

SPHERES AND BALLS AS INDEPENDENCE COMPLEXES

SUSAN M. COOPER, SARA FARIDI, THIAGO HOLLEBEN, LISA NICKLASSON, AND ADAM VAN TUYL

ABSTRACT. The terms “whiskering”, and more generally “grafting”, refer to adding generators to any monomial ideal to make the resulting ideal Cohen-Macaulay. We investigate the independence complexes of simplicial complexes that are constructed through a whiskering or grafting process, and we show that these independence complexes are (generalized) Bier balls. More specifically, the independence complexes are either homeomorphic to a ball or sphere. In a related direction, we classify when the independence complexes of very well-covered graphs are homeomorphic to balls or spheres.

1. INTRODUCTION

In 1990, Villarreal [32, Proposition 2.2] introduced an operation that takes any graph G and outputs a graph $w(G)$ with a Cohen-Macaulay edge ideal. Over the years, this construction was extensively studied in commutative algebra and became known as “whiskering”. In unpublished work from 1992, and brought to a wider attention by [7, 13, 25], Bier [3] introduced a simple operation that inputs any simplicial complex Δ on n vertices, and outputs a simplicial complex $B(\Delta)$ homeomorphic to a $(n - 1)$ -dimensional sphere. The complex $B(\Delta)$ is obtained by taking the boundary of a simplicial ball Δ' and, when Δ' is flag, its Stanley-Reisner ideal is exactly the one introduced by Villarreal in [32]. Bier’s construction is a strikingly simple way of generating many (combinatorially) different spheres [7, Subsection 6.1]. As a consequence of this observation, the realizability of these spheres (and their generalizations) as the boundary of a (simplicial) polytope became an interesting problem that has been studied from different perspectives, see for example [5, 21].

From an algebraic perspective, Villarreal’s construction is intrinsically related to polarizations of monomial ideals. In view of this, Faridi in 2005 [15] introduced the notion of “grafted complexes”, which are essentially the simplicial complexes whose facet ideals are polarizations of artinian monomial ideals. Similar to whiskering, Faridi’s construction takes any (square-free) monomial ideal and outputs a Cohen-Macaulay ideal generated by square-free monomials. In 2011, Murai [27] generalized Bier’s construction by considering simplicial complexes arising from multicomplexes. Our first contribution in this paper is to show that Murai’s construction coincides with Faridi’s construction, in the same sense that Bier’s construction coincides with Villarreal’s. The statement below summarizes Theorem 3.4.

Theorem 1.1 (Generalized Bier balls and grafted complexes). *A simplicial complex is grafted if and only if its independence complex is a generalized Bier ball $B(M)$, where M is a multicomplex.*

As a consequence of Theorem 1.1, Faridi’s results from [15] can be seen as a characterization of the minimal nonfaces of generalized Bier balls from [27].

The ideal connecting grafted complexes and generalized Bier balls in Theorem 1.1 is the polarization of an artinian monomial ideal. We note that more general notions of polarizations were considered in [1,

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 13F55, 05E45, 05C69.

Key words and phrases. simplicial complexes, simplicial spheres, Bier spheres, pseudomanifold, Cohen-Macaulay, very well-covered graphs, grafting, monomial ideals, Artinian rings, polarization.

Conjecture 3.2], where the authors conjecture that any notion of polarization of an artinian monomial ideal leads to a simplicial ball. A proof of this conjecture was recently announced in [18].

In commutative algebra, Faridi’s construction is only one of many generalizations of whiskering. Our second contribution shows that the notion of coloured-whiskering from Biermann and Van Tuyl [4] almost never outputs a pseudomanifold. In particular, these complexes are a very large class of interesting vertex decomposable but non-pseudomanifold simplicial complexes.

Theorem 1.2. *Let Δ be a simplicial complex and Δ_χ be the complex obtained via coloured-whiskering with respect to a partition χ of the vertices. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) Δ_χ is a pseudomanifold;
- (2) Δ_χ is a grafted complex.

From a completely different perspective, in 1982 Favaron [16] introduced the class of very well-covered graphs. This class of graphs includes whiskered graphs, which are sometimes called “leafy extensions” [8] in this context. We are able to make the following conclusions about the independence complex of G when G is a very well-covered graph. Combining with Stanley’s result [30, Theorem II.5.1] this classifies Gorenstein very well-covered graphs.

Theorem 1.3. *Let G be a very well-covered graph with edge ideal I . If G is not a disjoint set of edges, then I is Cohen-Macaulay if and only if the Stanley-Reisner complex of I , also known as the independence complex of G , is homeomorphic to a ball. If G is a disjoint set of edges, then I is Gorenstein and the independence complex of G is homeomorphic to a sphere. In particular, the edge ideal of a very well-covered graph G is Gorenstein if and only if G is a disjoint set of edges.*

We note that a great deal of the research on very well-covered graphs in graph theory is focused on the unimodality of their independence polynomials [8, 23]. For the sake of completeness, we state Levit and Mandrescu’s conjecture in the context of flag simplicial complexes.

Conjecture 1.4 ([23]). *If Δ is a $(d - 1)$ -dimensional pure flag complex on $2d$ vertices, its f -vector is unimodal.*

Theorem 1.3 suggests the study of Conjecture 1.4 in the special case where Δ is Cohen-Macaulay (for example when Δ is a flag Bier ball) is of special interest.

2. BACKGROUND

We begin with a review of necessary background on simplicial complexes and commutative algebra.

2.1. Simplicial Complexes. A (abstract) **simplicial complex** Δ on a **vertex set** $V = V(\Delta)$ is a set of subsets of V with the condition that if $F \in \Delta$ and $G \subseteq F$, then $G \in \Delta$. An element of Δ is called a **face** of Δ , and a **facet** of Δ is a maximal face under inclusion. The **dimension** of a face F is $\dim(F) = |F| - 1$, the **dimension** of Δ is the maximum of the dimensions of its faces, and Δ is **pure** if all its facets have the same dimension. A **simplex** is a simplicial complex with exactly one facet. We often denote Δ as $\langle F_1, \dots, F_q \rangle$ meaning F_1, \dots, F_q are the facets of Δ (in particular, a simplicial complex is uniquely determined by its facets). The **link** and **deletion** of a face F of Δ are, respectively, the subcomplexes

$$\text{link}_\Delta(F) = \{G \in \Delta : G \cup F \in \Delta, G \cap F = \emptyset\} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{del}_\Delta(F) = \{G \in \Delta : G \cap F = \emptyset\}.$$

A subset $W \subseteq V$ is an **independent set** of Δ if it contains no facet of Δ , and $\text{Ind}(\Delta)$, called the **independence complex** of Δ , is the simplicial complex whose faces are the independent sets of Δ ; in other words,

$$\text{Ind}(\Delta) = \{W \subseteq V : W \text{ is an independent set of } \Delta\}.$$

For every simplicial complex Δ , we may associate a topological space $|\Delta|$ contained in \mathbb{R}^k for some k such that for every face $\sigma \in \Delta$, $|\Delta|$ contains the convex hull of the corresponding vertices of σ (see [25, Chapter 1] for more details on this construction). We call $|\Delta|$ the **geometric realization** of Δ . When the geometric realization of a d -dimensional simplicial complex Δ is homeomorphic to a sphere S^d , we say Δ is a **simplicial sphere**, and when it is homeomorphic to a ball B^d , we say Δ is a **simplicial ball**.

