

COHEN-MACAULAYNESS OF POWERS OF EDGE IDEALS OF EDGE-WEIGHTED GRAPHS

JIAXIN LI, TRAN NAM TRUNG, AND GUANGJUN ZHU*

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we characterize the Cohen-Macaulayness of the second power $I(G_\omega)^2$ of the weighted edge ideal $I(G_\omega)$ when the underlying graph G is a very well-covered graph. We also characterize the Cohen-Macaulayness of all ordinary powers of $I(G_\omega)^n$ when G is a tree with a perfect matching consisting of pendant edges and the induced subgraph $G[V(G) \setminus S]$ of G on $V(G) \setminus S$ is a star, where S is the set of all leaf vertices, or if G is a connected graph with a perfect matching consisting of pendant edges and the induced subgraph $G[V(G) \setminus S]$ of G on $V(G) \setminus S$ is a complete graph and the weight function ω satisfies $\omega(e) = 1$ for all $e \in E(G[V(G) \setminus S])$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let G be a finite simple graph with the vertex set $V(G)$ and the edge set $E(G)$. A subset X of $V(G)$ is said to be *independent* if there is no edge $xy \in E(G)$ for $x, y \in X$. If X is an independent set and maximal in terms of inclusion, then X is called the *maximal independent set* of G , and its cardinality is called the *independence number* of G . A graph G is called *well-covered* (also called *unmixed*) if all maximal independent sets of G have the same independence number. It is known that a well-covered graph is a member of the class W_2 if removing any vertex leaves a well-covered graph with the same independence number as itself (see [18]). A graph G without isolated vertices is said to be *very well-covered* if $|V(G)|$ is an even integer and every maximal independent set of G has cardinality $|V(G)|/2$.

A function $\omega: E(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ is called an *edge-weighted function* (weighted function for short) on $E(G)$. The pair (G, ω) is called a *weighted graph* and is denoted by G_ω . If $V(G) = \{x_1, \dots, x_d\}$, then we can assume that $R = K[x_1, \dots, x_d]$ is a polynomial ring over a field K . The *weighted edge ideal* of G_ω is defined as a monomial ideal of R as follows:

$$I(G_\omega) = ((x_i x_j)^{\omega(x_i x_j)} \mid x_i x_j \in E(G)).$$

Date: February 10, 2025.

* Corresponding author.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 13C15, 13C14; Secondary 05E40, 13F20.

Keywords: Cohen-Macaulayness, powers of the edge ideal, the edge-weighted graph, very well-covered graph, weighted tree.

If the weighted function ω on $E(G)$ is the trivial one, i.e. $\omega(e) = 1$ for all $e \in E(G)$, then $I(G_\omega)$ is just the classical edge ideal of G , denoted by $I(G)$. It is known (see e.g. [24, Proposition 6.1.16]) that

$$\text{Ass}(R/I(G)) = \{(v : v \in C) \mid C \text{ is a minimal vertex cover of } G\}.$$

In particular, $\dim R/I(G) = \alpha(G)$, where $\alpha(G)$ is the maximum cardinality of independent sets in G . For an ideal $I \subset R$, we say that it is *Cohen-Macaulay* (resp. *Gorenstein*) if the quotient ring R/I is *Cohen-Macaulay* (resp. *Gorenstein*). A graph G is called a *Cohen-Macaulay* (resp. *Gorenstein*) graph if its edge ideal $I(G)$ is *Cohen-Macaulay* (resp. *Gorenstein*). It is known that if G is *Gorenstein*, then it is *Cohen-Macaulay*, so it is also *well-covered*. Note that $I(G) = \sqrt{I(G_\omega)}$, so G is *Cohen-Macaulay* if G_ω is *Cohen-Macaulay* (due to [10, Theorem 2.6]).

Recall that for a homogeneous ideal $I \subset R$ and any integer $n \geq 1$, the n -th symbolic power of I is defined as

$$I^{(n)} = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Min}(I)} I^n R_{\mathfrak{p}} \cap R,$$

where $\text{Min}(I)$ is the set of minimal primes of I .

Much research has been done on the characterization of *Cohen-Macaulay* graphs. Examples include bipartite graphs, chordal graphs, toric graphs, large perimeter graphs, etc. (see [8, 9, 12, 14, 21, 22, 23]). For the higher powers and higher symbolic power of $I(G)$, Hoang and the second author of this paper proved in [14] that $I(G)^2$ is *Cohen-Macaulay* if and only if G is a triangle-free *Gorenstein* graph. Furthermore, Cowsik and Nori in [1] showed that for a homogeneous radical ideal $I \subset R$, I^n is *Cohen-Macaulay* for infinitely many n if and only if I is a complete intersection. In particular, $I(G)^n$ is *Cohen-Macaulay* for infinitely many n if and only if $I(G)$ is a complete intersection. Hoang, Minh and the second author of this paper proved in [13] that $I(G)^{(2)}$ is *Cohen-Macaulay* if and only if G is a *Cohen-Macaulay* graph and for all edges xy , G_{xy} is *Cohen-Macaulay* and $\alpha(G_{xy}) = \alpha(G) - 1$, where $G_{xy} = G \setminus (N(x) \cup N(y))$ is the localization of G at the edge xy . In [5], Giancarlo, Naoki and Ken-ichi showed that $I(G)^{(n)}$ is *Cohen-Macaulay* for some integer $n \geq 3$ if and only if G is a disjoint union of finitely many complete graphs. In this case, $I(G)^{(n)}$ is *Cohen-Macaulay* for all n . We know that if $I(G)^n$ is *Cohen-Macaulay*, then $I(G)^n = I(G)^{(n)}$.

Recently, there has been a surge of interest in characterizing weight functions for which the edge ideal of a weighted graph is *Cohen-Macaulay*, and in computing the depth of powers of the edge ideals of some weighted graphs. For example, Paulsen and Sather-Wagstaff in [16] classified *Cohen-Macaulay* weighted graphs G_ω where the underlying graph G is a cycle, a tree, or a complete graph. Seyed Fakhari et al. in [19] continued this study, they classified *Cohen-Macaulay* weighted graph G_ω when G is a

very well-covered graph. Recently, Diem et al. in [3] gave a complete characterization of sequentially Cohen-Macaulay weighted graphs. In [25], Wei classified all Cohen-Macaulay weighted chordal graphs from a purely graph-theoretic point of view. Hien in [11] classified Cohen-Macaulay weighted graphs G_ω if G has a girth of at least 5. In [26], Zhu et al. gave some exact formulas for the depth of the powers of the edge ideal of a weighted star graph and also gave some lower bounds on the depth of powers of the integrally closed weighted path.

In this paper, we will focus on characterize the Cohen-Macaulayness of the second power $I(G_\omega)^2$ of the weighted edge ideal $I(G_\omega)$ when the underlying graph G is a very well-covered graph. We also characterize the Cohen-Macaulayness of all ordinary powers of $I(G_\omega)^n$ when G is a tree with a perfect matching consisting of pendant edges and the induced subgraph $G[V(G) \setminus S]$ of G on $V(G) \setminus S$ is a star, where S is the set of all leaf vertices, or if G is a connected graph with a perfect matching consisting of pendant edges and the induced subgraph $G[V(G) \setminus S]$ of G on $V(G) \setminus S$ is a complete graph and the weight function ω satisfies $\omega(e) = 1$ for all $e \in E(G[V(G) \setminus S])$.

The article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we will collect some of the essential definitions and terminology that will be needed later. In Section 3, we will prove that if G is a Cohen-Macaulay very well-covered graph, then G has at least two leaves. Furthermore, if G has exactly two leaves, then it is bipartite. We also give the necessary and sufficient condition that $I(G_\omega)^2$ is Cohen-Macaulay using the weight function ω . In Section 4, if G is a path of length of 3, using the weight function ω , we give the necessary and sufficient condition that $I(G_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay for all $n \geq 1$ (see Proposition 4.3). Under the condition that G is a tree, we give the conditions that the weight function ω satisfies if $I(G_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay for all $n \geq 1$. Furthermore, if G is a tree with a perfect matching consisting of pendant edges and the induced subgraph $G[V(G) \setminus S]$ of G on $V(G) \setminus S$ is a star, where S is the set of all leaf vertices, we show that these conditions are crucial. If G is a connected graph with a perfect matching consisting of pendant edges, and the induced subgraph $G[V(G) \setminus S]$ of G on $V(G) \setminus S$ is a complete graph, and the weight function ω satisfies $\omega(e) = 1$ for all $e \in E(G[V(G) \setminus S])$, we show that $I(G_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay for all $n \geq 1$ if and only if $\omega(e) \geq 2$ for any pendant edge e .

2. PRELIMINARIES

We begin this section by collecting some terminology and results from graph theory. Let G be a finite simple graph with a vertex set $V(G)$ and an edge set $E(G)$. A subset $C \subseteq V(G)$ is a vertex cover of G if, for each $e \in E(G)$, $e \cap C \neq \emptyset$. If C is minimal with respect to inclusion, then C is called a minimal vertex cover of G . Obviously, C is a vertex cover if and only if $V(G) \setminus C$ is an independent set. If v is a vertex in G , its neighborhood is the set $N_G(v) = \{u \in V(G) \mid vu \in E(G)\}$ and its degree,

denoted by $\deg_G(v)$, is $|N_G(v)|$. If $\deg_G(v) = 1$, then v is called a leaf vertex. An edge that is incident with a leaf vertex is called a pendant edge. The closed neighborhood of v is $N_G[v] = N_G(v) \cup \{v\}$; if there is no ambiguity on G , we use $N(v)$ and $N[v]$, respectively. For an independent set S of G , we denote the closed neighborhood of S by $N_G[S] = S \cup \{v \in V(G) \mid N_G(v) \cap S \neq \emptyset\}$; we write $N_G[v_1, \dots, v_s]$ stands for $N_G[S]$ if $S = \{v_1, \dots, v_s\}$.

A subset $M \subset E(G)$ is a matching if $e \cap e' = \emptyset$ for every pair of edges $e, e' \in M$. If every vertex of G is incident with an edge in M , then M is a perfect matching of G . For a subset $A \subset V(G)$, let $G[A]$ denote the induced subgraph of G on A . At the same time, we denote the induced subgraph of G on $V(G) \setminus A$ by $G \setminus A$. If $A = \{v\}$, we will write $G \setminus v$ instead of $G \setminus \{v\}$ for simplicity. Let G_ω be a weighted graph, its induced subgraph is a weighted graph H_ω , where $V(H) \subset V(G)$, and for any $u, v \in V(H)$, $uv \in E(H)$ if and only if $uv \in E(G)$, and the weight $\omega_H(uv)$ of edge uv in H is equal to its weight $\omega_G(uv)$ in G .

A monomial ideal I is unmixed if its associated primes have the same height. It is well known that I is unmixed if R/I is Cohen-Macaulay. If $I(G_\omega)$ is unmixed, we say that G_ω is unmixed. Note that $I(G) = \sqrt{I(G_\omega)}$, so G is well-covered if G_ω is unmixed. Note also that the height $I(G_\omega)$ is equal to the smallest size of the vertex covers of G .

Next, we recall a formula by Hochster to compute the depth of R/I , where I is a monomial ideal. Actually, it gives us a way to check the Cohen-Macaulayness of monomial ideals.

Lemma 2.1. [15, Theorem 7.1] *Let I be a monomial ideal. Then*

$$\text{depth } R/I = \min\{\text{depth } R/\sqrt{I: f} \mid f \text{ is a monomial such that } f \notin I\}.$$

As a consequence, we obtain

Lemma 2.2. *Let I be a monomial ideal. Then I is Cohen-Macaulay if and only if I has no embedded prime ideal and $I: f$ is Cohen-Macaulay for every monomial $f \notin I$.*

Let V be the set of all variables of R . For a monomial f in R , its support is $\text{supp}(f) = \{x \in V \mid x \text{ is divisible by } f\}$, i.e., it is the set of all variables appearing in f . For a monomial ideal I of R and a subset W of V , the restriction of I on W is

$$I|_W = (f \mid f \text{ is a minimal generator of } I \text{ such that } \text{supp}(f) \subseteq W),$$

denoted by $I|_W$, and define $I_W = IR_W \cap R$ as the localization of I with respect to W . Note that $I_W = I: f^\infty$ with $f = \prod_{x \in W} x$.

The following lemmas are obvious.

Lemma 2.3. *Let I and J be two monomial ideals in R and let W be a subset of V . Then*

- (1) $(I \cap J)|_W = I|_W \cap J|_W$; and
- (2) $(I^n)|_W = (I|_W)^n$ for all $n \geq 1$.

Lemma 2.4. *Let I and J be two monomial ideals in R and let $W \subseteq V$. Then*

- (1) $(I \cap J)_W = I_W \cap J_W$;
- (2) $(I^n)_W = (I_W)^n$ for all $n \geq 1$; and
- (3) if I is Cohen-Macaulay, then I_W is also Cohen-Macaulay.

Lemma 2.5. *Suppose that G has a pendant edge xy with $\deg_G(y) = 1$. For any integer $n \geq 1$, if $I(G_\omega)^n$ is unmixed, then $I((G \setminus x)_\omega)^n$ is also unmixed.*

Proof. For simplicity, set $I = I(G_\omega)$ and $H = G \setminus x$. Assume that

$$I = Q_1 \cap Q_2 \cap \cdots \cap Q_k \cap Q_{k+1} \cap \cdots \cap Q_m \cap Q_{m+1} \cap \cdots \cap Q_s$$

is an irredundant primary decomposition of I , where

- $\text{ht}(Q_i) = \text{ht}(I)$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$; and $\text{ht}(Q_i) > \text{ht}(I)$ for $i = m + 1, \dots, s$.
- $x \in Q_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$; and $y \in Q_i$ for $i = k + 1, \dots, m$.

Since I^n is unmixed, we have $I^n = I^{(n)}$, where $I^{(n)}$ is the n -th symbolic power of I . So $I^n = Q_1^n \cap \cdots \cap Q_k^n \cap Q_{k+1}^n \cap \cdots \cap Q_m^n$.

Let I' be the restriction of I on $V(G) \setminus \{x\}$, then, by Lemma 2.3, we have $I(H_\omega)^n = (I')^n = (I^n)'$. So again by this lemma we get that

$$I(H_\omega)^n = Q_1^n \cap \cdots \cap Q_k^n \cap Q_{k+1}^n \cap \cdots \cap Q_m^n$$

is a primary decomposition of $I(H_\omega)^n$.

