



Karim A. Adiprasito · Anders Björner · Afshin Goodarzi

Face numbers of sequentially Cohen–Macaulay complexes and Betti numbers of componentwise linear ideals

Received February 4, 2015

Abstract. A numerical characterization is given of the h -triangles of sequentially Cohen–Macaulay simplicial complexes. This result determines the number of faces of various dimensions and codimensions that are possible in such a complex, generalizing the classical Macaulay–Stanley theorem to the nonpure case. Moreover, we characterize the possible Betti tables of componentwise linear ideals. A key tool in our investigation is a bijection between shifted multicomplexes of degree $\leq d$ and shifted pure $(d - 1)$ -dimensional simplicial complexes.

Keywords. Simplicial complex, face numbers, Stanley–Reisner rings, sequential Cohen–Macaulayness, componentwise linear ideals

1. Introduction

The notion of sequentially Cohen–Macaulay complexes first arose in combinatorics: Motivated by questions concerning subspace arrangements, Björner & Wachs [BW96, BW97] introduced the notion of nonpure shellability. Stanley [Sta96] then introduced the sequential Cohen–Macaulay property in order to have a ring-theoretic analogue of nonpure shellability. Schenzel [Sch99] independently defined the notion of sequentially Cohen–Macaulay modules (called by him Cohen–Macaulay filtered modules), inspired by earlier work of Goto. In essence, a simplicial complex is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay if and only if it is naturally composed of a sequence of Cohen–Macaulay subcomplexes, namely the pure skeleta of the complex, graded by dimension. They come with an associated numerical invariant, the so-called h -triangle, which measures the face numbers of each component according to a doubly indexed grading. Just as the classical h -vector determines the numbers of faces of various dimensions of a simplicial complex, the h -triangle determines the numbers of faces in each component of the complex.

K. A. Adiprasito: Einstein Institute of Mathematics, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel;
e-mail: adiprasito@math.huji.ac.il

A. Björner: Matematiska institutionen, Kungl. Tekniska Högskolan, Stockholm, Sweden;
e-mail: bjorner@kth.se

A. Goodarzi: Institut für Mathematik, Freie Universität, Berlin, Germany;
e-mail: afshingo@kth.se

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 05E45, 13F55

Motivated by the Macaulay–Stanley theorem for Cohen–Macaulay complexes, which are always pure, Björner & Wachs [BW96] posed the problem of characterizing the possible h -triangles of sequentially Cohen–Macaulay simplicial complexes. Via a connection that seems to have up to now been overlooked, this problem is equivalent to characterizing the possible Betti tables of componentwise linear ideals—see for instance [CHH04, Theorem 2.3], [KK12] and [HRW99, Proposition 12]. After some significant initial progress, due to Duval [Duv96] and Aravoma, Herzog & Hibi [AHH00], which reduced these two questions to combinatorial settings, some partial results on the second question were obtained by Crupi & Utano [CU03] and Herzog, Sharifan & Varbaro [HSV14]. Part of the difficulty of this nonpure “Macaulay problem” is that, in contrast to the classical situation, it does not suffice to use a criterion that makes a decision by only pairwise “Macaulay type” comparisons of entries in the h -triangle.

Our main objective in this paper is to give a numerical characterization of the possible h -triangles of sequentially Cohen–Macaulay complexes. The method that we use is based on a modification of a correspondence between shifted multicomplexes and pure shifted simplicial complexes, provided by Björner, Frankl & Stanley [BFS87]. Finally, we also give a characteristic-independent characterization of the possible Betti tables of componentwise linear ideals using our main result and an observation made by Herzog, Sharifan & Varbaro [HSV14].

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present some basic definitions and derive some necessary relations on the face numbers of sequentially Cohen–Macaulay complexes. Section 3 is devoted to our study of the Björner, Frankl & Stanley (BFS) bijection, which we examine via a connection to lattice paths. The numerical characterization of the possible h -triangles of sequentially Cohen–Macaulay complexes is the subject of Section 4. Finally, in Section 5 we present a numerical characterization of the possible Betti tables of componentwise linear ideals.

2. Preliminaries

Simplicial complexes. A family Δ of subsets of the set $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$ is called a *simplicial complex* on $[n]$ if Δ is closed under taking subsets, i.e. if $F \in \Delta$ and $F' \subseteq F$, then $F' \in \Delta$. The members F of Δ are called *faces* of Δ . The *facets* of Δ are the inclusionwise maximal faces; the set of all facets of Δ is denoted by $\mathcal{F}(\Delta)$. The *dimension* $\dim F$ of a face F is one less than its cardinality and the *dimension* of Δ is defined to be the maximal dimension of a face. A simplicial complex of dimension $d - 1$ will be called a $(d - 1)$ -*complex*. A $(d - 1)$ -complex Δ is called *pure* if each facet of Δ has dimension $d - 1$.

For a $(d - 1)$ -complex Δ , let $\Delta^i := \{i\text{-dimensional faces of } \Delta\}$ and let $f_i := |\Delta^i|$. The vector $f(\Delta) = (f_{-1}, f_0, \dots, f_{d-1})$ is called the *f-vector* of Δ . The subcomplex $\Delta^{(i)} := \bigcup_{j \leq i} \Delta^j$ is called the *i-skeleton* of Δ . The *pure i-skeleton* $\Delta^{[i]}$ of Δ is the pure i -complex whose set of facets is the set of i -dimensional faces of Δ , that is, $\mathcal{F}(\Delta^{[i]}) = \Delta^i$.

The h -vector $h(\Delta) = (h_0, h_1, \dots, h_d)$ of Δ is defined by

$$\sum_{i=0}^d h_i y^i = \sum_{i=0}^d f_{i-1} (1-y)^{d-i} y^i.$$

For a $(d - 1)$ -complex Δ , let $\tilde{h}_{i,j} = \tilde{h}_{i,j}(\Delta) = h_j(\Delta^{[i-1]})$. Then the triangular integer array $\tilde{h}(\Delta) = (\tilde{h}_{i,j})_{0 \leq j \leq i \leq d}$ is called the h -triangle of Δ . Also, define $h_{i,j}$ by the relation

$$h_{i,j} = \tilde{h}_{i,j} - \sum_{\ell=0}^j \tilde{h}_{i+1,\ell}. \tag{1}$$

The triangular integer array $h(\Delta) = (h_{i,j})_{0 \leq j \leq i \leq d}$ is called the h -triangle of Δ . Note that our definition of the h -triangle is equivalent to the one presented in [BW96, Definition 3.1].