In this paper we are interested in identifying simplicial spheres and simplicial balls. One way to determine this property is to check if the complex is a shellable (or even more strongly, vertex decomposable) pseudomanifold.

Our main context is the ‘‘Cohen-Macaulay’’ property in algebra (Definition 2.5), which forces simplicial complexes to be pure. Therefore, we will focus on pure simplicial complexes for the next definitions.

Definition 2.1 (Pseudomanifolds, shellable, vertex decomposable). Let Δ be a pure d -dimensional simplicial complex.

- Δ is **shellable** if its facets can be ordered as F_1, \dots, F_q such that for all $i = 2, \dots, q$

$$\langle F_i \rangle \cap \langle F_1, \dots, F_{i-1} \rangle$$
 is pure and of dimension $d - 1$.
- Δ is **vertex decomposable** if
 - (1) $\Delta = \emptyset$, or Δ is a simplex, or
 - (2) there exists a vertex $v \in V$ such that every facet of $\text{del}_\Delta(\{v\})$ is a facet of Δ , and both $\text{link}_\Delta(\{v\})$ and $\text{del}_\Delta(\{v\})$ are vertex decomposable.
- A face of dimension $(d - 1)$ in Δ that belongs to at most two facets is called a **ridge**.
- Δ is said to be **strongly-connected** if for every two facets $F, F' \in \Delta$, there exists a sequence of facets

$$F = G_0, G_1, \dots, G_t = F' \quad \text{such that} \quad \dim(G_i \cap G_{i+1}) = d - 1$$
 for $i = 0, \dots, t - 1$.
- Δ is a **pseudomanifold** if
 - (1) Δ is pure;
 - (2) every face of dimension $(d - 1)$ is a ridge; and
 - (3) Δ is strongly-connected.
- a pseudomanifold Δ is said to have a **boundary** if there exists at least one face of dimension $(d - 1)$ of Δ that belongs to exactly one facet of Δ .

The series of implications in (2.2) shows how these classes of simplicial complexes relate to one another. In the sections that follow, we will rely on the following statement to detect if a simplicial complex is a simplicial sphere or ball.

Theorem 2.2 ([6, Theorem 11.4]). *Let Δ be a shellable pseudomanifold. Then*

- *if Δ has no boundary, then it is a simplicial sphere;*
- *if Δ has a boundary, then it is a simplicial ball.*

2.2. Square-free monomial ideals. There are two one-to-one correspondences between simplicial complexes and square-free monomial ideals. More precisely, to a simplicial complex Δ with vertex set $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ we associate two unique square-free monomial ideals: $\mathcal{F}(\Delta)$, called the **facet ideal** of Δ , and $\mathcal{N}(\Delta)$, called the **Stanley-Reisner ideal** of Δ , in the polynomial ring $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ over a field k , defined as

$$\mathcal{F}(\Delta) = (x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r} : \{x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_r}\} \in \text{Facets}(\Delta)) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{N}(\Delta) = (x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r} : \{x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_r}\} \notin \Delta).$$


We use x_1, \dots, x_n to denote both vertices and variables in the polynomial ring. The uniqueness of the correspondences allow us to define $\mathcal{F}(I)$ and $\mathcal{N}(I)$ for a square-free monomial ideal I by

$$I = \mathcal{F}(\Delta) \iff \Delta = \mathcal{F}(I) \quad \text{and} \quad I = \mathcal{N}(\Delta) \iff \Delta = \mathcal{N}(I).$$

It is straightforward to check from the definitions that if I is a square-free monomial ideal, then

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{N}(I) = \text{Ind}(\mathcal{F}(I)).$$

Example 2.3. If $I = (abc, cd, ad) \subset k[a, b, c, d]$, then $\Delta = \mathcal{F}(I)$ and $\Gamma = \mathcal{N}(I)$ are pictured below. Note that the facets of Γ are exactly the maximal independent sets of Δ , that is, $\Gamma = \text{Ind}(\Delta)$.



Example 2.4 (Edge ideals). Let $G = (V, E)$ be a finite simple graph with vertices $V = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ and edge set E . If we view G as a simplicial complex with its edges the facets, then $\mathcal{F}(G) = (x_i x_j : \{x_i, x_j\} \in E)$ in $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. The ideal $\mathcal{F}(G)$ is in fact the well-known **edge ideal** of G , and is normally denoted by $I(G)$. The Stanley-Reisner complex associated to $I(G)$ is the **independence complex** $\text{Ind}(G)$ of G . Simplicial complexes that are the independence complex of some graph are also called **flag complexes**.

2.3. The Cohen-Macaulay property. The Cohen-Macaulay property – defined algebraically for a local ring R via the property that $\text{depth}(R) = \dim(R)$ – is the dominating algebraic property of the square-free monomial ideals that we study in this paper. For quotients by square-free monomial ideals, the Cohen-Macaulay property was characterized by Reisner [29] in terms of the vanishing of reduced homology groups of the links of faces of Stanley-Reisner complexes. Reisner’s criterion has been used to great effect in combinatorics ever since its appearance, and remains the most concrete description of Cohen-Macaulayness for the class of square-free monomial ideals. In Definition 2.5 we will use Reisner’s criterion as the definition of Cohen-Macaulay square-free monomial ideals.

Definition 2.5 (Cohen-Macaulay ideals (Reisner’s Criterion)). Let I be a square-free monomial ideal of $R = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ with non-face complex $\Delta = \mathcal{N}(I)$. Then R/I is a **Cohen-Macaulay ring** if and only if for any $F \in \Delta$,

$$\tilde{H}_i(\text{link}_\Delta(F), k) = 0 \quad \text{for } i < \dim(\text{link}_\Delta(F)).$$

We call Δ a **Cohen-Macaulay simplicial complex** if $R/\mathcal{N}(\Delta)$ is a Cohen-Macaulay ring.

The simplest example of a simplicial complex that satisfies the conditions in Definition 2.5 is a simplex, where all homologies of links are zero. A more interesting basic example is a hollow simplex, where all the link homologies are one-dimensional. The hollow simplex is an example of what is known as a “homology sphere”. For a field k , a simplicial Δ is a **k -homology sphere** if for all $F \in \Delta$

$$\tilde{H}_i(\text{link}_\Delta(F), k) = \begin{cases} k & \text{if } i = \dim(\text{link}_\Delta(F)) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Simplicial spheres, introduced earlier, are examples of homology spheres and are therefore Cohen-Macaulay ([30, Theorem 5.1, Corollary 5.2]). It is known that every Cohen-Macaulay simplicial complex is strongly-connected ([6, Proposition 11.7], [2, Proposition 1.2.12]).

