j}=\left\{x_{i}, y_{j}\right\}$. Then $I_{K_{m, n}}$ is minimally generated by the $2 \times 2$ minors of the matrix $M=\left(b_{i j}\right)$, see [13, Proposition 10.6.2]. Thus $I_{K_{m, n}}$ is minimally generated by the set $S$ of all binomials $b_{i j} b_{k l}-b_{i l} b_{k j}$ which are in the form $B_{w}$, where $w$ is a cycle in $K_{m, n}$ of length 4 . Since $K_{m, n}$ is bipartite, the set $S$ is the unique minimal system of binomial generators of $I_{K_{m, n}}$.

Notice that if $m=1$ or $n=1$, then $I_{K_{m, n}}=\{0\}$. Moreover if $m=2$ and $n=2$, then $I_{K_{m, n}}$ is minimally generated by $b_{11} b_{22}-b_{12} b_{21}$ and therefore it is not subgraph splittable.

Assume that $m \geq 2, n \geq 2$ and $I_{K_{m, n}} \neq I_{K_{2,2}}$. Let $e=b_{i j}$ be any edge of $K_{m, n}$. We claim that $K_{m, n}^{e}=K_{m, n}$ which implies the equality $I_{K_{m, n}^{e}}=I_{K_{m, n}}$. By definition $K_{m, n}^{e}$ is a subgraph of $K_{m, n}$. It suffices to show that all edges of $K_{m, n}$ belong also to the graph $K_{m, n}^{e}$. Let $\xi=b_{k l} \in E\left(K_{m, n}\right)$. There are four cases:
(1) $k=i$ and $l=j$. Then $\xi=e$ which belongs to $K_{m, n}^{e}$.
(2) $k=i$ and $l \neq j$. Let $1 \leq i^{\prime} \leq m$ with $i^{\prime} \neq i$. Consider the cycle $w=\left(e, \xi, b_{i^{\prime} l}, b_{i^{\prime} j}\right)$, then $B_{w} \in S$ and therefore $\xi$ belongs to $K_{m, n}^{e}$.
(3) $k \neq i$ and $l=j$. Let $1 \leq j^{\prime} \leq n$ with $j^{\prime} \neq j$. Consider the cycle $w=\left(e, \xi, b_{k j^{\prime}}, b_{i j^{\prime}}\right)$, then $B_{w} \in S$ and therefore $\xi$ belongs to $K_{m, n}^{e}$.
(4) $k \neq i$ and $l \neq j$. Consider the cycle $w=\left(e, b_{i l}, \xi, b_{k j}\right)$, then $B_{w} \in S$ and therefore $\xi$ belongs to $K_{m, n}^{e}$.
We conclude that in all cases $\xi$ belongs to $K_{m, n}^{e}$, so $K_{m, n}^{e}=K_{m, n}$. From Theorem 2.8 it follows that $I_{K_{m, n}}$ is not edge splittable, and therefore $I_{K_{m, n}}$ is not subgraph splittable by Theorem 2.10.

The suspension $\widehat{G}$ of a graph $G$ is the graph obtained from $G$ by adding a new vertex adjacent to all vertices of $G$. Given a cycle $C_{n}$ in $G$ of length $n \geq 3$, the next theorem determines when the toric ideal $I_{\widehat{C_{n}}}$ is subgraph splittable.
Theorem 2.14. Let $C_{n}$ be a cycle of length $n \geq 3$ and $\widehat{C_{n}}$ be the suspension of $C_{n}$.
(1) Suppose that $n$ is even. Then $I_{\widehat{C_{n}}}$ is subgraph splittable if and only if $n=4$.
(2) If $n$ is odd, then $I_{\widehat{C_{n}}}$ is subgraph splittable.

Proof. Let $C_{n}=\left(\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}\right\},\left\{v_{2}, v_{3}\right\}, \ldots,\left\{v_{n-1}, v_{n}\right\},\left\{v_{1}, v_{n}\right\}\right)$ and $G=\widehat{C_{n}}$ be the suspension of $C_{n}$ obtained by adding a new vertex $v_{n+1}$ such that $\left\{v_{i}, v_{n+1}\right\}$ is an edge of $G$, for every $1 \leq i \leq n$.
(1) Suppose that $n \geq 4$ is even. From [9, Proposition 5.5] there is a bipartite graph $H$ such that $I_{G}=I_{H}$, thus $I_{G}$ has a unique minimal system of generators. We distinguish the following cases.
(a) $n=4$. Let $C_{4}=\left(\varepsilon_{12}=\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}\right\}, \varepsilon_{23}=\left\{v_{2}, v_{3}\right\}, \varepsilon_{34}=\left\{v_{3}, v_{4}\right\}, \varepsilon_{14}=\left\{v_{1}, v_{4}\right\}\right)$ and $\varepsilon_{i 5}=\left\{v_{i}, v_{5}\right\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq 4$. Then
$S=\left\{\varepsilon_{12} \varepsilon_{45}-\varepsilon_{14} \varepsilon_{25}, \varepsilon_{12} \varepsilon_{35}-\varepsilon_{23} \varepsilon_{15}, \varepsilon_{12} \varepsilon_{34}-\varepsilon_{23} \varepsilon_{14}, \varepsilon_{23} \varepsilon_{45}-\varepsilon_{34} \varepsilon_{25}, \varepsilon_{15} \varepsilon_{34}-\varepsilon_{14} \varepsilon_{35}\right\}$
is a minimal generating set of $I_{G}$. Let $e=\varepsilon_{15}$, then $E\left(G^{e}\right)=\left\{\varepsilon_{12}, \varepsilon_{14}, \varepsilon_{15}, \varepsilon_{23}, \varepsilon_{34}, \varepsilon_{35}\right\}$. Notice that $\varepsilon_{12} \varepsilon_{45}-\varepsilon_{14} \varepsilon_{25} \in I_{G}$ and $\varepsilon_{12} \varepsilon_{45}-\varepsilon_{14} \varepsilon_{25} \notin I_{G^{e}}$, so $I_{G^{e}} \neq I_{G}$. Also $e$ is an edge of the cycle $w=\left(\varepsilon_{12}, \varepsilon_{23}, \varepsilon_{35}, \varepsilon_{15}\right)$. Thus $I_{G}=I_{G^{e}}+I_{G \backslash e}$ is a splitting of $I_{G}$ by Theorem 2.8 .
(b) $n>4$. Let $e$ be an edge of $G$ then there are two cases:
(i) $e$ is an edge of the cycle $C_{n}$, for the sake of simplicity let $e=\varepsilon_{12}$. We will show that $G=G^{e}$. Since $C_{n}$ is a cycle with no chords, $B_{C_{n}}$ is a minimal binomial of $I_{G}$ by Theorem 2.2, and therefore $E\left(C_{n}\right) \subset E\left(G^{e}\right)$. Consider now the odd cycles $w_{1}=\left(e,\left\{v_{2}, v_{n+1}\right\},\left\{v_{n+1}, v_{1}\right\}\right)$ and $w_{2}=\left(\left\{v_{i}, v_{i+1}\right\},\left\{v_{i+1}, v_{n+1}\right\},\left\{v_{n+1}, v_{i}\right\}\right)$, where $4 \leq i \leq n-2$, which share only one vertex, namely $v_{n+1}$. The even closed walk $w=\left(w_{1}, w_{2}\right)$ has no chords and no bridges, and therefore $B_{w}$ is a minimal binomial of $I_{G}$ by Theorem 2.2. Thus $\left\{v_{i}, v_{n+1}\right\} \in E\left(G^{e}\right)$ for $i=1,2,4,5, \ldots, n-1$. Consider now the cycle