Since every monomial generator of $I(H_\omega)^n$ contains neither x nor y , it follows that

$$I(H_\omega)^n = Q_1^n \cap \cdots \cap Q_k^n.$$

Since every Q_i' with $i = 1, \dots, k$ has height $\text{ht}(I) - 1$, this representation is an irredundant primary decomposition of $I(H_\omega)^n$, and thus $I(H_\omega)^n$ is unmixed, as required. \square

Further, we obtain

Lemma 2.6. *Suppose that G has a pendant edge xy with $\deg_G(y) = 1$. For any integer $n \geq 1$, if $I(G_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay, then $I((G \setminus x)_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay.*

Proof. Let $I = I(G_\omega)$, $H = G \setminus x$ and

$$I = Q_1 \cap \cdots \cap Q_k \cap Q_{k+1} \cap \cdots \cap Q_m \cap Q_{m+1} \cap \cdots \cap Q_s$$

be an irredundant primary decomposition of I such that

- $\text{ht}(Q_i) = \text{ht}(I)$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$; and $\text{ht}(Q_i) > \text{ht}(I)$ for $i = m + 1, \dots, s$.

- $x \in Q_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$; and $y \in Q_i$ for $i = k + 1, \dots, m$.

Since I^n is Cohen-Macaulay, it is unmixed. Hence $I^n = Q_1^n \cap \dots \cap Q_k^n \cap Q_{k+1}^n \cap \dots \cap Q_m^n$ by Lemma 2.5.

Let I' be the restriction of I on $V(G) \setminus \{x\}$, then, by the proof of Lemma 2.5, we get that

$$I(H_\omega)^n = Q_1^n \cap \dots \cap Q_k^n$$

is an irredundant primary decomposition of $I(H_\omega)^n$.

Let $P_i = \sqrt{Q_i}$ and $P'_i = \sqrt{Q'_i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Let f be any monomial with $\text{supp}(f) \subseteq V(G) \setminus \{x, y\}$ such that $f \notin I(H_\omega)^n$. Suppose $f \notin Q'_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, t$ and $f \in Q'_i$ for $i = t + 1, \dots, k$. In particular,

$$\sqrt{I(H_\omega)^n : f} = \sqrt{Q'_1 : f} \cap \dots \cap \sqrt{Q'_t : f} = P'_1 \cap \dots \cap P'_t.$$

Let $g = fy^{n\omega(xy)}$, then $g \notin Q_i^n$ for $i = 1, \dots, t$; and $g \in Q_i^n$ for $i = t + 1, \dots, m$. It follows that

$$I(G_\omega)^n : g = (Q_1^n : g) \cap \dots \cap (Q_t^n : g),$$

and so

$$\sqrt{I(G_\omega)^n : g} = \sqrt{Q_1^n : g} \cap \dots \cap \sqrt{Q_t^n : g} = P_1 \cap \dots \cap P_t = (x) + P'_1 \cap \dots \cap P'_t.$$

Since $I(G_\omega)^n : g$ is Cohen-Macaulay by Lemma 2.2, so is $(x) + P'_1 \cap \dots \cap P'_t$. Therefore, $\sqrt{I(H_\omega)^n : f} = P'_1 \cap \dots \cap P'_t$ is Cohen-Macaulay. It follows that $I(H_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay again by Lemma 2.2, as required. \square

For a monomial u and a variable x , we denote $\deg_x(u) = \max\{m : x^m | u\}$.

Lemma 2.7. *Suppose that $I(G_\omega)^n$ is unmixed for some $n \geq 1$. If G has a pendant edge xy with $\deg_G(y) = 1$, then $\omega(xy) \geq \omega(xz)$ for all $z \in N_G(x)$.*

Proof. Let $I = I(G_\omega)$ and let $I = Q_1 \cap \dots \cap Q_k \cap Q_{k+1} \cap \dots \cap Q_m \cap Q_{m+1} \cap \dots \cap Q_s$ be an irredundant primary decomposition of I , where $\text{ht}(Q_i) = \text{ht}(I)$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$; and $\text{ht}(Q_i) > \text{ht}(I)$ for $i = m + 1, \dots, s$. Since I^n is unmixed, we have

$$I^n = Q_1^n \cap \dots \cap Q_m^n.$$

Let $P_i = \sqrt{Q_i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$, where $x \in P_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$, and $x \notin P_i$ for $i = k + 1, \dots, m$. Since $\text{Ass}(R/I^n) = \{P_1, \dots, P_m\}$, it follows that $\text{Ass}(R/I^n) = \text{Ass}(R/I(G))$. Since xy is a pendant edge of G , every associated prime ideal of G contains either x or y , but not both. Thus, $y \notin P_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$, and $y \in P_i$ for $i = k + 1, \dots, m$.

For a monomial ideal J of R , let $G(J)$ be the set of its minimal monomial generators. We have

$$I^n = (Q_1^n \cap \dots \cap Q_k^n) \cap (Q_{k+1}^n \cap \dots \cap Q_m^n) = ((x^p) + J_1) \cap ((y^q) + J_2)$$

where each monomial $f \in G(J_1)$ has $\deg_x(f) < p$ and $f \nmid x^p$; and each monomial $g \in G(J_2)$ has $\deg_y(g) < q$ and $g \nmid y^q$. Since $(xy)^{n\omega(xy)}$ is a monomial generator of I^n , it forces $(xy)^{n\omega(xy)} = x^p y^q$, and so $p = q = n\omega(xy)$.

Now for every $z \in N_G(x) \setminus \{y\}$. It is easy to check that $(xy)^{(n-1)\omega(xy)}(xz)^{\omega(xz)}$ is a monomial generator of I^n . It follows that $(xy)^{(n-1)\omega(xy)}(xz)^{\omega(xz)} = \text{lcm}(f, g)$ for some $f \in G((x^p) + J_1)$ and $g \in G((y^q) + J_2)$. Note that g does not contain x , so

$$\deg_x((xy)^{(n-1)\omega(xy)}(xz)^{\omega(xz)}) = \deg_x(\text{lcm}(f, g)) = \deg_x(f) < p.$$

Thus $(n-1)\omega(xy) + \omega(xz) < n\omega(xy)$, and thus $\omega(xz) \leq \omega(xy)$, as required. \square

If a graph G has a perfect matching consisting of pendant edges, and ω is a weight function on G , then [16, Lemma 5.3] gives a sufficient condition on ω for $I(G_\omega)$ to be Cohen-Macaulay. We will generalize this for powers of $I(G_\omega)$.

For this we introduce the polarization of a monomial ideal (see [17, Chapter I]). Let $m = x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots x_d^{\alpha_d}$ in R . Let $S = K[x_j^i \mid 1 \leq i \leq d, 1 \leq j \leq N]$ for some $N \gg 0$. Then we associate to m a squarefree monomial m^{pol} in S as follows:

$$m^{\text{pol}} = x_1^1 x_2^1 \cdots x_{\alpha_1}^1 x_1^2 x_2^2 \cdots x_{\alpha_2}^2 \cdots x_1^d x_2^d \cdots x_{\alpha_d}^d,$$

where each power $x_i^{\alpha_i}$ of a variable x_i is replaced by the product $x_1^i x_2^i \cdots x_{\alpha_i}^i$. We call m^{pol} the polarization of m . Let $I = (m_1, \dots, m_k)$ be a monomial ideal of R , where $\{m_1, \dots, m_k\}$ is the set of minimal monomial generators of I . Then we define the ideal I^{pol} of S by $I^{\text{pol}} = (m_1^{\text{pol}}, \dots, m_k^{\text{pol}})$, which is called the polarization of I . The following lemma is an useful fact used in the paper.

Lemma 2.8. *I is Cohen-Macaulay if and only if I^{pol} is Cohen-Macaulay.*

Proof. It follows from [17, Theorem 21.10]. \square

Theorem 2.9. *Suppose that G_ω is a weighted graph such that its underlying graph G has a perfect matching $x_1 y_1, \dots, x_t y_t$, where each y_i is a leaf vertex. If there exists an integer $k \geq 1$ such that $\omega(x_i y_i) \geq k\omega(x_i x_j)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, t$ and $x_j \in N_G(x_i)$, then $I(G_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay for all $n = 1, \dots, k$.*

Proof. For simplicity, we set $I = I(G_\omega)$, $m_i = \omega(x_i y_i)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, t$, and $\omega_{ij} = \omega(x_i x_j)$ for all $x_i x_j \in E(G)$. Then

$$I = (\{(x_i y_i)^{m_i} \mid i = 1, \dots, t\} \cup \{(x_i x_j)^{\omega_{ij}} \mid x_i x_j \in E(G)\}).$$

Let J be a monomial ideal in the polynomial ring $K[u_1, \dots, u_t]$ defined by

$$J = (\{u_i^{2m_i} \mid i = 1, \dots, t\} \cup \{(u_i u_j)^{\omega_{ij}} \mid x_i x_j \in E(G)\}),$$

i.e., J is obtained from I by replacing y_i and x_i by u_i for all i . Note that J is Artinian.

Fix an arbitrary integer $n = 1, \dots, k$. To prove that I^n is Cohen-Macaulay, we use the technique of polarization. Let S be the polynomial ring

$$S = K[x_1^1, \dots, x_{2nm_1}^1, \dots, x_1^t, \dots, x_{2nm_t}^t]$$

of variables x_j^i for $i = 1, \dots, t$ and $j = 1, \dots, 2nm_i$.

Then, for $1 \leq m \leq nm_i$, we define the polarizations of x_i^m and y_i^m in R to be monomials in S as follows. Let $m = m_i s + r$ where $0 \leq r < m_i$. Define

$$(x_i^m)^{\text{pol}} = (x_{2sm_i+1}^i \cdots x_{2sm_i+r}^i) \prod_{p=0}^{s-1} \prod_{j=1}^{m_i} x_{2pm_i+j}^i,$$

and

$$(y_i^m)^{\text{pol}} = (x_{(2s+1)m_i+1}^i \cdots x_{(2s+1)m_i+r}^i) \prod_{p=0}^{s-1} \prod_{j=1}^{m_i} x_{(2p+1)m_i+j}^i.$$

Next, we define the polarization of u_i^m with $1 \leq m \leq 2nm_i$ to be a monomial in S by

$$(u_i^m)^{\text{pol}} = x_1^i \cdots x_m^i.$$

Using the condition that $\omega(x_i y_i) \geq k\omega(x_i x_j)$ for each $i = 1, \dots, t$ and $x_j \in N_G(x_i)$, we can verify the following claim: Let f be a product of n monomial generators of I and let g be a monomial of $K[u_1, \dots, u_t]$ obtained from f by replacing x_i and y_i by u_i for each $i = 1, \dots, t$. Then $f^{\text{pol}} = g^{\text{pol}}$.

This claim yields $(I^n)^{\text{pol}} = (J^n)^{\text{pol}}$. Since J is Artinian, so is J^n , and so J^n is Cohen-Macaulay. So $(J^n)^{\text{pol}}$ is Cohen-Macaulay and so I^n is also Cohen-Macaulay by Lemma 2.8, as required. \square

3. SECOND POWERS OF EDGE IDEALS OF WEIGHTED BIPARTITE GRAPHS

In this section, we will characterize the Cohen-Macaulayness of $I(G_\omega)^2$, where G_ω is a weighted very well-covered graph. Note that if $I(G_\omega)^2$ is Cohen-Macaulay, then $I(G) = \sqrt{I(G_\omega)^2}$ is also Cohen-Macaulay by [10, Theorem 2.6].

Thus, in this section we will always consider G to be a Cohen-Macaulay very well-covered graph. By [2, Theorem 3.6] we can partition $V(G)$ into $V(G) = X \cup Y$ where X is a minimal vertex cover and Y is a maximal independent set such that the vertices of G are labeled such that the following condition holds.

$$(*) \quad X = \{x_1, \dots, x_t\} \text{ and } Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_t\}$$

such that

$$(1*) \quad x_i y_i \in E(G) \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, t;$$

$$(2*) \quad \text{if } x_i y_j \in E(G), \text{ then } i \leq j; \text{ and}$$

$$(3*) \quad \text{if } x_i y_j \in E(G), \text{ then } x_i x_j \notin E(G); \text{ and}$$

$$(4*) \quad \text{if } x_i y_k, x_k y_j \in E(G) \text{ for distinct indices } i, j, k, \text{ then } x_i y_j \in E(G).$$

(5*) if $x_i y_k, x_k x_j \in E(G)$ for distinct indices i, j, k , then $x_i x_j \in E(G)$.

If G is a bipartite graph, we can assume that Y is a maximal independent set of G such that (X, Y) is a bipartition of G (see [8]). An example of such a graph is shown in Figure 1, where we set $\omega_{ij} = \omega(x_i y_j)$ for all $x_i y_j \in E(G)$.




FIGURE 1. The weighted bipartite graph.

Lemma 3.1. *Every associated prime ideal of $I(G)$ contains either x_k or y_k , but not both, for every $k = 1, \dots, t$.*

Proof. Let \mathfrak{p} be an associated prime ideal of $I(G)$ such that $\mathfrak{p} = (C)$ for some minimal cover C of G . Let $T = V(G) \setminus C$, then T is a maximal independent set of G . If $x_k, y_k \notin T$, we have two cases:

Case 1: $x_i y_k \in E(G)$ and $x_k x_j \in E(G)$ for some $x_i, x_j \in T$. By Property (5*), we have $x_i x_j \in E(G)$, a contradiction.

Case 2: $x_i y_k \in E(G)$ and $x_k y_j \in E(G)$ for some $x_i, y_j \in T$. By Property (4*), we have $x_i y_j \in E(G)$, a contradiction.

So either x_k or y_k is in T , but not both, since T is an independent set. This shows that C contains either x_k or y_k , but not both, and the lemma follows. \square

Lemma 3.2. *G has at least two leaves.*

Proof. The case $t = 1$ is obvious, so we assume $t \geq 2$. Since y_1 is a leaf, it remains to show that G has another leaf. We consider the following two cases:

(1) If there exists some y_k such that $x_1 y_k \notin E(G)$, then we take k to be a minimal index among such indices. In this case, we claim that y_k is a leaf, so that y_1 and y_k are desired leaves.

In fact, if y_k is not a leaf, then $x_i y_k \in E(G)$ for some index $1 < i < k$. It follows that $x_1 y_i \in E(G)$ by the minimality of k , so $x_1 y_k \in E(G)$ according to Property (4*), which is a contradiction.

(2) If $x_1 y_k \in E(G)$ for all $k = 1, \dots, t$, then, by Property (3*), we get $x_1 x_k \notin E(G)$ for all $k = 2, \dots, t$. In this case, we claim that: $x_i x_j \notin E(G)$ for all $2 \leq i < j \leq t$.