The various classes of simplicial complexes introduced in this section satisfy the implications

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} \text{simplicial sphere} & \Rightarrow & \text{homology sphere} & \Rightarrow & \text{pseudomanifold} & \Rightarrow & \text{pure} \\ & & & \Downarrow & & \Downarrow & \Uparrow \\ \text{vertex decomposable} & \Rightarrow & \text{shellable} & \Rightarrow & \text{Cohen-Macaulay} & \Rightarrow & \text{strongly-connected} \end{array} .$$

All of the reverse implications in (2.2) fail to hold in general. However, as we will show in the sequel, implications can be reversed for special families of independence complexes.

We conclude this section with a description of the ‘‘polarization’’ of a monomial ideal, which is an operation that transforms a general monomial ideal into a square-free one, while maintaining its Cohen-Macaulay properties. If $m = x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_n^{a_n} \in k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is a monomial, then its **polarization** $\mathcal{P}(m)$ is the square-free monomial

$$\mathcal{P}(m) = (x_{1,1}x_{1,2} \cdots x_{1,a_1}) \cdots (x_{n,1} \cdots x_{n,a_n}) \in k[x_{i,j} : 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq a_i].$$

If I is minimally generated by monomials m_1, \dots, m_q , then the **polarization of I** is the square-free monomial ideal

$$\mathcal{P}(I) = (\mathcal{P}(m_1), \dots, \mathcal{P}(m_q))$$

in the polynomial ring containing all variables appearing in the monomials $\mathcal{P}(m_1), \dots, \mathcal{P}(m_q)$.

3. GRAFTING, WHISKERING, SPHERES, AND GENERALIZED BIER BALLS

When the Cohen-Macaulay property is present in a monomial ideal, both its facet and Stanley-Reisner complexes demonstrate strong combinatorial characteristics. However, despite Reisner’s criterion, it is quite difficult to determine if a ring is Cohen-Macaulay, because the process involves computing homology groups, which itself could depend on the characteristic of the base field. A fruitful line of research, therefore, has been to identify classes of monomial ideals I for which we can tell, based on the combinatorics of $\mathcal{N}(I)$ or $\mathcal{F}(I)$, that I is Cohen-Macaulay no matter what field we use. For example, when $\mathcal{N}(I)$ is a simplicial sphere, then I must be Cohen-Macaulay. Similarly, if $\mathcal{F}(I)$ is ‘‘grafted’’ I must be Cohen-Macaulay. Grafting [15] is essentially adding generators to a square-free monomial ideal in a way that the extended ideal is Cohen-Macaulay. This is a generalization of *whiskering* a graph, first discovered by Villarreal [32]. We begin by recalling how to graft a simplicial complex.

For a simplicial complex Δ with vertex set V , a **leaf** F is a facet where either F is the only facet of Δ , or there is another facet G of Δ such that $F \cap H \subseteq G$ for all facets $H \neq F$. The facet G is called a **joint** of F (see [14, 15]).

The operation of grafting is done via adding leaves to a simplicial complex. In the statement below, $V(\Delta')$ refers to the vertices of Δ' , and $V(F)$ refers to the vertices of the facet F .

Definition 3.1 (Grafting [15]). A simplicial complex Δ is a **grafting** of the simplicial complex $\Delta' = \langle G_1, \dots, G_s \rangle$ with the simplices F_1, \dots, F_r (or, Δ is said to be **grafted**) if


$$\Delta = \langle F_1, \dots, F_r \rangle \cup \langle G_1, \dots, G_s \rangle$$

with the following properties:

- (1) $V(\Delta') \subseteq V(F_1) \cup \cdots \cup V(F_r)$;
- (2) F_1, \dots, F_r are all the leaves of Δ ;
- (3) $\{G_1, \dots, G_s\} \cap \{F_1, \dots, F_r\} = \emptyset$;
- (4) for $i \neq j$, $F_i \cap F_j = \emptyset$;
- (5) if G_i is a joint of Δ , then $\Delta \setminus \langle G_i \rangle$ is also grafted.

In the special case where the leaves F_1, \dots, F_r are edges (i.e., 1-dimensional), then Δ is called a **whiskered simplicial complex**.

Example 3.2. The facet complex of $I_2 = (x_1x_2x_3, x_1x_2x_4, x_1x_3x_4, x_1x_3y_1, x_4y_2, x_2y_3)$ seen below, is a grafting of the facet complex of the ideal $I_1 = (x_1x_2x_3, x_1x_2x_4, x_1x_3x_4)$. By [15, Theorem 7.6] the ideal I_2 is Cohen-Macaulay, obtained by adding generators (leaves) to I_1 .



Remark 3.3 (Whiskering a graph [32]). In 1990, Villarreal introduced the whiskering construction for the edge ideal of a graph, citing Vasconcelos and Herzog’s observations that this process served as a way to obtain a Cohen-Macaulay square-free monomial ideal $J = w(I)$ from any square-free monomial ideal I , by adding quadratic monomials to the ideal. Then in 2005, Faridi introduced the notion of grafted simplicial complexes to generalize Villarreal’s construction, in the sense that higher degree monomials could be added to any monomial ideal to produce a Cohen-Macaulay ideal. Both of these constructions were introduced in a different language by Bier in an unpublished manuscript from 1992, and Murai in [27]. The notion of a whiskered graph specifically has also appeared in the graph theory literature under several names, for example the “leafy-extension” of a graph [8] and the “corona product” of a graph with a single vertex [19].

As we will see below in Theorem 3.4, the independence complex of a grafted complex is exactly what is known as a **generalized Bier ball**, which was defined by Murai [27] as the Stanley-Reisner complex of the polarization of an artinian monomial ideal. Bier spheres first appeared in unpublished work of Thomas Bier in 1992 according to [27]. This construction was then generalized by Murai in [27], where it is shown that the independence complex of the polarization of any artinian monomial ideal is a simplicial ball or sphere. The original case due to Bier is the case of an artinian monomial ideal that contains the square of every variable, or, by Theorem 3.4, the independence complex of a whiskered simplicial complex. Generalized Bier balls are always balls, except for one special case where they turn out to be spheres (as shown below).

Theorem 3.4 (Independence complexes of grafted complexes). *Let Δ be a simplicial complex, let $\Gamma = \text{Ind}(\Delta)$ be the independence complex of Δ , and let $I = \mathcal{F}(\Delta) = \mathcal{N}(\Gamma) \subseteq k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. The following are equivalent.*


- Δ is grafted;
- Γ is a generalized Bier ball;
- I is the polarization of an artinian monomial ideal.

If I is the polarization of an ideal minimally generated by monomials $\{x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_n^{a_n}\} \cup A$, then Γ is vertex decomposable and $\dim(\Gamma) = a_1 + \dots + a_n - n - 1$. Moreover, Γ is a simplicial sphere if and only if $A = \emptyset$, and is otherwise a simplicial ball.

Proof. The proof of Theorem 8.2 in [15] shows that the facet ideal of a grafted simplicial complex is the polarization of an artinian monomial ideal, which by Murai [27, Lemma 3.2] is the Stanley-Reisner

ideal of a generalized Bier ball. The remaining statements are [27, Lemma 1.4, Remark 1.8]. See also [26, Theorem 2.16]. \square

Example 3.5. We will highlight the cases where we get a ball or a sphere. Let $I_1 = (ab, bc, cd)$ and $I_2 = (ab, cd)$ be polarizations of the artinian monomial ideals (x^2, xy, y^2) and (x^2, y^2) , respectively. The facet and independence complexes of I_1 and I_2 are then the following.



