

LEVELABLE GRAPHS

KIERAN BHASKARA, MICHAEL Y. C. CHONG, TAKAYUKI HIBI, NAVEENA RAGUNATHAN,
AND ADAM VAN TUYL

ABSTRACT. We study a family of positive weighted well-covered graphs, which we call levelable graphs, that are related to a construction of level artinian rings in commutative algebra. A graph G is levelable if there exists a weight function with positive integer values on the vertices of G such that G is well-covered with respect to this weight function. That is, the sum of the weights in any maximal independent set of vertices of G is the same. We describe some of the basic properties of levelable graphs and classify the levelable graphs for some families of graphs, e.g., trees, cubic circulants, Cameron–Walker graphs. We also explain the connection between levelable graphs and a class of level artinian rings. Applying a result of Brown and Nowakowski about weighted well-covered graphs, we show that for most graphs, their edge ideals are not Cohen–Macaulay.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we introduce levelable graphs, a family of weighted well-covered graphs that can be used to be construct level artinian rings, objects of great interest in commutative algebra. Throughout this paper $G = (V, E)$ denotes a finite simple graph on the vertex set $V = V(G) = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ and with edge set $E = E(G)$. A subset W of V is an *independent* set if $e \not\subset W$ for all edges $e \in E$. We say W is a *maximal independent* set if no independent set of G strictly includes W . Let $\text{MaxInd}(G)$ denote the set of maximal independent sets of G . In 1970 Plummer [22] called a graph *well-covered* if every element of $\text{MaxInd}(G)$ has the same cardinality.

Weighted well-covered graphs, a generalization of well-covered graphs, were introduced in 1998 by Caro, Ellingham, and Ramey [5]. For a fixed field F , a *weight function* on G is a function $w : V(G) \rightarrow F$ that assigns to vertex $x_i \in V(G)$ a weight c_i . Note that we can view any $(c_1, \dots, c_n) \in F^{|V|}$ as a weight function on G . A graph G with a weight function (c_1, \dots, c_n) is a *weighted well-covered graph* if there is a $c \in F$ such that

$$\sum_{x_i \in W} c_i = c \text{ for all } W \in \text{MaxInd}(G).$$

In this case, c is called the *independence weight* of G . In this language, a graph is well-covered if G is a weighted well-covered graph with respect to the weight function $(1, \dots, 1)$, and the independence weight is the common cardinality of the maximum independent sets. Associated to any graph G is the vector space $\text{WCW}(G)$ which consists of all weight functions (c_1, \dots, c_n) that make G a weighted well-covered graph. Understanding the

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05C69, 05E40, 13E10.

Key words and phrases. well-covered graphs, level algebra, independence complex.

Version: April 4, 2025.

structure of $WCW(G)$ has been the focus of one branch of research surrounding weighted well-covered graphs; see, for example, [1, 3, 4, 5, 19, 20, 24].

When the field F is \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{Q} , Caro, *et al.* [5] defined a *positive well-covered weighting* to be a weight function (c_1, \dots, c_n) that not only makes G weighted well-covered, but $c_i > 0$ for all i . As they remark in [5, p. 653]:

We would guess that determining whether a positive well-covered weighting exists is, in general, a difficult problem.

We are interested in a variation of this “difficult problem” by also requiring the c_i ’s in the weight function to be positive integers. To this end, we make the following definition:

Definition 1.1. A graph G is a *levelable graph* if there exists a weight function

$$(c_1, \dots, c_n) \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}^n$$

that makes G a weighted well-covered graph. In this case, we say G is a levelable graph with respect to the weight function (c_1, \dots, c_n) .

Our choice of name is inspired by the fact that a levelable graph allows one to construct a level graded artinian ring. Level rings were introduced by Stanley [23] almost 50 years ago as a class of rings that sits “between” Gorenstein rings and Cohen–Macaulay rings. Understanding the properties of level rings has inspired a significant amount of research, including [10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 21], in commutative algebra. By applying a result of Van Tuyl and Zanella [25], we have the following link between graph theory and commutative algebra:

Theorem 1.2. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph, and let $I(G)$ be the edge ideal of G in the ring $R = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Then G is a levelable graph with respect to the weight function (c_1, \dots, c_n) if and only if*

$$R/(I(G) + \langle x_1^{c_1+1}, \dots, x_n^{c_n+1} \rangle)$$

is a level graded artinian ring.

This connection with combinatorial commutative algebra, as well as the “difficult problem” mentioned above, provides motivation to classify or find families of levelable graphs.

It is immediate that levelable graphs exist – all well-covered graphs are levelable with weight function $(1, \dots, 1)$. The goal of this paper is to identify other families of levelable graphs. Accordingly, we classify all the levelable graphs among the following families:

- Complete multipartite graphs (see Corollary 2.3),
- Cameron–Walker graphs (see Theorem 4.2),
- Co-chordal graphs (see Theorem 5.2),
- Trees (see Theorem 5.4), and
- Cubic circulant graphs (see Theorems 6.4 and 6.5).

We also provide constructions of levelable graphs, and obstructions that prevent G from being levelable.

As an interesting by-product of this new connection between weighted well-covered graphs and graded artinian level rings, we can use results about the vector space $WCW(G)$

to deduce some results in combinatorial commutative algebra. In particular, Brown and Nowakowski [4] showed that for a random graph (suitably defined), the expected dimension of $WCW(G)$ is zero. This implies that for a random graph G , there is no choice of positive integers (a_1, \dots, a_n) that makes

$$R/(I(G) + \langle x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_n^{a_n} \rangle)$$

a level graded artinian ring (see Corollary 7.8). Moreover, Brown and Nowakowski's result allows us to show that for a random graph G , $R/I(G)$ is not Cohen–Macaulay (see Corollary 7.9), complementing results of Docthermann–Newman [8, Corollary 1.4] and Erman–Yang [9, Corollary 7.1].

We have structured this paper so that the first part focuses on the properties of levelable graphs. Only in the last section do we introduce the relevant commutative algebra in order to keep the background on algebra to a minimum. In Section 2 we include some basic properties of levelable graphs and provide a useful lemma that describes an obstruction to a graph being levelable. Section 3 includes some constructions of levelable graphs from a given levelable graph. The sections that follow classify the levelable graphs among some families of graphs. In the final section, we explain the connection to commutative algebra, which motivated our original interest in these graphs, and explain how a result of Brown and Nowakowski has consequences for combinatorial commutative algebra.

2. BASIC PROPERTIES OF LEVELABLE GRAPHS

We begin by exhibiting some of the basic properties and families of levelable graphs. We first note that we can restrict to *connected* graphs, that is, for any two vertices of G , there is a path in G that connects the two vertices.

Lemma 2.1. *Let G and H be disjoint graphs. Then $G \cup H$ is levelable if and only if G and H are levelable.*

Proof. Let G be a graph on $V(G) = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ and H a graph on $V(H) = \{y_1, \dots, y_m\}$. Because the graphs G and H are disjoint, we have

$$\text{MaxInd}(G \cup H) = \{W \cup Y \mid W \in \text{MaxInd}(G), Y \in \text{MaxInd}(H)\}.$$

(“If”) Suppose that G and H are levelable with respect to the weight functions (c_1, \dots, c_n) and (d_1, \dots, d_m) , respectively. Let c be the independence weight of G and d the independence weight of H . We claim that $G \cup H$ is a levelable graph with respect to the weight function $(c_1, \dots, c_n, d_1, \dots, d_m)$. Indeed, for any $Z \in \text{MaxInd}(G \cup H)$, we have $Z = W \cup Y$ with $W \cap Y = \emptyset$ and $W \in \text{MaxInd}(G)$ and $Y \in \text{MaxInd}(H)$. Thus

$$\sum_{z_i \in Z} e_i = \sum_{x_i \in W} c_i + \sum_{y_j \in Y} d_j = c + d.$$

(“Only If”) Suppose that $G \cup H$ is levelable with respect to the weight function

$$(e_1, \dots, e_n, e_{n+1}, \dots, e_{n+m})$$

with independence weight e . We claim G and H are levelable with respect to the weight functions $c = (e_1, \dots, e_n)$ and $d = (e_{n+1}, \dots, e_{n+m})$, respectively. Fix a maximal independent set Y of H and consider any $W_i \in \text{MaxInd}(G)$. Then $W_i \cup Y \in \text{MaxInd}(G \cup H)$ and so

$$\sum_{z_j \in W_i \cup Y} e_j = \sum_{z_j \in W_i} e_j + \sum_{z_j \in Y} e_j = e.$$

Rearranging this equation, we have

$$(2.1) \quad \sum_{z_j \in W_i} e_j = e - \sum_{z_j \in Y} e_j.$$

Note that since W_i is a subset of $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$, the e_j 's that appear in $\sum_{z_j \in W_i} e_j$ only appear among $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$. Because (2.1) is true for all maximal independent sets of G , (e_1, \dots, e_n) is a weight function that makes G a levelable graph with independence weight $e - \sum_{z_j \in Y} e_j$.