Indeed, if there exist some $2 \leq i < j \leq t$ such that $x_i x_j \in E(G)$. Since $x_1 y_i \in E(G)$, we can obtain that $x_1 x_j \in E(G)$ by Property (5*), which contradicts Property (3*). So x_t is a leaf, as required. \square

Lemma 3.3. *If G has exactly two leaves, then it is bipartite.*

Proof. The case where $t = 1$ is trivial, since in this case G has exactly one edge. If $t = 2$, then G is a path of length 3, and it is obvious that it is bipartite. Suppose $t \geq 3$. It follows from Property (2*) that y_1 is a leaf. Consider the following two cases:

(1) If y_j is not a leaf of G for all $j \geq 2$, then $x_1 y_j \in E(G)$ for all $2 \leq j \leq t$. Indeed, if $x_1 y_j \notin E(G)$ for some $2 \leq j \leq t$, then we see from the proof of Lemma 3.2 that y_j is a leaf of G , a contradiction.

Now we show that in this case X is an independent set. Suppose that this is not the case. Then there exist p, q with $1 \leq p < q \leq t$ such that $x_p x_q \in E(G)$, so $x_1 x_q \in E(G)$ by Property (5*), since $x_1 y_p \in E(G)$. This contradicts Property (3*), so X is an independent set of G . This implies that G is bipartite.

(2) Suppose there exists some m with $2 \leq m \leq t$ such that y_m is a leaf in G , then the following claim holds:

Claim 1: $x_1 y_j \in E(G)$ or $x_m y_j \in E(G)$ for all $j \notin \{1, m\}$. If this is not the case, let j be the minimum index such that $x_1 y_j, x_m y_j \notin E(G)$. Since both y_1 and y_m are leaves and G has only two leaves, y_j is not a leaf. Therefore, by Property (2*), there exists some $x_i y_j \in E(G)$ with $i < j$. By the minimality of j , $x_1 y_i \in E(G)$ or $x_m y_i \in E(G)$. We can assume that $x_1 y_i \in E(G)$, but then $x_1 y_j \in E(G)$ by Property (4*), a contradiction.

We consider the following two subcases:

(i) If $x_1 x_m \notin E(G)$, then we have $G \setminus N_G[x_1, x_m]$ is an induced subgraph of $G[V(G) \setminus \{x_1, x_m\}]$. On the other hand, since G is well-covered, by [4, Lemma 1] we have

$$\alpha(G \setminus N_G[x_1, x_m]) = t - 2 = |X| - 2.$$

It forces $X \setminus \{x_1, x_m\}$ to be an independent set of G and $N_G[x_1, x_m] \cap (X \setminus \{x_1, x_m\}) = \emptyset$. This forces X to be an independent set of G , so G is bipartite.

(ii) If $x_1 x_m \in E(G)$. First, we will prove the following two claims:

Claim 2: $x_1 y_j \notin E(G)$ or $x_m y_j \notin E(G)$ for all $j \notin \{1, m\}$. On the contrary, assume that there exists some $j \notin \{1, m\}$ such that $x_1 y_j, x_m y_j \in E(G)$. Let j be the maximum index among such indices. Since x_j is not a leaf, we have either $x_j y_q \in E(G)$ for $j < q$ or $x_i x_j \in E(G)$ for $i \neq j$. In the first case, by Property (4*), we have $x_1 y_q, x_m y_q \in E(G)$, which contradicts the maximality of j . Hence $x_i x_j \in E(G)$ for some $i \neq j$. By Property (3*), one has $i \notin \{1, m\}$. On the other hand, either

$x_1y_i \in E(G)$ or $x_my_i \in E(G)$ by Claim 1, so $x_1x_j \in E(G)$ or $x_mx_j \in E(G)$ by Property (5*). This contradicts Property (3*). Hence $x_1y_j \notin E(G)$ or $x_my_j \notin E(G)$ for all $j \notin \{1, m\}$.

Claim 3: $x_1x_j \in E(G)$ or $x_mx_j \in E(G)$ for all $j \notin \{1, m\}$, but not both. In fact, this is not the case, let j be the maximal index such that $x_1x_j, x_jx_m \notin E(G)$. Since x_j is not a leaf, we have either $x_jy_k \in E(G)$ for some $j < k$, or $x_jx_s \in E(G)$ for $s \notin \{1, j, m\}$. In the first case, we can obtain that $x_1y_k \in E(G)$ or $x_my_k \in E(G)$ by Claim 1. If $x_1y_k \in E(G)$, then $x_1x_k \notin E(G)$ by Property (3*). So $x_kx_m \in E(G)$ by the maximality of j . It follows that $x_jx_m \in E(G)$ by Property (5*). If $x_my_k \in E(G)$, then $x_1x_j \in E(G)$ by similar arguments as in the case $x_1y_k \in E(G)$. These two cases contradict the hypothesis that $x_1x_j, x_jx_m \notin E(G)$. For the second case, by similar arguments as for the first case, we can get that then $x_1x_j \in E(G)$ if $x_1y_s \in E(G)$, and $x_mx_j \in E(G)$ if $x_my_s \in E(G)$. This also contradicts the hypothesis that $x_1x_j, x_jx_m \notin E(G)$. Therefore, $x_1x_j \in E(G)$ or $x_mx_j \in E(G)$ for all $j \notin \{1, m\}$. Since $x_1y_j \in E(G)$ or $x_my_j \in E(G)$ for all $j \notin \{1, m\}$, $x_1x_j \in E(G)$ and $x_mx_j \in E(G)$ do not simultaneously hold by Property (3*), as claimed.

Now we return to the proof of the lemma. Let $A = \{v \mid vx_1 \in E(G)\}$ and $B = \{v \mid vx_m \in E(G)\}$. By Claims 1, 2 and 3, we conclude that $V(G) = A \cup B$ and $A \cap B = \emptyset$. It remains to show that A and B are independent sets of G . If A is not an independent set of G , then we have two possible cases:

Case 1: If $x_ix_j \in E(G)$ for some $x_i, x_j \in A$, then $x_i, x_j \notin B$, since $A \cap B = \emptyset$. It follows that $i \neq m$ and $j \neq m$. Indeed, if $i = m$, then $x_mx_j \in E(G)$. By the definition of B , $x_j \in B$, so $x_j \in A \cap B$, a contradiction. Similarly, $j \neq m$. On the other hand, since $x_1x_i, x_1x_j \in E(G)$, we have $x_1y_i, x_1y_j \notin E(G)$ by Property (3*). This forces $x_my_i, x_my_j \in E(G)$ by Claims 1 and 2. Again, using $x_ix_j \in E(G)$ and $x_my_j \in E(G)$, we can see that $x_ix_m \in E(G)$. It follows that $x_i \in A \cap B$, which is impossible.

Case 2: If $x_iy_j \in E(G)$ for some $x_i, y_j \in A$, then $y_j \notin B$ since $A \cap B = \emptyset$. By the definition of B , $i \neq m$. Since $x_i, y_j \in A$, $x_1x_i \in E(G)$, $x_1y_j \in E(G)$. It follows from Property (3*) that $i \neq j$. On the other hand, since $x_1x_i \in E(G)$, we have $x_1y_i \notin E(G)$ by Property (3*). This forces $x_my_i \in E(G)$ by Claims 1 and 2. Again, using $x_iy_j \in E(G)$, we can see that $x_my_j \in E(G)$. It follows that $y_j \in A \cap B$, which is impossible.

So two cases are impossible. This means that A is an independent set of G . Similarly, we can prove that B is also an independent set of G . Hence, G is a bipartite graph, as required. \square

We now characterize the weight function ω such that $I(G_\omega)^2$ are Cohen-Macaulay. If $t = 1$, then G has only one edge, and any weight function is possible. If $t = 2$, we get the following result.

Lemma 3.4. *Let G_ω be a weighted path of length 3 with $E(G) = \{ax, ab, by\}$. If $I(G_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay for some $n \geq 2$, then $\min\{\omega(ax), \omega(by)\} \geq 2\omega(ab)$.*

Proof. For simplicity, let $I = I(G_\omega)$ and let $p = \omega(ax)$, $k = \omega(ab)$, $q = \omega(by)$ (see Figure 2). Then

$$I(G_\omega) = ((ax)^p, (ab)^k, (by)^q)$$

and we need to prove $2k \leq \min\{p, q\}$.

First, since I^n is unmixed, we have $k \leq \min\{p, q\}$ by Lemma 2.7.




FIGURE 2. The weighted path of length 3.

We can assume that $p \leq q$, so that $k \leq p \leq q$. First, We claim that $k < q$. Assume that this is not the case, so that $p = k = q$. Hence,

$$I = ((ab)^k, (ax)^k, (by)^k) = (a^k, b^k) \cap (a^k, y^k) \cap (b^k, x^k).$$

Since I^n is unmixed, we have

$$I^n = (a^k, b^k)^n \cap (a^k, y^k)^n \cap (b^k, x^k)^n.$$

Let $f = a^k b^{(n-1)k}$. Using the fact that $n \geq 2$, we have $f \in (a^k, b^k)^n$, $f \notin (a^k, y^k)^n$ and $f \notin (b^k, x^k)^n$. It follows that

$$\sqrt{I^n : f} = (a, y) \cap (b, x).$$

Note that $\sqrt{I^n : f}$ is not Cohen-Macaulay. This contradicts Lemma 2.2. Therefore we have $k < q$.

We now proceed to prove the lemma. It suffices to show that $p \geq 2k$. Suppose, on the contrary that, that $p < 2k$. Since I^n is Cohen-Macaulay, the localization $I_{\{y\}}^n$ of I^n with respect to $\{y\}$ is also Cohen-Macaulay by Lemma 2.4. In particular, $I_{\{y\}}^n = I_{\{y\}}^{(n)}$, where $I_{\{y\}}^{(n)}$ is the n -th symbolic power of $I_{\{y\}}$. Note that $I_{\{y\}} = (a^p x^p, a^k b^k, b^q) = (a^p, a^k b^k, b^q) \cap (b^k, x^p)$, so

$$I_{\{y\}}^{(n)} = (a^p, a^k b^k, b^q)^n \cap (b^k, x^p)^n.$$

Let $f = (a^k b^k)^{n-2} a^p b^s$ where $s = \max\{q, 2k\}$, then $f \in (a^p, a^k b^k, b^q)^n \cap (b^k, x^p)^n$. Thus $f \in I_{\{y\}}^{(n)}$.

We claim that $f \notin I_{\{y\}}^n$. Indeed, suppose on the contrary that $f \in I_{\{y\}}^n$. Then $f = g(a^k b^k)^{n-u} b^{qu}$, where g is a monomial in R and $0 \leq u \leq n$. It follows that

$$(n-2)k + p \geq (n-u)k \text{ and } (n-2)k + s \geq (n-u)k + qu,$$

and so $(u-2)k + p \geq 0$ and $(u-2)k + s \geq qu$.

Since $p < 2k$, the inequality $(u-2)k + p \geq 0$ yields $u \geq 1$. Note that $k < q$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} q &\leq (u-2)k + s - (u-1)q \leq (u-2)k + s - (u-1)k = s - k \\ &= \max\{2k - k, q - k\} = \max\{k, q - k\}. \end{aligned}$$

This is impossible because $1 \leq k < q$. Hence $f \notin I_{\{y\}}^n$, and hence $I_{\{y\}}^n \neq I_{\{y\}}^{(n)}$, a contradiction. Therefore, $p \geq 2k$, and the proof is complete. \square

Lemma 3.5. *If $I(G_\omega)^2$ is unmixed, then $I((G \setminus \{x_k, y_k\})_\omega)^2$ is also unmixed for all $k = 1, \dots, t$.*

Proof. Let $I = I(G_\omega)$ and $J = I((G \setminus \{x_k, y_k\})_\omega)$. Since I^2 is unmixed, it has the irredundant primary decomposition as

$$I^2 = Q_1^2 \cap Q_2^2 \cap \dots \cap Q_s^2,$$

where each Q_i is a primary monomial ideal and $\mathfrak{p}_i = \sqrt{Q_i}$ is the associated prime ideal of $I(G)$.

Let $W = V(G) \setminus \{x_k, y_k\}$, then $J = I|_W$ is the restriction of I on W . It follows that

$$(1) \quad J^2 = (Q_1|_W)^2 \cap (Q_2|_W)^2 \cap \dots \cap (Q_s|_W)^2.$$

On the other hand, for each i , by Lemma 3.1, \mathfrak{p}_i contains either x_k or y_k , but not both. It follows that $\text{ht}(Q_i|_W) = \text{ht}(Q_i) - 1$. Combining this fact with Eq. (1), we conclude that J^2 is unmixed, as required. \square

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose further that X is an independent set of G . If $I(G_\omega)^2$ is Cohen-Macaulay, then the following results hold:*

- (1) *If $x_i y_j \in E(G)$ with $i < j$, then $2\omega(x_i y_j) \leq \min\{\omega(x_i y_i), \omega(x_j y_j)\}$.*
- (2) *If $x_i y_k, x_k y_j \in E(G)$ with $i < k < j$, then $2\omega(x_i y_j) \leq \min\{\omega(x_i y_k), \omega(x_k y_j)\}$.*

Proof. By our assumption, G is a bipartite graph with bipartition (X, Y) . We prove the statement by induction on t . If $t = 2$, then it follows from Lemma 3.4.

Suppose $t \geq 3$. If $i \neq 1$, let $H = G \setminus x_1$. Since $x_1 y_1$ is a pendant edge with $\deg_G(y_1) = 1$, we have $I(H_\omega)^2$ is Cohen-Macaulay by Lemma 2.6. Applying the

induction hypothesis to H_ω , we obtain the desired inequalities. Similarly, if $j \neq t$, then the desired inequalities follow by considering the weighted graph $(G \setminus y_t)_\omega$.

This argument also shows that all the inequalities hold if either $i \neq 1$ or $j \neq t$. Let $\omega_{ij} = \omega(x_i y_j)$ for all $x_i y_j \in E(G)$. It remains to prove the case $i = 1$ and $j = t$, i.e., we will prove that

$$(2) \quad 2\omega_{1t} \leq \min\{\omega_{11}, \omega_{tt}\} \text{ if } x_1 y_t \in E(G),$$

and

$$(3) \quad 2\omega_{1t} \leq \min\{\omega_{1k}, \omega_{kt}\} \text{ if } x_1 y_k, x_k y_t \in E(G) \text{ with } 1 < k < t.$$

We consider the following three cases:

Case 1: If there exists an edge $x_p y_p$ such that $x_1 y_p \notin E(G)$, then we can assume that p is the smallest integer such that $x_1 y_p \notin E(G)$. We then claim that y_p is a leaf. Indeed, if y_p is not a leaf, then $x_q y_p \in E(G)$ for some $q < p$. By the minimality of p , we see that $x_1 y_q \in E(G)$, so $x_1 y_p \in E(G)$ by Property (4*), a contradiction. So y_p is a leaf of G . Then, by considering the weighted graph $(G \setminus x_p)_\omega$, we obtain the desired inequalities.