A byproduct of Theorem 3.4 is new conditions added to the list of equivalent conditions for facet ideals of simplicial trees (or edge ideals of graphs) to be Cohen-Macaulay. The first three equivalences in Corollary 3.6 were proved for graphs in [32] and generalized to simplicial complexes in [15]. The new items are consequences of Theorem 3.4.

Corollary 3.6 (Cohen-Macaulay (simplicial) trees). *If Δ is a simplicial tree (and in particular a graph which is a tree), then the following are equivalent.*

- Δ is unmixed;
- $R/\mathcal{F}(\Delta)$ is Cohen-Macaulay;
- Δ is grafted;
- $\text{Ind}(\Delta)$ is a generalized Bier ball;
- $\text{Ind}(\Delta)$ is vertex decomposable.

4. SIMPLICIAL BALLS AND SPHERES VIA GENERAL WHISKERING

The previous section showed that grafting a simplicial complex, which was defined in 2005 as a generalization of Villarreal’s graph whiskering from 1990, results in a simplicial complex whose independence complex is a simplicial ball or sphere. In 2012 Cook and Nagel [10] introduced another generalization of Villarreal’s graph-whiskering called the “clique-whiskering” of graphs. To clique-whisker a graph, the vertex set V is partitioned into $V = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_s$ such that the induced graph on each V_i is a clique, that is, a subset of the vertices that are all adjacent to each other. For each clique, a new vertex is added to the graph, and this new vertex is joined to all vertices in the clique. Whiskered graphs are then the case that the graph is partitioned into cliques of single vertices. The independence complexes of clique-whiskered graphs enjoy many similar properties to independence complexes of whiskered graphs, e.g., they are pure and vertex decomposable, and in particular, Cohen-Macaulay.

Biermann and Van Tuyl [4] in 2013 generalized Cook and Nagel’s construction to all simplicial complexes. In view of the earlier discussions, it is natural to ask if any of these Cohen-Macaulay “generalized whiskered complexes” of Biermann and Van Tuyl are simplicial balls or spheres. It turns out that this is rarely the case, and when it is, the generalized whiskered complex is in fact the independence complex of a grafted (or more specifically, whiskered) complex.

We begin by recalling the construction of a generalized whiskered complex from [4]. Let Δ be a simplicial complex on the vertex set V with facets F_1, \dots, F_t . An s -colouring χ is a partition $V = V_1 \cup V_2 \cup \dots \cup V_s$ such that for each $|V_i \cap F| \leq 1$ for all $i = 1, \dots, s$ and every facet F . We do allow some of the V_i to be empty.

Example 4.1 (The n -colouring). Suppose that Δ is a simplicial complex on $V = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$. Then $V = \{x_1\} \cup \{x_2\} \cup \dots \cup \{x_n\}$ is an n -colouring of Δ since $|\{x_i\} \cap F| \leq 1$ for all facets $F \in \Delta$.


From a simplicial complex Δ and an s -colouring χ , we construct another simplicial complex Δ_χ on vertex set $V \cup \{y_1, \dots, y_s\}$. For a face F of Δ , let

$$Y_F = \{y_j : F \cap V_j = \emptyset\} \subseteq \{y_1, \dots, y_s\}.$$

Then the faces of Δ_χ are the sets $F \cup G$ such that F is a face of Δ and $G \subseteq Y_F$. In particular

$$(4.1) \quad \Delta_\chi = \langle F \cup Y_F : F \in \Delta \rangle.$$

Example 4.2. Consider the simplicial complex on $\{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ given by $\Delta = \langle \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}, \{x_3, x_4\} \rangle$. Consider the colouring $\chi = \{x_1, x_4\} \cup \{x_2\} \cup \{x_3\}$ below, represented by the different shaded vertices.



Then the facets of Δ_χ , which is a simplicial complex on $\{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, y_1, y_2, y_3\}$, are

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} \{x_1, x_2, x_3\} & \{x_1, x_2, y_3\} & \{x_1, y_2, x_3\} & \{y_1, x_2, x_3\} & \{x_3, x_4, y_2\} \\ \{x_1, y_2, y_3\} & \{y_1, x_2, y_3\} & \{y_1, y_2, x_3\} & \{y_2, y_3, x_4\} & \{y_1, y_2, y_3\}. \end{array}$$

The following theorem recalls some properties of Δ_χ .

Theorem 4.3 ([4, Theorems 3.5, 3.7]). *Let Δ be a simplicial complex on $V = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$. Suppose that the partition $V = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_s$ is an s -colouring χ of Δ . Then*

- (1) $\dim \Delta_\chi = s - 1$;
- (2) Δ_χ is vertex decomposable, and thus shellable, Cohen–Macaulay, and pure.

When χ is the n -colouring described in Example 4.1, we show that Δ_χ is exactly the independence complex of a whiskered simplicial complex (Definition 3.1, see also [4, Remark 3.16]).

Proposition 4.4. *Suppose that Δ is a simplicial complex on $V = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$, and χ is the n -colouring $\{x_1\} \cup \dots \cup \{x_n\}$. Then*

- (1) every facet $G \in \Delta_\chi$ has the form

$$G = \{z_1, \dots, z_n\} \text{ where } z_i \in \{x_i, y_i\} \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n.$$

- (2) If $\Delta = \text{Ind}(\Gamma)$ for some simplicial complex Γ , then Δ_χ is the independence complex of a whiskering of Γ . In other words,

$$\mathcal{N}(\Delta_\chi) = \mathcal{N}(\Delta) + (x_1 y_1, \dots, x_n y_n).$$

Proof. Suppose $G = F \cup Y_F$ is a facet of Δ_χ for some $F \in \Delta$. Then $Y_F = \{y_j : x_j \notin F\}$ and so we cannot have both x_i and y_i in G . By Theorem 4.3 Δ_χ is a pure simplicial complex of dimension $n - 1$, so $|G| = n$. Hence, for each i either $x_i \in G$ or $y_i \in G$, but not both. This settles the first statement.

For the second statement, note that if $F = \emptyset \in \Delta$, then $F \cup Y_F = \{y_1, \dots, y_n\} \in \Delta_\chi$. Therefore, every nonface of Δ_χ must contain at least one vertex x_i . Part (1) shows that for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $x_i y_i$ is a minimal nonface of Δ_χ . The only remaining minimal nonfaces are those containing only x_i 's, and those are exactly the minimal nonfaces of Δ . Statement (2) now follows from (2.1). \square


Example 4.5. The independence complex of $\Gamma = \langle \{x_1, x_4\}, \{x_2, x_4\}, \{x_3\} \rangle$ is the simplicial complex Δ in Example 4.2. The 4-colouring $\chi = \{x_1\} \cup \{x_2\} \cup \{x_3\} \cup \{x_4\}$, produces the simplicial complex Δ_χ on vertex set $\{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4\}$ with facets

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} \{y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4\} & \{x_1, y_2, y_3, y_4\} & \{y_1, x_2, y_3, y_4\} & \{y_1, y_2, x_3, y_4\} & \{y_1, y_2, y_3, x_4\} \\ \{x_1, x_2, y_3, y_4\} & \{x_1, y_2, x_3, y_4\} & \{y_1, x_2, x_3, y_4\} & \{y_1, y_2, x_3, x_4\} & \{x_1, x_2, x_3, y_4\} \end{array}$$

which is the independence complex of a whiskering of the complex Γ , drawn below on the left. On the other hand, when χ is the 3-colouring in Example 4.2, then

$$\mathcal{N}(\Delta_\chi) = (x_1x_4, x_2x_4, x_1y_1, x_4y_1, x_2y_2, x_3y_3)$$

and Δ_χ is not the independence complex of a grafted complex, as can be seen on the right.



