

# NEWTON COMPLEMENTARY DUALS OF $f$ -IDEALS

SAMUEL BUDD AND ADAM VAN TUYL

ABSTRACT. A square-free monomial ideal  $I$  of  $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  is said to be an  $f$ -ideal if the facet complex and non-face complex associated with  $I$  have the same  $f$ -vector. We show that  $I$  is an  $f$ -ideal if and only if its Newton complementary dual  $\widehat{I}$  is also an  $f$ -ideal. Because of this duality, previous results about some classes of  $f$ -ideals can be extended to a much larger class of  $f$ -ideals. An interesting by-product of our work is an alternative formulation of the Kruskal-Katona theorem for  $f$ -vectors of simplicial complexes.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $I$  be a square-free monomial ideal of  $R = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  where  $k$  is a field. Associated with any such ideal are two simplicial complexes. The *non-face complex*, denoted  $\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I)$ , (also called the *Stanley-Reisner complex*) is the simplicial complex whose faces are in one-to-one correspondence with the square-free monomials not in  $I$ . Faridi [7] introduced a second complex, the *facet complex*  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)$ , where the generators of  $I$  define the facets of the simplicial complex (see the next section for complete definitions). In general, the two simplicial complexes  $\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I)$  and  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)$  can be very different. For example, the two complexes may have different dimensions; as a consequence, the  $f$ -vectors of  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)$  and  $\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I)$ , which enumerate all the faces of a given dimension, may be quite different.

If  $I$  is a square-free monomial ideal with the property that the  $f$ -vectors of  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)$  and  $\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I)$  are the same, then  $I$  is called an  $f$ -ideal. The notion of an  $f$ -ideal was first introduced by Abbasi, Ahmad, Anwar, and Baig [1]. It is natural to ask if it is possible to classify all the square-free monomial ideals that are  $f$ -ideals. Abbasi, et. al classified all the  $f$ -ideals generated in degree two. This result was later generalized by Anwar, Mahmood, Binyamin, and Zafar [3] which classified all the  $f$ -ideals  $I$  that are unmixed and generated in degree  $d \geq 2$ . An alternative proof for this result was found by Guo and Wu [10]. Gu, Wu, and Liu [9] later removed the unmixed restriction of [3]. Other work related to  $f$ -ideals includes the papers [14, 15].

The purpose of this note is to show that the property of being an  $f$ -ideal is preserved after taking the Newton complementary dual of  $I$ . The notion of a Newton complementary dual was first introduced in a more general context by Costa and Simis [5] in their study of Cremona maps; additional properties were developed by Dória and Simis [6]. Ansaldo, Lin, and Shin [2] later investigated the Newton complementary duals of monomial ideals.

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05E45,05E40,13F55.

*Key words and phrases.*  $f$ -ideals, facet ideal, Stanley-Reisner correspondence,  $f$ -vectors, Newton complementary dual, Kruskal-Katona.

Version: March 3, 2022.

Using the definition of [2], the *Newton complementary dual* of a square-free monomial ideal  $I$  is

$$\widehat{I} = \left\langle \frac{x_1 \cdots x_n}{m} \mid m \in \mathcal{G}(I) \right\rangle$$

where  $\mathcal{G}(I)$  denotes the minimal generators of  $I$ . With this notation, we prove:

**Theorem 1.1** (Theorem 4.1). *Let  $I \subseteq R$  be a square-free monomial ideal. Then  $I$  is an  $f$ -ideal if and only if  $\widehat{I}$  is an  $f$ -ideal.*

Our proof involves relating the  $f$ -vectors of the four simplicial complexes  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)$ ,  $\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I)$ ,  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(\widehat{I})$ , and  $\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(\widehat{I})$ . An interesting by-product of this discussion is to give a reformulation of the celebrated Kruskal-Katona theorem (see [12, 13]) which classifies what vectors can be the  $f$ -vector of a simplicial complex (see Theorem 3.7).

A consequence of Theorem 1.1 is that  $f$ -ideals come in “pairs”. Note that when  $I$  is an  $f$ -ideal generated in degree  $d$ , then  $\widehat{I}$  gives us an  $f$ -ideal generated in degree  $n - d$ . We can use the classification of [1] of  $f$ -ideals generated in degree two to also give us a classification of  $f$ -ideals generated in degree  $n - 2$ . This corollary and others are given as applications of Theorem 1.1.

Our paper uses the following outline. In Section 2 we provide all the necessary background results. In Section 3, we introduce the Newton complementary dual of a square-free monomial ideal, and we study how the  $f$ -vector behaves under this duality. In Section 4 we prove Theorem 1.1 and devote the rest of the section to applications.

**Acknowledgments.** Parts of this paper appeared in the first author’s MSc project [4]. The second author’s research was supported in part by NSERC Discovery Grant 2014-03898. We thank Hasan Mahmood for his feedback and comments. Macaulay2 [8] was used in the initial stages of this project. We also thank the referee for his/her helpful suggestions and improvements.