By swapping the roles of G and H , the same proof also shows that H is levelable. \square

As noted in the introduction, all well-covered graphs are levelable. The following lemma allows us to deduce that all complete multipartite graphs, which are not necessarily well-covered, are levelable. Consequently, the set of levelable graphs is strictly larger than the class of well-covered graphs.

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose G is a graph such that the elements of $\text{MaxInd}(G)$ are pairwise disjoint. Then G is a levelable graph.*

Proof. Suppose $\text{MaxInd}(G) = \{W_1, \dots, W_t\}$ with $d_i = |W_i|$ for $i = 1, \dots, t$. Since every vertex x_i appears in some W_i and because the W_i 's are pairwise disjoint, we have that $W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_t$ is a partition of $V(G)$. Thus, after relabeling, we can assume that

$$W_i = \{x_{d_1+d_2+\dots+d_{i-1}+1}, \dots, x_{d_1+d_2+\dots+d_i}\} \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, t,$$

where $d_0 = 0$.

Set $d = \text{lcm}(d_1, \dots, d_t)$. A straightforward calculation will now show G is a levelable graph with respect to the weight function

$$\underbrace{(d/d_1, \dots, d/d_1)}_{d_1}, \underbrace{(d/d_2, \dots, d/d_2)}_{d_2}, \dots, \underbrace{(d/d_t, \dots, d/d_t)}_{d_t}.$$

\square

For integers $d, a_1, \dots, a_d \geq 1$, the *complete d -partite graph* K_{a_1, \dots, a_d} is the graph with vertices $V = \{x_{i,j} \mid 1 \leq i \leq d, 1 \leq j \leq a_i\}$ and edges of the form $\{x_{i,j}, x_{k,l}\}$ for all $1 \leq i < k \leq d$. Note that with this notation, the well-known complete graph K_d is the graph $K_{1, \dots, 1}$.¹ Since the maximal independent sets of K_{a_1, \dots, a_d} are the pairwise disjoint sets $W_i = \{x_{i,1}, \dots, x_{i,a_i}\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, d$, we have the following corollary.

¹This is an abuse of notation, since our notation for a complete multipartite graph would imply that K_d should be the 1-partite graph consisting of d isolated vertices. Moving forward, we will use the standard notation of K_d for the complete graph.

Corollary 2.3. *For all $d, a_1, \dots, a_d \geq 1$, the complete d -partite graph K_{a_1, \dots, a_d} is levelable.*

The *independence number* of G , denoted $\alpha(G)$, is the size of the largest maximal independent set of G . If $\alpha(G)$ is small, then G must also be levelable.

Theorem 2.4. *If G is a graph on $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ with $\alpha(G) \leq 2$, then G is levelable.*

Proof. If $\alpha(G) = 1$, then $G = K_a$ is the complete a -partite graph (or simply, complete graph) and is levelable by Theorem 2.3.

Suppose that $\alpha(G) = 2$. If all $W \in \text{MaxInd}(G)$ have $|W| = 2$, then G is well-covered, and thus levelable. So, suppose that $|W| = 1$ for at least one $W \in \text{MaxInd}(G)$. Let $\text{MaxInd}(G) = \{W_1, \dots, W_t\}$. After relabeling we can assume that $|W_1| = \dots = |W_s| = 1$ and $|W_{s+1}| = \dots = |W_t| = 2$. Note that if $|W_j| = 1$, then $W_j \cap W_k = \emptyset$ for all $j \neq k$. So, we can relabel again so that $W_i = \{x_i\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, s$, and $W_{s+1} \cup \dots \cup W_t = \{x_{s+1}, \dots, x_n\}$. Then G is levelable with respect to the weight function

$$c = (\underbrace{2, \dots, 2}_s, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{n-s})$$

since $\sum_{x_i \in W_i} c_i = 2$ if $|W_i| = 1$ and $\sum_{x_i \in W_i} c_i = 2$ if $|W_i| = 2$. \square

We let C_n denote the n -cycle on n -vertices with $n \geq 3$. For any graph G , we write G^c for the *graph complement* of G , that is, the graph with the same vertex set as G , but edge set $\{\{x_i, x_j\} : \{x_i, x_j\} \notin E(G)\}$. When $n = 3$, C_n^c is three disjoint vertices, and thus clearly levelable. On the other hand, $\alpha(C_n^c) = 2$ if $n \geq 4$. Consequently, we have the following corollary:

Corollary 2.5. *For any $n \geq 3$, C_n^c is levelable.*

The next example exhibits a non-levelable graph with $\alpha(G) = 3$. In fact, this example illustrates that levelable graphs are not preserved by taking induced subgraphs.

Example 2.6. Let P_n denote the *path graph* of length $n - 1$ on $n \geq 2$ vertices, that is, the graph with vertex set $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ and edge set $\{\{x_i, x_{i+1}\} : 1 \leq i \leq n - 1\}$. We show that P_5 (see Figure 1) is not levelable. We see that $\text{MaxInd}(P_5) = \{\{x_1, x_3, x_5\}, \{x_1, x_4\}, \{x_2, x_4\}, \{x_2, x_5\}\}$, and thus $\alpha(G) = 3$. Suppose that a weight





FIGURE 1. The path P_5 which is non-levelable

function (c_1, \dots, c_5) makes P_5 levelable. Then

$$(c_1 + c_3 + c_5) + (c_2 + c_4) = (c_1 + c_4) + (c_2 + c_5).$$

Consequently $c_3 = 0$, contradicting the fact that the entries of (c_1, \dots, c_5) are all positive.

The graph given in Figure 2 is a well-covered graph that has P_5 as an induced subgraph. Consequently, the levelable property is not preserved by taking induced subgraphs.

FIGURE 2. A levelable graph with P_5 as an induced subgraph

Embedded in Example 2.6 is a condition on the elements of $\text{MaxInd}(G)$ that prevents G from being levelable. We make this condition explicit in the next lemma.

Lemma 2.7. *Suppose there exist $F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4 \in \text{MaxInd}(G)$ such that $F_3 \cup F_4 \subsetneq F_1 \cup F_2$ and $F_3 \cap F_4 = \emptyset$. Then G is not levelable.*

Proof. Suppose towards a contradiction that (c_1, \dots, c_n) is a weight function for G with independence weight c . Then $\sum_{x_j \in F_1} c_j + \sum_{x_j \in F_2} c_j = \sum_{x_j \in F_3} c_j + \sum_{x_j \in F_4} c_j = 2c$. Since $c_j > 0$ for all j , and $F_3 \cup F_4 \subsetneq F_1 \cup F_2$, we must have

$$\sum_{x_j \in F_3 \cup F_4} c_j < \sum_{x_j \in F_1 \cup F_2} c_j \leq \sum_{x_j \in F_1} c_j + \sum_{x_j \in F_2} c_j = 2c.$$

But then since $F_3 \cap F_4 = \emptyset$, we have

$$2c = \sum_{x_j \in F_3} c_j + \sum_{x_j \in F_4} c_j = \sum_{x_j \in F_3 \cup F_4} c_j < 2c,$$

which is impossible. \square

This next result, which can also be deduced from Theorem 5.4 given later in the paper, demonstrates how to apply Lemma 2.7.