$$
\left.\gamma=\left(\left\{v_{n+1}, v_{1}\right\}, e, \underset{8}{\{ } v_{2}, v_{3}\right\},\left\{v_{3}, v_{n+1}\right\}\right)
$$

and notice that $\gamma$ has exactly one odd chord, namely $\left\{v_{2}, v_{n+1}\right\}$, so from Theorem $2.2 B_{\gamma}$ is a minimal binomial of $I_{G}$. Thus $\left\{v_{3}, v_{n+1}\right\} \in E\left(G^{e}\right)$. Consider the cycle $\delta=\left(\left\{v_{n+1}, v_{2}\right\}, e,\left\{v_{1}, v_{n}\right\},\left\{v_{n}, v_{n+1}\right\}\right)$ and notice that $\delta$ has exactly one odd chord, namely $\left\{v_{1}, v_{n+1}\right\}$. By Theorem $2.2 B_{\delta}$ is a minimal binomial of $I_{G}$. Thus $\left\{v_{n}, v_{n+1}\right\} \in E\left(G^{e}\right)$ and therefore $E(G)=E\left(G^{e}\right)$. Consequently $G=G^{e}$, so from Theorems 2.8, 2.10 the ideal $I_{G}$ is not subgraph splittable.
(ii) $e=\left\{v_{i}, v_{n+1}\right\}$ with $1 \leq i \leq n$. For the sake of simplicity we let $i=1$, namely $e=\left\{v_{1}, v_{n+1}\right\}$. Consider the odd cycles $w_{1}=\left(e,\left\{v_{2}, v_{n+1}\right\},\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}\right\}\right)$ and $w_{2}=\left(\left\{v_{i}, v_{i+1}\right\},\left\{v_{i+1}, v_{n+1}\right\},\left\{v_{n+1}, v_{i}\right\}\right)$, where $4 \leq i \leq n-2$, which share only one vertex, namely $v_{n+1}$. The even closed walk $w=\left(w_{1}, w_{2}\right)$ has no chords and no bridges, so $B_{w}$ is a minimal binomial of $I_{G}$ by Theorem 2.2. Thus $\left\{v_{i}, v_{n+1}\right\} \in E\left(G^{e}\right)$ for $i=2,4,5, \ldots, n-1$. Moreover $\left\{v_{i}, v_{i+1}\right\} \in E\left(G^{e}\right)$ for $i=1,4,5, \ldots, n-2$. Consider now the cycle $\gamma=$ (e, $\left.\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}\right\},\left\{v_{2}, v_{3}\right\},\left\{v_{3}, v_{n+1}\right\}\right)$ and notice that it has exactly one odd chord, namely $\left\{v_{2}, v_{n+1}\right\}$. By Theorem $2.2 B_{\gamma}$ is a minimal binomial of $I_{G}$. Thus $\left\{v_{2}, v_{3}\right\} \in E\left(G^{e}\right)$ and also $\left\{v_{3}, v_{n+1}\right\} \in E\left(G^{e}\right)$. Consider the cycle $\delta=$ $\left(\left\{v_{2}, v_{n+1}\right\}, e,\left\{v_{1}, v_{n}\right\},\left\{v_{n}, v_{n+1}\right\}\right)$ and notice that $\delta$ has exactly one odd chord, namely $\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}\right\}$. By Theorem $2.2 B_{\delta}$ is a minimal binomial of $I_{G}$. Thus $\left\{v_{1}, v_{n}\right\} \in E\left(G^{e}\right)$ and also $\left\{v_{n}, v_{n+1}\right\} \in E\left(G^{e}\right)$. Furthermore

$$
\mu=\left(\left\{v_{n-1}, v_{n}\right\},\left\{v_{n}, v_{1}\right\}, e,\left\{v_{n-1}, v_{n+1}\right\}\right)
$$

is an even cycle with exactly one odd chord, namely $\left\{v_{n}, v_{n+1}\right\}$. By Theorem $2.2 B_{\mu}$ is a minimal binomial of $I_{G}$, and therefore $\left\{v_{n-1}, v_{n}\right\}$ is an edge of $G^{e}$. Consider the odd cycles $\zeta_{1}=\left(e,\left\{v_{1}, v_{n}\right\},\left\{v_{n}, v_{n+1}\right\}\right), \zeta_{2}=$ $\left(\left\{v_{3}, v_{4}\right\},\left\{v_{4}, v_{n+1}\right\},\left\{v_{3}, v_{n+1}\right\}\right)$ and let $\zeta=\left(\zeta_{1}, \zeta_{2}\right)$. Then $B_{\zeta}$ is a minimal binomial of $I_{G}$ by Theorem 2.2 , since $\zeta$ does not have any chords or bridges, and therefore $\left\{v_{3}, v_{4}\right\} \in E\left(G^{e}\right)$. Thus $E(G)=E\left(G^{e}\right)$, so $G=G^{e}$ and therefore $I_{G}$ is not subgraph splittable by Theorems 2.8, 2.10.
(2) Suppose that $n$ is odd. Then any odd cycle of $G$ either coincides with $C_{n}$ or has at least three vertices, namely $v_{n+1}$ and two vertices of $C_{n}$. Thus $G$ has no two odd vertex disjoint cycles. For $n=3$ we have that $\widehat{C_{3}}$ is the complete graph on the vertex set $\left\{v_{1}, \ldots, v_{4}\right\}$, so $I_{\widehat{C_{3}}}$ is splittable by Example 2.5. Suppose that $n \geq 5$. Consider a minimal binomial $B_{w} \in I_{G}$. For the walk $w$ there are two cases:
(1) $w$ is a cycle of length 4 with exactly one odd chord. Then $B_{w}$ is indispensable of $I_{G}$ by Theorem 2.2.
(2) $w$ has no chords or bridges and it is of the form $w=\left(w_{1}, w_{2}\right)$ where $w_{1}, w_{2}$ are odd cycles of length 3 intersecting in exactly one vertex, namely $v_{n+1}$. By Theorem 2.2 the binomial $B_{w}$ is indispensable of $I_{G}$.

Thus $I_{G}$ has a unique minimal system of generators.
Let $e=\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}\right\}$, then there is no cycle of length 4 in $G$ containing the edges $e$ and $\varepsilon_{34}=\left\{v_{3}, v_{4}\right\}$. Consider the odd cycles $\gamma_{1}=\left(e,\left\{v_{2}, v_{n+1}\right\},\left\{v_{1}, v_{n+1}\right\}\right)$ and $\gamma_{2}=$ $\left(\varepsilon_{34},\left\{v_{4}, v_{n+1}\right\},\left\{v_{3}, v_{n+1}\right\}\right)$ intersecting in $v_{n+1}$. Let $\gamma=\left(\gamma_{1}, \gamma_{2}\right)$, then $B_{\gamma}$ is not a minimal binomial of $I_{G}$ since there is a bridge $\left\{v_{2}, v_{3}\right\}$. Thus the edge $\varepsilon_{34}$ does not belong to $E\left(G^{e}\right)$. Consider the even cycle $\zeta=\left(\left\{v_{2}, v_{3}\right\},\left\{v_{3}, v_{4}\right\},\left\{v_{4}, v_{n+1}\right\},\left\{v_{2}, v_{n+1}\right\}\right)$, then $B_{\zeta}$ is a minimal binomial of $I_{G}$ and also $B_{\zeta} \notin I_{G^{e}}$. Thus $I_{G} \neq I_{G^{e}}$ and therefore $I_{G}$ is splittable by Theorem 2.8.