Let \mathbb{k} be an infinite field and $S = \mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ the polynomial ring over n variables. For a simplicial complex Δ on $[n]$, let I_Δ be the Stanley–Reisner ideal of Δ , that is, the ideal

$$I_\Delta := \langle \{x_{i_1} \dots x_{i_r} : \{i_1, \dots, i_r\} \notin \Delta \} \rangle$$

of S . The quotient ring $\mathbb{k}[\Delta] := S/I_\Delta$ is called the *face ring* of Δ . The complex Δ is said to be *Cohen–Macaulay over \mathbb{k}* if $\mathbb{k}[\Delta]$ is Cohen–Macaulay (see e.g. [HH11, p. 273], for Cohen–Macaulay rings). A topological characterization of the Cohen–Macaulay complexes can be found in the book by Stanley [Sta96]. The reference to the base field will usually be dropped and we simply say that Δ is Cohen–Macaulay, or CM for short.

A $(d - 1)$ -complex Δ is said to be *sequentially Cohen–Macaulay*, or SCM for short, if the pure i -skeleton $\Delta^{[i]}$ of Δ is CM for all $i \leq d - 1$.

A simplicial complex Δ on $[n]$ is called *shifted* if for all integers r and s with $1 \leq r < s \leq n$ and all faces F of Δ such that $r \in F$ and $s \notin F$ one has $(F \setminus \{r\}) \cup \{s\} \in \Delta$. Recall that every shifted complex is (nonpure) shellable [BW97], and a shifted complex is CM if and only if it is pure.

Face numbers of CM complexes. Let $W_n = \{w_1, \dots, w_n\}$ be a set of variables. A *multicomplex* M on $V \subseteq W_n$ is a collection of monomials on V that is closed under divisibility. A multicomplex M on V is said to be *shifted* if for all x_r and x_s in V with $r < s$ and all monomials m in M divisible by x_r one has $x_s \cdot (m/x_r) \in M$.

Let M^i denote the set of monomials in M of degree i . The sequence $f(M) = (f_0, f_1, \dots)$ is called the f -vector of M , where $f_i = |M^i|$. The numerical characterization of f -vectors of multicomplexes (due to Macaulay [Mac27]) can be seen as the historical starting point for a line of research that this investigation is part of.

The ℓ -representation of a positive integer p is the unique way of writing

$$p = \binom{a_\ell}{\ell} + \binom{a_{\ell-1}}{\ell-1} + \dots + \binom{a_e}{e},$$

where $a_\ell > a_{\ell-1} > \dots > a_e \geq e \geq 1$. Define

$$\partial^\ell(p) = \binom{a_\ell - 1}{\ell - 1} + \binom{a_{\ell-1} - 1}{\ell - 2} + \dots + \binom{a_e - 1}{e - 1}.$$

Also set $\partial^\ell(0) = 0$ for all ℓ . A vector $f = (f_0, f_1, \dots)$ of nonnegative integers is called an *M-sequence* if $f_0 = 1$ and $\partial^\ell(f_\ell) \leq f_{\ell-1}$ for all ℓ .

A complete characterization of the h -vectors of CM complexes is achieved by combining the results by Macaulay [Mac27] and Stanley [Sta96, Sta77]. With some additional information taken from Björner, Frankl & Stanley [BFS87] we get all parts of the following theorem.

Theorem 1 (Macaulay–Stanley Theorem). *For an integer vector $h = (h_0, h_1, \dots, h_d)$ the following are equivalent:*

- (a) h is the h -vector of a CM complex on $[n]$ of dimension $d - 1$;
- (b) h is the h -vector of a pure shifted complex on $[n]$ of dimension $d - 1$;
- (c) h is the f -vector of a multicomplex on $\{w_1, \dots, w_{n-d}\}$;
- (d) h is the f -vector of a shifted multicomplex on $\{w_1, \dots, w_{n-d}\}$;
- (e) h is an M -sequence with $h_1 \leq n - d$.

This is one of the early pinnacles of algebraic combinatorics. To understand why this theorem is so remarkable, notice for instance that the h -numbers of a Cohen–Macaulay complex (motivated by ring theory) generally do NOT have a direct combinatorial interpretation in that same simplicial complex [Lic91]. However, there is another simplicial complex (combinatorially motivated) and a multicomplex with the same h -numbers, and in which they do have a simple interpretation.

Face numbers of SCM complexes: some necessary conditions. The h -triangle of a shifted complex (more generally, a shellable complex) has a combinatorial interpretation that we now recall; the reader may consult [BW96, BW97] for more information. For a shifted complex Δ , reverse lexicographic order of the facets is a shelling order with restriction map $\mathcal{R}(F) = F \setminus \sigma(F)$, where $\sigma(F)$ is the longest segment $\{s, \dots, n\} \subseteq F$ if $n \in F$ and is empty otherwise. In particular,

$$h_{i,j}(\Delta) = |\{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Delta) : |F| = i \text{ \& \ } |\sigma(F)| = i - j\}|. \quad (2)$$

Algebraic shifting is an operator on simplicial complexes that associates to a simplicial complex a shifted complex, preserving many interesting invariants of the complex. We refer the reader to the article by Kalai [Kal02] or the book by Herzog & Hibi [HH11] to see the precise definition and properties. It was shown by Duval [Duv96] that a complex is SCM if and only if algebraic shifting preserves its h -triangle (or equivalently \tilde{h} -triangle). In particular, the set of h -triangles of SCM complexes coincides with the set of h -triangles of shifted complexes.

Putting these facts together we can deduce the following necessary conditions.