## 2. BACKGROUND

In this section, we review the required background results.

Let  $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  be a set of vertices. A *simplicial complex*  $\Delta$  on  $X$  is a subset of the power set of  $X$  that satisfies: (i) if  $F \in \Delta$  and  $G \subseteq F$ , then  $G \in \Delta$ , and (ii)  $\{x_i\} \in \Delta$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . An element  $F \in \Delta$  is called a *face*; maximal faces with respect to inclusion are called *facets*. If  $F_1, \dots, F_r$  are the facets of  $\Delta$ , then we write  $\Delta = \langle F_1, \dots, F_r \rangle$ .

For any face  $F \in \Delta$ , the *dimension* of  $F$  is given by  $\dim(F) = |F| - 1$ . Note that  $\emptyset \in \Delta$  and  $\dim(\emptyset) = -1$ . The *dimension* of  $\Delta$  is given by  $\dim(\Delta) = \max\{\dim(F) \mid F \in \Delta\}$ . If  $d = \dim(\Delta)$ , then the  $f$ -vector of  $\Delta$  is the  $d + 2$  tuple

$$f(\Delta) = (f_{-1}, f_0, f_1, \dots, f_d)$$

where  $f_i$  is number of faces of dimension  $i$  in  $\Delta$ . We write  $f_i(\Delta)$  if we need to specify the simplicial complex.

Suppose that  $I$  is a square-free monomial ideal of  $R = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  with  $k$  a field. We use  $\mathcal{G}(I)$  to denote the unique set of minimal generators of  $I$ . If we identify the variables

of  $R$  with the vertices  $X$ , we can associate to  $I$  two simplicial complexes. The *non-face complex* (or *Stanley-Reisner complex*) is the simplicial complex

$$\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I) = \{ \{x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_j}\} \subseteq X \mid x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_j} \notin I \}.$$

In other words, the faces of  $\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I)$  are in one-to-one correspondence with the square-free monomials of  $R$  not in the ideal  $I$ . The *facet complex* is the simplicial complex

$$\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I) = \langle \{x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_j}\} \subseteq X \mid x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_j} \in \mathcal{G}(I) \rangle.$$

The facets of  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)$  are in one-to-one correspondence with the minimal generator of  $I$ .

In general, the two simplicial complexes  $\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I)$  and  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)$  constructed from  $I$  are very different. In this note, we are interested in the following family of monomial ideals:

**Definition 2.1.** A square-free monomial ideal  $I$  is an *f-ideal* if  $f(\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I)) = f(\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I))$ .

**Example 2.2.** We illustrate the above ideas with the following example. Let  $I = \langle x_1x_4, x_2x_5, x_1x_2x_3, x_3x_4x_5 \rangle \subseteq R = k[x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5]$  be a square-free monomial ideal. Then Figure 1 shows both the facet and non-face complexes that are associated with  $I$ .




FIGURE 1. Facet and non-face complexes of  $I = \langle x_1x_4, x_2x_5, x_1x_2x_3, x_3x_4x_5 \rangle$ .

From Figure 1, one can see that  $f(\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)) = f(\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I)) = (1, 5, 8, 2)$ , and therefore  $I$  is an *f-ideal*. We note that  $I$  in this example is generated by monomials of different degrees. In most of the other papers on this topic (e.g., [1, 3, 9, 10, 14, 15]) the focus has been on *equigenerated ideals*, i.e., ideals where all generators have the same degree.

**Remark 2.3.** It is important to note that  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)$  and  $\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I)$  may be simplicial complexes on different sets of vertices, and in particular, one must pay attention to the ambient ring.

For example, consider  $I = \langle x_1, x_2x_3, x_2x_4, x_3x_4 \rangle \subseteq k[x_1, \dots, x_5]$ . For this ideal,  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)$  is a simplicial complex on  $\{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$  with facets  $\{\{x_1\}, \{x_2, x_3\}, \{x_2, x_4\}, \{x_3, x_4\}\}$ . So  $f(\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)) = (1, 4, 3)$ . The vertices of  $\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I)$  are  $\{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5\} \setminus \{x_1\}$ . Its facets are  $\{\{x_2, x_5\}, \{x_3, x_5\}, \{x_4, x_5\}\}$ . From this description, we see that  $I$ , in fact, is an *f-ideal*.

Note, however, that if  $I$  is an *f-ideal*, and if every generator of  $I$  has degree at least two, then  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)$  and  $\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I)$  must be simplicial complexes on the vertex set  $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ . To see why, since every generator of  $I$  has degree  $\geq 2$ , this implies that  $\{x_i\} \in \delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I)$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . So,  $n = f_0(\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I)) = f_0(\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I))$ , that is,  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)$  must also have  $n$  vertices.