To classify which colourings χ make Δ_χ a sphere or a ball, we first show that it would be necessary for χ to be an n -colouring.

Theorem 4.6. *Let Δ be a simplicial complex on the vertex set $V = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ and χ a colouring of Δ . The following are equivalent:*

- (1) Δ_χ is a pseudomanifold;
- (2) χ is the n -colouring $V = \{x_1\} \cup \dots \cup \{x_n\}$;
- (3) Δ_χ is the independence complex of a whiskered complex;
- (4) Δ_χ is the independence complex of a grafted complex;
- (5) Δ_χ is a simplicial sphere if Δ is a simplex, and a simplicial ball otherwise.

Proof. (2) \Rightarrow (1) We first suppose that the s -colouring χ is $V = \{x_1\} \cup \dots \cup \{x_n\}$. Then Δ_χ is Cohen-Macaulay of dimension $n - 1$ by Theorem 4.3, and thus Δ_χ strongly-connected (see (2.2)). Consider any face $F \in \Delta_\chi$ of dimension $n - 2$. Suppose that $G \in \Delta_\chi$ is a facet that contains F . By Proposition 4.4, $G = \{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n\}$ with $z_i \in \{x_i, y_i\}$. Thus, there is some $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $F = G \setminus \{z_j\}$. So, the only facets of Δ_χ that can contain F are $F \cup \{x_j\}$ or $F \cup \{y_j\}$. Thus, each $n - 2$ dimensional face of Δ_χ is a ridge. Consequently, Δ_χ is a pseudomanifold.

(1) \Rightarrow (2) We prove the contrapositive statement. So suppose that χ is an s -colouring of Δ such that the associated partition $V = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_s$ has at least one V_i with $|V_i| \geq 2$. After relabelling, we can assume $|V_1| \geq 2$, and $u, v \in V_1$ are two distinct vertices in V_1 . Let $\{y_1, \dots, y_s\}$ denote the new vertices of Δ_χ . Then $\{y_1, \dots, y_s\}$ is a facet of Δ_χ by Equation (4.1) when we take $F = \emptyset$. So, $\{y_2, \dots, y_s\}$ is a $(s - 2)$ -dimensional face that is contained in three facets, namely, $\{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_s\}$, $\{u, y_2, \dots, y_s\}$ and $\{v, y_2, \dots, y_s\}$. Thus, Δ_χ cannot be a pseudomanifold since this face is not a ridge.

For the other implications, (2) \Rightarrow (3) follows from Proposition 4.4, (3) \Rightarrow (4) follows by definition and (4) \Rightarrow (1) follows from Theorem 3.4.

For (5), since simplicial spheres and balls are pseudomanifolds (see (2.2)), we can assume χ is the colouring $\{x_1\} \cup \dots \cup \{x_n\}$ and, by what we just proved and Proposition 4.4 (2), Δ_χ is the independence complex of a whiskering of Γ where $\text{Ind}(\Gamma) = \Delta$. By Theorem 3.4, Δ_χ is a simplicial ball, unless $\Gamma = \emptyset$, or equivalently, Δ is the full simplex. \square

Example 4.7. With the 3-colouring χ in Example 4.2, in light of Theorem 4.6, Δ_χ is not a pseudomanifold, and thus not a sphere, since the one-dimensional face $\{y_2, y_3\}$ appears in three facets. However, Δ_χ is Cohen–Macaulay by Theorem 4.3. On the other hand with the 4-colouring of the same simplicial complex Δ in Example 4.5, we obtain a complex Δ_χ which is a ball since it is the independence complex of a whiskered simplicial complex that is not a simplex.

5. SIMPLICIAL BALLS AND SPHERES AS FLAG COMPLEXES OF VERY WELL-COVERED GRAPHS

The implications in (2.2) summarized how one property of a simplicial complex leads to another one. While the reverse implications fail to hold in general, in this section we show that all the implications (except the pure property) can be reversed for independence complexes of very well-covered graphs. Some of these reverse implications were discovered earlier in [12, 24]. Our main contribution is to show that the independence complex of a Cohen-Macaulay very well-covered graph with no isolated vertices is always a simplicial ball or sphere. As a by-product of our work, we conclude that assuming the size of a facet of a pure flag complex is half the number of vertices – a restriction often considered in graph theory – is enough to make several interesting properties, such as being Cohen-Macaulay and being a simplicial ball be equivalent.


We begin by recalling some relevant graph theory. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with vertex set V and edge set E . We sometimes write $V(G)$ or $E(G)$ to highlight the vertex set or edge set belonging to G . If $W \subseteq V$, then the **induced graph of G on W** is the graph $G_W = (W, E_W)$ where $E_W = \{e \in E : e \subseteq W\}$. In other words, G_W is the subgraph of G where an edge e of G is an edge of G_W if both endpoints of e belong to W . A **cycle** on n vertices, denoted C_n , is the graph with vertex set $V = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ and edge set $E = \{\{x_i, x_{i+1}\} : i = 1, \dots, n-1\} \cup \{\{x_n, x_1\}\}$. A **clique** on n vertices, denoted K_n , is the graph with vertices $V = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ and edge set $\{\{x_i, x_j\} : 1 \leq i < j \leq n\}$. In particular, K_1 denotes a vertex. A subset $W \subseteq V$ is an **independent set** of G if for all $e \in E$, $e \not\subseteq W$. **Maximal independent sets** are independent sets that are maximal with respect to inclusion. A vertex cover of G is a notion dual to an independent set. Specifically, a subset $Y \subseteq V$ is a **vertex cover** of G if for all $e \in E$, $e \cap Y \neq \emptyset$. A vertex cover Y is **minimal** if Y is a vertex cover, but $Y \setminus \{y\}$ is not a vertex cover for all $y \in Y$. It is not hard to verify that $W \subseteq V$ is an (maximal) independent set of G if and only if $V \setminus W$ is a (minimal) vertex cover of G . A graph G is **unmixed** or **well-covered** if all of its maximal independent sets have the same cardinality. Note this is equivalent to the statement that all the minimal vertex covers have the same size.

As noted earlier, the **edge ideal** $I(G)$ of a graph G is the facet ideal of G when considered as a 1-dimensional simplicial complex. Similarly, the well-known **independence complex** of G is the complex $\text{Ind}(G)$ as defined earlier for simplicial complexes. In particular, the facets of $\text{Ind}(G)$ correspond to maximal independent sets, and $\text{Ind}(G)$ is pure if and only if G is well-covered.