Proposition 2 (cf. [BW96, Theorem 3.6]). *If a triangular integer array $\tilde{h}(\Delta) = (\tilde{h}_{i,j})_{0 \leq j \leq i \leq d}$ is the \tilde{h} -triangle of a SCM complex, then*

- (a) every row $\tilde{h}^{[i]} := (\tilde{h}_{i,0}, \tilde{h}_{i,1}, \dots, \tilde{h}_{i,i})$ is an M -sequence; and
- (b) $\tilde{h}_{i,j} \geq \sum_{\ell \leq j} \tilde{h}_{i+1,\ell}$.

These necessary conditions are, however, not sufficient, as the following example shows.

Example 3. The triangular integer array

$$\tilde{h} = \begin{array}{cccccc} & & & & & 1 \\ & & & & & 1 & 5 \\ & & & & 1 & 4 & 7 \\ & & & 1 & 3 & 3 & 4 \\ & & 1 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array}$$

satisfies the conditions in Proposition 2. However, there exists *no* SCM complex with the given array as its \tilde{h} -triangle.

To see this, assume the contrary and let Δ be a shifted complex with $\tilde{h}(\Delta) = \tilde{h}$. Let X and Y be the pure 3- and 2-skeleta of Δ , respectively. It follows from equation (2) that X is obtained by taking three iterated cones from a disjoint union of three points. Now, looking at f -vectors, it is clear that the underlying graph (1-skeleton) of Y is the same as the underlying graph of X , which is a complete 4-partite graph $K_{3,1,1,1}$. Now, if we remove from Y the smallest vertex in the shifted ordering, the underlying graph becomes $K_{3,1,1}$. However, this graph has only three missing triangles, whereas Y has four homology facets (i.e. facets F with $\mathcal{R}(F) = F$). Thus we get a contradiction.

Remark. Criterion (e) in Theorem 1 shows that in order to decide whether h is the h -vector of a Cohen–Macaulay simplicial complex it suffices to check a certain criterion for pairs of entries of h . The answer is yes if and only if the answer is yes for every pair of consecutive entries.

The same is not true for SCM complexes, as shown by the necessity of condition (b) in Proposition 2, as well as by Example 3. More than pairwise checks are needed here.

3. A combinatorial correspondence

Correspondences between monomials and sets (or between sets with repetitions and sets without) are well-known in combinatorics. We are going to make crucial use of such a correspondence, namely a more precise and elaborated version of the bijection defined in [BFS87] (see Remark 7). We call it the BFS correspondence. It is conveniently explained in terms of lattice paths.

By a *lattice path* from $(0, 0)$ to (r, a) we mean a path restricted to east (E) and north (N) steps, each connecting two adjacent lattice points. Thus, a lattice path can be seen as a word $L = L_1L_2 \dots L_{r+a}$ on the alphabet $\{N, E\}$ with the letter N appearing exactly a times. For two lattice paths L and L' , let $L < L'$ mean that L never goes above L' . The poset consisting of all lattice paths from $(0, 0)$ to (r, a) ordered by this partial order will be denoted by $\mathcal{L}_{r,a}$.

The lattice paths in $\mathcal{L}_{r,a}$ can be encoded in two natural ways: either by the position of the north steps, or by the number of north steps in each column. Thus, for $L \in \mathcal{L}_{r,a}$ let us define:

- $\nu(L)$ is the set of positions within L of its north steps, i.e. $\nu(L) := \{i : L_i = N\}$;
- $\lambda(L)$ is the monomial $\prod_{i=1}^r w_i^{\lambda_i(L)}$, where $\lambda_i(L)$ is the number of north steps of L coordinatized as $(i-1, j) \rightarrow (i-1, j+1)$, for some j .

Example 4. Let $L = NEENENNEEEN$. Then $\nu(L) = \{1, 4, 6, 7, 11\}$ and $\lambda(L) = w_1 w_3 w_4^2$ (see Figure 1).




Fig. 1. The lattice path $L = NEENENNEEEN$ from $(0, 0)$ to $(6, 5)$.


A few more definitions are needed. Recall that an *order ideal* Q in a poset P is a subset $Q \subseteq P$ such that if $x \in Q$ and $z < x$ then $z \in Q$. We use the following notation:

- $\binom{[r+a]}{a}$ = the set of a -element subsets of $\{1, \dots, r + a\}$,
- $\left(\binom{W_r}{\leq a}\right)$ = the set of monomials of degree $\leq a$ in indeterminates $W_r = \{w_1, \dots, w_r\}$.

We leave it to the the reader to verify the following simple observations.

- Proposition 5.** (a) *The map ν induces a bijection between shifted set families in $\binom{[r+a]}{a}$ and order ideals in $\mathcal{L}_{r,a}$.*
 (b) *The map λ induces a bijection between shifted multicomplexes in $\left(\binom{W_r}{\leq a}\right)$ and order ideals in $\mathcal{L}_{r,a}$.* □

Now, let a be a positive integer and m a monomial on W_r such that $\deg m \leq a$. Define $\varphi^a(m)$ to be the a -subset $\nu\lambda^{-1}(m)$ of $[r + a]$. We drop the integer a from the notation whenever there is no danger of confusion. Also, let ψ be the inverse of φ . The situation is illustrated in the following diagram of bijective maps:



- Proposition 6** (BFS correspondence). (a) *The map $\varphi := \nu\lambda^{-1}$ induces a bijection $\bar{\varphi}$, with inverse $\bar{\psi}$, between shifted multicomplexes in $\left(\binom{W_r}{\leq a}\right)$ and shifted set families in $\binom{[r+a]}{a}$.*
 (b) *For a pure shifted $(a - 1)$ -complex Δ with facets $\mathcal{F}(\Delta)$, one has $h(\Delta) = f(\bar{\psi}(\mathcal{F}(\Delta)))$.*

Proof. (a) follows from Proposition 5. For (b), observe that for a facet F of Δ , the cardinality of its restriction $\mathcal{R}(F)$, as discussed in connection with equation (2), is equal to the number of N steps in the last column of $v^{-1}(F)$. Hence,

$$|\mathcal{R}(F)| = |F| - |\sigma(F)| = \deg \psi(F).$$

This implies that $h_i(\Delta) = f_i(\overline{\psi}(\mathcal{F}(\Delta)))$ for all i . □

Remark 7. Our map φ from monomials to sets can be shown to be identical to the map φ defined in [BFS87, p. 30], up to relabeling (reversing the order of vertices and monomials).