Case 2: If there exists an edge $x_p y_p$ such that $x_p y_t \notin E(G)$, then we can assume that p is the largest integer such that $x_p y_t \notin E(G)$. We then claim that x_p is a leaf. Indeed, if x_p is not a leaf, then $x_p y_q \in E(G)$ for some $p < q < t$. By the maximality of p , we have $x_q y_t \in E(G)$, so $x_p y_t \in E(G)$ by Property (4*), a contradiction. So x_p is a leaf of G . Considering the weighted graph $(G \setminus y_p)_\omega$, we get the desired inequalities.

Case 3: If $x_p y_t, x_1 y_p \in E(G)$ for all $p = 2, \dots, t-1$. Fix an integer k such that $2 \leq k \leq t-1$. By applying Lemma 3.5 repeatedly, we obtain that $I(H_\omega)^2$ is unmixed, where $H = G[\{x_1, y_1, x_k, y_k, x_t, y_t\}]$ is the induced subgraph of G on the set $\{x_1, y_1, x_k, y_k, x_t, y_t\}$ (see Figure 3).




FIGURE 3. The weighted bipartite graph H_ω .

Since $1 < k < t$, by the induction hypothesis, we get

$$(4) \quad 2\omega_{1k} \leq \min\{\omega_{11}, \omega_{kk}\} \text{ and } 2\omega_{kt} \leq \min\{\omega_{kk}, \omega_{tt}\}.$$

Let $W = \{y_1, x_t\}$ and let $J = I(H_\omega)_W$ be the localization of $I(H_\omega)$ with respect to W . Then J is Cohen-Macaulay and

$$(5) \quad J = (x_1^{\omega_{11}}, (x_1y_k)^{\omega_{1k}}, (x_1y_t)^{\omega_{1t}}, (x_ky_k)^{\omega_{kk}}, (x_ky_t)^{\omega_{kt}}, y_t^{\omega_{tt}}).$$

So $\sqrt{J} = (x_1, x_ky_k, y_t) = \mathfrak{p}_1 \cap \mathfrak{p}_2$, where $\mathfrak{p}_1 = (x_1, x_k, y_t)$ and $\mathfrak{p}_2 = (x_1, y_k, y_t)$, we have $J^2 = J^{(2)} = Q_1^2 \cap Q_2^2$, where $Q_1 = JR_{\mathfrak{p}_1} \cap R$ and $Q_2 = JR_{\mathfrak{p}_2} \cap R$.

From Eq. (4), we have $\omega_{1k} \leq \omega_{11}$, and so

$$\begin{aligned} JR_{\mathfrak{p}_1} &= (x_1^{\omega_{11}}, x_1^{\omega_{1k}}, (x_1y_t)^{\omega_{1t}}, x_k^{\omega_{kk}}, (x_ky_t)^{\omega_{kt}}, y_t^{\omega_{tt}})R_{\mathfrak{p}_1} \\ &= (x_1^{\omega_{1k}}, (x_1y_t)^{\omega_{1t}}, x_k^{\omega_{kk}}, (x_ky_t)^{\omega_{kt}}, y_t^{\omega_{tt}})R_{\mathfrak{p}_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $Q_1 = JR_{\mathfrak{p}_1} \cap R = (x_1^{\omega_{1k}}, (x_1y_t)^{\omega_{1t}}, x_k^{\omega_{kk}}, (x_ky_t)^{\omega_{kt}}, y_t^{\omega_{tt}})$.

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} JR_{\mathfrak{p}_2} &= (x_1^{\omega_{11}}, (x_1y_k)^{\omega_{1k}}, (x_1y_t)^{\omega_{1t}}, y_k^{\omega_{kk}}, y_t^{\omega_{kt}}, y_t^{\omega_{tt}})R_{\mathfrak{p}_2} \\ &= (x_1^{\omega_{11}}, (x_1y_k)^{\omega_{1k}}, (x_1y_t)^{\omega_{1t}}, y_k^{\omega_{kk}}, y_t^{\omega_{kt}})R_{\mathfrak{p}_2}, \end{aligned}$$

and so $Q_2 = JR_{\mathfrak{p}_2} \cap R = (x_1^{\omega_{11}}, (x_1y_k)^{\omega_{1k}}, (x_1y_t)^{\omega_{1t}}, y_k^{\omega_{kk}}, y_t^{\omega_{kt}})$.

Let $f = x_1^{\omega_{11}}y_t^{\omega_{kt}}$. Since $\omega_{11} \geq 2\omega_{1k}$ by Eq. (4), we have $f \in Q_1^2$. Note that $f \in Q_2^2$ since $x_1^{\omega_{11}}, y_t^{\omega_{kt}} \in Q_2$, so $f \in J^2$. Note that $y_t^{\omega_{tt}} \nmid f$ since $\omega_{tt} \geq 2\omega_{kt} > \omega_{kt}$ by Eq. (4). Together with the fact that $f \in J^2$, this implies that either $x_1^{\omega_{11}}(x_1y_t)^{\omega_{1t}} \mid f$ or $(x_1y_t)^{2\omega_{1t}} \mid f$. The first case is impossible because $\deg_{x_1}(x_1^{\omega_{11}}(x_1y_t)^{\omega_{1t}}) > \deg_{x_1}(f)$. Hence $(x_1y_t)^{2\omega_{1t}} \mid f$. It follows that $2\omega_{1t} \leq \omega_{11}$ and $2\omega_{1t} \leq \omega_{kt}$.

Similarly, if we choose $g = x_1^{\omega_{1k}}y_t^{\omega_{tt}}$, then we can get $2\omega_{1t} \leq \omega_{tt}$ and $2\omega_{1t} \leq \omega_{1k}$. The proof is now complete. \square

Lemma 3.7. *If $I(G_\omega)^2$ is Cohen-Macaulay, then*

- (1) $2\omega(x_i x_j) \leq \min\{\omega(x_i y_i), \omega(x_j y_j)\}$ if $x_i x_j \in E(G)$ with $i \neq j$.
- (2) $2\omega(x_i x_j) \leq \min\{\omega(x_i y_k), \omega(x_k x_j)\}$ for all different indices i, j, k such that $x_i y_k, x_k x_j \in E(G)$.

Proof. (1) We prove the statement by induction on $t \geq 2$. If $t = 2$, then it follows from Lemma 3.4. Suppose $t \geq 3$. Note that $i \neq j$. If G has a pendant edge $x_p y_p$ with $p \notin \{i, j\}$, then $I((G \setminus \{x_p, y_p\})_\omega)^2$ is Cohen-Macaulay by Lemma 2.6. By applying the induction hypothesis on H_ω , we obtain the desired inequalities. Therefore, we can assume that $x_p y_p$ is not a pendant edge for $p \notin \{i, j\}$, and hence $x_i y_i$ and $x_j y_j$ are the only pendant edges by Lemma 3.2. In particular, y_i and y_j are the only leaves of G . Therefore, by Lemma 3.3, G is bipartite. Thus, by [8, Theorem 3.4], G has a

bipartition (U, V) that satisfies the condition $(*)$. Furthermore, if $U = \{u_1, \dots, u_t\}$ and $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_t\}$, by [2, Theorem 0.2], G has a unique perfect matching, we have

$$\{x_1y_1, \dots, x_ty_t\} = \{u_1v_1, \dots, u_tv_t\}.$$

Since u_1v_1 and u_tv_t are pendent edges, it follows that $\{x_iy_i, x_jy_j\} = \{u_1v_1, u_tv_t\}$. We can assume that $x_iy_i = u_1v_1$ as edges of G so that $x_jy_j = u_tv_t$. Since v_1, u_t are leaves, we deduce that $y_i = v_1$ and $y_j = u_t$. Then, the inequality now becomes $2\omega(u_1v_t) \leq \min\{\omega(u_1v_1), \omega(u_tv_t)\}$, which follows from Lemma 3.6.

(2) The proof is almost the same as in the previous case. We prove by induction on $t \geq 3$. If $t = 3$, since x_ky_k is not a pendent edge, we deduce that G is a bipartite graph by Lemma 3.3. Actually, we can check that $(\{x_i, x_k, y_j\}, \{y_i, y_k, x_j\})$ is a bipartition of G and it has a representation as in Figure 4. With this configuration of G , the desired inequality follows from Lemma 3.6.




FIGURE 4. The graph G_ω after swapping the endpoints of x_jy_j .

Suppose that $t \geq 4$. If G has a pendant edge x_py_p with $p \notin \{i, j\}$, then $I((G \setminus \{x_p, y_p\})_\omega)^2$ is Cohen-Macaulay by Lemma 2.6. Applying the induction hypothesis to H_ω , we obtain the desired inequalities. Hence we can assume that x_py_p is not a pendant edge for $p \notin \{i, j\}$, and hence x_iy_i and x_jy_j are the only pendant edges of G by Lemma 3.2. In particular, y_i and y_j are the only leaves of G . In this case, G is bipartite by Lemma 3.3.

By the same argument as in the previous case, G has a bipartition (U, V) that satisfies the condition $(*)$, and if $U = \{u_1, \dots, u_t\}$ and $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_t\}$, then

$$\{x_1y_1, \dots, x_ty_t\} = \{u_1v_1, \dots, u_tv_t\}.$$

Since u_1v_1 and u_tv_t are pendent edges of G , it follows that $\{x_iy_i, x_jy_j\} = \{u_1v_1, u_tv_t\}$. So either $x_iy_i = u_1v_1$ and $x_jy_j = u_tv_t$ or $x_iy_i = u_tv_t$ and $x_jy_j = u_1v_1$. This also implies that $x_ky_k = u_s v_s$ for some s with $1 < s < t$. We now consider two possible cases:

Case 1: $x_iy_i = u_1v_1$ and $x_jy_j = u_tv_t$. Then $y_i = v_1$ and $y_j = u_t$, since v_1 and u_t are the only leaves of G , and then $x_i = u_1$ and $x_j = v_t$. Since $x_ky_k \in E(G)$, we

conclude that $x_k = u_s$ and $y_k = v_s$. The desired inequality now becomes $2\omega(u_1v_t) \leq \min\{\omega(u_1v_s), \omega(u_s v_t)\}$. In this context, this inequality follows from Lemma 3.6.

Case 2: $x_i y_i = u_t v_t$ and $x_j y_j = u_1 v_1$. We follow the same proof as in the previous case, and the proof is now complete. \square

The following lemma can be proved by similar arguments as in the proof of Lemma 3.7, we omit its proof.

Lemma 3.8. *If $I(G_\omega)^2$ is Cohen-Macaulay, then the following conclusions hold:*

- (1) $2\omega(x_i y_j) \leq \min\{\omega(x_i y_i), \omega(x_j y_j)\}$ if $x_i y_j \in E(G)$ with $i \neq j$.
- (2) $2\omega(x_i y_j) \leq \min\{\omega(x_i y_k), \omega(x_k y_j)\}$ for all different indices i, j, k such that $x_i y_k, x_k y_j \in E(G)$.

Lemma 3.9. *Suppose that G_ω satisfies all the conditions (1) and (2) in Lemmas 3.7 and 3.8. Then $I(G_\omega)^2$ is unmixed.*

Proof. Let $I = I(G_\omega)$. Suppose that I^2 is not unmixed, then there exists an associated prime ideal \mathfrak{p} of I^2 containing at least $t + 1$ variables. In particular, it contains x_k, y_k for some k . Let f be a monomial such that $\mathfrak{p} = I^2 : f$. Then $f x_k = u f_1 f_2$ and $f y_k = v g_1 g_2$, where f_1, f_2, g_1, g_2 are monomial generators of I and u, v are monomials in R . Note that $f \notin I^2$, so $x_k \nmid u$ and $y_k \nmid v$. We next prove the following claim.

Claim : $(x_k y_k)^{\omega(x_k y_k)} \notin \{f_1, f_2, g_1, g_2\}$. Assume by contradiction that the monomial $(x_k y_k)^{\omega(x_k y_k)}$ is in this set. If $(x_k y_k)^{\omega(x_k y_k)} \in \{f_1, f_2\}$, then we can assume that $f_1 = (x_k y_k)^{\omega(x_k y_k)}$. It follows that $f = u x_k^{\omega(x_k y_k)-1} y_k^{\omega(x_k y_k)} f_2$ and

$$(6) \quad y_k f = u x_k^{\omega(x_k y_k)-1} y_k^{\omega(x_k y_k)+1} f_2 = v g_1 g_2.$$

This gives $y_k^{\omega(x_k y_k)+1} \mid g_1 g_2$ since $y_k \nmid v$. In particular, $\deg_{y_k}(g_1 g_2) \geq \omega(x_k y_k) + 1$. Using the conditions (1) in Lemmas (3.7) and (3.8), we conclude that either $g_1 = (x_k y_k)^{\omega(x_k y_k)}$ or $g_2 = (x_k y_k)^{\omega(x_k y_k)}$. We can assume that $g_1 = (x_k y_k)^{\omega(x_k y_k)}$, then $g_1 = f_1$. Since $(x_k y_k)^{\omega(x_k y_k)} \mid f x_k$ and $(x_k y_k)^{\omega(x_k y_k)} \mid f y_k$, it follows that $y_k^{\omega(x_k y_k)} \mid f$ and $x_k^{\omega(x_k y_k)} \mid f$, respectively. So $f_1 \mid f$. Next, we let $h = f/f_1$. Then $h x_k = u f_2 \in I$ and $h y_k = v g_2 \in I$.

On the other hand, by the conditions (1) and (2) in Lemmas (3.7) and (3.8) and [19, Theorem 3.4], we see that I is unmixed. In particular, every associated prime ideal of I contains either x_k or y_k , but not both, by Lemma 3.1. It follows that $h \in I$. Hence, $f = h f_1 \in I^2$, a contradiction.

Similarly, the case $(x_k y_k)^{\omega(x_k y_k)} \in \{g_1, g_2\}$ also leads to a contradiction. This proves the claim.

Now, since $y_k \nmid v$ and $f y_k = v g_1 g_2$, $y_k \mid g_1 g_2$, and so we can assume $y_k \mid g_1$. Together with the above claim, this gives $g_1 = (x_i y_k)^{\omega(x_i y_k)}$ for some $i < k$. Hence $x_i^{\omega(x_i y_k)} \mid f$

by the expression $fy_k = vg_1g_2$. Similarly, using $fx_k = uf_1f_2$ and $x_k \nmid u$, we can suppose that $x_k \mid f_1$. Since $f_1 \neq (x_ky_k)^{\omega(x_ky_k)}$ by the above claim, we have either $f_1 = (x_kx_j)^{\omega(x_kx_j)}$ for some $j \neq k$, or $f_1 = (x_ky_j)^{\omega(x_ky_j)}$ for some $k < j$.