A graph G is **very well-covered** if every maximal independent set has cardinality $|V|/2$. Note that this forces $|V|$ to be even. Very well-covered graphs, which were first defined [16], have appeared often within the combinatorial commutative algebra literature (see the survey [22] and the references therein). Whiskered graphs are examples of very well-covered graphs, as we now show.

Example 5.1. Let G be any graph with vertex set $V(G) = \{x_1, \dots, x_d\}$ and let $H = w(G)$ be the whiskered graph with $V(H) = \{x_1, \dots, x_d, y_1, \dots, y_d\}$. We verify that H is very well-covered by showing that every maximal independent set has $d = |V(H)|/2$ elements. Let W be an independent set of H . First note that as $\{x_i, y_i\}$ is an edge of H , at most one of x_i and y_i can be in W for each $i = 1, \dots, d$, and thus $|W| \leq d$. If $|W| < d$, then there is an i such that $x_i, y_i \notin W$, and $W \cup \{y_i\}$ is an independent set of H since y_i is only adjacent to x_i . So if W is maximal then $|W| = d$, and thus any whiskered graph is very well-covered.

The converse, however, is not true. The graph



is Cohen-Macaulay and very well-covered by [12] (see Theorem 5.3 below), but not whiskered.

As indicated earlier, some of the reverse implications of (2.2) are known to hold for the independence complexes of very well-covered graphs. We recall the specific statements below.

Theorem 5.2 ([12, Theorem 0.2], [24, Theorem 1.1], [9, Theorem 2.3]). *Let G be a very well-covered graph without isolated vertices. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) $\text{Ind}(G)$ is strongly-connected;
- (2) $I(G)$ is Cohen-Macaulay;
- (3) $\text{Ind}(G)$ is shellable;
- (4) $\text{Ind}(G)$ is vertex-decomposable.

The main result of this section is to show that we can add the conditions that $\text{Ind}(G)$ is a pseudomanifold and that $\text{Ind}(G)$ is a simplicial ball or sphere to the list of equivalent conditions of Theorem 5.2. To prove this result, we need a graph-theoretic classification of the very well-covered graphs with the property that $I(G)$ is Cohen-Macaulay.

Theorem 5.3 ([12], see also [24, Lemma 3.1]). *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a very well-covered graph with $2d$ vertices. Then $I(G)$ is Cohen-Macaulay if and only if there is a labelling of the vertices $V = \{x_1, \dots, x_d, y_1, \dots, y_d\}$ such that*

- (1) $\{x_1, \dots, x_d\}$ is a minimal vertex cover of G and $\{y_1, \dots, y_d\}$ is a maximal independent set of G ;
- (2) $\{x_i, y_i\}$ are edges of G for $i = 1, \dots, d$;
- (3) if $\{z_i, x_j\}$ and $\{y_j, x_k\}$ are edges of G for distinct i, j, k , then $\{z_i, x_k\} \in E$ for $z_i \in \{x_i, y_i\}$;
- (4) if $\{x_i, y_j\}$ is an edge of G , then $\{x_i, x_j\} \notin E$; and
- (5) if $\{x_i, y_j\}$ is an edge of G , then $i \leq j$.

We can use Theorem 5.3 to describe the facets of $\text{Ind}(G)$ when G is a very well-covered graph and $I(G)$ is Cohen-Macaulay.

Corollary 5.4. *Let G be a very well-covered graph, and suppose that $I(G)$ is Cohen-Macaulay. Let $V = \{x_1, \dots, x_d, y_1, \dots, y_d\}$ be the labelling of the vertices of G as given in Theorem 5.3. Then every facet $F \in \text{Ind}(G)$ has the form*

$$F = \{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_d\} \text{ where } z_i \in \{x_i, y_i\} \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, d.$$

Proof. Let $F \in \text{Ind}(G)$ be a facet. Since $\{x_i, y_i\}$ is an edge of G by Theorem 5.3 (2), $|F \cap \{x_i, y_i\}| \leq 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, d$ because F is an independent set. But since G is very well-covered, every maximal independent set, or equivalently, every facet, has d elements. So $|F \cap \{x_i, y_i\}| = 1$ for all i . \square

We come to our new result about pseudomanifolds. Our next statement generalizes our earlier result [11, Theorem 3.1] about the independence complexes of whiskered graphs.

Theorem 5.5. *Let G be a very well-covered graph on $2d$ vertices where $d \geq 1$ and with no isolated vertices. Then $\text{Ind}(G)$ is a pseudomanifold if and only if $I(G)$ is Cohen-Macaulay. Furthermore, if $\text{Ind}(G)$ is a pseudomanifold, then $\text{Ind}(G)$ has a boundary if and only if $G \neq dK_2$, that is, G is not the graph of d disjoint edges.*

Proof. One direction is clear by Theorem 5.2 and (2.2): if $\text{Ind}(G)$ is a pseudomanifold, then $\text{Ind}(G)$ is strongly-connected, and thus $I(G)$ is Cohen-Macaulay.

For the converse, let G be a very well-covered graph with no isolated vertices such that $I(G)$ is Cohen-Macaulay. If $G = dK_2$, then G is a whiskering of a graph with no edges, and so by Theorem 3.4 $\text{Ind}(G)$ is a simplicial sphere, and in particular a pseudomanifold with no boundary (see (2.2)).

Suppose $G \neq dK_2$ and assume the vertices of G have been labeled as in Theorem 5.3. Since G is well-covered $\text{Ind}(G)$ is pure of dimension $d - 1$, and by Theorem 5.2 $\text{Ind}(G)$ is strongly-connected. Let H be any $(d - 2)$ -dimensional face. By Corollary 5.4 H has the form $\{z_1, \dots, \hat{z}_j, \dots, z_d\}$ with $z_i \in \{x_i, y_i\}$ for all i . If F is a facet that contains H , it must have the form $H \cup \{x_j\}$ or $H \cup \{y_j\}$. That is, there are at most two facets that contain H . Thus $\text{Ind}(G)$ is a pseudomanifold.

It remains to show the second statement about the boundary when $G \neq dK_s$. With the labeling of Theorem 5.3, we consider two cases.

First suppose that $\{x_1, \dots, x_d\}$ is an independent set. Since G is not a collection of disjoint edges, there is pair $i < j$ such that $\{x_i, y_j\}$ is an edge of G . The set $H = \{y_1, \dots, \hat{y}_i, \dots, y_d\}$ is a face of dimension $d - 2$ of $\text{Ind}(G)$. It follows from Corollary 5.4 that H is contained in either the facet $H \cup \{y_i\}$ or $H \cup \{x_i\}$. But since x_i is adjacent to $y_j \in H$, the only facet containing H is $\{y_1, \dots, y_d\} \in \text{Ind}(G)$.