## 3. The COMPLETE GRAPH AND MINIMAL SPlittings

In this section, we study the special case of toric ideals of complete graphs. In contrast to toric ideals of (complete) bipartite graphs which always have a unique minimal set of binomial generators, toric ideals of complete graphs have a huge number of different minimal systems of binomial generators.

Let $n \geq 4$ be an integer and $K_{n}$ be the complete graph on the vertex set $\left\{v_{1}, \ldots, v_{n}\right\}$ with edges $\left\{\varepsilon_{i j} \mid 1 \leq i<j \leq n\right\}$, where $\varepsilon_{i j}=\left\{v_{i}, v_{j}\right\}$. By [12, Theorem 3.3] the set

$$
T=\left\{\varepsilon_{i j} \varepsilon_{k l}-\varepsilon_{i l} \varepsilon_{j k}, \varepsilon_{i k} \varepsilon_{j l}-\varepsilon_{i l} \varepsilon_{j k} \mid 1 \leq i<j<k<l \leq n\right\}
$$

is a minimal generating set of $I_{K_{n}}$. Let $\left\{\mathbf{e}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_{n}\right\}$ be the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^{n}$. Since $T$ is a minimal generating set of $I_{K_{n}}$, the only $A_{K_{n}}$-fibers contributing to minimal generators are those consisting of all monomials with $A_{K_{n}}$-degree $\mathbf{e}_{i}+\mathbf{e}_{j}+\mathbf{e}_{k}+\mathbf{e}_{l}$, where $1 \leq i<$ $j<k<l \leq n$. There are $\binom{n}{4}$ such fibers and each one consists of three monomials, namely $\varepsilon_{i j} \varepsilon_{k l}, \varepsilon_{i l} \varepsilon_{j k}$ and $\varepsilon_{i k} \varepsilon_{j l}$, which have no common factor other than 1 . Therefore to generate the ideal $I_{K_{n}}$ we need to take any two of the three binomials $\varepsilon_{i j} \varepsilon_{k l}-\varepsilon_{i l} \varepsilon_{j k}, \varepsilon_{i k} \varepsilon_{j l}-$ $\varepsilon_{i l} \varepsilon_{j k}, \varepsilon_{i j} \varepsilon_{k l}-\varepsilon_{i k} \varepsilon_{j l}$, for every $1 \leq i<j<k<l \leq n$, see [2, 4] for more details. The monomials $\varepsilon_{i j} \varepsilon_{k l}, \varepsilon_{i l} \varepsilon_{j k}$ and $\varepsilon_{i k} \varepsilon_{j l}$, where $1 \leq i<j \leq n$, are indispensable monomials, namely each one is a monomial term of at least one binomial in every minimal system of binomial generators of $I_{K_{n}}$. Thus every minimal system of binomial generators of $I_{K_{n}}$ consists of $2\binom{n}{4}$ binomials. By [2, Theorem 2.9] the ideal $I_{K_{n}}$ has $3\binom{n}{4}$ different minimal systems of binomial generators, which is a huge number even for a small $n$.

Theorem 3.1. The toric ideal of $K_{n}$ is subgraph splittable if and only if $n \geq 4$.
Proof. For $n \in\{1,2,3\}$ we have that $I_{K_{n}}=\{0\}$, so $I_{K_{n}}$ is not splittable. Suppose that $n \geq 4$. From the analysis above we deduce that

$$
S=\left\{\varepsilon_{i j} \varepsilon_{k l}-\varepsilon_{i k} \varepsilon_{j l}, \varepsilon_{i l} \varepsilon_{j k}-\varepsilon_{i k} \varepsilon_{j l} \mid 1 \leq i<j<k<l \leq n\right\}
$$

is a minimal generating set for $I_{K_{n}}$. The set $S$ has a nice geometric interpretation, see [3].
Let $G=K_{n}$ and $e=\varepsilon_{12}$. First we show that the graph $G_{S}^{e}$ contains all edges of $G$, except perhaps the edges $\varepsilon_{1 n}$ and $\varepsilon_{23}$. Let $\varepsilon_{i j}$ be an edge of $G$ where $\{i, j\} \cap\{1,2\}=\emptyset$ and $3 \leq i<j \leq n$. Since $\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}, v_{i}, v_{j}\right\}$ is a set of vertices of $K_{n}$, the binomials $\varepsilon_{12} \varepsilon_{i j}-\varepsilon_{1 i} \varepsilon_{2 j}$ and $\varepsilon_{i 2} \varepsilon_{1 j}-\varepsilon_{1 i} \varepsilon_{2 j}$ belong to $S$, thus $\varepsilon_{i j}$ is an edge of $G_{S}^{e}$. From the above binomials we also deduce that $\varepsilon_{1 i}$, for $3 \leq i \leq n-1$, and $\varepsilon_{2 j}$, for $4 \leq j \leq n$, are edges of $G_{S}^{e}$. With the possible exception of the edges $\varepsilon_{1 n}$ and $\varepsilon_{23}$, the graph $G_{S}^{e}$ contains all edges of $G$. Suppose that $\varepsilon_{1 n}$ is an edge of $G_{S}^{e}$, so there exists a binomial $B \in S$ in four variables which contains the variables $\varepsilon_{12}$ and $\varepsilon_{1 n}$. Then $B=\varepsilon_{12} \varepsilon_{i n}-\varepsilon_{1 n} \varepsilon_{2 i}$ where $3 \leq i \leq n-1$. But $\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}, v_{i}, v_{n}\right\}$ is a set of vertices of $K_{n}$ which contributes the binomials $\varepsilon_{12} \varepsilon_{i n}-\varepsilon_{1 i} \varepsilon_{2 n}$ and $\varepsilon_{1 n} \varepsilon_{2 i}-\varepsilon_{1 i} \varepsilon_{2 n}$ in $S$. Thus $B$ does not belong to $S$, a contradiction. Consequently $\varepsilon_{1 n}$ is not an edge of $G_{S}^{e}$. Similar arguments show that $\varepsilon_{23}$ is not an edge of $G_{S}^{e}$. Since $\varepsilon_{12} \varepsilon_{3 n}-\varepsilon_{1 n} \varepsilon_{23} \in I_{G}$ and $\varepsilon_{12} \varepsilon_{3 n}-\varepsilon_{1 n} \varepsilon_{23} \notin I_{G_{S}^{e}}$, we get $I_{G_{S}^{e}} \neq I_{G}$ and therefore $I_{G}=I_{G_{S}^{e}}+I_{G \backslash e}$ is a splitting of $I_{G}$ by Theorem 2.8 .

Definition 3.2. Let $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ be a subgraph splitting of $I_{G}, S=\left\{f_{1}, \ldots, f_{r}\right\}$ be a minimal system of binomial generators of $I_{G_{1}}$ and $T=\left\{g_{1}, \ldots, g_{t}\right\}$ be a minimal system of binomial generators of $I_{G_{2}}$. We say that the splitting $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ is a minimal splitting of $I_{G}$ if $\left\{f_{1}, \ldots, f_{r}, g_{1}, \ldots, g_{t}\right\}$ is a minimal system of generators of $I_{G}$.