It was shown in [BFS87] for multicomplexes M that M compressed $\Rightarrow \overline{\varphi}(M)$ shellable. Also, we have seen here that M shifted $\Rightarrow \overline{\varphi}(M)$ shifted. Since compressed \Rightarrow shifted \Rightarrow shellable, the latter implication strengthens the former at both ends of the implication arrow.

Definition 8. Let a be a positive integer and M a shifted multicomplex on W_r of degree less than or equal to a . Define $\Phi^a(M) = \Phi(M)$ to be the simplicial complex whose set of facets, $\mathcal{F}(\Phi(M))$, is $\overline{\varphi}(M)$. Also, for a pure shifted $(a - 1)$ -complex Δ , set $\Psi(\Delta)$ to be the multicomplex consisting of the monomials $\psi(F)$ for all facets F of Δ .

Let a be a positive integer and M a shifted multicomplex on W_r of degree less than or equal to a . Define the a -cone $\mathcal{C}_{r+1}^a M$ of M to be

$$\mathcal{C}_{r+1}^a M = \{w_{r+1}^\ell \cdot m : m \in M \text{ and } \deg m + \ell < a\}.$$

We will drop the indices $r + 1$ and a from the notation when they are clear from the context. The cone construction on multicomplexes can be seen as a non-square-free analogue of the topological cone. However, it is more useful to see it as an analogue of yet another combinatorial construction: the codimension one skeleton of a simplicial complex.

Proposition 9. Let M be a shifted multicomplex on W_r of degree less than or equal to a . Then the set $\mathcal{C}_{r+1}^a M$ is a shifted multicomplex on W_{r+1} . Furthermore, $\Phi^{a-1}(\mathcal{C}_{r+1}^a M)$ is the $(a - 2)$ -skeleton of $\Phi^a(M)$.

Proof. Obviously, $\mathcal{C}_{r+1}^a M$ is a pure shifted multicomplex on W_{r+1} of degree $a - 1$. Set $\Delta = \Phi^a(M)$. Then the facets of the codimension one skeleton of Δ are

$$\mathcal{F}(\Delta^{(a-2)}) = \{F \setminus j : F \in \mathcal{F}(\Delta) \ \& \ j \in \sigma(F)\}.$$

Let F be a facet of Δ and j an element in $\sigma(F)$. Observe that if $v^{-1}(F) = L_1 \dots L_{r+a}$, then $L_j = N$, and that $v^{-1}(F \setminus j)$ is the lattice path from $(0, 0)$ to $(r + 1, a - 1)$ obtained by changing L_j to an E step. On the level of monomials this is the same as multiplying by a suitable power of w_{r+1} . □

We wish to extend the BFS bijection to the realm of not-necessarily-pure shifted complexes, the motivation being to make this useful tool available for SCM complexes. To do so we need the following definition.

Definition 10 (Metacomplex). A d -metacomplex is a sequence $\mathcal{M} = (M^{[0]}, M^{[1]}, \dots, M^{[d]})$ of multicomplexes on W such that

- (a) $M^{[i]}$ is a multicomplex on $\{w_1, \dots, w_{n-i}\}$ of degree less than or equal to i , for all $0 \leq i \leq d$; and
- (b) $\mathcal{C}^i M^{[i]} \subseteq M^{[i-1]}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$.

Also, define the f -triangle of \mathcal{M} to be the triangular integer array $\mathfrak{f}(\mathcal{M}) = (f_{i,j})_{0 \leq j \leq i \leq d}$, where $f_{i,j}(\mathcal{M})$ is the number $f_j(M^{[i]})$ of degree j monomials in $M^{[i]}$. A metacomplex is *shifted* if all underlying multicomplexes $M^{[i]}$ are.

For a d -metacomplex \mathcal{M} , let $\overline{\Phi}(\mathcal{M})$ be the union

$$\overline{\Phi}(\mathcal{M}) = \bigcup_{i=0}^d \{\varphi^i(m) : m \in M^{[i]}\}$$

of subsets of $[n]$. It follows by Proposition 9 that the shadow of the collection of i -sets in $\overline{\Phi}(\mathcal{M})$ is contained in the collection of $(i - 1)$ -sets, for all $i \in [d]$. Thus, $\overline{\Phi}(\mathcal{M})$ is a shifted $(d - 1)$ -complex on $[n]$. Also, Proposition 6(b) implies that the \tilde{h} -triangle of $\overline{\Phi}(\mathcal{M})$ coincides with the f -triangle of \mathcal{M} .

Conversely, for a shifted $(d - 1)$ -complex Δ on $[n]$ the sequence

$$\overline{\Psi}(\Delta) := (\Psi(\Delta^{[0]}), \Psi(\Delta^{[1]}), \dots, \Psi(\Delta^{[d]}))$$

is a metacomplex whose f -triangle coincides with the \tilde{h} -triangle of Δ . Summarizing, we have established this:

Proposition 11 (Extended BFS correspondence). *The pair $(\overline{\Phi}, \overline{\Psi})$ is a bijection between shifted d -metacomplexes on W and shifted $(d - 1)$ -complexes on $[n]$. Moreover $\tilde{h}(\Delta) = \mathfrak{f}(\overline{\Psi}(\Delta))$. \square*

The extended BFS correspondence can also be derived in terms of lattice paths. Namely, let $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{r,a}$ be the set of all $\{N, E\}$ lattice paths beginning at $(0, 0)$ and ending at some point among $(n - j, j)$, $0 \leq j \leq d$. Then order ideals in $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{r,a}$ correspond bijectively to shifted d -metacomplexes on W on the one hand and to shifted $(d - 1)$ -complexes on $[n]$ on the other.

4. Face numbers of SCM complexes: A numerical characterization

In this section we give a numerical characterization of possible \tilde{h} -triangles of SCM complexes. For that purpose, we need to consider special kinds of integer systems $\mathcal{D} = \{q^m\}_m$, indexed by monomials m of degree less than or equal to t on a set $W_s = \{w_1, \dots, w_s\}$ of variables.