Corollary 2.8. *The path graph P_n is levelable if and only if $n \in \{2, 3, 4\}$.*

Proof. When $n = 2, 3$, or 4 , the graph P_n is well-covered, and thus levelable. Suppose that $n \geq 5$. Suppose that $n = 2m + 1$ is odd. Then

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 &= \{x_1, x_3, \dots, x_{2m-1}, x_{2m+1}\}, & F_2 &= \{x_2, x_4, \dots, x_{2m}\}, \\ F_3 &= \{x_1, x_4, x_6, \dots, x_{2m}\} & \text{and } F_4 &= \{x_2, x_5, x_7, \dots, x_{2m+1}\} \end{aligned}$$

are all elements of $\text{MaxInd}(G)$. The result now follows from Lemma 2.7.

Similarly, if $n = 2m$ is even, we have $m \geq 3$, and we consider the sets:

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 &= \{x_1, x_3, \dots, x_{2m-1}\}, & F_2 &= \{x_2, x_4, \dots, x_{2m}\}, \\ F_3 &= \{x_1, x_4, x_6, \dots, x_{2m}\} & \text{and } F_4 &= \{x_2, x_5, x_7, \dots, x_{2m-1}\} \end{aligned}$$

and again use Lemma 2.7. \square

Remark 2.9. While our paper has focused on independent sets, we also could have used the notion of vertex covers to define levelable graphs. A subset $W \subseteq V(G)$ is called a *vertex cover* if $e \cap W \neq \emptyset$ for all $e \in E(G)$. A vertex cover is the complement of an

independent set, that is, W is a vertex cover of G if and only if $V \setminus W$ is an independent set. Maximal independent sets correspond to minimal vertex covers.

If we let $\text{MinVC}(G)$ be the collection of minimal vertex covers, then the following definition for levelable graphs is equivalent to Definition 1.1: a graph G is levelable if there exists a weight function $(d_1, \dots, d_n) \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}^n$ and some constant d such that

$$\sum_{x_i \in W} d_i = d \text{ for all } W \in \text{MinVC}(G).$$

To see that these definitions are equivalent, set $D = d_1 + \dots + d_n$. Then

$$\sum_{x_i \in V \setminus W} d_i = D - \sum_{x_i \in W} d_i = D - d.$$

But as W runs through all elements of $\text{MinVC}(G)$, $V \setminus W$ runs through all elements of $\text{MaxInd}(G)$. So G is levelable with respect to Definition 1.1. By simply reversing this argument, we can show Definition 1.1 is equivalent to this reformulation.

3. CONSTRUCTIONS

In this section, we introduce basic techniques to construct a new levelable graph from a levelable graph.

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

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

$$E(G^x) = E(G) \cup \{\{y, b\} : \{x, b\} \in E(G)\}.$$

- The graph $G^{[x]}$, called the *expansion* of G at x , is the finite graph obtained by adding a new vertex y to G with

$$E(G^{[x]}) = E(G^x) \cup \{\{x, y\}\}.$$

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose that G is a levelable graph and fix a vertex x of G . Then both G^x and $G^{[x]}$ are levelable.*

Proof. Let G be a levelable graph on $V = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ with respect to a weight function (c_1, \dots, c_n) . Set $x = x_n$ and $y = x_{n+1}$.

Let W be a maximal independent set of G^x . If $x \notin W$, then W is a maximal independent set of G . If $x \in W$, then $y \in W$ and $W \setminus \{y\}$ is a maximal independent set of G . Hence G^x is levelable with respect to the weight function

$$(2c_1, \dots, 2c_{n-1}, c_n, c_n).$$

A maximal independent set W of $G^{[x]}$ is either a maximal independent set of G or $(W \setminus \{x\}) \cup \{y\}$, where W is a maximal independent set of G with $x \in W$. Hence $G^{[x]}$ is levelable with respect to the weight function

$$(c_1, \dots, c_{n-1}, c_n, c_n).$$

□

Example 3.3. The pentagon is levelable since it is a well-covered graph. Then repeated applications of the duplication technique shows that the graph of Figure 3 is levelable.




FIGURE 3. A pentagon with duplications

Corollary 3.4. Let G be a levelable graph on $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ with respect to a weight function (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n) . Then for any positive integers r_1, \dots, r_n , there is a graph G' which is levelable with respect to the weight function

$$(3.1) \quad \underbrace{(c_1, c_1, \dots, c_1)}_{r_1}, \underbrace{(c_2, c_2, \dots, c_2)}_{r_2}, \dots, \underbrace{(c_n, c_n, \dots, c_n)}_{r_n}.$$

Proof. Let r_i be the number of c_i in (3.1). Then doing r_i expansions of each vertex x_i yields the desired graph G' . \square

Remark 3.5. Let G be a graph consisting of n isolated vertices. Since $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ is the unique maximal independent set of G , it follows that G is levelable with respect to any weight function (c_1, \dots, c_n) . In particular, given any sequence (c_1, \dots, c_n) of positive integers, there is a levelable graph on $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ with respect to (c_1, \dots, c_n) . Let $n = 3$. Then the connected graphs are the triangle and the path of length 2. Hence given a sequence (c_1, c_2, c_3) of positive integers with $c_1 \leq c_2 \leq c_3$, there is a connected levelable graph on $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ with respect to (c_1, c_2, c_3) if and only if either $c_1 = c_2 = c_3$ or $c_3 = c_1 + c_2$. It would, of course, be of interest to classify all possible weight functions for connected levelable graphs. Note that if G is a levelable graph on $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ with respect to a weight function (c_1, \dots, c_n) , then G is also levelable with respect to the weight function (mc_1, \dots, mc_n) , where m is a positive integer.

Definition 3.6. Let G be a finite connected graph on $V(G) = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$. Given finite graphs H_1, \dots, H_n with each $V(H_i) = \{z_1^{(i)}, \dots, z_{r_i}^{(i)}\}$, where $V(G), V(H_1), \dots, V(H_n)$ are pairwise disjoint, we introduce the finite graph $G(H_1, \dots, H_n)$ on $V(G) \cup V(H_1) \cup \dots \cup V(H_n)$ whose set of edges is

$$E(G) \cup E(H_1) \cup \dots \cup E(H_n) \cup \left(\bigcup_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq n \\ 1 \leq j \leq r_i}} \{\{x_i, z_j^{(i)}\}\} \right).$$

Theorem 3.7. *With the notation as in Definition 3.6, the graph $G(H_1, \dots, H_n)$ is levelable if and only if each H_i is levelable.*

In particular, if each H_i is a complete graph K_{r_i} , then $G(H_1, \dots, H_n)$ is levelable.

Proof. Let $\Gamma = G(H_1, \dots, H_n)$. A maximal independent set of Γ consists of an independent set W_0 of G together with maximal independent sets W_i of H_i for each i such that $x_i \notin W_0$.

(“If”) Suppose that each H_i is levelable with respect to a weight function

$$(c(z_1^{(i)}), \dots, c(z_{r_i}^{(i)})).$$

Let $d_i = \sum_{z_j^{(i)} \in W} c(z_j^{(i)})$ be its independence weight, where W is a maximal independent set of H_i . Let $c(x_i) = d_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. It can be checked that Γ is levelable with respect to the weight function

$$(3.2) \quad (c(x_1), \dots, c(x_n), c(z_1^{(1)}), \dots, c(z_{r_n}^{(n)})).$$

(“Only If”) Suppose that Γ is levelable with respect to a weight function of the form (3.2). Let W be a maximal independent set of Γ with $x_i \notin W$ and W_i a maximal independent set of H_i with $W_i \subset W$. Let W'_i be a maximal independent set of H_i with $W_i \neq W'_i$. Since $(W \setminus W_i) \cup W'_i$ is a maximal independent set of Γ , it follows that H_i is levelable with respect to the weight function $(c(z_1^{(i)}), \dots, c(z_{r_i}^{(i)}))$. \square

Corollary 3.8. *Given positive integers c_1, \dots, c_n , there is a connected levelable graph on $V = \{x_1, \dots, x_{2n}\}$ with respect to the weight function*

$$(c_1, c_1, c_2, c_2, \dots, c_n, c_n).$$

Proof. Let P_n be the path on $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$. We introduce the graph G on

$$\{x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n\}$$

which is obtained by adding edges $\{x_1, y_1\}, \dots, \{x_n, y_n\}$ to P_n . Theorem 3.7 says that G is levelable. A maximal independent set of G is of the form $A \cup B$, where A is an independent set of P_n and $B = \{y_i : x_i \notin A\}$. Hence G is levelable with respect to the weight function

$$(c(x_1), c(y_1), \dots, c(x_n), c(y_n)) = (c_1, c_1, c_2, c_2, \dots, c_n, c_n).$$

\square

Remark 3.9. In the proof of Corollary 3.8, since G is well-covered, it follows that G is also levelable with respect to the weight function $(1, \dots, 1)$.