Next, if $\{x_1, \dots, x_d\}$ is not an independent set of G , then there is at least one edge $\{x_i, x_j\}$ among these vertices. Suppose that $i < j$. Note that $\{y_i, x_j\}$ is not an edge in G by Theorem 5.3 (5). Consequently, $\{y_i, x_j\}$ belongs to some facet H of G as every independent set belongs to a maximal independent set. Then $H \setminus \{y_i\}$ is a face of dimension $d - 2$ that is contained in H . However, it is not contained in $(H \setminus \{y_i\}) \cup \{x_i\}$ since x_i and x_j are adjacent. So $H \setminus \{y_i\}$ is only contained in the facet H .

These two cases now show that $\text{Ind}(G)$ has a boundary. □

We are now ready to summarize our new contributions to the properties of $\text{Ind}(G)$ when G is a very well-covered graph. In particular, all the reverse implications in (2.2) that do not involve the pure property hold for this class of simplicial complexes.

Corollary 5.6. *Let $d \geq 1$ and G be a very well-covered graph on $2d$ vertices with no isolated vertices. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) $\text{Ind}(G)$ is strongly connected;
- (2) $I(G)$ is Cohen-Macaulay;
- (3) $\text{Ind}(G)$ is a pseudomanifold;
- (4) $\text{Ind}(G)$ is a simplicial ball or sphere.

In particular, the following more refined statements are equivalent:

- $G = dK_2$ for some $d \geq 1$;
- $\text{Ind}(G)$ is a pseudomanifold with no boundary;
- $\text{Ind}(G)$ is a homology sphere;
- $\text{Ind}(G)$ is a simplicial sphere.

Proof. Theorems 5.2 and 5.5 show the equivalence of (1), (2) and (3). We always have (4) implies (3). It remains to show (3) implies (4). If $\text{Ind}(G)$ is a pseudomanifold with boundary, we have $I(G)$

is Cohen-Macaulay. Since $I(G)$ is Cohen-Macaulay, we know that $\text{Ind}(G)$ is shellable by Theorem 5.2. So $\text{Ind}(G)$ is a shellable pseudomanifold. The rest now follows from Theorem 5.5, and the fact that a shellable pseudomanifold is a simplicial sphere if it has no boundary, and is a simplicial ball otherwise by Theorem 2.2. \square

It follows immediately that if G is a whiskered graph, then $\text{Ind}(G)$ is a pseudomanifold, this was one of the main tools the authors used in [11, Theorem 3.1]. We can apply Corollary 5.6 to deduce a further corollary. Recall that a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a **bipartite** graph if the vertices can be partitioned as $V = V_1 \cup V_2$ such that every edge $e \in E$ satisfies $e \cap V_1 \neq \emptyset$ and $e \cap V_2 \neq \emptyset$.

Corollary 5.7 (Cohen-Macaulay bipartite graphs). *Let G be a bipartite graph with no isolated vertices. If $I(G)$ is Cohen-Macaulay, then $\text{Ind}(G)$ is a pseudomanifold. If $G \neq dK_2$ then $\text{Ind}(G)$ is a simplicial ball, and otherwise it is a simplicial sphere.*

Proof. Let $V = V_1 \cup V_2$ be the bipartition of V . Since $I(G)$ is Cohen-Macaulay, $\text{Ind}(G)$ is pure, and since V_1 and V_2 are maximal independent sets, we must have $|V_1| = |V_2| = |V|/2$. So, G must be very well-covered, since every maximal independent set must also have cardinality $|V|/2$. Now apply Corollary 5.6. \square

6. APPLICATIONS TO GORENSTEIN RINGS

In [30, Theorem II.5.1] Stanley shows that if $R/\mathcal{N}(\Delta)$ is a Gorenstein ring, where $R = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and $\mathcal{N}(\Delta)$ is the Stanley-Reisner ideal of Δ , then the simplicial complex Δ is either a k -homology sphere, or a cone over some k -homology sphere. In particular, if every variable of R divides a generator of $\mathcal{N}(\Delta)$, then $R/\mathcal{N}(\Delta)$ is Gorenstein if and only if Δ is a k -homology sphere, and in particular, Δ has non-trivial homology.

Throughout this paper, we have shown that two classes of complexes, namely the independence complexes of grafted complexes and very well-covered graphs are always balls, except in the cases where their respective Stanley-Reisner ideals are complete intersections. In a different language, our result implies the following:

Proposition 6.1. *Let I be a square-free monomial ideal such that either*

- (1) *the facet complex of I is grafted, or*
- (2) *the facet complex of I is a very-well covered graph.*

Then I is Gorenstein if and only if it is a complete intersection.

Proof. Let Δ be the Stanley-Reisner complex of I and assume Δ is either the independence complex of a grafted complex or the independence complex of a very well-covered graph. By Theorems 3.4 and 5.3 we know Δ is not a cone over a face, and in particular by [30, Theorem 5.1 Part 2], if I is Gorenstein, Δ must have non-trivial homology. The result then follows since by Theorems 3.4 and 5.5 Δ has non-trivial homology exactly when the corresponding Stanley-Reisner ideal is a complete intersection. \square

Remark 6.2. Since polarization preserves the Gorenstein property, and the polarization of every artinian monomial ideal is grafted (Theorem 3.4), Proposition 6.1 (1) can be seen as a different proof for the fact that the only Gorenstein artinian monomial ideals are the monomial artinian complete intersections.

In the case of edge ideals, known results from graph theory on well-covered graphs [17, 28] can be used to directly obtain more information on the classification of Gorenstein edge ideals. For the sake of completeness, below we include a proof of a slightly weaker version of [20, Remark 3.5] to showcase

how the techniques from this paper can be applied to the problem of classifying Gorenstein square-free monomial ideals.

Proposition 6.3 (see [20, Remark 3.5]). *Suppose that G is a graph such that $I(G)$ is Gorenstein. Then the connected components of G are either K_1 , K_2 , or graphs with girth ≤ 5 .*

Proof. By [31, Lemma 2.2], G is a Gorenstein graph if and only if each connected component of G is Gorenstein. A direct computation shows that K_1 and K_2 are Gorenstein. So, it suffices to show that if G is a connected Gorenstein graph with $G \neq K_1$ and $G \neq K_2$, its girth is at most five.

Since $I(G)$ is Gorenstein, $I(G)$ is Cohen-Macaulay, and thus G is well-covered. Suppose G has girth six or greater. By [17, Corollary 5], either $G = C_7$, or G is whiskered. Since $I(C_7)$ is not Cohen-Macaulay, C_7 is also not Gorenstein. Hence, we only have to show G is not whiskered.