Definition 12. Let s and t be integers with $1 \leq s, t \leq d$. An $M_{s,t}$ -array is a function $q : \binom{W_s}{\leq t} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$ (whose values we write q^m rather than the conventional $q(m)$) such that

- (1) if $\deg(m) = t - \ell$ and $m' = u_j \cdot (m/u_i)$ for some $i < j$ such that u_i divides m , then $q^m \leq q^{m'}$;
- (2) if $\deg m = t$, then $q^m = 1$;
- (3) if $m' = m \cdot u_j$ for some $j \in [s]$ and $\deg(m) = t - \ell$, then $\partial^\ell(q^m) \leq q^{m'}$.

Let $h = (h_0, h_1, \dots, h_d)$ be an M -sequence and $r \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. An $M_{s,t}(h)$ -composition of r is an $M_{s,t}$ -array $\mathcal{D} = \{q^m\}_m$ such that

- (4) $h_\ell \leq q^m$ if $\deg(m) = t - \ell$;
- (5) $\sum_m q^m = r$.

For an $M_{s,t}$ -array $\mathcal{D} = \{q^m\}_m$, we let $\Sigma_s \mathcal{D}$ be the sum of all q^m such that u_s divides m . Further, we define:

- (6) $\rho_{s,t}(r; h) = \min\{\Sigma_s \mathcal{D} : \mathcal{D} \text{ is an } M_{s,t}(h)\text{-composition of } r\}$.
- (7) An $M_{s,t}(h)$ -composition \mathcal{D} of r is said to be *minimal* if $\Sigma_s \mathcal{D} = \rho_{s,t}(r; h)$.

Example 13. Let $h = (1, 4, 9, 4, 1)$ and $r = 22$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_1 &= \{q^1 = 10, q^{u_1} = 4, q^{u_2} = 5, q^{u_1^2} = q^{u_2^2} = q^{u_1 u_2} = 1\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_2 &= \{q^1 = 9, q^{u_1} = 5, q^{u_2} = 5, q^{u_1^2} = q^{u_2^2} = q^{u_1 u_2} = 1\} \end{aligned}$$

are two minimal $M_{2,2}(h)$ -composition of 22, whereas

$$\mathcal{D}_3 = \{q^1 = 9, q^{u_1} = 4, q^{u_2} = 6, q^{u_1^2} = q^{u_2^2} = q^{u_1 u_2} = 1\}$$

is a nonminimal $M_{2,2}(h)$ -composition of 22.

Clearly, for an integer r and a triple (h, t, s) as in Definition 12 such that $r \geq \sum_{i=0}^t \binom{s+i-1}{i} h_{t-i}$, an $M_{s,t}(h)$ -composition of r exists. Hence, the quantity $\rho_{s,t}(r; h)$ is well-defined. However, there is a canonical way to obtain a minimal composition that we now discuss.

Remark 14. For $s = 1$ condition (1) is void and the array is linear. So, by conditions (2) and (3) the concept is then equivalent to that of an ordinary M -sequence.

Let us first fix some notation. For a positive integer p with ℓ -representation

$$p = \binom{a_\ell}{\ell} + \binom{a_{\ell-1}}{\ell-1} + \dots + \binom{a_e}{e},$$

where $a_\ell > a_{\ell-1} > \dots > a_e \geq e \geq 1$, define

$$\partial^{(\ell,j)}(p) = \binom{a_\ell - j}{\ell - j} + \binom{a_{\ell-1} - j}{\ell - j - 1} + \dots + \binom{a_e - j}{e - j}.$$

In particular, $\partial^{(\ell,0)}(p) = p$ and $\partial^{(\ell,1)}(p) = \partial^\ell(p)$. Note that $\partial^{(\ell,j)}(p)$ is a lower bound for the number of monomials of degree $\ell - j$ in a multicomplex M with $f_\ell(M) = p$.

Let us define a linear order on the monomials of degree less than or equal to t on the set U_s of variables. For all i , set $1 <_i u_i <_i u_i^2 <_i \dots <_i u_i^t$. Finally set $<_\pi$ to be the product order of all $<_i$ induced by $u_1 < \dots < u_s$. Also, for a monomial m of degree $t - \ell$ on U_s and a nonnegative integer $j \leq t$ define

$$c_j(m) = |\{\text{monomials } m' \text{ on } U_{s,t-j} : \deg m' = t - j \text{ \& } m <_\pi m'\}|.$$

Construction 15. Let r, h, t and s be as in Definition 12. We construct a minimal $M_{s,t}(h)$ -composition of r inductively as follows.

- Set q^1 to be the maximum integer p such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^t \binom{s+j-1}{j} \cdot \max\{h_{t-j}, \partial^{(t,j)}(p)\} \leq r - p.$$

- Let m be a monomial of a positive degree $t - \ell$ and assume that $q^{m'}$ is defined for all monomials $m' <_\pi m$. Set q^m to be the maximum integer p such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m' <_\pi m} q^{m'} + \sum_{j=0}^{\ell} c_{\ell-j}(m) \cdot \max\{h_{\ell-j}, \partial^{(\ell,j)}(p)\} \\ + \sum_{j=\ell+1}^t c_j(m) \cdot \max\{q^{m'} : \deg m' = t - j \text{ \& } m' <_\pi m\} \geq r - p. \end{aligned}$$

It is not difficult to see that the construction above yields a minimal $M_{s,t}(h)$ -composition of r . This minimal composition will be called the *regular $M_{s,t}(h)$ -composition* of r .

The following is our main result.

Theorem 16. A triangular integer array $\tilde{h} = (\tilde{h}_{i,j})_{0 \leq j \leq i \leq d}$ is the \tilde{h} -triangle of a sequentially CM complex if and only if

- (a) every row $h^{[i]} = (\tilde{h}_{i,0}, \tilde{h}_{i,1}, \dots, \tilde{h}_{i,i})$ is an M -sequence;
- (b) $\tilde{h}_{i,j} \geq \sum_{\ell \leq j} \tilde{h}_{i+1,\ell}$;
- (c) $\rho_{j,d-i}(h_{i,j}; h^{[d]}) \leq \tilde{h}_{i,j-1}$.