Remark 3.3. (1) The property of being minimal splitting does not depend on the minimal systems of generators chosen in the definition. Suppose that $\left\{f_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, f_{r}^{\prime}\right\}$ is a minimal
system of binomial generators of $I_{G_{1}}$ and $\left\{g_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, g_{t}^{\prime}\right\}$ is a minimal system of binomial generators of $I_{G_{2}}$. But $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$, so $\left\{f_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, f_{r}^{\prime}, g_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, g_{t}^{\prime}\right\}$ is a generating set of $I_{G}$ consisting of $r+t$ elements and therefore it is a minimal system of generators.
(2) Let $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ be a minimal splitting of $I_{G}$. For any $f_{i} \in S, 1 \leq i \leq r$, we have that neither $f_{i}$ nor $-f_{i}$ belongs to $T$. For any $g_{j} \in T, 1 \leq j \leq t$, we have that neither $g_{j}$ nor $-g_{j}$ belongs to $S$.
(3) All the splittings which appeared in [5, 6] are minimal splittings.
(4) The splitting of $I_{G_{n}}$ in Example 2.9 is not minimal, since the ideal $I_{G_{n} \backslash e}$ has a minimal system of generators with $n+1+3\binom{n}{2}$ binomials, while the ideal $I_{G_{n}^{e}}$ has a minimal system of generators with $n$ binomials and the ideal $I_{G_{n}}$ is generated minimally with $2 n+1+2\binom{n}{2}$ binomials.
Example 3.4. Let $K_{4}$ be the complete graph on the vertex set $\left\{v_{1}, \ldots, v_{4}\right\}$. Let $G_{1}=$ $K_{4} \backslash\left\{\varepsilon_{12}, \varepsilon_{34}\right\}$ and $G_{2}=K_{4} \backslash\left\{\varepsilon_{14}, \varepsilon_{23}\right\}$ be subgraphs of $K_{4}$, then $I_{K_{4}}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ is a minimal splitting of $I_{K_{4}}$, since $I_{G_{1}}=<\varepsilon_{13} \varepsilon_{24}-\varepsilon_{14} \varepsilon_{23}>, I_{G_{2}}=<\varepsilon_{13} \varepsilon_{24}-\varepsilon_{12} \varepsilon_{34}>$ and $I_{K_{4}}=<\varepsilon_{13} \varepsilon_{24}-\varepsilon_{14} \varepsilon_{23}, \varepsilon_{13} \varepsilon_{24}-\varepsilon_{12} \varepsilon_{34}>$.

We will show that the toric ideal of $K_{n}$ has no minimal splitting for $n \geq 6$.
Proposition 3.5. Let $n \geq 4$ be an integer and $w=(a, b, c, d)$ be an even cycle of $K_{n}$. Then

$$
I_{K_{n}}=I_{K_{n} \backslash\{a, c\}}+I_{K_{n} \backslash\{b, d\}}
$$

is a splitting of $I_{K_{n}}$.
Proof. Since $K_{n}$ is the complete graph, the cycle $w$ has two chords, namely $e$ and $f$. Then $a c-e f \in I_{K_{n}}$ does not belong to $I_{K_{n} \backslash\{a, c\}}$, thus $I_{K_{n} \backslash\{a, c\}} \neq I_{K_{n}}$. Also $I_{K_{n} \backslash\{b, d\}} \neq I_{K_{n}}$ since ef $-b d \in I_{K_{n}}$ does not belong to $I_{K_{n} \backslash\{b, d\}}$.

It remains to show that $I_{K_{n}} \subset I_{K_{n} \backslash\{a, c\}}+I_{K_{n} \backslash\{b, d\}}$. Let $B_{\gamma}$ be a binomial belonging to the set $S$ defined in the proof of Theorem 3.1. Clearly if $B_{\gamma}$ belongs to $I_{K_{n} \backslash\{a, c\}}$ or $I_{K_{n} \backslash\{b, d\}}$, then $B_{\gamma}$ belongs to $I_{K_{n} \backslash\{a, c\}}+I_{K_{n} \backslash\{b, d\}}$. Suppose that $B_{\gamma}$ does not belong to $I_{K_{n} \backslash\{a, c\}}$ or $I_{K_{n} \backslash\{b, d\}}$. Then $\gamma$ contains at least one edge from the set $\{a, c\}$, say $a$, and at least one edge from the set $\{b, d\}$, say $b$. Let $\gamma=\left(a, b, c^{\prime}, d^{\prime}\right)$ and $e^{\prime}, f^{\prime}$ be the chords of the walk $\gamma$. Notice that $a c^{\prime}-e^{\prime} f^{\prime}$ belongs to $I_{K_{n} \backslash\{b, d\}}$ and $b d^{\prime}-e^{\prime} f^{\prime}$ belongs to $I_{K_{n} \backslash\{a, c\}}$. Thus

$$
B_{\gamma}=a c^{\prime}-b d^{\prime}=\left(a c^{\prime}-e^{\prime} f^{\prime}\right)-\left(b d^{\prime}-e^{\prime} f^{\prime}\right) \in I_{K_{n} \backslash\{a, c\}}+I_{K_{n} \backslash\{b, d\}} .
$$