If $f_1 = (x_kx_j)^{\omega(x_kx_j)}$ for some $j \neq k$, then $x_j^{\omega(x_kx_j)} \mid f$. Since $g_1 = (x_iy_k)^{\omega(x_iy_k)}$, $x_iy_k \in E(G)$, we have $x_ix_j \in E(G)$ and $i \neq j$ by Property (5*). By the inequalities in Lemma 3.7, $2\omega(x_ix_j) \leq \min\{\omega(x_iy_k), \omega(x_kx_j)\}$. Thus $(x_ix_j)^{2\omega(x_ix_j)} \mid f$, and hence $f \in I^2$, a contradiction.

If $f_1 = (x_ky_j)^{\omega(x_ky_j)}$ for some $k < j$, then $x_ky_j \in E(G)$. Note that $x_iy_k \in E(G)$, since $g_1 = (x_iy_k)^{\omega(x_iy_k)}$. This implies that $x_iy_j \in E(G)$ by Property (4*). By Lemma 3.8, we get $(x_iy_j)^{2\omega(x_iy_j)} \mid f$, and so $f \in I^2$, a contradiction.

In summary, all cases are impossible. So I^2 is unmixed, as required. \square

Now we are ready to prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 3.10. *Let G be a very well-covered graph with $2t$ vertices and let ω be a weight function on $E(G)$. Further, assume that the vertices of G are labeled in such a way that the condition (*) at the beginning of this section holds. Then $I(G_\omega)^2$ is Cohen-Macaulay if and only if the following conditions hold:*

- (1) $2\omega(x_iz_j) \leq \min\{\omega(x_iy_i), \omega(x_jy_j)\}$ for each $x_iz_j \in E(G)$ with $i \neq j$ and $z_j \in \{x_j, y_j\}$.
- (2) $2\omega(x_iz_j) \leq \min\{\omega(x_iy_k), \omega(x_kz_j)\}$ for all distinct indices i, j, k such that $x_iy_k, x_kz_j \in E(G)$ with $z_j \in \{x_j, y_j\}$.

Proof. (\implies): This follows from Lemmas 3.7 and 3.8.

(\impliedby): We prove the statement by induction on $m(G_\omega) := \sum_{i=1}^t \deg_G(y_i)$. The base case where $m(G_\omega) = t$ follows from Theorem 2.9. Now suppose that $m(G_\omega) > t$. There exists some ℓ such that $\deg_G(y_\ell) > 1$. We can construct a new very well-covered graph G' from G such that $V(G') = V(G)$ and the edge set is

$$E(G') = \{E(G) \setminus \{x_iy_\ell \mid x_iy_\ell \in E(G) \text{ with } i < \ell\}\} \cup \{x_ix_\ell \mid x_iy_\ell \in E(G) \text{ with } i < \ell\}.$$

We can check that G' satisfies the condition (*), so it is also very well-covered.

Next, we define the weight function ω' on $E(G')$ by

$$\omega'(e) = \begin{cases} \omega(x_iy_\ell) & \text{if } e = x_ix_\ell \text{ and } x_iy_\ell \in E(G) \text{ with } i < \ell, \\ \omega(e) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We can check that the weight function ω' on $E(G')$ satisfies all the conditions of our theorem and that $m(G'_{\omega'}) < m(G_\omega)$. By the induction hypothesis, $I(G'_{\omega'})^2$ is Cohen-Macaulay. Since

$$(R/I(G_\omega)^2)/(y_\ell - x_\ell) \cong (R/I(G'_{\omega'})^2)/(y_\ell - x_\ell)$$

and $y_1 - x_1, \dots, y_t - x_t$ is a system of parameters for both $R/I(G_\omega)^2$ and $R/I(G'_\omega)^2$. This implies that $(R/I(G_\omega)^2)/(y_\ell - x_\ell)$ is Cohen-Macaulay.

So $I(G_\omega)^2$ is Cohen-Macaulay if $y_\ell - x_\ell$ is regular on $R/I(G_\omega)^2$. We now prove that $y_\ell - x_\ell$ is indeed regular on $R/I(G_\omega)^2$. Since $I(G_\omega)^2$ is unmixed by Lemma 3.9, we have

$$\text{Ass}(R/I(G_\omega)^2) = \text{Ass}(R/I(G)).$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 3.1, $y_\ell - x_\ell$ does not belong to the set of associated prime ideals of $I(G)$, so

$$y_\ell - x_\ell \notin \bigcup_{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Ass}(R/I(G_\omega)^2)} \mathfrak{p}.$$

So $y_\ell - x_\ell$ is regular on $R/I(G_\omega)^2$, hence $R/I(G_\omega)^2$ is Cohen-Macaulay. The proof of the theorem is now complete. \square

4. HIGHER POWERS OF EDGE IDEALS OF WEIGHTED GRAPHS

In this section, we study the Cohen-Macaulayness of higher powers of $I(G_\omega)$. Actually, Theorem 2.9 deals with this problem for the case where G has a perfect matching consisting of pendant edges. Note that this graph is a very well-covered graph. The following result generalizes this theorem for any very well-covered graph.

Theorem 4.1. *Let G be a very well-covered graph satisfying the condition $(*)$ at the beginning of Section 3. Suppose there exists an integer $\ell \geq 1$ such that the following conditions hold:*

- (1) $\ell\omega(x_i z_j) \leq \min\{\omega(x_i y_i), \omega(x_j y_j)\}$ for each $x_i z_j \in E(G)$ with $i \neq j$ and $z_j \in \{x_j, y_j\}$.
- (2) $\ell\omega(x_i z_j) \leq \min\{\omega(x_i y_k), \omega(x_k z_j)\}$ for all distinct indices i, j, k such that $x_i y_k, x_k z_j \in E(G)$ with $z_j \in \{x_j, y_j\}$.

Then $I(G_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay for all $n = 1, \dots, \ell$.

Proof. This can be shown by arguments similar to the only part of Theorem 3.10, and we sketch the main ideas of the proof here.

The first step is to prove that $I(G_\omega)^n$ is unmixed. To prove this, we do induction on n . If $n = 1$, this is done by [19, Theorem 3.4]. If $n > 1$, we do the same as in the proof of Lemma 3.9.

The second step is to prove that $I(G_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay by doing the same proof as in the proof of Theorem 3.10, using the fact that $I(G_\omega)^n$ is unmixed, which was proved in the previous step. \square

By virtue of Theorem 4.1, for any $\ell \geq 1$ and any very well-covered graph G , we can construct a weight function ω on $E(G)$ such that $I(G_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay for all

$n = 1, \dots, \ell$. However, a characterization of G_ω for which $I(G_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay for a given integer n is still unknown.

Our calculation supports the following conjecture.

Conjecture 4.2. Let $n \geq 2$ be an integer and let G be a very well-covered graph and ω be a weight function on $E(G)$. Then $I(G_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay if and only if $I(G_\omega)^2$ is Cohen-Macaulay and $I(G_\omega)^n$ is unmixed.

In the rest of this section, we are interested in characterizing G_ω such that $I(G_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay for all $n \geq 1$ in the case where G is a tree. The structure of the graph G is given in [24, Theorem 6.3.4]: G has a perfect matching $\{x_1y_1, \dots, x_t y_t\}$, where each y_i is a leaf vertex, and $G[x_1, \dots, x_t]$ is a tree.

For the case $t = 2$, $G[x_1, x_2]$ is only one edge, and we have the following result.

Proposition 4.3. Let G_ω be a weighted tree with the edge set $E(G) = \{ab, ax, by\}$. Then $I(G_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay for all $n \geq 1$ if and only if $\min\{\omega(ax), \omega(by)\} \geq 2\omega(ab)$.

Proof. For simplicity, let $I = I(G_\omega)$ and $p = \omega(ax)$, $k = \omega(ab)$, $q = \omega(by)$. Then the weighted graph G_ω is shown as in Figure 2 and $I = (a^p x^p, a^k b^k, b^q y^q)$.

If I^n is Cohen-Macaulay for all $n \geq 1$, then $\min\{p, q\} \geq 2k$ by Lemma 3.4.

Conversely, suppose that $\min\{p, q\} \geq 2k$. Then I has an irredundant primary decomposition

$$I = (a^k b^k, a^p, b^q) \cap (a^k, y^q) \cap (b^k, x^p).$$

For any integer $n \geq 1$, we will prove that I^n is Cohen-Macaulay in the following two steps.

Step 1: We prove that $I^n = I^{(n)}$, where $I^{(n)}$ is the n -th symbolic power of I . Let f be any monomial of $I^{(n)}$. Since $I^{(n)} = (a^k b^k, a^p, b^q)^n \cap (a^k, y^q)^n \cap (b^k, x^p)^n$, we can write $f = ga^{ku} b^{kv} x^{(n-v)p} y^{(n-u)q}$, where g is a monomial in R and $u, v \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ such that $ga^{ku} b^{kv} \in (a^k b^k, a^p, b^q)^n$. So we can write

$$ga^{ku} b^{kv} = h(a^k b^k)^s (a^p)^i (b^q)^j,$$

where h is a monomial in R and $s + i + j = n$. We choose such an expression for which $i + j$ is minimal. If $i \geq 1$ and $j \geq 1$, then

$$ga^{ku} b^{kv} = (ha^{p-2k} b^{q-2k}) (a^k b^k)^{s+2} (a^p)^{i-1} (b^q)^{j-1}$$

since $\min\{p, q\} \geq 2k$. This contradicts the minimality of $i + j$, so either $i = 0$ or $j = 0$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $j = 0$.

If $i = 0$, then $s = n$ and $ga^{ku} b^{kv} = h(a^k b^k)^n$. It follows that $f = ga^{ku} b^{kv} x^{(n-v)p} y^{(n-u)q} = h(a^k b^k)^n x^{(n-v)p} y^{(n-u)q} \in I^n$. Suppose $i > 0$. Then we have $b^k \nmid h$. Because if $b^k \mid h$,

we can write

$$ga^{ku}b^{kv} = h'(a^kb^k)^{s+1}(a^p)^{i-1}$$

where $h' = a^{p-k}h/b^k$, which also contradicts the minimality of $i+j$. So $b^k \nmid h$. Together with the equality $ga^{ku}b^{kv} = h(a^kb^k)^s(a^p)^i$, this forces $v \leq s$, so $i = n - s \leq n - v$. It follows that

$$f = h(a^kb^k)^s(a^p)^i x^{(n-v)p} y^{(n-u)q} = hy^{(n-u)q} x^{(n-v-i)p} (a^kb^k)^s (a^p x^p)^i \in I^n,$$

since $i + s = n$. So we always have $f \in I^n$, and hence $I^n = I^{(n)}$.

Step 2: We prove that I^n is Cohen-Macaulay. Suppose, on the contrary, that I^n is not Cohen-Macaulay. Since $I^n = I^{(n)}$, it is unmixed, so $\sqrt{I^n}: f$ is not Cohen-Macaulay for some monomial $f \notin I^n$ by Lemma 2.2.

Note that $\text{Ass}(R/I^n) = \{(a, b), (a, y), (b, x)\}$. So $\sqrt{I^n}: f$ is not Cohen-Macaulay if and only if $\sqrt{I^n}: f = (a, y) \cap (b, x)$. This means that

$$f \in (a^kb^k, a^p, b^q)^n, f \notin (a^k, y^q)^n, \text{ and } f \notin (b^k, x^p)^n.$$

Since $f \in (a^kb^k, a^p, b^q)^n$, we can write $f = f_1(a^kb^k)^s(a^p)^i(b^q)^j$, where f_1 is a monomial in R and $s + i + j = n$. Choose such an expression for which $i + j$ is minimal. By the same argument as in the previous step, we have either $i = 0$ or $j = 0$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $j = 0$. It follows that $f = f_1(a^kb^k)^s(a^p)^i = f_1 b^{ks} a^{(p-k)i} (a^k)^n \in (a^k, y^q)^n$, a contradiction. So I^n is Cohen-Macaulay, and the proof is now complete. \square

We now consider the case $t = 3$, in which case $G[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ is just a path of length 3. For simplicity, consider the weighted tree G_ω with the edge set

$$E(G) = \{ab, bc, ax, by, cz\}$$

and the weight function


$$k = \omega(ab), m = \omega(bc), p = \omega(ax), q = \omega(by), r = \omega(cz),$$

which is shown in Figure 5.

Lemma 4.4. *Let G_ω be a weighted graph as shown in Figure 5. If $m = k$, then $I(G_\omega)^n$ is not Cohen-Macaulay for all $n \geq \max\{p, r\}/m + 2$.*

Proof. Let $I = I(G_\omega)$, then $I = ((ab)^m, (bc)^m, (ax)^p, (by)^q, (cz)^r)$. Suppose by contradiction that $I(G_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay for some $n \geq \max\{p, r\}/m + 2$.

First, we claim that $\min\{p, q, r\} \geq 2m$. Indeed, let $H = G \setminus c$ so that $I(H_\omega) = ((ab)^m, (ax)^p, (by)^q)$. By Lemma 2.6, $I(H_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay, and hence $\min\{p, q\} \geq 2m$ by Lemma 3.4. Similarly, by considering the graph $G \setminus a$, we obtain $r \geq 2m$, and the claim follows.

FIGURE 5. The weighted graph G_ω .

Let $J = I_{\{y\}}$ be the localization of I with respect to the set $\{y\}$, then $J = ((ab)^m, (bc)^m, (ax)^p, b^q, (cz)^r)$. Using the above claim, we can check that

$$J = ((ab)^m, (bc)^m, a^p, b^q, c^r) \cap (a^p, b^m, z^r) \cap (b^m, c^r, x^p) \cap (b^m, x^p, z^r)$$

is an irredundant decomposition.

Since I^n is Cohen-Macaulay, J^n is also Cohen-Macaulay by Lemma 2.4. Consequently,

$$J^n = ((ab)^m, (bc)^m, a^p, b^q, c^r)^n \cap (a^p, b^m, z^r)^n \cap (b^m, c^r, x^p)^n \cap (b^m, x^p, z^r)^n.$$

Let $f = (b^m)^{n-1} a^p c^r$, then $f \in (a^p, b^m, z^r)^n \cap (b^m, c^r, x^p)^n$ and $f \notin (b^m, x^p, z^r)^n$. Now we show that $f \notin ((ab)^m, (bc)^m, a^p, b^q, c^r)^n$. If this is not the case, then f could be written as

$$f = g((ab)^m)^s ((bc)^m)^t (a^p)^u (b^q)^v (c^r)^w,$$

where $s, t, u, v, w \in \mathbb{N}$ with $s + t + u + v + w = n$ and g is a monomial in R . Therefore,

$$\begin{cases} p \geq ms + pu \\ m(n-1) \geq ms + mt + qv \\ r \geq mt + rw \end{cases}$$

The inequality $p \geq ms + pu$ forces $u \leq 1$. Similarly, the inequality $r \geq mt + rw$ forces $w \leq 1$. So we have four possible cases:

Case 1: If $u = w = 0$, then $s + t + v = n$. Since $q \geq 2m$, we have

$$m(n-1) \geq ms + mt + qv \geq ms + mt + 2mv = m(s + t + v) + mv \geq mn,$$

a contradiction.