Corollary 3.10. *Given positive integers c_1, \dots, c_n , there is a connected levelable graph on $V = \{x_1, \dots, x_n, \dots, x_N\}$ with respect to the weight function*

$$(c_1, \dots, c_n, 1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{Z}^N,$$

where

$$N = n + \sum_{i=1}^n c_i.$$

Proof. Let P_n be the path on $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$. We introduce the graph G on

$$\{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \cup \{y_j^{(i)} : 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq c_i\}$$

which is obtained by adding edges $\{x_i, y_1^{(i)}\}, \dots, \{x_i, y_{c_i}^{(i)}\}$ to P_n . Theorem 3.7 says that G is levelable. A maximal independent set of G is of the form $A \cup B$, where A is an independent set of P_n and $B = \{y_j^{(i)} : x_i \notin A, 1 \leq j \leq c_i\}$. Hence G is levelable with respect to the weight function

$$(c(x_1), \dots, c(x_n), c(y_1^{(1)}), \dots, c(y_{c_n}^{(n)})) = (c_1, \dots, c_n, 1, 1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{Z}^N.$$

□

4. CAMERON–WALKER GRAPHS

We now turn to the discussion of the problem of which Cameron–Walker graphs are levelable. A Cameron–Walker graph [6, 18] is a finite graph consisting of a connected bipartite graph with vertex partition $U \cup V$ such that there is at least one leaf (or pendant edge) attached to each $x \in U$ and that there may be possibly some pendant triangles attached to each $y \in V$. A vertex $y \in V$ is called *exceptional* if there is no pendant triangle attached to y . It will be assumed that, for each exceptional $y \in V$, there exists $x, x' \in U$ with $x \neq x'$ for which $\{x, y\}, \{x', y\} \in E(G)$.

Example 4.1. The Cameron–Walker graph G of Figure 4 is not levelable. To see why this is true, suppose that G is levelable with respect to a weight function (c_1, \dots, c_{10}) . Since $\{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_7, x_8\}$ and $\{x_1, x_2, x_6, x_7\}$ are maximal independent sets of G , one has $c_3 + c_8 = c_6$. Furthermore, since $\{x_3, x_4, x_5, x_9\}$ and $\{x_4, x_5, x_6, x_9\}$ are maximal independent sets of G , one has $c_3 = c_6$. Hence $c_8 = 0$, a contradiction.




FIGURE 4. A non-levelable Cameron–Walker graph

We now come to a classification of levelable Cameron–Walker graphs.

Theorem 4.2. *A Cameron–Walker graph is levelable if and only if it has no exceptional vertex.*

Proof. First, the “If” part follows from Theorem 3.7. To prove the “Only If” part, suppose that G is a Cameron–Walker graph with an exceptional vertex. Let $U = \{x_1, \dots, x_a\}$ and $V = \{y_1, \dots, y_b\}$. Let A_i denote the set of vertices z of G for which $\{x_i, z\}$ is a leaf attached to x_i for $1 \leq i \leq a$ and B_j the set of edges $\{v, w\}$ for which $G|_{\{y_j, v, w\}}$ is a pendant triangle attached to y_j for $1 \leq j \leq b$. Each A_i is nonempty and some B_j might be empty. Let $A_i = \{z_1^{(i)}, \dots, z_{q_i}^{(i)}\}$ and $B_j = \{\{v_1^{(j)}, w_1^{(j)}\}, \dots, \{v_{r_j}^{(j)}, w_{r_j}^{(j)}\}\}$. Let V' denote the set of exceptional vertices. Without loss of generality, let y_1 be an exceptional vertex and $\{x_1, y_1\} \in E(G)$. Now,

$$(A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_a) \cup V' \cup \left(\bigcup_{y_j \notin V'} \{v_1^{(j)}, \dots, v_{r_j}^{(j)}\} \right)$$

is a maximal independent set of G . Furthermore,

$$\{x_1\} \cup (A_2 \cup \dots \cup A_a) \cup \{y_j \in V' : \{x_1, y_j\} \notin E(G)\} \cup \left(\bigcup_{y_j \notin V'} \{v_1^{(j)}, \dots, v_{r_j}^{(j)}\} \right)$$

is a maximal independent set of G . Suppose that G is levelable with respect to a weight function $(c(x_1), \dots, c(y_b), c(z_1^{(1)}), \dots)$. It then follows that

$$(4.1) \quad c(z_1^{(1)}) + \dots + c(z_{q_1}^{(1)}) + \sum_{y_j \in V', \{x_1, y_j\} \in E(G)} c(y_j) = c(x_1).$$

On the other hand,

$$U \cup \left(\bigcup_{y_j \notin V'} \{v_1^{(j)}, \dots, v_{r_j}^{(j)}\} \right)$$

is a maximal independent set G . Furthermore, by using the assumption that, for each $y \in V'$, there exists $x, x' \in U$ with $x \neq x'$ for which $\{x, y\}, \{x', y\} \in E(G)$, it follows that

$$A_1 \cup \{x_2, \dots, x_a\} \cup \left(\bigcup_{y_j \notin V'} \{v_1^{(j)}, \dots, v_{r_j}^{(j)}\} \right)$$

is a maximal independent set of G . Hence

$$(4.2) \quad c(x_1) = c(z_1^{(1)}) + \dots + c(z_{q_1}^{(1)}).$$

Finally, by (4.1) and (4.2), one has

$$\sum_{y_j \in V', \{x_1, y_j\} \in E(G)} c(y_j) = 0,$$

a contradiction. □

Suppose that G is a Cameron–Walker graph with no exceptional vertex and work in the same notation as in the proof of Theorem 4.2. Then G is levelable with respect to the weight function

$$(c(x_1), \dots, c(y_b), c(z_1^{(1)}), \dots) = (q_1, \dots, q_a, r_1, \dots, r_b, 1, 1, \dots, 1, 1).$$

5. CHORDAL GRAPHS

Let Δ be a simplicial complex (the formal definitions are postponed until Section 7). A vertex x of Δ is called *free* if x belongs to exactly one facet. A facet F of Δ is said to be a *leaf* of Δ if there exists a facet G of Δ with $G \neq F$, called a *branch* of F , for which $H \cap F \subset G \cap F$ for all facets H of Δ with $H \neq F$. Each vertex belonging to $F \setminus G$ is free. A labeling F_1, \dots, F_s of the facets of Δ is called a *leaf order* if, for each $1 < i \leq s$, the facet F_i is a leaf of the subcomplex $\langle F_1, \dots, F_i \rangle$. A simplicial complex possessing a leaf order is called a *quasi-forest*. We refer the reader to [14, Chapter 9] for the detailed information.