So $I_{K_{n}}=I_{K_{n} \backslash\{a, c\}}+I_{K_{n} \backslash\{b, d\}}$ is a splitting.
Remark 3.6. Let $I_{A}=I_{A_{1}}+I_{A_{2}}$ be a splitting of $I_{A}$. If there exists a set $A_{1}^{\prime}$ such that $I_{A_{1}} \subset I_{A_{1}^{\prime}} \varsubsetneqq I_{A}$ then $I_{A}=I_{A_{1}^{\prime}}+I_{A_{2}}$ is also a splitting. By Proposition 3.5. $I_{K_{n}}=$ $I_{K_{n} \backslash\{a, c\}}+I_{K_{n} \backslash\{b, d\}}$ is a splitting of $I_{K_{n}}$, and therefore $I_{K_{n}}=I_{K_{n} \backslash a}+I_{K_{n} \backslash b}, I_{K_{n}}=$ $I_{K_{n} \backslash\{a, c\}}+I_{K_{n} \backslash b}$ and $I_{K_{n}}=I_{K_{n} \backslash a}+I_{K_{n} \backslash\{b, d\}}$ are also splittings of $I_{K_{n}}$.
Proposition 3.7. Let $n \geq 4$ be an integer and $I_{K_{n}}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ be a subgraph splitting of $I_{K_{n}}$. If e is an edge of $K_{n}$ which does not belong to $G_{1}$ and $f$ is an edge of $K_{n}$ which does not belong to $G_{2}$, then the edges e, $f$ are adjacent in $K_{n}$. Moreover, if $h$ is another edge of $K_{n}$ which does not belong to $G_{2}$, then the edges $f, h$ are not adjacent in $K_{n}$.
Proof. Suppose that the edges $e, f$ are not adjacent. Let $e=\left\{v_{i}, v_{j}\right\}, f=\left\{v_{k}, v_{l}\right\}$ and $e \cap f=\emptyset$. Let $\left\{g_{1}, \ldots, g_{r}\right\}$ be a system of binomial generators of $I_{G_{1}}$ and $\left\{h_{1}, \ldots, h_{s}\right\}$ be a system of binomial generators of $I_{G_{2}}$, then $\left\{g_{1}, \ldots, g_{r}, h_{1}, \ldots, h_{s}\right\}$ is a generating set of $I_{G}$. Therefore we can find a minimal system of generators $V$ of $I_{K_{n}}$ formed by
binomials belonging to either $I_{G_{1}}$ or $I_{G_{2}}$. From the introduction of section 3 the monomial ef $=\varepsilon_{i j} \varepsilon_{k l}$ is indispensable of $I_{K_{n}}$, so it is a monomial term in a binomial $B_{w}$ of $I_{G_{1}}$ or $I_{G_{2}}$. Since $e$ is not an edge of $G_{1}$, we have that $B_{w} \notin I_{G_{1}}$. But $f$ is not an edge of $G_{2}$, so $B_{w} \notin I_{G_{2}}$. Thus $B_{w}$ does not belong to $I_{G_{1}}$ or $I_{G_{2}}$, a contradiction. Consequently, the edges $e, f$ are adjacent.
Let $e=\varepsilon_{i j}$ and $f=\varepsilon_{j k}$. Suppose that $h$ is another edge of $K_{n}$ which does not belong to $G_{2}$. Since $e$ does not belong to $G_{1}$, we have, from the first part of the Proposition, that the edges $e, h$ are adjacent. We claim that $f$ and $h$ are not adjacent. Suppose that $f$, $h$ are adjacent. Since $h$ is adjacent to both $e$ and $f$, there are two cases for the edge $h$, namely either $h=\varepsilon_{i k}$ or $h=\varepsilon_{j l}$ for an index $l$ different than $i, j, k$.
(1) $h=\varepsilon_{i k}$. Let $l$ be an index different than $i, j, k$. In a previous step we found that there is a minimal system of generators $V$ formed by binomials belonging to either $I_{G_{1}}$ or $I_{G_{2}}$. Moreover, $V$ must contain exactly two of the following three binomials $\varepsilon_{i j} \varepsilon_{k l}-\varepsilon_{i l} \varepsilon_{j k}=e \varepsilon_{k l}-\varepsilon_{i l} f, \varepsilon_{i k} \varepsilon_{j l}-\varepsilon_{i l} \varepsilon_{j k}=h \varepsilon_{j l}-\varepsilon_{i l} f, \varepsilon_{i j} \varepsilon_{k l}-\varepsilon_{i k} \varepsilon_{j l}=e \varepsilon_{k l}-h \varepsilon_{j l}$. But none of them belongs to $I_{G_{2}}$, since $f, h \notin E\left(G_{2}\right)$, while $e \varepsilon_{k l}-\varepsilon_{i l} f$ and $e \varepsilon_{k l}-h \varepsilon_{j l}$ do not belong to $I_{G_{1}}$, since $e \notin E\left(G_{1}\right)$. A contradiction.
(2) $h=\varepsilon_{j l}$. We argue similarly as above. The set $V$ must contain two of the following three binomials $e \varepsilon_{k l}-\varepsilon_{i l} f, \varepsilon_{i k} h-\varepsilon_{i l} f, e \varepsilon_{k l}-\varepsilon_{i k} h$. But none of them belongs to $I_{G_{2}}$, since $f, h \notin E\left(G_{2}\right)$, while $e \varepsilon_{k l}-\varepsilon_{i l} f$ and $e \varepsilon_{k l}-\varepsilon_{i k} h$ do not belong to $I_{G_{1}}$, since $e \notin E\left(G_{1}\right)$. A contradiction.
Consequently, the edges $f, h$ are not adjacent.
Remark 3.8. From Proposition 3.7 we deduce that any of the graphs $G_{1}, G_{2}$ contains all edges of $K_{n}$ except at most two. Suppose not, and let $e=\varepsilon_{i j} \notin E\left(G_{1}\right),\left\{f_{1}, f_{2}, f_{3}\right\} \subset$ $E\left(K_{n}\right)$ such that $f_{l} \notin E\left(G_{2}\right)$, for every $1 \leq l \leq 3$. By Proposition 3.7, any of the edges $f_{1}, f_{2}, f_{3}$ is adjacent to $e=\varepsilon_{i j}$, so $v_{i}$ is a vertex of the edges $f_{1}, f_{2}, f_{3}$ or $v_{j}$ is a vertex of the edges $f_{1}, f_{2}, f_{3}$. Thus either $v_{i}$ or $v_{j}$ is a vertex of at least two of the edges $f_{1}, f_{2}, f_{3}$, and therefore two of the edges $f_{1}, f_{2}, f_{3}$ are adjacent, a contradiction to the second part of Proposition 3.7.
Proposition 3.9. Let $n \geq 4$ be an integer and $I_{K_{n}}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ be a subgraph splitting of $I_{K_{n}}$. Then there exists a cycle $w=(a, b, c, d)$ in $K_{n}$ such that
(1) $G_{1}=K_{n} \backslash a$ and $G_{2}=K_{n} \backslash b$ or
(2) $G_{1}=K_{n} \backslash\{a, c\}$ and $G_{2}=K_{n} \backslash b$ or
(3) $G_{1}=K_{n} \backslash a$ and $G_{2}=K_{n} \backslash\{b, d\}$ or
(4) $G_{1}=K_{n} \backslash\{a, c\}$ and $G_{2}=K_{n} \backslash\{b, d\}$.

Proof. Since $I_{G_{1}} \varsubsetneqq I_{K_{n}}$, there exists an edge $a$ of $K_{n}$ such that $a$ is not an edge of $G_{1}$. Thus $I_{G_{1}} \subset I_{K_{n} \backslash a}$. Since $I_{G_{2}} \varsubsetneqq I_{K_{n}}$, there exists an edge $b$ of $K_{n}$ such that $b$ is not an edge of $G_{2}$. Thus $I_{G_{2}} \subset I_{K_{n} \backslash b}$. By Proposition 3.7, the edges $a, b$ are adjacent. We distinguish the following cases:
(1) $G_{1}=K_{n} \backslash a$ and $G_{2}=K_{n} \backslash b$. Since $a, b$ are adjacent edges in the complete graph $K_{n}$ with $n \geq 4$ vertices, there exists a cycle $w$ of length 4 in $K_{n}$ with two consecutive edges $a, b$.
(2) $G_{1} \varsubsetneqq K_{n} \backslash a$ and $G_{2}=K_{n} \backslash b$. In this case, there exists an edge $c$ of $K_{n} \backslash a$ such that $c$ is not an edge of $G_{1}$. By Proposition 3.7, the edges $a, c$ do not share a common vertex and they are adjacent to $b$. Furthermore, $G_{1}$ contains all edges of $K_{n}$ except at most two. Thus $G_{1}=K_{n} \backslash\{a, c\}$ and there exists a cycle $w$ of length 4 in $K_{n}$ with three consecutive edges $a, b, c$.
(3) $G_{1}=K_{n} \backslash a$ and $G_{2} \varsubsetneqq K_{n} \backslash b$. In this case, there exists an edge $d$ of $K_{n} \backslash b$ such that $d$ is not an edge of $G_{2}$. By Proposition 3.7, the edges $b, d$ do not share a common vertex and they are adjacent to $a$. Moreover, $G_{2}$ contains all edges of $K_{n}$ except at most two. Thus $G_{2}=K_{n} \backslash\{b, d\}$ and there exists a cycle $w$ of length 4 in $K_{n}$ with three consecutive edges $d, a, b$.
(4) $G_{1} \varsubsetneqq K_{n} \backslash a$ and $G_{2} \varsubsetneqq K_{n} \backslash b$. Then there exists an edge $c$ of $K_{n} \backslash a$ and an edge $d$ of $K_{n} \backslash b$ such that $c$ is not an edge of $G_{1}$ and $d$ is not an edge of $G_{2}$. By Proposition 3.7, the edges $a, c$ do not share a common vertex and they are adjacent to both $b, d$. Additionally $G_{1}$ contains all edges of $K_{n}$ except at most two. By the same proposition, the edges $b, d$ do not share a common vertex and they are adjacent to both $a, c$. Furthermore $G_{2}$ contains all edges of $K_{n}$ except at most two. Thus $w=(a, b, c, d)$ is a cycle in $K_{n}, G_{1}=K_{n} \backslash\{a, c\}$ and $G_{2}=K_{n} \backslash\{b, d\}$.