Case 2: If $u = 1$ and $w = 0$, then $s + t + v = n - 1$, and then

$$m(n-1) \geq ms + mt + 2mv = m(s + t + v) + mv \geq m(n-1) + mv.$$

This implies $v = 0$. Since $u = 1$, combined with the inequality $p \geq ms + pu$, we get $s = 0$. Thus $t = n - (s + u + v + w) = n - 1$.

On the other hand, since $r \geq mt + rw$ and $w = 0$, we get $n = t + 1 \leq r/m + 1$. This contradicts the assumption that $n \geq \max\{p, r\}/m + 2$.

Case 3: When $u = 0$ and $w = 1$. We derive a contradiction by the same argument as in the previous case.

Case 4: If $u = w = 1$, then, in this case, we must have $s = t = 0$. Hence, $v = n - (s + t + u + w) = n - 2$, and hence $m(n - 1) \geq ms + mt + qv \geq q(n - 2) \geq 2m(n - 2)$. This forces $n \leq 3$, a contradiction.

To sum up, all cases are impossible. It follows that $f \notin ((ab)^m, (bc)^m, a^p, b^q, c^r)^n$. Hence $J^n: f = (((ab)^m, (bc)^m, a^p, b^q, c^r)^n: f) \cap ((b^m, x^p, z^r)^n: f)$, and hence $\sqrt{J^n}: f = (a, b, c) \cap (b, x, z)$. In particular, $\sqrt{J^n}: f$ is not Cohen-Macaulay, it contradicts Lemma 2.2. Therefore, $I(G_\omega)^n$ is not Cohen-Macaulay for all $n \geq \max\{p, r\}/m + 2$, and the proof is complete. \square

Lemma 4.5. *Let G_ω be a weighted tree as shown in Figure 5, with $k < m$. If $I(G_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay for all $n \geq 1$, then $p \geq k \lceil m/(m - k) \rceil$, where $\lceil m/(m - k) \rceil$ is the smallest integer $\geq m/(m - k)$.*

Proof. For simplicity, let $I = I(G_\omega)$, then $I = (a^k b^k, b^m c^m, a^p x^p, b^q y^q, c^r z^r)$. Since I^n is Cohen-Macaulay for all $n \geq 1$, we have $2k \leq \min\{p, q\}$ and $2m \leq \min\{q, r\}$ by Theorem 3.10.

Let $J = I_{\{c, y\}}$ be the localization of I with respect to the set $\{c, y\}$. Since $k < m < \min\{q, r\}$, we have

$$J = (a^k b^k, b^m, a^p x^p, z^r).$$

Note also that J has an irredundant primary decomposition as follows

$$J = (a^k b^k, a^p, b^m, z^r) \cap (b^k, x^p, z^r).$$

Let $f = a^p b^{m(m-1)}$, then $f \in (a^k b^k, a^p, b^m, z^r)^m$. On the other hand, since $k < m$, we have $m(m - 1) \geq mk$, so $f \in (b^k, x^p, z^r)^m$. It follows that $f \in J^{(m)}$. In particular, $f \in J^m$ since J^m is unmixed. So we can write f as

$$f = g(a^k b^k)^s (b^m)^t$$

with $s + t = m$ and g is a monomial in R . This yields

$$\begin{cases} p \geq ks, \\ m(m - 1) \geq ks + mt. \end{cases}$$

Since $s + t = m$, the second inequality of the above system gives $m(m - 1) \geq ks + m(m - s)$, or equivalently $(m - k)s \geq m$. Hence, $s \geq m/(m - k)$, and hence $s \geq \lceil m/(m - k) \rceil$ since s is an integer. Hence $p \geq ks \geq k \lceil m/(m - k) \rceil$, as required. \square

Lemma 4.6. *Let G_ω be a weighted tree as shown in Figure 5, with $k < m$. If $I(G_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay for all $n \geq 1$, then $r \geq m(\lceil m/(m-k) \rceil - 2)$.*

Proof. Let $I = I(G_\omega)$ and $i = \lceil m/(m-k) \rceil - 1 = \lceil k/(m-k) \rceil$. If $i = 1$, the lemma is trivial, so we assume that $i \geq 2$. By Theorem 3.10, $\min\{p, q\} \geq 2k$ and $\min\{q, r\} \geq 2m$. By Lemma 4.5, we have

$$p \geq k \left\lceil \frac{m}{m-k} \right\rceil \geq k \frac{m}{m-k} = m \frac{k}{m-k} \geq m \left(\left\lceil \frac{k}{m-k} \right\rceil - 1 \right) = m(i-1).$$

Let $J = I_{\{x, y\}}$ be the localization of I with respect to the set $\{x, y\}$, then $J = (a^k b^k, b^m c^m, a^p, b^q, c^r z^r)$ and it has an irredundant primary decomposition as follows

$$J = (a^k b^k, b^m c^m, a^p, b^q, c^r) \cap (a^k b^k, a^p, b^m, z^r).$$

Let $f = a^p b^{m(i-1)} c^r$. Since $p \geq m(i-1)$, we have $(a^m b^m)^{i-1} c^r \mid f$, and so $f \in (a^k b^k, b^m c^m, a^p, b^q, c^r)^i$. Obviously, $f \in (a^k b^k, a^p, b^m, z^r)^i$, so $f \in J^{(i)}$. In particular, $f \in J^i$ because J^i is unmixed. Therefore, we can write f as

$$f = g(a^k b^k)^u (b^m c^m)^v (a^p)^s (b^q)^t,$$

where $u + v + s + t = i$ and g is a monomial in R . It follows that

$$\begin{cases} p \geq ku + ps, \\ m(i-1) \geq ku + mv + qt, \\ r \geq mv. \end{cases}$$

The first inequality implies that $s = 0$ or $s = 1$. If $s = 0$, then $u + v + t = i$. Since $q \geq 2m > k$, from the second inequality of the above system, we have

$$m(i-1) \geq ku + mv + qt \geq ku + kv + kt = k(u + v + t) = ki,$$

and so $i \geq m/(m-k)$. On the other hand, since $i = \lceil k/(m-k) \rceil$, we have $i < k/(m-k) + 1 = m/(m-k)$, a contradiction. So $s = 1$.

Since $s = 1$, we get $u = 0$, and hence $v + t = i - 1$. The second inequality of the above system yields $m(i-1-v) \geq qt$. Note that $i-1-v = t$, so $mt \geq qt$. Since $m < q$, we get $t = 0$. So $v = i - 1$. Together with the last inequality of the above system, this forces $r \geq m(i-1)$, and the proof is now complete. \square

Now we give a necessary condition for a weighted tree G_ω such that $I(G_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay for all $n \geq 1$.

Proposition 4.7. *Let G_ω be a weighted tree. If $I(G_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay for all $n \geq 1$, then G has a perfect matching $\{x_1 y_1, \dots, x_t y_t\}$, where each y_i is a leaf vertex in G . Let $\omega_{ij} = \omega(x_i x_j)$ if $x_i x_j \in E(G)$ and $m_i = \omega(x_i y_i)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, t$. Then the following conditions hold:*

- (1) $2\omega_{ij} \leq \min\{m_i, m_j\}$ for any $x_i x_j \in E(G)$,
- (2) For any two different $x_i x_j, x_j x_k \in E(G)$, we have $\omega_{ij} \neq \omega_{jk}$. Furthermore, if $\omega_{ij} < \omega_{jk}$, then
 - (a) $m_i \geq \omega_{ij} \lceil \omega_{jk} / (\omega_{jk} - \omega_{ij}) \rceil$, and
 - (b) $m_k \geq \omega_{jk} (\lceil \omega_{jk} / (\omega_{jk} - \omega_{ij}) \rceil - 2)$.

Proof. (1) Since $I(G_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay, $I(G) = \sqrt{I(G_\omega)^n}$ is also Cohen-Macaulay by [10, Theorem 2.6]. By [2, Proposition 3.3], we get that G has a perfect matching $\{x_1 y_1, \dots, x_t y_t\}$, where each y_i is a leaf vertex in G . On the other hand, since $I(G_\omega)^2$ is Cohen-Macaulay, by Lemma 3.7, $\omega(x_i y_i) \geq 2\omega(x_i z)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, t$ and $z \in N_G(x_i) \setminus \{y_i\}$. This proves (1).

(2) Let $H = G \setminus \{x_s \mid s \notin \{i, j, k\}\}$, then $E(H) = \{x_i y_i, x_j y_j, x_k y_k, x_i x_j, x_j x_k\}$. Since $I(G_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay for all $n \geq 1$, $I(H_\omega)^n$ is also Cohen-Macaulay for all $n \geq 1$ by Lemma 2.6. Thus $\omega(x_i x_j) \neq \omega(x_j x_k)$ by Lemma 4.4. Therefore, (a) and (b) follow from Lemmas 4.5 and 4.6, respectively. \square

To characterize the weighted trees G_ω such that $I(G_\omega)^n$ are Cohen-Macaulay for all $n \geq 1$, we propose the following conjecture.

Conjecture 4.8. The converse of Proposition 4.7 is true.

Note that the conjecture is true for $t = 2$ by Proposition 4.3. We will prove the conjecture for the case where $G[x_1, \dots, x_t]$ is a star. Recall that a graph T is called a star if it has a vertex v such that $E(T) = \{vu \mid u \in V(T) \setminus \{v\}\}$. In this case, the vertex v is called the center of T . We begin by proving the unmixedness of the edge ideals of such weighted graphs.

Lemma 4.9. Suppose $G[x_1, \dots, x_t]$ is a star with the center x_t . Let $m_i = \omega(x_i y_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, t$ and let $d_i = \omega(x_i x_t)$ for $i \neq t$. Suppose that

- (1) $m_t \geq 2 \max\{d_i \mid i \neq t\}$.
- (2) $d_i \neq d_k$ for any two different $x_i x_t, x_k x_t \in E(G)$. Furthermore, if $d_i < d_k$, then
 - (a) $m_i \geq d_i \lceil d_k / (d_k - d_i) \rceil$, and
 - (b) $m_k \geq d_k \max\{2, \lceil d_k / (d_k - d_i) \rceil - 2\}$.

Then, $I(G_\omega)^n$ is unmixed for all $n \geq 1$.

Proof. Let $I = I(G_\omega)$, then

$$I = ((x_i x_t)^{d_i}, (x_k y_k)^{m_k} \mid i \in [t] \setminus \{t\} \text{ and } k \in [t]).$$

We now prove by induction on t that I^n is unmixed. If $t = 2$, the lemma follows from Proposition 4.3. Suppose $t \geq 3$. We continue to prove the statement by induction on n . The case $n \leq 2$ follows from Theorem 2.9. Suppose that $n \geq 3$ and I^{n-1} is unmixed. Suppose by contradiction that I^n is not unmixed, so there exists an

associated prime ideal \mathfrak{p} of I^n containing at least $t + 1$ variables. In particular, it contains x_i, y_i for some $i \in [t]$. Let f be a monomial such that $\mathfrak{p} = I^n : f$, then $f \notin I^n$. Since $fx_i, fy_i \in I^n$, we can write $fx_i = gf_1 \cdots f_n$ and $fy_i = hg_1 \cdots g_n$, where g, h are monomials and f_i, g_i are monomial generators of I for $i = 1, \dots, n$. We first prove the following six claims:

Claim 1: $\{f_1, \dots, f_n\} \cap \{g_1, \dots, g_n\} = \emptyset$. Indeed, assuming by contradiction that this is not true, we can assume that $f_1 = g_1$. First we show that $f_1 \mid f$. It is obvious that $f_1 \mid f$ if either $x_i \nmid f_1$ or $y_i \nmid f_1$, so we can assume that $x_i \mid f_1$ and $y_i \mid f_1$, it follows that $f_1 = (x_i y_i)^{m_i}$. From $f_1 \mid fx_i$ we get $y_i^{m_i} \mid f$. Similarly, $x_i^{m_i} \mid f$, and hence $f_1 \mid f$, as desired. Now, let $f' = f/f_1$. Then $f'x_i = gf_2 \cdots f_n \in I^{n-1}$ and $f'y_i = hg_2 \cdots g_n \in I^{n-1}$. We can prove that $f' \in I^{n-1}$. In fact, suppose that $I = Q_1 \cap Q_2 \cap \cdots \cap Q_s$ is an irredundant primary decomposition of I . By the induction hypothesis, I^{n-1} is unmixed, so $I^{n-1} = I^{(n-1)}$, where $I^{(n-1)}$ is the $(n-1)$ -th symbolic power of I . In other words, $I^{n-1} = Q_1^{n-1} \cap Q_2^{n-1} \cap \cdots \cap Q_s^{n-1}$. Conversely, if $f' \notin I^{n-1}$, there exists some $j \in [s]$ such that $f' \notin Q_j^{n-1}$, i.e. $\sqrt{Q_j^{n-1} : f'} = \sqrt{Q_j}$. Thus forces

$$\begin{aligned} (I^{n-1} : f') &= (Q_1^{n-1} \cap Q_2^{n-1} \cap \cdots \cap Q_s^{n-1}) : f' \\ &= (Q_1^{n-1} : f') \cap (Q_2^{n-1} : f') \cap \cdots \cap (Q_s^{n-1} : f') \\ &\subseteq (Q_j^{n-1} : f') \subseteq \sqrt{Q_j^{n-1} : f'} = \sqrt{Q_j}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\sqrt{Q_j}$ is an associated prime ideal of $I(G)$, by Lemma 3.1, we get $(x_i, y_i) \not\subseteq \sqrt{Q_j}$, which implies $(x_i, y_i) \not\subseteq (I^{n-1} : f')$, i.e., $f'x_i \notin I^{n-1}$ or $f'y_i \notin I^{n-1}$, a contradiction. So $f' \in I^{n-1}$.

Claim 2: $x_i \nmid g$ and $y_i \nmid h$. Indeed, if $x_i \mid g$, then $f = (g/x_i)f_1 \cdots f_n \in I^n$. Similarly, if $y_i \mid h$, then $f \in I^n$. These two cases are impossible, since $f \notin I^n$, and the claim follows.

Claim 3: There is no index $k \neq t$ such that either $(x_k x_t)^{d_k}, (x_k y_k)^{m_k} \in \{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$, or $(x_k x_t)^{d_k}, (x_k y_k)^{m_k} \in \{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$. In fact, if this assertion is not true, we can assume that $(x_k x_t)^{d_k}, (x_k y_k)^{m_k} \in \{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$ for some $k \neq t$. By Claim 1, we get $(x_k x_t)^{d_k}, (x_k y_k)^{m_k} \notin \{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$. It follows that $\gcd((x_k y_k)^{m_k}, g_q) = 1$ for $q = 1, \dots, n$. Hence $(x_k y_k)^{m_k} \mid h$, since $fy_i = hg_1 \cdots g_n$. Let $h = \lambda(x_k y_k)^{m_k}$ for some monomial λ , then $fy_i = \lambda(x_k y_k)^{m_k} g_1 \cdots g_n$. This implies that $f \in I^n$, a contradiction, and the claim follows.