To see that G cannot be a whiskered graph, note that by [30, Theorem II.5.1] the independence complexes of Gorenstein graphs without isolated vertices correspond to flag homology spheres. In particular, the independence complex of G has non-trivial homology. However, the independence complex of a whiskered graph that is not dK_2 is a simplicial ball by Corollary 5.6 and hence has trivial homology. So we conclude G cannot be a whiskered graph. So the girth of G is at most five. \square

Acknowledgments. Part of the work on this project took place at the Fields Institute in Toronto, Canada where some of the authors participated in the “Thematic Program in Commutative Algebra and Applications”. Faridi, Holleben, Nicklasson, and Van Tuyl thank Fields for the financial support they received. Cooper’s research is supported by NSERC Discovery Grant 2024-05444. Faridi’s research is supported by NSERC Discovery Grant 2023-05929. Van Tuyl’s research is supported by NSERC Discovery Grant 2024-05299.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ayah Almousa, Gunnar Fløystad, and Henning Lohne, *Polarizations of powers of graded maximal ideals*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **226** (2022), no. 5, Paper No. 106924, 33. MR4328650
- [2] N. J. Alves, *On pure vertex decomposable graphs and their dominating shedding vertices*, Master’s Thesis, 2017.
- [3] Thomas Bier, *A remark on alexander duality and the disjoint join*, Preprint (1992).
- [4] Jennifer Biermann and Adam Van Tuyl, *Balanced vertex decomposable simplicial complexes and their h-vectors*, Electron. J. Combin. **20** (2013), no. 3, Paper 15, 12.
- [5] Louis J. Billera and Eran Nevo, *Nonpolytopal nonsimplicial lattice spheres with nonnegative toric g-vector*, Discrete Comput. Geom. **48** (2012), no. 4, 1048–1057. MR3000574
- [6] A. Björner, *Topological methods*, Handbook of combinatorics, Vol. 1, 2, 1995, pp. 1819–1872.
- [7] Anders Björner, Andreas Paffenholz, Jonas Sjöstrand, and Günter M. Ziegler, *Bier spheres and posets*, Discrete Comput. Geom. **34** (2005), no. 1, 71–86. MR2140883
- [8] J. I. Brown and B. Cameron, *On the unimodality of independence polynomials of very well-covered graphs*, Discrete Math. **341** (2018), no. 4, 1138–1143. MR3764366
- [9] Alexandru Constantinescu and Matteo Varbaro, *On the h-vectors of Cohen-Macaulay flag complexes*, Math. Scand. **112** (2013), no. 1, 86–111. MR3057601
- [10] David Cook II and Uwe Nagel, *Cohen-Macaulay graphs and face vectors of flag complexes*, SIAM J. Discrete Math. **26** (2012), no. 1, 89–101.
- [11] Susan M. Cooper, Sara Faridi, Thiago Holleben, Lisa Nicklasson, and Adam Van Tuyl, *The weak Lefschetz property of whiskered graphs*, Lefschetz properties—current and new directions, 2024, pp. 97–110.
- [12] Marilena Crupi, Giancarlo Rinaldo, and Naoki Terai, *Cohen-Macaulay edge ideal whose height is half of the number of vertices*, Nagoya Math. J. **201** (2011), 117–131.
- [13] Mark de Longueville, *Bier spheres and barycentric subdivision*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **105** (2004), no. 2, 355–357. MR2046088
- [14] Sara Faridi, *The facet ideal of a simplicial complex*, Manuscripta Math. **109** (2002), no. 2, 159–174.
- [15] ———, *Cohen-Macaulay properties of square-free monomial ideals*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **109** (2005), no. 2, 299–329.

- [16] O. Favaron, *Very well covered graphs*, Discrete Math. **42** (1982), no. 2-3, 177–187.
- [17] A. Finbow, B. Hartnell, and R. J. Nowakowski, *A characterization of well covered graphs of girth 5 or greater*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B **57** (1993), no. 1, 44–68.
- [18] Gunnar Fløystad, Ine Gabrielsen, and Amir Mafi, *Polarizations of artin monomial ideals*, arXiv:2212.09528 [math.AC] (2025).
- [19] Roberto Frucht and Frank Harary, *On the corona of two graphs*, Aequationes Math. **4** (1970), 322–325. MR281659
- [20] Do Trong Hoang and Tran Nam Trung, *A characterization of triangle-free Gorenstein graphs and Cohen-Macaulayness of second powers of edge ideals*, J. Algebraic Combin. **43** (2016), no. 2, 325–338.
- [21] Filip D. Jevtić, Marinko Timotijević, and Rade T. Živaljević, *Polytopal Bier spheres and Kantorovich-Rubinstein polytopes of weighted cycles*, Discrete Comput. Geom. **65** (2021), no. 4, 1275–1286. MR4249903
- [22] K. Kimura, M. R. Pournaki, S. A. Seyed Fakhari, N. Terai, and S. Yassemi, *A glimpse to most of the old and new results on very well-covered graphs from the viewpoint of commutative algebra*, Res. Math. Sci. **9** (2022), no. 2, Paper No. 29, 18.
- [23] Vadim E. Levit and Eugen Mandrescu, *Independence polynomials of well-covered graphs: generic counterexamples for the unimodality conjecture*, European J. Combin. **27** (2006), no. 6, 931–939.
- [24] Mohammad Mahmoudi, Amir Mousivand, Marilena Crupi, Giancarlo Rinaldo, Naoki Terai, and Siamak Yassemi, *Vertex decomposability and regularity of very well-covered graphs*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **215** (2011), no. 10, 2473–2480.
- [25] Jiří Matoušek, *Using the Borsuk-Ulam theorem*, Universitext, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003. Lectures on topological methods in combinatorics and geometry, Written in cooperation with Anders Björner and Günter M. Ziegler.
- [26] Susan Morey, Enrique Reyes, and Rafael H. Villarreal, *Cohen-Macaulay, shellable and unmixed clutters with a perfect matching of König type*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **212** (2008), no. 7, 1770–1786.
- [27] Satoshi Murai, *Spheres arising from multicomplexes*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **118** (2011), no. 8, 2167–2184.
- [28] Michael R. Pinter, *A class of planar well-covered graphs with girth four*, J. Graph Theory **19** (1995), no. 1, 69–81. MR1315426
- [29] Gerald Allen Reisner, *Cohen-Macaulay quotients of polynomial rings*, Advances in Math. **21** (1976), no. 1, 30–49.
- [30] Richard P. Stanley, *Combinatorics and commutative algebra*, Second, Progress in Mathematics, vol. 41, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1996.
- [31] Tran Nam Trung, *A characterization of Gorenstein planar graphs*, The 50th anniversary of Gröbner bases, 2018, pp. 399–409. MR3839715
- [32] Rafael H. Villarreal, *Cohen-Macaulay graphs*, Manuscripta Math. **66** (1990), no. 3, 277–293.

(S. M. Cooper) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA, WINNIPEG, MB, CANADA R3T 2M6
Email address: susan.cooper@umanitoba.ca

(S. Faridi) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS & STATISTICS, DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY, 6297 CASTINE WAY, PO BOX 15000, HALIFAX, NS, CANADA B3H 4R2
Email address: faridi@dal.ca

(T. Holleben) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS & STATISTICS, DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY, 6297 CASTINE WAY, PO BOX 15000, HALIFAX, NS, CANADA B3H 4R2
Email address: hollebenthiago@dal.ca

(L. Nicklasson) DIVISION OF MATHEMATICS AND PHYSICS, MÄLARDALEN UNIVERSITY, UNIVERSITETSPLAN 1, 722 18 VÄSTERÅS, SWEDEN
Email address: lisa.nicklasson@mdu.se

(A. Van Tuyl) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS MCMMASTER UNIVERSITY, HAMILTON, ON, L8S 4L8
Email address: vantuyula@mcmaster.ca