Theorem 3.10. Let $n \geq 4$ be an integer. Then $I_{K_{n}}$ has a minimal splitting if and only if $4 \leq n \leq 5$.

Proof. Suppose first that $n=4$. Then $I_{K_{4}}=I_{K_{4} \backslash\left\{\varepsilon_{12}, \varepsilon_{34}\right\}}+I_{K_{4} \backslash\left\{\varepsilon_{14}, \varepsilon_{23}\right\}}$ is a minimal splitting of $I_{K_{4}}$ by Example 3.4. Suppose now that $n=5$ and let $\left\{v_{1}, \ldots, v_{5}\right\}$ be the vertex set of $K_{5}$. Let $G_{1}=K_{5} \backslash\left\{\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}\right\},\left\{v_{3}, v_{4}\right\}\right\}$ and $G_{2}=K_{5} \backslash\left\{\left\{v_{1}, v_{4}\right\},\left\{v_{2}, v_{3}\right\}\right\}$ be subgraphs of $K_{5}$. Then $S=\left\{\varepsilon_{13} \varepsilon_{24}-\varepsilon_{14} \varepsilon_{23}, \varepsilon_{14} \varepsilon_{25}-\varepsilon_{15} \varepsilon_{24}, \varepsilon_{23} \varepsilon_{45}-\varepsilon_{24} \varepsilon_{35}, \varepsilon_{13} \varepsilon_{25}-\right.$ $\left.\varepsilon_{15} \varepsilon_{23}, \varepsilon_{13} \varepsilon_{45}-\varepsilon_{14} \varepsilon_{35}\right\}$ is a minimal generating set of $I_{G_{1}}$ and $T=\left\{\varepsilon_{12} \varepsilon_{34}-\varepsilon_{13} \varepsilon_{24}, \varepsilon_{24} \varepsilon_{35}-\right.$ $\left.\varepsilon_{25} \varepsilon_{34}, \varepsilon_{13} \varepsilon_{45}-\varepsilon_{15} \varepsilon_{34}, \varepsilon_{12} \varepsilon_{45}-\varepsilon_{15} \varepsilon_{24}, \varepsilon_{12} \varepsilon_{35}-\varepsilon_{13} \varepsilon_{25}\right\}$ is a minimal generating set of $I_{G_{2}}$. Also for any binomial $B \in S$ we have that neither $B$ nor $-B$ belongs to $T$, while for any binomial $B^{\prime} \in T$ we have that neither $B^{\prime}$ nor $-B^{\prime}$ belongs to $S$. Moreover $S \cup T$ is a minimal generating set of $I_{K_{5}}$, and therefore $I_{K_{5}}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ is a minimal splitting of $I_{K_{5}}$.

Finally assume that $n \geq 6$ and let $I_{K_{n}}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ be a minimal splitting of $I_{K_{n}}$. Then there exists a cycle $w=(a, b, c, d)$ of $K_{n}$ such that $G_{1}$ and $G_{2}$ are of one of the four types of Proposition 3.9. Without loss of generality we can assume that $a=\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}\right\}, b=\left\{v_{2}, v_{3}\right\}$, $c=\left\{v_{3}, v_{4}\right\}$ and $d=\left\{v_{1}, v_{4}\right\}$. Since $n \geq 6$, the graph $K_{n}$ has at least two more vertices, say $v_{5}$ and $v_{6}$. Notice that the complete subgraph of $K_{n}$ on the vertex set $\left\{v_{1}, v_{3}, v_{5}, v_{6}\right\}$ is also a subgraph of both $G_{1}$ and $G_{2}$. Let $S$ be a minimal system of binomial generators of $I_{G_{1}}$ and $T$ be a minimal system of binomial generators of $I_{G_{2}}$. Both $S$ and $T$ must contain exactly two of the binomials $\varepsilon_{13} \varepsilon_{56}-\varepsilon_{15} \varepsilon_{36}, \varepsilon_{13} \varepsilon_{56}-\varepsilon_{16} \varepsilon_{35}, \varepsilon_{15} \varepsilon_{36}-\varepsilon_{16} \varepsilon_{35}$. Thus $S$ and $T$ have at least one minimal generator in common which contradicts the fact that $I_{K_{n}}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ is a minimal splitting of $I_{K_{n}}$. Consequently, for $n \geq 6$ the ideal $I_{K_{n}}$ has no minimal splitting.

## 4. Reduced splittings

In this section, we introduce reduced splittings of toric ideals of graphs and show that every minimal splitting of the toric ideal of a graph is also a reduced splitting.

Definition 4.1. We say that the subgraph splitting $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ of $I_{G}$ is reduced if for any subgraphs $H_{1}$ of $G_{1}$ and $H_{2}$ of $G_{2}$ with $I_{G}=I_{H_{1}}+I_{H_{2}}$ it holds that $I_{H_{1}}=I_{G_{1}}$ and $I_{H_{2}}=I_{G_{2}}$.

A basic step towards determining all subgraph splittings of the toric ideal of a graph is to find its reduced splittings. All other subgraph splittings are found from a reduced splitting $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ by adding edges to one of $G_{1}, G_{2}$ or both to get graphs $G_{1}^{\prime}, G_{2}^{\prime}$, as long as $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}^{\prime}}+I_{G_{2}^{\prime}}$ is a splitting.

Remark 4.2. The reduced splittings of $I_{K_{n}}$ are those of the last type in Proposition 3.9, namely $I_{K_{n}}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ where $G_{1}=K_{n} \backslash\{a, c\}$ and $G_{2}=K_{n} \backslash\{b, d\}$. The other two types in Proposition 3.9 can be taken from the reduced splittings, by adding edges.
Proposition 4.3. If $I_{G}$ is subgraph splittable, then it has at least one reduced splitting.
Proof. Any subgraph splitting $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}^{\prime}}+I_{G_{2}^{\prime}}$ of $I_{G}$ is either reduced or there exist a splitting $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ such that $G_{1}$ is a proper subgraph of $G_{1}^{\prime}$ or/and $G_{2}$ is a proper subgraph of $G_{2}^{\prime}$. In the latter case, $G_{1}$ has fewer edges than $G_{1}^{\prime}$ or/and $G_{2}$ has fewer edges than $G_{2}^{\prime}$. This procedure cannot be repeated indefinitely, since the number of edges of $G$ is finite.

To understand the structure of reduced splittings one has to generalize first the notion of edge splitting by replacing the edge with a set of edges.

Let $S=\left\{B_{w_{1}}, B_{w_{2}}, \ldots, B_{w_{r}}\right\}$ be a minimal system of binomial generators of $I_{G}$. Given a set $F \subset E(G)$, we define $G_{S}^{F}=\bigcup_{e \in F} G_{S}^{e}$ and get $I_{G}=I_{G_{S}^{F}}+I_{G \backslash F}$, by using similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem 2.4.