FIGURE 5. A leaf order

Lemma 5.1. *Let Δ be a quasi-forest on $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ and suppose that F_1, \dots, F_s is a leaf order. Then there is a sequence (c_1, \dots, c_n) of positive integers and an integer c for which $\sum_{i \in F_j} c_i = c$ for all F_j .*

Proof. Let x_t, x_{t+1}, \dots, x_n be the free vertices of F_s . The simplicial complex $\langle F_1, \dots, F_{s-1} \rangle$ on $\{x_1, \dots, x_{t-1}\}$ is a quasi-forest with a leaf order F_1, \dots, F_{s-1} . Thus, by using induction on s , there is a sequence (c_1, \dots, c_{t-1}) of positive integers and an integer c for which $\sum_{i \in F_j} c_i = c$ for all F_j with $1 \leq j < n$. Let $\sum_{i \in (F_{s-1} \cap F_s)} c_i = c'$. One may assume that $c - c' > n - t + 1$ since we can replace (c_1, \dots, c_{t-1}) and c with (dc_1, \dots, dc_{t-1}) and dc for any positive integer $d \geq 1$. Let c_t, \dots, c_n be positive integers with $c_t + \dots + c_n = c - c'$. It then follows that (c_1, \dots, c_n) has the required property. \square

Recall from [14, Theorem 9.2.12] that the clique complex of a finite graph G is a quasi-forest if and only if G is a chordal graph. A co-chordal graph is a finite graph for which the complementary graph G^c of G is chordal.

Theorem 5.2. *A co-chordal graph is levelable.*

Proof. Let G be a co-chordal graph on $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$. Then the set of maximal independent sets of G is the set of maximal cliques of the chordal graph G^c . Thus the desired result follows from Lemma 5.1. \square

Example 5.3. The chordal graph G of Figure 5 is levelable, since G is co-chordal. It follows from Theorem 4.2 that the path of P_5 of Figure 6 is non-levelable, thus giving a proof different from Example 2.6. On the other hand, by Theorem 3.7, the tree of Figure 7 is levelable.




FIGURE 6. A non-levelable tree




FIGURE 7. A levelable tree

It is a reasonable project to classify all levelable chordal graphs. As a first step in achieving this goal, one must classify all levelable trees. We now turn our attention to this goal.

Recall that a *free vertex* of a tree is a vertex which belongs to exactly one edge. Every tree has at least two free vertices. The *distance* of vertices x and y in a tree is the length of the unique path between x and y in the tree. Note that in a tree a path between x and y is unique.

Theorem 5.4. *A tree is levelable if and only if each non-free vertex is adjacent to at least one free vertex.*

Proof. Theorem 3.7 guarantees that “If” is true. To show that “Only If” is true, suppose that a tree G is levelable and that there is a non-free vertex x which is adjacent to no free vertex. Let G_1, \dots, G_q with $q \geq 2$ denote the connected components of $G \setminus \{x\}$. Each G_i has at least one edge.

Let $q > 2$. Taking a maximal independent set W of G_q which does not contain the vertex of G_q which is adjacent to x , it follows that $G \setminus G_q$ is levelable. Since $q > 2$, the vertex x cannot be a free vertex. Thus working with induction on the number of vertices of a tree guarantees the existence of a free vertex of $G \setminus G_q$ which is adjacent to x , a contradiction. Hence $q = 2$.

Let $q = 2$. Let A denote the set of vertices y of G for which the distance of y and x in G is 2. Thus both $A \cap G_1$ and $A \cap G_2$ are nonempty. Let y_i denote the vertex of G_i which is adjacent to x for $i = 1, 2$. Let W be a maximal independent set of G_1 which contains $A \cap G_1$ and W' a maximal independent set of G_2 which contains $A \cap G_2$. Let U be a maximal independent set of G_1 which contains y_1 and U' a maximal independent set of G_2 which contains y_2 . Then

$$W \cup W' \cup \{x\}, U \cup U', W' \cup U, W \cup U'$$

are maximal independent sets of G . Let $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ be the vertex set of G and suppose that G is levelable with respect to a weight function (c_1, \dots, c_n) . Let $a = \sum_{x_i \in W} c_i$, $b = \sum_{x_i \in W'} c_i$, $c = \sum_{x_i \in U} c_i$ and $d = \sum_{x_i \in U'} c_i$. Let $x = x_1$. It then follows that the positive integers

$$c_1 + a + b, c + d, b + c, a + d$$

are equal. Hence $a = c$. Thus $c_1 = 0$, a contradiction. \square

Definition 5.5. A graph G is called a *caterpillar graph* if G is a tree and if all the vertices of G are within distance one of a central path. Each vertex that is not on the central path is called a *leg* of G .




FIGURE 8. A caterpillar graph

One will assume that each end vertex of a central path has at least one leg. If not, then it can be regarded as a leg of a shorter central path.

Corollary 5.6. *Let G be a caterpillar graph. Then G is levelable if and only if every vertex of a central path has at least one leg.*

Theorem 5.4 gives an alternative proof to Corollary 2.8.

Corollary 5.7. *The path P_n is levelable if and only if $n \in \{2, 3, 4\}$.*

Definition 5.8. Let $q \geq 3$ be an integer and n_1, \dots, n_q positive integers. Let P_i denote the path of length n_i on the vertex set $V_i = \{x, x_1^{(i)}, \dots, x_{n_i}^{(i)}\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq q$. We assume $V_i \cap V_j = \{x\}$ for $i \neq j$. Let $G(n_1, \dots, n_q) = P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_q$. We call $G(n_1, \dots, n_q)$ a *big star graph* with a center x .




FIGURE 9. The big star graph $G(1, 2, 2, 3)$

Corollary 5.9. *A big star graph $G(n_1, \dots, n_q)$ is levelable if and only if each $n_i \leq 2$ and there is at least one j with $n_j = 1$.*

6. CIRCULANT GRAPHS

In this section, we concern ourselves with classifying circulant levelable graphs.

Definition 6.1. Let $n \geq 2$ and $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor\}$. The *circulant graph* $C_n(S)$ is the graph on the vertex set $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ such that $\{x_i, x_j\} \in E(C_n(S))$ precisely when $|i - j| \in S$ or $n - |i - j| \in S$.

Figure 10 shows an example of the circulant graph $C_{10}(2, 5)$. Theorem 2.3 and Corollary 2.5 already classify when the circulant graphs $C_n(1, 2, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor)$ and $C_n(2, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor)$ are levelable since $C_n(1, 2, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor) \cong K_n$ and $C_n(2, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor) \cong C_n^c$. We now classify two further families of circulant graphs.

We first consider the case when $S = \{1\}$, which corresponds to the *cycle graph* C_n with vertices $V(C_n) = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ and edges $E(C_n) = \{\{x_1, x_2\}, \dots, \{x_{n-1}, x_n\}, \{x_n, x_1\}\}$.




FIGURE 10. The circulant $C_{10}(2, 5)$

Theorem 6.2. *Let $G = C_n = C_n(1)$. Then G is levelable if and only if $n \in \{2, 3, 4, 5, 7\}$.*

Proof. One can easily check that C_n is well-covered for $n \in \{2, 3, 4, 5, 7\}$ and hence levelable. For $n = 6$, the maximal independent sets of C_6 are $\{1, 3, 5\}$, $\{2, 4, 6\}$, $\{1, 4\}$, $\{2, 5\}$, and $\{3, 6\}$. Taking $F_1 = \{1, 3, 5\}$, $F_2 = \{2, 4, 6\}$, $F_3 = \{1, 4\}$, and $F_4 = \{2, 5\}$, we see that the hypotheses of Lemma 2.7 are satisfied and so C_6 is not levelable.

We now show that $G = C_n$ is not levelable for $n \geq 8$. If $n \geq 8$ is even, we define

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 &= \{x_1, x_3, \dots, x_{n-1}\}, & F_2 &= \{x_2, x_4, \dots, x_n\}, \\ F_3 &= \{x_1, x_3, \dots, x_{n-5}, x_{n-2}\}, & \text{and } F_4 &= \{x_2, x_4, \dots, x_{n-4}, x_{n-1}\}, \end{aligned}$$

and if $n \geq 9$ is odd, we define

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 &= \{x_1, x_3, \dots, x_{n-2}\}, & F_2 &= \{x_2, x_4, \dots, x_{n-1}\}, \\ F_3 &= \{x_1, x_3, \dots, x_{n-8}, x_{n-5}, x_{n-2}\}, & \text{and } F_4 &= \{x_2, x_4, \dots, x_{n-7}, x_{n-4}, x_{n-1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

In either case, one can check that the hypotheses of Lemma 2.7 are satisfied, and so it follows that G is not levelable. \square

A *cubic circulant graph* is a circulant graph such that every vertex has degree 3. We seek to classify those cubic circulants that are levelable. We begin with a structural result for cubic circulants due to Davis and Domke.