Claim 4: There exists some $p \in [n]$ such that $g_p = (x_i y_i)^{m_i}$. Indeed, since $fy_i = hg_1 \cdots g_n$ and $y_i \nmid h$ by Claim 2, we have $y_i \mid g_p$ for some $p \in [n]$, and hence $g_p = (x_i y_i)^{m_i}$.

Claim 5: If $i \neq t$, then there exists some $p \in [n]$ such that $f_p = (x_i x_t)^{d_i}$. Indeed, since $f x_i = g f_1 \cdots f_n$ and $x_i \nmid g$ by Claim 2, we have $x_i \mid f_p$ for some $p \in [n]$. Note that $x_i \mid f_p$ if and only if $f_p \in \{(x_i y_i)^{m_i}, (x_i x_t)^{d_i}\}$. By Claims 1 and 4, we get $f_p = (x_i x_t)^{d_i}$.

Claim 6: $\{(x_k x_t)^{d_k} \mid k \in [t] \setminus \{t\}\} \subseteq \{f_1, \dots, f_n, g_1, \dots, g_n\}$.

In fact, if there exists some $k \in [t] \setminus \{t\}$ such that $(x_k x_t)^{d_k} \notin \{f_1, \dots, f_n, g_1, \dots, g_n\}$, then we can get $k \neq i$. Indeed, the case $i = t$ is trivial. If $i \neq t$, then $(x_i x_t)^{d_i} \in \{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$ by Claim 5, so $k \neq i$. Now we prove that for such k , $(x_k y_k)^{m_k} \notin \{f_1, \dots, f_n, g_1, \dots, g_n\}$. Conversely, $(x_k y_k)^{m_k} \in \{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$ or $(x_k y_k)^{m_k} \in \{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$. We distinguish between the following two cases:

(i) If $(x_k y_k)^{m_k} \in \{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$, then $(x_k y_k)^{m_k} \mid f x_i$ by the expression of $f x_i$. It follows that $(x_k y_k)^{m_k} \mid f$, since $k \neq i$. In particular, $(x_k y_k)^{m_k} \notin \{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$ by Claim 1. Since $k \neq t$, by Claim 5, there exists some $p \in [n]$ such that $f_p = (x_k x_t)^{d_k}$. Again, by Claim 1, we get $(x_k x_t)^{d_k} \notin \{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$. So $x_k \nmid g_j$ and $y_k \nmid g_j$ for all $j \in [n]$, since $N_G(x_k) = \{y_k, x_t\}$. Since $(x_k y_k)^{m_k} \mid f$, we get $(x_k y_k)^{m_k} \mid f y_i = h g_1 \cdots g_n$. This forces $(x_k y_k)^{m_k} \mid h$. Let $h = \lambda (x_k y_k)^{m_k}$ for some monomial λ , then $f y_i = h g_1 \cdots g_n = \lambda (x_k y_k)^{m_k} g_1 \cdots g_n \in I^{n+1}$. This implies that $f \in I^n$, a contradiction.

(ii) If $(x_k y_k)^{m_k} \in \{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$, then, by similar arguments as in case (i) we also get $f \in I^n$, a contradiction.

Therefore, $(x_k x_t)^{d_k}, (x_k y_k)^{m_k} \notin \{f_1, \dots, f_n, g_1, \dots, g_n\}$. In this case, let $H_\omega = G_\omega \setminus \{x_k, y_k\}$, then $f x_i, f y_i \in I(H_\omega)^n$. Note that H_ω is an induced subgraph of G_ω on the set $V(G_\omega) \setminus \{x_k, y_k\}$ and $G[x_1, \dots, \hat{x}_k, \dots, x_t]$ is a star with center x_t , where \hat{x}_k denotes x_k removed from $\{x_1, \dots, x_t\}$. By the induction hypothesis, $I(H_\omega)^n$ is unmixed, so $f \in I(H_\omega)^n$ by the same argument as in Claim 1. In particular, $f \in I^n$, a contradiction. Hence $\{(x_k x_t)^{d_k} \mid k \in [t] \setminus \{t\}\} \subseteq \{f_1, \dots, f_n, g_1, \dots, g_n\}$.

Next, we will prove that $f \in I^n$ in the expression $\mathfrak{p} = I^n$: f of the associated prime ideal \mathfrak{p} , which contradicts $f \notin I^n$. This implies that I^n is unmixed. We distinguish into the following two cases:

Case 1: If $i \neq t$, then $(x_t y_t)^{m_t} \notin \{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$. Indeed, if this is not the case, then we can assume that $g_{n-1} = (x_t y_t)^{m_t}$ and $g_n = (x_i y_i)^{m_i}$ by Claim 4. Since $\min\{m_i, m_t\} \geq 2d_i$, we get $(x_i x_t)^{2d_i} \mid (x_i y_i)^{m_i} (x_t y_t)^{m_t}$, and hence $(x_i y_i)^{m_i} (x_t y_t)^{m_t} = y_i \lambda (x_i x_t)^{2d_i}$ for some monomial λ . It follows that

$$f y_i = y_i \lambda h g_1 \cdots g_{n-2} (x_i x_t)^{2d_i}, \text{ and so } f \in I^n,$$

a contradiction, and hence $(x_t y_t)^{m_t} \notin \{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$.

Let $V_1 = \{k \mid (x_k x_t)^{d_k} \in \{f_1, \dots, f_n\}\} \setminus \{i\}$ and $V_2 = [t] \setminus (V_1 \cup \{i, t\})$. Then, by Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6, we have

$$(7) \quad f x_i = g (x_i x_t)^{t_i d_i} \prod_{k \in V_1} (x_k x_t)^{t_k d_k} \prod_{p \in V_2 \cup \{t\}} (x_p y_p)^{s_p m_p},$$

and

$$(8) \quad fy_i = h(x_i y_i)^{\alpha_i m_i} \prod_{a \in V_1} (x_a y_a)^{\alpha_a m_a} \prod_{b \in V_2} (x_b x_t)^{\beta_b d_b},$$

where $t_k \geq 1$ for every $k \in V_1 \cup \{i\}$, $s_p \geq 0$ for every $p \in V_2 \cup \{t\}$, $\alpha_i \geq 1$, $\alpha_a \geq 0$ for every $a \in V_1$ and $\beta_b \geq 0$ for every $b \in V_2$, and

$$t_i + \sum_{k \in V_1} t_k + \sum_{p \in V_2 \cup \{t\}} s_p = \alpha_i + \sum_{a \in V_1} \alpha_a + \sum_{b \in V_2} \beta_b = n.$$

Since $x_i \nmid g$, from Eqs. (7) and (8) we get

$$t_i d_i - 1 = \deg_{x_i}(fx_i) - 1 = \deg_{x_i}(f) = \deg_{x_i}(fy_i) \geq \alpha_i m_i,$$

and hence

$$(9) \quad t_i d_i \geq \alpha_i m_i + 1.$$

Next, we will show that $V_2 \neq \emptyset$. Indeed, if $V_2 = \emptyset$, then $x_t^{t_i d_i} \mid f$ by Eq. (7), so that $x_t^{t_i d_i} \mid fy_i$. It follows that $x_t^{t_i d_i} \mid h$ by Eq. (8). In particular, $x_t^{\alpha_i m_i} \mid h$ by Eq. (9). Hence $h = \lambda x_t^{\alpha_i m_i}$ for some monomial λ . Since $m_i > d_i$, from Eq. (8) we have

$$fy_i = h(x_i y_i)^{\alpha_i m_i} \prod_{a \in V_1} (x_a y_a)^{\alpha_a m_a},$$

and hence

$$f = (\lambda x_i^{\alpha_i m_i - \alpha_i d_i} y_i^{\alpha_i m_i - 1}) x_t^{\alpha_i m_i - \alpha_i d_i} (x_i x_t)^{\alpha_i d_i} \prod_{a \in V_1} (x_a y_a)^{\alpha_a m_a} \in I^n,$$

a contradiction. It follows that $V_2 \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, there exists some $q \in V_2$. We consider the following two subcases:

Subcase 1.1: If $d_q < d_i$, then $s_q \geq 1$. Indeed, if $s_q = 0$, then $x_q^{d_q} \mid fy_i$ by Eq. (8). This implies that $x_q^{d_q} \mid f$. It follows that $x_q^{d_q} \mid g$ by Eq. (7). Let $g = \lambda x_q^{d_q}$ for some monomial λ , then it follows from Eq. (7) that

$$f = \lambda x_i^{d_i - 1} x_t^{d_i - d_q} (x_i x_t)^{(t_i - 1)d_i} (x_q x_t)^{d_q} \prod_{x_k \in V_1} (x_k x_t)^{t_k d_k} \prod_{x_p \in V_2 \cup \{t\}} (x_p y_p)^{s_p m_p} \in I^n,$$

a contradiction. Hence $s_q \geq 1$.

Now let $m = \lceil d_i / (d_i - d_q) \rceil$, then $m_q \geq m d_q$ by the assumption that condition (2)(a). By the definition of m , $m \geq d_i / (d_i - d_q)$, i.e., $(m - 1)d_i \geq m d_q$. Hence $(x_q x_t)^{m d_q} \mid x_q^{m_q} x_t^{(m-1)d_i}$, it follows that

$$(10) \quad (x_q y_q)^{m_q} (x_i x_t)^{(m-1)d_i} = \lambda (x_q x_t)^{m d_q}$$

for some monomial λ .

Claim: $t_i \geq m - 1$, where t_i is from Eq. (7). Indeed, $t_i \geq \alpha_i(m_i/d_i) + 1/d_i$ by Eq. (9). This gives $t_i \geq \alpha_i(\lceil d_i / (d_i - d_q) \rceil - 2) + 1/d_i$ by assuming that condition (2)(b).

It follows that $t_i \geq \alpha_i(\lceil d_i/(d_i - d_q) \rceil - 2) + 1 = \alpha_i(m - 2) + 1$, since t_i is an integer. In particular, $t_i \geq (m - 2) + 1 = m - 1$.

From Eqs. (7) and (10), we get

$$\begin{aligned} fx_i &= g(x_i x_t)^{t_i d_i} (x_q y_q)^{s_q m_q} \prod_{k \in V_1} (x_k x_t)^{t_k d_k} \prod_{p \in (V_2 \cup \{t\}) \setminus \{q\}} (x_p y_p)^{s_p m_p}, \\ &= g \lambda (x_q x_t)^{m d_q} (x_i x_t)^{(t_i - m + 1) d_i} (x_q y_q)^{(s_q - 1) m_q} \prod_{k \in V_1} (x_k x_t)^{t_k d_k} \prod_{p \in (V_2 \cup \{t\}) \setminus \{q\}} (x_p y_p)^{s_p m_p}, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts Claim 1, since $(x_q x_t)^{d_q} \in \{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$ by Eq. (8). This implies that $f \in I^n$.

Subcase 1.2: If $d_i < d_p$ for all $p \in V_2$. Let $d_p = \min\{d_k \mid k \in V_2\}$, $m = \lceil d_p/(d_p - d_i) \rceil$ and $\beta = \sum_{b \in V_2} \beta_b$, where each β_b is from Eq. (8). We distinguish into the following two cases:

(i) If $\beta \geq m - 1$, then by Claim 4, we can assume that

$$(11) \quad fy_i = h g_1 \cdots g_{n-1} (x_i y_i)^{m_i},$$

where $g_{n-m+1}, \dots, g_{n-1} \in \{(x_k x_t)^{d_k} \mid k \in V_2\}$.

Note that $\deg_{x_t}(g_{n-m+1} \cdots g_{n-1}) \geq (m-1)d_p$, since $\deg_{x_t}(g_k) \geq d_p$ for every $k \in V_2$. We can write $g_{n-m+1} \cdots g_{n-1} = \lambda x_t^{(m-1)d_p}$ for some monomial λ . By assuming that condition (2)(a), we can verify that $m_i \geq m d_i$ and $(m-1)d_p \geq m d_i$ by the definition of m . It follows that

$$fy_i = (\lambda x_t^{(m-1)d_p - m d_i} x_i^{m_i - m d_i} y_i^{m_i}) g_1 \cdots g_{n-m} (x_i x_t)^{m d_i},$$

and hence

$$f = (\lambda x_t^{(m-1)d_p - m d_i} x_i^{m_i - m d_i} y_i^{m_i - 1}) g_1 \cdots g_{n-m} (x_i x_t)^{m d_i} \in I^n.$$

(ii) If $\beta < m - 1$, then $x_t^{t_i d_i} \mid h \prod_{b \in V_2} (x_b x_t)^{\beta_b d_b}$ by Eqs. (7) and (8). Hence $h \prod_{b \in V_2} (x_b x_t)^{\beta_b d_b} = \lambda x_t^{t_i d_i}$, where λ is a monomial. We also write Eq. (8) in the form

$$fy_i = \lambda g_1 \cdots g_{n-\beta-1} x_t^{t_i d_i} (x_i y_i)^{m_i}.$$

where $g_1, \dots, g_{n-\beta-1}$ are monomial generators of I .

Note that $t_i \geq \alpha_i(m_i/d_i) + 1/d_i \geq \alpha_i m + 1/d_i$ by Eq. (9) and the condition (2)(a). It follows that $t_i \geq \alpha_i m + 1$, since t_i is an integer. In particular, $t_i > m$. It follows that

$$fy_i = (\lambda x_t^{d_i(t_i - m)} y_i^{m_i}) x_i^{m_i - m d_i} g_1 \cdots g_{n-\beta-1} (x_i x_t)^{m d_i},$$

and so

$$f = (\lambda x_t^{d_i(t_i - m)} y_i^{m_i - 1}) x_i^{m_i - m d_i} g_1 \cdots g_{n-\beta-1} (x_i x_t)^{m d_i} \in I^{n-\beta-1+m} \subseteq I^n,$$

as $\beta < m - 1$.

Case 2: If $i = t$, then $(x_t y_t)^{m_t} \in \{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$ by Claim 4. Using the same argument as at the beginning of the proof of Case 1, we get $(x_k y_k)^{m_k} \notin \{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$ for any $k \neq t$. Note that $f x_t = g f_1 \dots f_n$ and $x_t \nmid g$, we have $x_t \mid f_p$ for some $p \in [n]$. Hence $f_p = (x_t y_t)^{m_t}$ or $f_p = (x_v x_t)^{d_v}$ for some $v \neq t$. The first case cannot occur by Claim 1. So $(x_v x_t)^{d_v} \in \{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$.