Of particular interest is the case that $F$ is the set of all edges of $G$ having a common vertex $v$. Given a vertex $v$ of $G$, we let $G-v$ be the subgraph of $G$ obtained by deleting the vertex $v$. We denote by $G_{S}^{v}$ the subgraph of $G$ with edges

$$
E\left(G_{S}^{v}\right)=\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq r \text { and } v \in V\left(w_{i}\right)} E\left(w_{i}\right)
$$

It holds that $I_{G}=I_{G_{S}^{v}}+I_{G-v}$.
The next theorem asserts that the reduced splittings of $I_{G}$ are always in the form $I_{G}=I_{G_{S}^{F}}+I_{G \backslash F}$, for suitable sets $S$ and $F$.

Theorem 4.4. Let $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ be a reduced splitting of $I_{G}$. Then there exist a set $F \subset E(G)$ and a minimal system of binomial generators $S$ of $I_{G}$ such that $I_{G_{1}}=I_{G_{S}^{F}}$ and $I_{G_{2}}=I_{G \backslash F}$.
Proof. Let $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ be a reduced splitting of $I_{G}$ and set $F=G \backslash G_{2}$. Let $\left\{f_{1}, \ldots, f_{s}\right\}$ be a system of binomial generators of $I_{G_{1}},\left\{g_{1}, \ldots, g_{t}\right\}$ be a system of binomial generators of $I_{G_{2}}$ and $S=\left\{B_{w_{1}}, \ldots, B_{w_{r}}\right\} \subset\left\{f_{1}, \ldots, f_{s}, g_{1}, \ldots, g_{t}\right\}$ be a minimal system of binomial generators of $I_{G}$ as in the proof of Theorem 2.10. Then $G \backslash F=G_{2}$, so $I_{G \backslash F}=I_{G_{2}}$, and $I_{G_{S}^{F}} \subset I_{G_{1}}$ since $I_{G_{S}^{e}} \subset I_{G_{1}}$ for each $e \in F$ from the proof of Theorem 2.10, But $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ is a reduced splitting of $I_{G}$ and also $I_{G}=I_{G_{S}^{F}}+I_{G_{2}}$, since $I_{G}=I_{G_{S}^{F}}+I_{G \backslash F}$ and $I_{G \backslash F}=I_{G_{2}}$, with $I_{G_{S}^{F}} \subset I_{G_{1}}$, therefore $I_{G_{S}^{F}}=I_{G_{1}}$.
Remark 4.5. A reduced splitting $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ can be also written in the form $I_{G}=$ $I_{G \backslash F}+I_{G_{S}^{F}}$ where $F=G \backslash G_{1}, I_{G_{1}}=I_{G \backslash F}$ and $I_{G_{2}}=I_{G_{S}^{F}}$.

Example 4.6. Let $G$ be the bipartite graph consisting of four 4-cycles $w_{1}, w_{2}, w_{3}, w_{4}$ in a row, i.e. for $i<j$ it holds that $E\left(w_{i}\right) \cap E\left(w_{j}\right)=\emptyset$ except if $j=i+1$ in which case they have one edge in common. The ideal $I_{G}$ has a unique minimal system of binomial generators consisting of the binomials $B_{w_{1}}, B_{w_{2}}, B_{w_{3}}, B_{w_{4}}$. Then there are 19 different splittings. More precisely, four minimal and reduced splittings in the form $I_{G}=<B_{w_{i}}>$ $+<B_{w_{j}}, B_{w_{k}}, B_{w_{l}}>$, where $\{i, j, k, l\}=\{1,2,3,4\}$. Also three minimal and reduced splittings in the form $I_{G}=<B_{w_{i}}, B_{w_{j}}>+<B_{w_{k}}, B_{w_{l}}>$. Finally twelve non-minimal and non-reduced splittings in the form $I_{G}=<B_{w_{i}}, B_{w_{j}}>+<B_{w_{j}}, B_{w_{k}}, B_{w_{l}}>$.

The next Theorem asserts that minimal splittings are always reduced.
Theorem 4.7. Every minimal splitting of $I_{G}$ is also a reduced splitting.
Proof. Let $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ be a minimal splitting which is not reduced. Then there exist $I_{G_{1}^{\prime}} \subset I_{G_{1}}$ and $I_{G_{2}^{\prime}} \subset I_{G_{2}}$ such that $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}^{\prime}}+I_{G_{2}^{\prime}}$, where $I_{G_{1}^{\prime}}$ is a proper subset of $I_{G_{1}}$ or/and $I_{G_{2}^{\prime}}$ is a proper subset of $I_{G_{2}}$. Suppose that for instance $I_{G_{1}^{\prime}}$ is a proper subset of $I_{G_{1}}$. Let $\left\{B_{w_{1}}, \ldots, B_{w_{s}}\right\}$ and $\left\{B_{w_{s+1}}, \ldots, B_{w_{l}}\right\}$ be minimal systems of binomial generators of the ideals $I_{G_{1}}$ and $I_{G_{2}}$, respectively. Since $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ is a minimal splitting, the ideal $I_{G}$ is minimally generated by the set $\left\{B_{w_{1}}, \ldots, B_{w_{s}}, B_{w_{s+1}}, \ldots, B_{w_{l}}\right\}$. Let $\left\{f_{1}, \ldots, f_{t}\right\}$ be a system of binomial generators of $I_{G_{1}^{\prime}}$ then from the equality $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}^{\prime}}+I_{G_{2}^{\prime}}$ we have that $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}^{\prime}}+I_{G_{2}}$, since $G_{2}^{\prime} \subset G_{2}$. Thus there exists a set $\left\{B_{w_{1}^{\prime}}, \ldots, B_{w_{s}^{\prime}}\right\} \subset\left\{f_{1}, \ldots, f_{t}\right\}$ such that $\left\{B_{w_{1}^{\prime}}, \ldots, B_{w_{s}^{\prime}}, B_{w_{s+1}}, \ldots, B_{w_{l}}\right\}$ is a minimal system of generators of $I_{G}$, since toric ideals of graphs are homogeneous and therefore any two minimal systems of generators have the same cardinality. Then, after reordering $B_{w_{1}^{\prime}}, \ldots, B_{w_{s}^{\prime}}$ if necessary, we can assume that $B_{w_{j}^{\prime}}=B_{w_{j}}$ if $B_{w_{j}}$ is indispensable, and the binomials $B_{w_{j}^{\prime}}, B_{w_{j}}$ are $F_{4}$-equivalent if $B_{w_{j}}$ is dispensable, namely $B_{w_{j}}$ is not indispensable, since dispensability of toric ideals of graphs is only caused by $F_{4}$ 's. Recall that two primitive walks $\gamma, \gamma^{\prime}$ are $F_{4}$-equivalent if either $\gamma=\gamma^{\prime}$ or there exists a series of walks $\gamma_{1}=\gamma, \gamma_{2}, \ldots, \gamma_{r-1}, \gamma_{r}=\gamma^{\prime}$ such that $\gamma_{i}$ and $\gamma_{i+1}$ differ by an $F_{4}$, where $1 \leq i \leq r-1$, see [10, Section 4]. Since $G_{1}^{\prime}$ is a proper subgraph of $G_{1}$, there exists an edge $e \in E\left(w_{i}\right) \subset E\left(G_{1}\right)$ which is not in $E\left(G_{1}^{\prime}\right)$, but $e \notin E\left(w_{i}^{\prime}\right)$ for at least one index $1 \leq i \leq s$. Then $B_{w_{i}}$ is dispensable, thus $w_{i}, w_{i}^{\prime}$ are $F_{4}$-equivalent and $e$ belongs to a common $F_{4}$ of both $w_{i}, w_{i}^{\prime}$. Suppose that the edges of the $F_{4}$ belonging to $w_{i}$ are $e, f$ and to $w_{i}^{\prime}$ are $a, b$, thus $F_{4}=(e, a, f, b)$. Consider the binomial $e f-a b \in I_{G}$, we have that all $e, f, a, b$ are edges of $G_{1}$, since $G_{1}^{\prime} \subset G_{1}$, and therefore $e f-a b \in I_{G_{1}}$.