Theorem 6.3 ([7]). *Let $1 \leq a < n$ and $t = \gcd(2n, a)$.*

- (a) *If $\frac{2n}{t}$ is even, then $C_{2n}(a, n)$ is isomorphic to t copies of $C_{\frac{2n}{t}}(1, \frac{n}{t})$.*
- (b) *If $\frac{2n}{t}$ is odd, then $C_{2n}(a, n)$ is isomorphic to $\frac{t}{2}$ copies of $C_{\frac{4n}{t}}(2, \frac{2n}{t})$.*

By Lemma 2.1, it now suffices to determine for which $n \geq 2$ the graphs $C_{2n}(1, n)$ and $C_{2n}(2, n)$ are levelable. (Note that we may assume n is odd for the latter.) Explicitly, these graphs have the vertex sets $V(C_{2n}(1, n)) = \{x_1, \dots, x_{2n}\}$ and $V(C_{2n}(2, n)) = \{x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ and edge sets

$$E(C_{2n}(1, n)) = \{\{x_i, x_{i+1}\} \mid 1 \leq i \leq 2n - 1\} \cup \{\{x_1, x_{2n}\}\} \cup \{\{x_i, x_{n+i}\} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$$

and

$$E(C_{2n}(2, n)) = \{\{x_i, x_{i+1}\} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n-1\} \cup \{\{y_i, y_{i+1}\} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n-1\} \\ \cup \{\{x_1, x_n\}, \{y_1, y_n\}\} \cup \{\{x_i, y_i\} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$$

respectively. Figure 11 shows the labeling of these graphs will use in our argument.




FIGURE 11. The graphs $C_{2n}(1, n)$ and $C_{2n}(2, n)$ (with n odd).

Theorem 6.4. *Let $G = C_{2n}(1, n)$. Then G is levelable if and only if $n \in \{2, 3, 4\}$.*

Proof. For $n \in \{2, 3, 4\}$, one can directly check that the graphs $C_{2n}(1, n)$ are well-covered and hence levelable (also see [2, Theorem 4.3]). So suppose $n \geq 5$. We will show that $G = C_{2n}(1, n)$ is not levelable. We consider two cases.

Case 1: If $n \geq 5$ is odd, define

$$F_1 = \{x_1, x_3, \dots, x_{2n-1}\}, \\ F_2 = \{x_2, x_4, \dots, x_{2n}\}, \\ F_3 = \{x_1, x_3, \dots, x_{n-4}, x_{n-1}\} \cup \{x_{n+2}, x_{n+4}, \dots, x_{2n-3}\}, \\ F_4 = \{x_2, x_4, \dots, x_{n-3}, x_n\} \cup \{x_{n+3}, x_{n+5}, \dots, x_{2n-2}\}.$$

We claim that F_1, \dots, F_4 are maximal independent sets of G that satisfy the hypotheses of Lemma 2.7.

Since $F_3 \cup F_4 \subsetneq F_1 \cup F_2$ and $F_3 \cap F_4 \neq \emptyset$, it only remains to check that F_1, \dots, F_4 are maximal independent sets of G . We see that F_1, \dots, F_4 are independent sets by construction. Since $\{x_1, x_{2n}\}$ and $\{x_i, x_{i+1}\}$ are edges of G for each $1 \leq i \leq 2n-1$, it is clear that F_1 and F_2 are maximal. Additionally, since $\{x_{n-1}, x_{2n-1}\}$ (resp. $\{x_n, x_{2n}\}$) is an edge of G , we conclude that F_3 (resp. F_4) is maximal. It follows from Lemma 2.7 that G is not levelable.

Case 2: If $n \geq 6$ is even, define

$$F_1 = \{x_1, x_3, \dots, x_{n-1}, x_{n+2}, x_{n+4}, \dots, x_{2n-2}\}, \\ F_2 = \{x_2, x_4, \dots, x_n, x_{n+3}, x_{n+5}, \dots, x_{2n-1}\}, \\ F_3 = \{x_1, x_3, \dots, x_{n-5}, x_{n-1}, x_{2n-3}\} \cup A, \\ F_4 = \{x_2, x_4, \dots, x_{n-4}, x_n, x_{2n-2}\} \cup A',$$

where $A = A' = \emptyset$ if $n = 6$ and

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \{x_{n+2}, x_{n+4}, \dots, x_{2n-6}\}, \\ A' &= \{x_{n+3}, x_{n+5}, \dots, x_{2n-5}\} \end{aligned}$$

for all $n \geq 8$.

We proceed as above. Since $F_3 \cup F_4 \subsetneq F_1 \cup F_2$ and $F_3 \cap F_4 \neq \emptyset$, it only remains to check that F_1, \dots, F_4 are maximal independent sets of G . We see that F_1, \dots, F_4 are independent sets by construction. Since $\{x_1, x_{2n}\}$ and $\{x_i, x_{i+1}\}$ are edges of G for each $1 \leq i \leq 2n - 1$, it is clear that F_1 and F_2 are maximal. Additionally, since $\{x_{n-3}, x_{2n-3}\}$ and $\{x_{n-1}, x_{2n-1}\}$ (resp. $\{x_{n-2}, x_{2n-2}\}$ and $\{x_n, x_{2n}\}$) are edges of G , we conclude that F_3 (resp. F_4) is maximal. It follows from Lemma 2.7 that G is not levelable. \square

Theorem 6.5. *Let $G = C_{2n}(2, n)$ with n odd. Then G is levelable if and only $n \in \{3, 5\}$.*

Proof. For $n \in \{3, 5\}$, one can directly check that the graphs $C_{2n}(2, n)$ are well-covered (also see [2, Theorem 4.3]) and hence levelable. So suppose $n \geq 7$ is odd. Define

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 &= \{x_1, x_3, \dots, x_{n-2}\} \cup \{y_2, y_4, \dots, y_{n-1}\}, \\ F_2 &= \{x_2, x_4, \dots, x_{n-1}\} \cup \{y_3, y_5, \dots, y_n\}, \\ F_3 &= \{x_1, x_3, \dots, x_{n-6}, x_{n-3}\} \cup \{y_2, y_4, \dots, y_{n-5}, y_{n-1}\}, \\ F_4 &= \{x_2, x_4, \dots, x_{n-5}, x_{n-2}\} \cup \{y_3, y_5, \dots, y_{n-4}, y_n\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $F_3 \cup F_4 \subsetneq F_1 \cup F_2$ and $F_3 \cap F_4 \neq \emptyset$, it only remains to check that F_1, \dots, F_4 are maximal independent sets of G . We see that F_1, \dots, F_4 are independent sets by construction. Since $\{x_1, x_n\}$, $\{y_1, y_n\}$, $\{x_i, x_{i+1}\}$, and $\{y_i, y_{i+1}\}$ are edges of G for each $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$, it is clear that F_1 and F_2 are maximal. Additionally, since $\{x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}\}$ and $\{x_{n-3}, y_{n-3}\}$ (resp. $\{x_n, y_n\}$ and $\{x_{n-2}, y_{n-2}\}$) are edges of G , we conclude that F_3 (resp. F_4) is maximal. It follows from Lemma 2.7 that G is not levelable. \square

7. LEVELABLE GRAPHS AND A CONNECTION TO LEVEL ARTINIAN RINGS

This last section describes the origins of levelable graphs and their connection to level artinian rings. Level rings, which were introduced by Stanley [23] almost 50 years ago, have inspired a significant amount of research in combinatorial commutative algebra. As we shall show, our new connection allows us to use the properties of levelable graphs to deduce consequences for the existence of level artinian rings of a certain form.