Let $V_1 = \{k \mid (x_k x_t)^{d_k} \in \{g_1, \dots, g_n\}\}$ and $V_2 = [t] \setminus (V_1 \cup \{t\})$. Then, by Claim 1, 3, 4 and 6, we have

$$f x_t = g \prod_{p \in V_1} (x_p y_p)^{s_p m_p} \prod_{k \in V_2} (x_k x_t)^{t_k d_k},$$

and

$$f y_t = h (x_t y_t)^{\alpha_t m_t} \prod_{a \in V_1} (x_a x_t)^{\alpha_a d_a},$$

where $s_p \geq 0$ for every $p \in V_1$, $t_k \geq 1$ for every $k \in V_2$, $\alpha_t \geq 1$, $\alpha_a \geq 0$ for every $a \in V_1$, and

$$\sum_{p \in V_1} s_p + \sum_{k \in V_2} t_k = \alpha_t + \sum_{a \in V_1} \alpha_a = n.$$

Note that since $x_v^{d_v} \mid f x_t$ and $v \neq t$, we have $x_v^{d_v} \mid f$. This implies that $x_v^{d_v} \mid f y_t$, so $x_v^{d_v} \mid h$, since $v \in V_2$. Let $h = \lambda x_v^{d_v}$, where λ is a monomial. Since $m_t > d_v$ by the condition (1) of the lemma, it follows that

$$f = (\lambda x_t^{m_t - d_v} y_t^{m_t - 1}) (x_v x_t)^{d_v} (x_t y_t)^{(\alpha_t - 1) m_t} \prod_{a \in V_1} (x_a x_t)^{\alpha_a d_a} \in I^n.$$

In summary, we always get that $f \in I^n$ in the expression $\mathfrak{p} = I^n : f$ of the associated prime ideal \mathfrak{p} , a contradiction. The proof is now complete. \square

We are now ready to prove Conjecture 4.8 in the case where $G[x_1, \dots, x_t]$ is a star.

Theorem 4.10. *Suppose $G[x_1, \dots, x_t]$ is a star with the center x_t . Let $m_i = \omega(x_i y_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, t$ and let $d_i = \omega(x_i x_t)$ for $i \neq t$. Then $I(G_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay for all $n \geq 1$ if and only if*

- (1) $m_t \geq 2 \max\{d_i \mid i \neq t\}$.
- (2) $d_i \neq d_k$ for any two different $x_i x_t, x_i x_k \in E(G)$. Furthermore, if $d_i < d_k$, then
 - (a) $m_i \geq d_i \lceil d_k / (d_k - d_i) \rceil$, and
 - (b) $m_k \geq d_k \max\{2, \lceil d_k / (d_k - d_i) \rceil - 2\}$.

Proof. (\implies): This follows from Proposition 4.7.

(\impliedby): We will prove that $I(G_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay for any $n \geq 1$. For $k = 0, \dots, t$, we define the weight function ω_k on G as follows:

$$\omega_k(e) = \begin{cases} 2\omega(e) & \text{if } e = x_i y_i \text{ with } i \leq k, \\ \omega(e) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In particular, $\omega_0 = \omega$. By Lemma 4.9, we have $I(G_{\omega_k})^n$ is unmixed for all $k = 0, \dots, t$.

For $k = 0, \dots, t$, let $I_k = I(G_{\omega_k})^n$ and $J_k = (I_k)_{W_k}$ be the localization of I_k with respect to W_k , where $W_k = \{y_1, \dots, y_k\}$, then $J_0 = I_0 = I(G_\omega)^n$ and J_k is unmixed by Lemma 2.4, since I_k is unmixed.

We now prove that J_k is Cohen-Macaulay for every k by the descending induction on k . If $k = t$, then

$$J_k = ((x_i x_t)^{d_i}, x_q^{2m_q} \mid i \in [t] \setminus \{t\} \text{ and } q \in [t])^n$$

is a primary monomial ideal, so it is Cohen-Macaulay.

Suppose that J_k is Cohen-Macaulay for $k > 0$. Note that

$$(R/J_{k-1})/(y_k - x_k) \cong (R/J_k)/(y_k - x_k)$$

and $y_1 - x_1, \dots, y_t - x_t$ is a system of parameters for both R/J_{k-1} and R/J_k . This implies that $(R/J_k)/(y_k - x_k)$ is Cohen-Macaulay. Hence $(R/J_{k-1})/(y_k - x_k)$ is Cohen-Macaulay.

Next, we prove that $y_k - x_k$ is regular on R/J_{k-1} . So R/J_{k-1} is Cohen-Macaulay. By Lemma 3.1, $y_k - x_k$ does not belong to any associated prime ideal of $I(G)$, so

$$y_k - x_k \notin \bigcup_{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Ass}(R/I(G))} \mathfrak{p}.$$

Since $\text{Ass}(R/J_{k-1}) \subseteq \text{Ass}(R/I(G))$, we have

$$y_k - x_k \notin \bigcup_{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Ass}(R/J_{k-1})} \mathfrak{p}.$$

Hence $y_k - x_k$ is regular on R/J_{k-1} , and this implies that R/J_{k-1} is Cohen-Macaulay.

If we choose $k = 0$, then J_0 is Cohen-Macaulay, i.e. $I(G_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay. The proof is now complete. \square

Remark 4.11. For the edge ideal I of a simple graph or more generalized, of a weighted oriented graph (see e.g. [7] for the definition of such a graph), if I^n is unmixed for all $n \geq 1$, then the underlying graph is bipartite (see [6, 20]). However, this is not true for edge-weighted graphs, as in the following result.

Proposition 4.12. *Let G be a connected graph with a perfect matching $\{x_1 y_1, \dots, x_t y_t\}$ with $t \geq 2$, where each y_i is a leaf vertex in G . Suppose $G[x_1, \dots, x_t]$ is a complete graph and ω is a weight function on $E(G)$ such that $\omega(x_j x_k) = 1$ for all $x_j x_k \in E(G)$. Then $I(G_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay for all $n \geq 1$ if and only if $\omega(x_i y_i) \geq 2$ for all $i = 1, \dots, t$.*

Proof. (\implies): For each i , we choose $j \neq i$. Let $H = G \setminus \{x_s \mid s \notin \{i, j\}\}$, then $E(H) = \{x_i y_i, x_i x_j, x_j y_j\}$. Since $I(G_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay for all $n \geq 1$, $I(H_\omega)^n$ is also Cohen-Macaulay. Thus $\omega(x_i y_i) \geq 2$ by Proposition 4.3.

(\Leftarrow): We will prove that $I(G_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay by induction on n . The case $n \leq 2$ is shown separately in Theorem 4.1. So we can assume that $n \geq 3$, and prove the statements by induction on t . The case $t \leq 2$ is shown separately in Proposition 4.3. Thus, in the following, we can assume that $t \geq 3$. We will divide the proof into the following two steps:

Step 1: We prove that $I(G_\omega)^n$ is unmixed. Let $I = I(G_\omega)$ and $m_i = \omega(x_i y_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, t$. Conversely, suppose that I^n is not unmixed, then there exists some monomial $f \notin I^n$ such that $f x_i, f y_i \in I^n$ for some $i \in [t]$. We can write $f x_i = g f_1 \cdots f_n$ and $f y_i = h g_1 \cdots g_n$, where g, h are monomials and f_i, g_i are monomial generators of I for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Similarly to Claims 1, 4 and 5 of the proof in Lemma 4.9, we obtain that

- (1) $\{f_1, \dots, f_n\} \cap \{g_1, \dots, g_n\} = \emptyset$;
- (2) there exists some $p \in [n]$ such that $g_p = (x_i y_i)^{m_i}$;
- (3) there exists some $p \in [n]$ such that $f_p = x_i x_j$ for some $j \neq i$.

We can assume that $g_n = (x_i y_i)^{m_i}$ and $f_n = x_i x_j$ for some $j \neq i$. *Claim:* $(x_k y_k)^{m_k} \notin \{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$ for every $k \neq i$. In fact, assume that $(x_k y_k)^{m_k} \in \{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$ for some $k \neq i$. Then, we can assume that $g_{n-1} = (x_k y_k)^{m_k}$, so that

$$f y_i = h g_1 \cdots g_{n-2} (x_k y_k)^{m_k} (x_i y_i)^{m_i}.$$

Therefore,

$$f = (h x_k^{m_k-2} y_k^{m_k} x_i^{m_i-2} y_i^{m_i-1}) g_1 \cdots g_{n-2} (x_i x_k)^2 \in I^n,$$

a contradiction, and the claim follows.

Since $x_i x_j \mid f x_i$, we have $x_j \mid f$, and hence $x_j \mid f y_i$. It follows that either $x_j \mid h$ or $x_j \mid g_k$ for some $k \neq n$. In the former case $f = (h/x_j)(x_i^{m_i-1} y_i^{m_i-1}) g_1 \cdots g_{n-1} (x_i x_j) \in I^n$, a contradiction. In the second case, by Claim, (1) and (3), we can assume that $g_k = x_i x_q$ for some $q \notin \{i, j\}$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $k = n-1$. Then

$$f = (h x_i^{m_i-2} y_i^{m_i-1}) g_1 \cdots g_{n-2} (x_i x_j) (x_i x_q) \in I^n,$$

a contradiction. This implies that I^n is unmixed.

Step 2: We prove that $I(G_\omega)^n$ is Cohen-Macaulay. This can be shown by similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem 4.10, so we omit its proof. \square

Data availability

The data that has been used is confidential.

Acknowledgement

The third author is supported by the Natural Science Foundation of Jiangsu Province (No. BK20221353) and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (12471246).

Part of this work was done while the second and the third authors were at the Vietnam Institute of Advanced Studies in Mathematics (VIASM) in Hanoi, Vietnam. We would like to thank VIASM for its hospitality.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. C. Cowsik, M. V. Nori, *On the fibres of blowing up*, J. Indian Math. Soc. (N.S.) **40** (1976), 217-222.
- [2] M. Crupi, G. Rinaldo and N. Terai, *Cohen–Macaulay edge ideals whose height is half of the number of vertices*, Nagoya Math. J. **201** (2011), 116-130.
- [3] L. T. K. Diem, N. C. Minh, and T. Vu, *The sequentially Cohen–Macaulay property of edge ideals of edge-weighted graphs*, J. Algebraic Combin. **60** (2024), 589-597.
- [4] A. Finbow, B. Hartnell and R. Nowakowski, *A characterisation of well covered graphs of girth 5 or greater*, J. Combin. Theory, Ser. B, **57** (1993), 44-68.
- [5] R. Giancarlo, T. Naokib and Y. Ken-ichi, *Cohen–Macaulayness for symbolic power ideals of edge ideals*, J. Algebra **347** (2011), 1-22.
- [6] G. Grisolde, J. Martínez-Bernal and R.H. Villarreal, *Normally torsion-free edge ideals of weighted oriented graphs*, Comm. Algebra, **52** (2023), 4, 1672–1685.
- [7] H.T. Ha, K. Lin, S. Morey, E. Reyes and R. H. Villarreal, *Edge ideals of oriented graphs*, Int. J. Algebra Comput. **29** (2019), 535–559.
- [8] J. Herzog and T. Hibi, *Distributive lattices, bipartite graphs and Alexander duality*, J. Algebraic Combin. **22** (2005), no. 3, 289-302.
- [9] J. Herzog and T. Hibi and X. Zheng, *Cohen–Macaulay chordal graphs*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **113** (2006) , 911–916.
- [10] J. Herzog, Y. Takayama and N. Terai, *On the radical of a monomial ideal*, Arch. Math. **85** (2005), 397-408.
- [11] T. T. Hien, *Cohen–Macaulay edge-weighted graphs of girth 5 or greater*, arXiv:2309.05056.
- [12] D. T. Hoang, N. C. Minh and T. N. Trung, *Cohen–Macaulay graphs with large girth*, J. Algebra Appl. **14** (2015), 1550112-1-16.
- [13] D. T. Hoang, N. C. Minh and T. N. Trung, *Combinatorial characterizations of the Cohen–Macaulayness of the second power of edge ideals*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **120** (2013), 1073–1086.
- [14] D. T. Hoang and T. N. Trung, *A characterization of triangle-free Gorenstein graphs and Cohen–Macaulayness of second powers of edge ideals*, J. Algebraic Combin. **43** (2016), 325–338.
- [15] M. Hochster, *Cohen–Macaulay rings, combinatorics, and simplicial complexes*. In: Ring Theory, II (Proceedings of the Second Conference, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla., 1975). Lecture Notes in Pure and Applied Mathematics, vol. 26, pp. 171–223. Dekker, New York (1977).
- [16] C. Paulsen and S. Sather-Wagstaff, *Edge ideals of weighted graphs*, J. Algebra Appl. **12** (2013), no 5, 1250223, 24pp.
- [17] I. Peeva, Graded syzygies, Algebra and Applications, **14**, Springer-Verlag London Ltd., London, 2011.
- [18] M. D. Plummer, *Well-covered graphs: Survey*, Quaestiones Math. **16** (1993), 253–287.
- [19] S. A. Seyed Fakhari, K. Shibata, N. Terai and Siamak Yassemi, *Cohen–Macaulay edge weighted edge ideals of very well-covered graphs*, Comm. Algebra, **49** (2021), no.10, 4249-4257.

- [20] A. Simis, W.V. Vasconcelos and R.H. Villarreal, *On the ideal theory of graphs*, J. Algebra **167** (1994), 389–416.
- [21] T. N. Trung, *On Gorenstein graphs*, J. Algebraic Combin. **54** (2021), 673–688.
- [22] K. N. Vander Meulen, A. Van Tuyl and C. Watt, *Cohen–Macaulay circulant graphs*, Comm. Alg. **42** (2014), 1896–1910.
- [23] R. Villarreal, *Cohen–Macaulay graphs*, Manusc. Math. **66**, 277–293 (1990).
- [24] R. Villarreal, *Monomial Algebras*, Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics Vol. 238, Marcel Dekker, New York, 2001.
- [25] S. Wei, *Cohen–Macaulay weighted chordal graphs*, arXiv:2309.02414.
- [26] G. J. Zhu, S. Y. Duan, Y. J. Cui and J. X. Li, *Edge ideals of some edge-weighted graphs*, To appear in Rocky Mountain J. Math., arXiv:2401.02111.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, SOOCHOW UNIVERSITY, SUZHOU, JIANGSU, 215006,
P.R. CHINA

Email address: lijiaxinworking@163.com

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, VIETNAM ACADEMY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, 18 HOANG
QUOC VIET, 10307 HANOI, VIETNAM

Email address: tntrung@math.ac.vn

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, SOOCHOW UNIVERSITY, SUZHOU, JIANGSU, 215006,
P.R. CHINA

Email address: zhuguangjun@suda.edu.cn