We distinguish the following cases.
(1) ef $-a b$ is an indispensable binomial of $I_{G}$. The set $\left\{B_{w_{1}^{\prime}}, \ldots, B_{w_{s}^{\prime}}, B_{w_{s+1}}, \ldots, B_{w_{l}}\right\}$ is a minimal system of generators of $I_{G}$ and $e f-a b$ is indispensable of $I_{G}$, so $e f-a b$ is one of the binomials $B_{w_{i}^{\prime}}, 1 \leq k \leq s$ or $B_{w_{k}}, s+1 \leq k \leq l$. But $e f-a b \notin I_{G_{1}^{\prime}}$ since $e$ is not an edge of $G_{1}^{\prime}$, thus ef $-a b=B_{w_{k}}$ for an index $s+1 \leq k \leq l$. Since the binomial $e f-a b$ is indispensable of $I_{G}$, the $A_{G}$-fiber of $\operatorname{deg}_{A_{G}}(e f)$ has only two elements, namely ef and $a b$, see [2]. Then the $A_{G_{1}}$-fiber of $\operatorname{deg}_{A_{G_{1}}}(e f)$ has at most two elements; in fact, it has exactly two with no common factor other than 1 since $e f-a b \in I_{G_{1}}$. Thus $e f-a b$ is indispensable of $I_{G_{1}}$, and therefore $e f-a b=B_{w_{q}}$ for an index $1 \leq q \leq s$ a contradiction to the hypothesis that $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ is a minimal splitting.
(2) $e f-a b$ is not an indispensable binomial of $I_{G}$. Then there is a binomial $e f-c d$ in $I_{G}$. In this case, the $A_{G}$-fiber of $\operatorname{deg}_{A_{G}}(e f)$ corresponds to a subgraph of $G$ homomorphic to $K_{4}$ and it consists of exactly three monomials, namely $e f, a b$, and $c d$. Every minimal system of generators of $I_{G}$ should contain exactly two of the binomials ef $-a b, e f-c d, a b-c d$. There are two subcases.
(i) Both edges $c, d$ belong to $G_{1}$. Then all binomials $e f-a b, e f-c d, a b-c d$ belong to $I_{G_{1}}$, so any minimal system of binomial generators of $I_{G_{1}}$ should contain exactly two of them. Since $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ is a minimal splitting, the ideal $I_{G_{2}}$ cannot contain any of the above three binomials. But $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}^{\prime}}+I_{G_{2}}$ is also a splitting of $I_{G}$ and $e$ is not an edge of $G_{1}^{\prime}$, therefore only $a b-c d$ can be an element of $I_{G_{1}^{\prime}}$. Then $\left\{B_{w_{1}^{\prime}}, \ldots, B_{w_{s}^{\prime}}, B_{w_{s+1}}, \ldots, B_{w_{l}}\right\}$ is a minimal generating
set of $I_{G}$, which contains at most one of the binomials $e f-a b, e f-c d, a b-c d$, a contradiction.
(ii) At least one of $c, d$ does not belong to $G_{1}$. Then the binomial $e f-a b$ is indispensable of $I_{G_{1}}$, since the $A_{G_{1}}$-fiber of $\operatorname{deg}_{A_{G_{1}}}(e f)$ has only two elements, namely ef and $a b$, with no common factor other than 1 . Thus the set $\left\{B_{w_{1}}, \ldots, B_{w_{s}}\right\}$ contains the binomial ef-ab. The set $\left\{B_{w_{1}}, \ldots, B_{w_{s}}, B_{w_{s}+1}, \ldots, B_{w_{l}}\right\}$ is a minimal system of generators of $I_{G}$, so $\left\{B_{w_{s+1}}, \ldots, B_{w_{l}}\right\}$ contains exactly one of the binomials $e f-c d$ or $a b-c d$ and does not contain $e f-a b$. But $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}^{\prime}}+I_{G_{2}}$ is a splitting of $I_{G}$ and none of the binomials ef -ab,ef$c d, a b-c d$ belongs to $I_{G_{1}^{\prime}}$, since $e$ and at least one of $c, d$ does not belong to $E\left(G_{1}^{\prime}\right)$. Thus the set $\left\{B_{w_{s+1}}, \ldots, B_{w_{l}}\right\}$ contains exactly two of the binomials $e f-a b, e f-c d, a b-c d$, a contradiction.
In all cases we reach a contradiction, so every minimal splitting is reduced.
Remark 4.8. The converse of Theorem 4.7 is not true. By Theorem 3.10, $I_{K_{n}}$ does not have a minimal splitting for $n \geq 6$. But from Proposition 3.9 any splitting $I_{G}=$ $I_{K_{n} \backslash\{a, c\}}+I_{K_{n} \backslash\{b, d\}}$ is reduced.
Remark 4.9. In [5, Question 5.1] G. Favacchio, J. Hofscheier, G. Keiper, and A. Van Tuyl pose the following question: For what graphs $G$ can we find $G_{1}$ and $G_{2}$ so that their respective toric ideals satisfy $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ ? We answered this question in the case that $G_{1}, G_{2}$ are subgraphs of $G$. The general question seems difficult, since one has information from $G$ only about the edges and possible closed walks of $G_{1}, G_{2}$, but not about their set of vertices.

The next example shows that there may be splittings $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ such that one of $G_{1}, G_{2}$ or both are not isomorphic to any subgraph of $G$.


Figure 4. The graphs $G, G_{1}$ and $G_{2}$ of a non subgraph splitting.

Let $G$ be the grid graph of Figure 4 with 9 vertices and 12 edges. The graph $G$ has four cycles of length 4 with no chord, namely $w_{1}, w_{2}, w_{3}$ and $w_{4}$, and a cycle of length 8 with no chord, namely $w_{5}$. Then the ideal $I_{G}$ is generated by the binomials $B_{w_{i}}, 1 \leq i \leq 5$. The ideal $I_{G_{1}}$ is generated by $B_{w_{1}}, B_{w_{3}}$ and the ideal $I_{G_{2}}$ is generated by $B_{w_{2}}, B_{w_{4}}, B_{w_{5}}, B_{w_{6}}, B_{w_{7}}, B_{w_{8}}$, where $w_{i}, 5 \leq i \leq 8$, are closed walks of length 8 with no chord. Then $I_{G}=I_{G_{1}}+I_{G_{2}}$ is a splitting of $I_{G}$ and $G_{2}$ is not isomorphic to any subgraph of $G$, since it has 10 vertices. Thus there exist splittings of graphs that are not subgraph splittings.
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