Let A be a graded \mathbb{K} -algebra, i.e., $A = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]/I$ for some homogeneous ideal I . We will define level rings only in the case that A is artinian – the general definition of level rings is in terms of the canonical module of A . The ring A is *artinian* if the Krull dimension of A is 0. Being artinian is equivalent to the fact that there exists positive integers a_1, \dots, a_n such that $x_i^{a_i} \in I$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. If A is a graded artinian ring, then there is an integer e such that

$$A = A_0 \oplus A_1 \oplus A_2 \oplus \dots \oplus A_e \text{ with } A_e \neq 0$$

where each A_i is a \mathbb{K} -vector space of homogeneous elements of A of degree i . Note that $A_i = 0$ for all $i > e$. The *socle* of A is the homogeneous ideal of A defined by

$$\text{soc}(A) = \{a \in A \mid a\bar{x}_i = 0 \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n\},$$

i.e., $\text{soc}(A)$ is the annihilator of the maximal ideal $\langle \bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n \rangle$ in A . The *socle-vector* is $s(A) = (s_0, s_1, \dots, s_e)$ where $s_i = \dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{soc}(A)_i$. We come to the key definition:

Definition 7.1. A graded artinian algebra A is *level* if the socle-vector of A has the form $s(A) = (0, 0, \dots, 0, s_e)$ for some integer $s_e > 0$.

In 2010, Van Tuyl and Zanello [25] introduced *levelable simplicial complexes*; these are simplicial complexes that allow one to build a level graded artinian ring. We recall the main ideas of Stanley–Reisner theory – see [14] for more details. A simplicial complex on a set $V = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ is a subset of the power set of V with the property that if $F \in \Delta$ and $G \subseteq F$, then $G \in \Delta$. The elements of Δ are called *faces*, and the maximal faces of Δ under inclusion are the *facets*. If F_1, \dots, F_s is a complete list of the facets of Δ , then we write $\Delta = \langle F_1, \dots, F_s \rangle$. The Stanley–Reisner correspondence allows one to associate a simplicial complex Δ on V with a squarefree monomial ideal in $R = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ with \mathbb{K} as field. Precisely,

$$I_\Delta = \langle x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_s} : \{x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_s}\} \notin \Delta \rangle.$$

The ideal I_Δ is the *Stanley–Reisner ideal* of Δ , and R/I_Δ is the *Stanley–Reisner ring*.

Given any simplicial complex and integers $a_1, \dots, a_n \geq 2$, set

$$A(\Delta, (a_1, \dots, a_n)) = \frac{\mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]}{I_\Delta + \langle x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_n^{a_n} \rangle}.$$

The ring $A(\Delta, (a_1, \dots, a_n))$ is an example of a graded artinian ring. We omit the case that $a_i = 1$ for some i because in this situation

$$A(\Delta, (a_1, \dots, a_n)) \cong A(\Delta', (a_1, \dots, \hat{a}_i, \dots, a_n))$$

where Δ' is the induced simplicial complex on $V \setminus \{x_i\}$.

In general, whether or not $A(\Delta, (a_1, \dots, a_n))$ is a level ring will depend upon both Δ and (a_1, \dots, a_n) . Van Tuyl and Zanello called Δ a *levelable simplicial complex* if there exists $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$ with all $a_i \geq 2$ such that $A(\Delta, (a_1, \dots, a_n))$ is a level ring. As shown by Van Tuyl and Zanello, determining if Δ is levelable reduces to solving a particular system of equations constructed from the facets of Δ .

Theorem 7.2 ([25, Theorem 6]). *Let Δ be a simplicial complex on $V = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ with facets $\{F_1, \dots, F_s\}$. Let $F_i = \{x_{i,1}, \dots, x_{i,d_i}\}$ denote the i -th facet. Then $A(\Delta, (a_1, \dots, a_n))$ is level if and only if (a_1, \dots, a_n) is an integral solution with $a_i \geq 2$ to the system*

$$\begin{aligned} (x_{1,1} + x_{1,2} + \cdots + x_{1,d_1}) - (x_{2,1} + x_{2,2} + \cdots + x_{2,d_2}) &= d_1 - d_2 \\ (x_{2,1} + x_{2,2} + \cdots + x_{2,d_2}) - (x_{3,1} + x_{3,2} + \cdots + x_{3,d_3}) &= d_2 - d_3 \\ &\vdots \\ (x_{s-1,1} + x_{s-1,2} + \cdots + x_{s-1,d_{s-1}}) - (x_{s,1} + x_{s,2} + \cdots + x_{s,d_s}) &= d_{s-1} - d_s. \end{aligned}$$

Levelable graphs, as we have defined them in this paper, arise when considering when the independence complex of a graph is a levelable simplicial complex. The *independence complex* of a graph G is the simplicial complex

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

that is, the faces of $\text{Ind}(G)$ are the independent sets of G . The facets of $\text{Ind}(G)$ is the set $\text{MaxInd}(G)$ that we defined in the introduction. The connection between levelable graphs and level graded artinian rings is then caputerd in the following result.

Theorem 7.3. *A graph G is a levelable graph if and only if $\text{Ind}(G)$ is a levelable simplicial complex.*

Proof. Let $\text{MaxInd}(G) = \{W_1, \dots, W_s\}$ be the maximal independent sets of G , and let $W_i = \{x_{i,1}, \dots, x_{i,d_i}\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, s$. Note that W_1, \dots, W_s are also the facets of $\text{Ind}(G)$.

(“**Only If**”) Suppose G is a levelable graph. So there is a weight function (c_1, \dots, c_n) with positive integers and independence weight c such that

$$c_{i,1} + \dots + c_{i,d_i} = c \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, s.$$

If we now consider the vector $(c_1 + 1, \dots, c_n + 1)$, each W_i gives the equality:

$$(c_{i,1} + 1) + \dots + (c_{i,d_i} + 1) = c + d_i.$$

But then for $i = 1, \dots, s - 1$, we have

$$((c_{i,1} + 1) + \dots + (c_{i,d_i} + 1)) - ((c_{i+1,1} + 1) + \dots + (c_{i,d_{i+1}} + 1)) = d_i - d_{i+1}.$$

By Theorem 7.2, this means that $\text{Ind}(G)$ is a levelable simplicial complexes since $(c_1 + 1, \dots, c_n + 1)$ is solution to the system of equations with $c_i + 1 \geq 2$ for all i .

(“**If**”) Let (a_1, \dots, a_n) with all $a_i \geq 2$ be an integral solution to the equations of Theorem 7.2 constructed from the facets of $\text{Ind}(G)$. By reversing the above argument, we can show G is levelable with respect to the weight function $(a_1 - 1, \dots, a_n - 1)$. \square

In light of the previous result, finding levelable graphs immediately allows us to construct a level graded artinian ring. The *edge ideal* of G is the squarefree monomial ideal $I(G) = \langle x_i x_j : \{x_i, x_j\} \in E(G) \rangle$. It is well-known (e.g., see [14]) that $I(G)$ is the Stanley–Reisner ideal of the simplicial complex $\text{Ind}(G)$, that is, $I(G) = I_{\text{Ind}(G)}$. By simply translating definitions and using the previous theorem, we deduce Theorem 1.2:

Theorem 7.4. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with edge ideal $I(G)$ in $R = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Then G is a levelable graph with respect to the weight function (c_1, \dots, c_n) if and only if*

$$R/(I(G) + \langle x_1^{c_1+1}, \dots, x_n^{c_n+1} \rangle)$$

is a level graded artinian ring.

As the previous result shows, constructing level graded artinian rings from an edge ideal of a graph G reduces to verifying that G is a levelable graph. We conclude this paper by using a result of Brown and Nowakowski [4] to show that level graded artinian rings of this form are quite rare.

Recall from the introduction that we can associate to any G a vector space

$$\text{WCW}(G) = \{\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_n) : G \text{ with weight function } \mathbf{c} \text{ is a weighted well-covered graph}\} \subseteq F^{|V|}.$$

for a fixed field F . Note that to construct $\text{WCW}(G)$ we must first fix a field. If the field has characteristic zero, then F contains a copy of \mathbb{N} . We then have the following fact:

Lemma 7.5. *Fix a field F of characteristic zero. Let G be a graph and view $\text{WCW}(G)$ as a vector space over F . If $\dim \text{WCW}(G) = 0$, then G is not levelable.*

Proof. If G was levelable, then there is a weight vector (c_1, \dots, c_n) with $c_i \geq 0$ and $c_i \in \mathbb{N} \subseteq F$. But then $(c_1, \dots, c_n) \in \text{WCW}(G)$ is a non-zero vector, and thus $0 = \dim \text{WCW}(G) \geq 1$, a contradiction. \square

Example 7.6. The converse of the previous statement is false. As we have seen, P_5 is not a levelable graph. However $(1, 1, 0, -1, -1) \in \text{WCW}(P_5)$, so $\dim \text{WCW}(P_5) \neq 0$.