Proof. Necessity. Conditions (a) and (b) are already discussed in Proposition 2. We shall prove the necessity of (c).

Let Δ be a shifted $(d - 1)$ -complex and $\mathcal{M} := (M^{[0]}, M^{[1]}, \dots, M^{[d]})$ its associated metacomplex on W . Denote by $Q_{i,j}$ the set of all monomials in $M^{[i]}$ of degree j . In particular, the cardinality of $Q_{i,j}$ is equal to $\tilde{h}_{i,j}$. Now, for a monomial m on $U = \{w_{n-d+1}, \dots, w_{n-i}\}$, consider the set

$$Q_{i,j}^m = \{p = p(w_1, \dots, w_{n-i}) \in Q_{i,j} : p(1, \dots, 1, w_{n-d}, \dots, w_{n-i}) = m\}.$$

We denote by $q_{i,j}^m$ the cardinality of $Q_{i,j}^m$.

Claim. Set $u_t := w_{n-d+t}$ for all $t \in [d - i]$. Then $\mathcal{D} = \{q_{i,j}^m\}_m$ is an $M_{j,d-i}(h^{[d]})$ -composition of $\tilde{h}_{i,j}$.

Proof of the claim. First observe that the sets $Q_{i,j}^m$ form a partition of $Q_{i,j}$. Hence, condition (5) of Definition 12 is satisfied. Now, let m be a monomial of degree $j - \ell$ on U and $m' = u_k \cdot (m/u_r)$ for some r and k such that $r < k \leq d - i$ and u_r divides m . It follows from Proposition 11 and Definition 10 that $\tilde{h}_{d,\ell} \leq q_{i,j}^m$. Also, since $M^{[i]}$ is shifted, for every $p \in Q_{i,j}^m$, one has $u_k \cdot u_r^{-1} \cdot p \in Q_{i,j}^{m'}$. Thus, $q_{i,j}^m \leq q_{i,j}^{m'}$ and condition (1) is also valid.

Finally, set $m' = u_k \cdot m$ for some $k \leq d - i$. Let $p \in Q_{i,j}^m$. For every $w \in \{w_1, \dots, w_{n-d}\}$ that divides p , the monomial $u_k \cdot (p/w)$ is in $Q_{i,j}^{m'}$, since $M^{[i]}$ is shifted. Hence, the shadow of the collection $\{p/m : p \in Q_{i,j}^m\}$ of monomials is contained in $\{p'/m' : p' \in Q_{i,j}^{m'}\}$. This proves condition (3) of Definition 12. Therefore, $\mathcal{D} = \{q_{i,j}^m\}_m$ is an $M_{j,d-i}(h^{[d]})$ -composition of $\tilde{h}_{i,j}$. \square

To complete the proof of necessity, for every monomial m on U that is divisible by w_{n-i} , set $m' = m/w_{n-i}$. The division map

$$\times w_{n-i}^{-1} : Q_{i,j}^m \rightarrow Q_{i,j-1}^{m'}$$

is an injection, since $M^{[i]}$ is a multicomplex. Hence,

$$\Sigma_{d-i} \mathcal{D} = \sum_{w_{n-i} | m} q_{i,j}^m \leq \sum_{m'} q_{i,j-1}^{m'} = \tilde{h}_{i,j-1}.$$

Therefore $\rho_{j,d-i}(\tilde{h}_{i,j}; h^{[d]}) \leq \tilde{h}_{i,j-1}$, as desired.

Sufficiency. Let \tilde{h} be a triangular integer array satisfying conditions (a)–(c) of the statement. In the light of Proposition 11, it suffices to construct a metacomplex \mathcal{M} such that $f(\mathcal{M}) = \tilde{h}$. We construct \mathcal{M} as follows:

- Let $M^{[d]}$ be the compressed multicomplex on $\{w_1, \dots, w_{n-d}\}$ consisting of the first $\tilde{h}_{d,j}$ monomials of degree j in reverse lexicographic order, for all $0 \leq j \leq d$.
- Let i be an integer less than d . We shall construct $M^{[i]}$. For $j \leq i$, let $\mathcal{D}_{i,j} = \{q_{i,j}^m\}_m$ be the regular $M_{j,d-i}(h^{[d]})$ -composition of $\tilde{h}_{i,j}$. Consider the change of variables $u_t \rightarrow w_{n-d+t}$ for $t \in [d - i]$. We will use the same notation m to denote the image of m under this change of variables; this should not lead to any confusion. Now, for a monomial m of degree ℓ on $\{w_{n-d+1}, \dots, w_{n-i}\}$, let $P_{i,j}^m$ be the set of the first $q_{i,j}^m$ monomials of degree $j - \ell$ on $\{w_1, \dots, w_{n-d}\}$ in reverse lexicographic order. Also, let

$$Q_{i,j} = \bigcup_m \{m \cdot p : p \in P_{i,j}^m\}.$$

Finally, we set $M^{[i]} = \bigcup_{j=0}^i Q_{i,j}$.

Clearly, the number of elements of degree j in $M^{[i]}$ is $\tilde{h}_{i,j}$. Also, since the $M^{[i]}$'s are shifted multicomplexes, it follows from condition (b) that $\mathcal{C}^{i+1} M^{[i+1]} \subseteq M^{[i]}$. Thus, it only remains to show that $M^{[i]}$ is a shifted multicomplex. We first show that $Q_{i,j}$ is a shifted family of monomials for all j . Let p be a monomial in $Q_{i,j}^m$, and let w_r and w_k be two variables in $\{w_1, \dots, w_{n-i}\}$ such that $k < r$ and w_k divides p . We shall show that $w_r \cdot (p/w_k) \in Q_{i,j}$. Consider the following cases:

Case 1: $k < r \leq n - d$. If $p' = p/m$, then $w_r \cdot (p'/w_k) \in P_{i,j}^m$, since $P_{i,j}^m$ is shifted. Hence, $w_r \cdot (p/w_k) \in Q_{i,j}^m$.

Case 2: $k \leq n - d < r \leq n - i$. Note that the shadow of $P_{i,j}^m$ is contained in $P_{i,j}^{m'}$ by condition (3) of Definition 12, where $m' = w_r \cdot m$. Thus, $w_r \cdot (p/w_k) \in Q_{i,j}^{m'}$.

Case 3: $k \leq n - d < r \leq n - i$. Condition (1) of Definition 12 implies that $P_{i,j}^m$ is contained in $P_{i,j}^{m'}$ for $m' = w_r \cdot (m/w_k)$. In particular, $w_r \cdot (p/w_k) \in Q_{i,j}^{m'}$ and $Q_{i,j}$ is a shifted family.

Finally, assume that $p \in Q_{i,j}$ and w is a variable dividing p . The shifted property ensures that $w_{n-i} \cdot (p/w) \in Q_{i,j}$. However, it follows from (c) that $p/w \in Q_{i,j-1}$. This shows that $M^{[1]}$ is a multicomplex. \square

5. Betti tables of componentwise linear ideals

In this section we obtain a characterization of the possible Betti tables of componentwise linear ideals in a polynomial ring over a field of arbitrary characteristic. We start by recalling some definitions and refer the reader to the book by Herzog & Hibi [HH11] for undefined terminology.

A graded ideal I is said to have an r -linear resolution if $b_{s,s+\ell}(I) = 0$ for all $\ell \neq r$. For a graded ideal I , let $I_{(r)}$ be the ideal generated by all monomials of degree r in I . Then I is called *componentwise linear* if $I_{(r)}$ has an r -linear resolution for all r .

For square-free monomial ideals the notion of componentwise linearity is dual to sequential Cohen–Macaulayness, in the sense that the Stanley–Reisner ideal I_Δ of a complex Δ is componentwise linear if and only if its Alexander dual Δ^* is SCM. In particular, the Stanley–Reisner ideal of a shifted complex is componentwise linear; such an ideal is called *square-free strongly stable*. Square-free strongly stable ideals are square-free analogues of strongly stable ideals. Recall that a monomial ideal $I \subseteq S$ is said to be *strongly stable* if for every monomial u in the minimal set $\mathcal{G}(I)$ of monomial generators of I and all $i < j$ such that x_j divides u , the element $x_i \cdot (u/x_j)$ is in I .

Observation 17 (Herzog, Sharifan & Varbaro, [HSV14]). The set of Betti tables of componentwise linear ideals in a polynomial ring over a field of an arbitrary characteristic coincides with those of the strongly stable ideals.

In characteristic zero, it is known [HH11, Theorem 8.2.22] that componentwise linearity can be characterized as ideals with stable Betti table under (reverse lexicographic) generic initial ideal. The interesting part of the observation is that the characterization of the Betti tables does not depend on the characteristic. We do not rewrite the observation here, instead we refer the reader to [HSV14, p. 1879] for more details.

Proposition 18. *The set of all Betti tables of r -regular componentwise linear ideals in the polynomial ring $\mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ coincides with the set of all Betti tables of r -regular square-free strongly stable ideals in the polynomial ring $\mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_{n+r-1}]$.*

Proof. Note that the Betti table of an ideal depends only on the set of generators, in the sense that if $I \subseteq \mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and J is the ideal generated by the set $\mathcal{G}(I)$ of generators of I in the polynomial ring $\mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_{n+r}]$, then I and J have the same Betti tables. Now the conclusion follows from [HH11, Lemmas 11.2.5 and 11.2.6]. \square

Let I be a square-free strongly stable ideal in S . For $u \in \mathcal{G}(I)$, denote by $m(u)$ the largest index t such that x_t divides u . If $d = \{\min \deg u : u \in \mathcal{G}(I)\}$, then for $\ell \geq d$ define

$$m_{k,\ell}(I) = |\{u \in \mathcal{G}(I) : \deg u = \ell \ \& \ m(u) = k + \ell - 1\}|.$$

Clearly, $m_{k,\ell} = 0$ if $k + \ell \geq n + 1$. Thus we may think of the collection of doubly indexed m -numbers as a triangular array. The triangular integer array $m(I) := (m_{k,\ell})_{1 \leq k \leq n-\ell+1 \leq n-d+1}$ is called the *reduced array of generators* of I .

The square-free version of Eliahou–Kervaire implies (see [HH11, Subsection 7.2]) that

$$b_{s,s+\ell}(I) = \sum_{k=s-1}^n \binom{k}{s} m_{k,\ell}(I),$$

or equivalently

$$\sum_{s \geq 0} b_{s,s+\ell}(I)t^s = \sum_{s \geq 0} m_{s+1,\ell}(I)(1+t)^s. \tag{3}$$

In particular, the characterization of the possible Betti tables of square-free strongly stable ideals is equivalent to characterizing the possible reduced arrays of generators. Following [HSV14], for a square-free strongly stable ideal I we also consider doubly indexed μ -numbers defined recursively by

$$m_{\ell,k} = \mu_{\ell,k} - \sum_{q=1}^{\ell} \mu_{q,k-1}. \tag{4}$$

The triangular integer array $\tilde{m}(I) = (\mu_{\ell,k})_{1 \leq k \leq n-\ell+1 \leq n-d+1}$ is called the *array of generators* of I .

The task of characterizing all possible (reduced) arrays of generators of square-free strongly stable ideals, however, translates nicely into combinatorics as follows.

Lemma 19. *Let Δ be a shifted simplicial complex on $[n]$. Then*

$$m_{s+1,k}(I_\Delta) = h_{n-k,s}(\Delta^*).$$

In particular, the array of generators of I_Δ is the same as the \tilde{h} -triangle of Δ^ (up to a suitable rotation).*

Proof. For a facet F in a shifted simplicial complex on $[n]$, let ℓ_F be the smallest integer such that $\ell_F \in \sigma(F)$ if $\sigma(F)$ is nonempty; otherwise set $\ell_F = n + 1$. It follows from equation (2) that

$$h_{n-k,s}(\Delta^*) = |\{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Delta^*) : |F| = n - k \ \& \ \ell_F = s + k + 1\}|.$$

Now, observe that the complement map $F \mapsto F^c$ induces a bijection between $\mathcal{F}(\Delta^*)$ and $\mathcal{G}(I_\Delta)$ with the property that if u is the image of F , then $\deg u + |F| = n$ and $\ell_F - 1 = m(u)$. Hence,

$$h_{n-k,s}(\Delta^*) = |\{u \in \mathcal{G}(I_\Delta) : \deg u = k \text{ \& } m(u) = s + k\}| = m_{s+1,k}(I_\Delta).$$

The last part of the statement follows by comparing equations (1) and (4). \square

The following corollary first appeared in [HRW99, Proposition 12]. Unfortunately, there is a misprint in the statement in the published version of that paper.