We recall some of the terminology related to random graphs. A *random graph* G of order n is a graph on $V = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ where there is an edge between x_i and x_j of fixed probability $p \in (0, 1)$ for all possible $1 \leq i < j \leq n$. We say that *almost all graphs* G have property P if $\text{Prob}(G \text{ has property } P) \rightarrow 1$ as $|V| \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 7.7 ([4, Theorem 1; Corollary 2]). *Fix a field F . For almost all graphs G , $\dim \text{WCW}(G) = 0$. In particular, for almost all graphs G , G is not well-covered.*

We can now deduce the following results that are of interest to those working in combinatorial commutative algebra.

Corollary 7.8. *For almost all graphs G , the graded artinian ring*

$$R/(I(G) + \langle x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_n^{a_n} \rangle)$$

is not level for any choice of $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$ with $a_i \geq 2$ for all i .

Proof. By Theorem 7.7, almost all graphs G have $\dim \text{WCW}(G) = 0$, which by Lemma 7.5 implies that almost all graphs are not levelable, and thus by Theorem 7.4, for almost all graphs, the ring in the statement of the corollary cannot be level. \square

One class of rings that are of great importance in commutative algebra are Cohen–Macaulay rings. We say a ring S is *Cohen–Macaulay* if $\dim S = \text{depth} S$. A graph G is a *Cohen–Macaulay graph* if the ring $R/I(G)$ is a Cohen–Macaulay ring (for more details, see [14]). For G to be Cohen–Macaulay, a necessary property is that G is well-covered. Consequently, we can also deduce the following result from Theorem 7.7:

Corollary 7.9. *For almost all graphs G , G is not Cohen–Macaulay.*

Remark 7.10. The previous result was also proved by Dothermann–Newman [8, Corollary 1.4] and Erman–Yang [9, Corollary 7.1], using approaches different than Brown–Nowakowski.

Acknowledgments. Some of our results first appeared in the senior undergraduate thesis of M. Chong under the supervision of A. Van Tuyl. Part of this work was carried out while T. Hibi visited the other authors at McMaster University, and when T. Hibi and A. Van Tuyl visited the Fields Institute in Toronto as part of the “Thematic Program in Commutative Algebra and Applications”. We thank the hospitality of both institutions. A. Van Tuyl’s research is supported by NSERC Discovery Grant 2024-05299.

REFERENCES

- [1] Isaac Birnbaum, Megan Kuneli, Robyn McDonald, Katherine Urabe, and Oscar Vega, The well-covered dimension of products of graphs, *Discuss. Math. Graph Theory* **34** (2014), no. 4, 811–827.
- [2] Jason I. Brown and Richard Hoshino, Well-covered circulant graphs, *Discrete Math.* **311** (2011), no. 4, 244–251.
- [3] Jason I. Brown and Richard J. Nowakowski, Well-covered vector spaces of graphs, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* **19** (2005), no. 4, 952–965.
- [4] Jason I. Brown and Richard J. Nowakowski, The well-covered dimension of random graphs, *Discrete Math.* **307** (2007), no. 3-5, 352–355.
- [5] Yair Caro, Mark N. Ellingham, and J.E. Ramey, Local structure when all maximal independent sets have equal weight, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* **11** (1998), no. 4, 644–654.
- [6] Kathie Cameron and Tracy Walker, The graphs with maximum induced matching and maximum matching the same size, *Discrete Math.* **299** (2005), no. 1-3, 49–55.
- [7] George J. Davis and Gayla S. Domke, 3-Circulant Graphs, *J. Combin. Math. Combin. Comput.* **40** (2002), 133–142.
- [8] Anton Dochtermann and Andrew Newman, Random subcomplexes and Betti numbers of random edge ideals, *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* (2023), no. 10, 8832–8871.
- [9] Daniel Erman and Jay Yang, Random flag complexes and asymptotic syzygies, *Algebra Number Theory* **12** (2018), no. 9, 2151–2166.
- [10] Anthony V. Geramita, Tadahito Harima, Juan C. Migliore, and Yong-Su Shin, The Hilbert function of a level algebra, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **186** (2007), no. 872.
- [11] Huy Tài Hà, Eric Stokes, and Fabrizio Zanello, Pure O -sequences and matroid h -vectors, *Ann. Comb.* **17** (2013), 495–508.
- [12] Amy He, Pierce Lai, and Suho Oh, The h -vector of a positroid is a pure O -sequence, *European J. Combin.* **110** (2023), Paper No. 103684, 10 pp.
- [13] Jürgen Herzog and Takayuki Hibi, Level rings arising from meet-distributive meet-semilattices, *Nagoya Math. J.* **181** (2006), 29–39.
- [14] Jürgen Herzog and Takayuki Hibi, *Monomial Ideals*, GTM 260, Springer, 2011.
- [15] Takayuki Hibi, Level rings and algebras with straightening laws, *J. Algebra* **117** (1988), 343–362.
- [16] Takayuki Hibi, Flawless O -sequences and Hilbert functions of Cohen–Macaulay integral domains, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **60** (1989), 245–251.
- [17] Takayuki Hibi, Face number inequalities of matroid complexes and Cohen–Macaulay types of Stanley–Reisner rings of finite distributive lattices, *Pacific J. Math* **154** (1992), 253–264.
- [18] Takayuki Hibi, Akihiro Higashitani, Kyouko Kimura, and Augustine B. O’Keefe, Algebraic study on Cameron–Walker graphs, *J. Algebra* **422** (2015), 257–269.
- [19] Vadim E. Levit and David Tankus, Weighted well-covered graphs without C_4, C_5, C_6, C_7 , *Discrete Appl. Math.* **159** (2011), no. 5, 354–359.
- [20] Vadim E. Levit and David Tankus, Weighted well-covered claw-free graphs, *Discrete Math.* **338** (2015), no. 3, 99–106.
- [21] Juan Migliore, Uwe Nagel, and Fabrizio Zanello, Pure O -sequences: known results, applications, and open problems, in *Commutative Algebra; Expository Papers Dedicated to David Eisenbud on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. (I. Peeva, Ed.), Springer, New York (2013), 527–550.
- [22] Michael D. Plummer, Some covering concepts in graphs, *J. Combinatorial Theory* **8** (1970), 91–98.
- [23] Richard Stanley, Cohen–Macaulay complexes, in *Higher Combinatorics* (M. Aigner, Ed.), NATO Advanced Study Institute Series, Reidel, Dordrecht/Boston (1977), pp. 51–62.
- [24] David Tankus, Weighted well-covered graphs without cycles of lengths 5, 6 and 7, *Inform. Process. Lett.* **174** (2022), Paper No. 106189, 7 pp.
- [25] Adam Van Tuyl and Fabrizio Zanello, Simplicial complexes and Macaulay’s inverse systems, *Math. Z.* **265** (2010), no. 1, 151–160.

(K. Bhaskara) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, MCMASTER UNIVERSITY, HAMILTON, ON, L8S 4L8, CANADA

Email address: kieran.bhaskara@mcmaster.ca

(M. Y. C. Chong) DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO, TORONTO, ON, M5G 1X6, CANADA

Email address: myc.chong@mail.utoronto.ca

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

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

(N. Ragnathan) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, MCMASTER UNIVERSITY, HAMILTON, ON, L8S 4L8, CANADA

Email address: ragunatn@mcmaster.ca

(A. Van Tuyl) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, MCMASTER UNIVERSITY, HAMILTON, ON, L8S 4L8, CANADA

Email address: vantuyla@mcmaster.ca