Corollary 20. *Let Δ be sequentially Cohen–Macaulay. Then*

$$\sum_{i \geq 0} b_{i,i+j}(I_{\Delta^*})t^i = \sum_{i \geq 0} h_{n-j-1,i}(\Delta)(1+t)^i.$$

Proof. Using algebraic shifting, it is enough to prove the result for the special case of shifted complexes. However, in this case the result follows from equation (3) and Lemma 19. \square

Theorem 21. *A triangular integer array $\tilde{\mu} = (\mu_{\ell,k})_{1 \leq k \leq n-\ell+r \leq n-d+r}$ is the array of generators of an r -regular componentwise linear ideal of S with minimum degree of a generator equal to d if and only if*

- (a) every column $\mu^{[j]} = (\tilde{\mu}_{1,j}, \tilde{\mu}_{2,j}, \dots, \tilde{\mu}_{n+r-j,j})$ is an M -sequence;
- (b) $\tilde{\mu}_{i,j} \geq \sum_{\ell \leq i} \tilde{\mu}_{\ell,j-1}$;
- (c) $\rho_{i,j-d+1}(\tilde{\mu}_{i+1,j}; \mu^{[d]}) \leq \tilde{\mu}_{i,j}$.

Proof. This follows from Lemma 19 and Theorem 16. \square

Acknowledgments. K. Adiprasito was supported by an EPDI/IPDE postdoctoral fellowship, and a Minerva fellowship of the Max Planck Society. A. Björner and A. Goodarzi enjoyed the support of Vetenskapsrådet, grant 2011-11677-88409-18.

References

- [AHH00] Aramova, A., Herzog, J., Hibi, T.: Ideals with stable Betti numbers. *Adv. Math.* **152**, 72–77 (2000) [Zbl 0968.13008](#) [MR 1762120](#)
- [BFS87] Björner, A., Frankl, P., Stanley, R.: The number of faces of balanced Cohen–Macaulay complexes and a generalized Macaulay theorem. *Combinatorica* **7**, 23–34 (1987) [Zbl 0651.05010](#) [MR 0905148](#)
- [BW96] Björner, A., Wachs, M. L.: Shellable nonpure complexes and posets. I. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **348**, 1299–1327 (1996) [Zbl 0857.05102](#) [MR 1333388](#)
- [BW97] Björner, A., Wachs, M. L.: Shellable nonpure complexes and posets. II. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **349**, 3945–3975 (1997) [Zbl 0886.05126](#) [MR 1401765](#)
- [CHH04] Conca, A., Herzog, J., Hibi, T.: Rigid resolutions and big Betti numbers. *Comment. Math. Helv.* **79**, 826–839 (2004) [Zbl 1080.13008](#) [MR 2099124](#)
- [CU03] Crupi, M., Utano, R.: Extremal Betti numbers of graded ideals. *Results Math.* **43**, 235–244 (2003) [Zbl 1052.13007](#) [MR 1989802](#)

- [Duv96] Duval, A. M.: Algebraic shifting and sequentially Cohen–Macaulay simplicial complexes. *Electron. J. Combin.* **3** (1996), no. 1, research paper 21, approx. 14 pp. [Zbl 0883.06003](#) [MR 1399398](#)
- [HH11] Herzog, J., Hibi, T.: *Monomial Ideals*. Grad. Texts in Math. 260, Springer London, London (2011) [Zbl 1206.13001](#) [MR 2724673](#)
- [HRW99] Herzog, J., Reiner, V., Welker, V.: Componentwise linear ideals and Golod rings. *Michigan Math. J.* **46**, 211–223 (1999) [Zbl 0967.13018](#) [MR 1704158](#)
- [HSV14] Herzog, J., Sharifan, L., Varbaro, M.: The possible extremal Betti numbers of a homogeneous ideal. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **142**, 1875–1891 (2014) [Zbl 1291.13022](#) [MR 3182008](#)
- [Kal02] Kalai, G., Algebraic shifting. In: *Computational Commutative Algebra and Combinatorics* (Osaka, 1999), *Adv. Stud. Pure Math.* 33, Math. Soc. Japan, Tokyo, 121–163 (2002) [Zbl 1034.57021](#) [MR 1890098](#)
- [KK12] Kämpf, G., Kubitzke, M.: Exterior depth and exterior generic annihilator numbers. *Comm. Algebra* **40**, 1–25 (2012) [Zbl 1238.05285](#) [MR 2876285](#)
- [Lic91] Lickorish, W. B. R.: Unshellable triangulations of spheres. *Eur. J. Combin.* **12**, 527–530 (1991) [Zbl 0746.57007](#) [MR 1136394](#)
- [Mac27] Macaulay, F. S.: Some properties of enumeration in the theory of modular systems. *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (2) **26**, 531–555 (1927) [Zbl 53.0104.01](#) [MR 1576950](#)
- [Sch99] Schenzel, P.: On the dimension filtration and Cohen–Macaulay filtered modules. In: *Commutative Algebra and Algebraic Geometry* (Ferrara), Dekker, New York, NY, 245–264 (1999) [Zbl 0942.13015](#) [MR 1702109](#)
- [Sta96] Stanley, R. P.: *Combinatorics and Commutative Algebra*. 2nd ed., *Progr. Math.* 41, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA (1996) [Zbl 1157.13302](#) [MR 1453579](#)
- [Sta77] Stanley, R. P.: Cohen–Macaulay complexes. In: *Higher Combinatorics* (Berlin, 1976), *NATO Adv. Study Inst. Ser. C Math. Phys. Sci.* 31, Reidel, Dordrecht, 51–62 (1977) [Zbl 0376.55007](#) [MR 0572989](#)