The above observation implies that the ideal  $I = \langle x_1x_2 \rangle \subseteq k[x_1, x_2, x_3]$  cannot be an *f-ideal* since it is generated by a monomial of degree two, but  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)$  is a simplicial complex on  $\{x_1, x_2\}$ , but the vertices of  $\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I)$  are  $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ .

**Remark 2.4.** Although the  $f$ -vector counts faces of a simplicial complex, we can reinterpret the  $f_j$ 's as counting square-free monomials of a fixed degree. In particular,

$$f_j(\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I)) = \# \left\{ m \in R_{j+1} \mid \begin{array}{l} m \text{ is a square-free monomial of degree} \\ j+1 \text{ and } m \notin I_{j+1} \end{array} \right\}.$$

On the other hand, for the  $f$ -vector of  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)$  we have

$$f_j(\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)) = \# \left\{ m \in R_{j+1} \mid \begin{array}{l} m \text{ is a square-free monomial of degree } j+1 \\ \text{that divides some } p \in \mathcal{G}(I) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Here,  $R_t$ , respectively  $I_t$ , denotes the degree  $t$  homogeneous elements of  $R$ , respectively  $I$ .

We refine Remark 2.4 by introducing a partition of the set of square-free monomials of degree  $d$ . This partition will be useful in Section 4. For each integer  $d \geq 0$ , let  $M_d \subseteq R_d$  denote the set of square-free monomial of degree  $d$  in  $R_d$ . Given a square-free monomial ideal  $I$  with generating set  $\mathcal{G}(I)$ , set

$$\begin{aligned} A_d(I) &= \{m \in M_d \mid m \notin I_d \text{ and } m \text{ does not divide any element of } \mathcal{G}(I)\} \\ B_d(I) &= \{m \in M_d \mid m \notin I_d \text{ and } m \text{ divides some element of } \mathcal{G}(I)\} \\ C_d(I) &= \{m \in M_d \mid m \in \mathcal{G}(I)\}, \text{ and} \\ D_d(I) &= \{m \in M_d \mid m \in I_d \setminus \mathcal{G}(I)\}. \end{aligned}$$

So, for any square-free monomial ideal  $I$  and integer  $d \geq 0$  we have the partition

$$(2.1) \quad M_d = A_d(I) \sqcup B_d(I) \sqcup C_d(I) \sqcup D_d(I).$$

Using this notation, we have the following characterization of  $f$ -ideals.

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $I \subseteq k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  be a square-free monomial ideal. Then  $I$  is an  $f$ -ideal if and only if  $|A_d(I)| = |C_d(I)|$  for all  $0 \leq d \leq n$ .*

*Proof.* Note that Remark 2.4 implies that

$$f_j(\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I)) = |A_{j+1}(I)| + |B_{j+1}(I)| \text{ for all } j \geq -1$$

and

$$f_j(\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)) = |B_{j+1}(I)| + |C_{j+1}(I)| \text{ for all } j \geq -1.$$

The conclusion now follows since  $f_j(\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)) = f_j(\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I))$  for all  $-1 \leq j \leq n-1$  if and only if  $|A_d(I)| = |C_d(I)|$  for all  $0 \leq d \leq n$ .  $\square$

### 3. THE NEWTON COMPLEMENTARY DUAL AND $f$ -VECTORS

We introduce the generalized Newton complementary dual of a monomial ideal as defined by [2] (based upon [5]). We then show how the  $f$ -vector behaves under this operation.

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $I \subseteq R = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  be a monomial ideal with  $\mathcal{G}(I) = \{m_1, \dots, m_p\}$ . Suppose that  $m_i = x_1^{\alpha_{i,1}} x_2^{\alpha_{i,2}} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_{i,n}}$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, p$ . Let  $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$  be a vector such that  $\beta_i \geq \alpha_{k,i}$  for all  $l = 1, \dots, n$  and  $k = 1, \dots, p$ . The *generalized Newton complementary dual* of  $I$  determined by  $\beta$  is the ideal

$$\widehat{I}^{[\beta]} = \left\langle \frac{x^\beta}{m} \mid m \in \mathcal{G}(I) \right\rangle = \left\langle \frac{x^\beta}{m_1}, \frac{x^\beta}{m_2}, \dots, \frac{x^\beta}{m_p} \right\rangle \text{ where } x^\beta = x_1^{\beta_1} \cdots x_n^{\beta_n}.$$

**Remark 3.2.** If  $I \subseteq R = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  is a square-free monomial ideal, then one can take  $\beta = (1, \dots, 1) = \mathbf{1}$ , i.e.,  $x^\beta = x_1 \cdots x_n$ . For simplicity, we denote  $\widehat{I}^{[1]}$  by  $\widehat{I}$  and call it the *complementary dual* of  $I$ . Note that we have  $\widehat{\widehat{I}} = I$ .

**Example 3.3.** We return to the ideal  $I$  of Example 2.2. For this ideal we have

$$\widehat{I} = \left\langle \frac{x_1 \cdots x_5}{x_1 x_4}, \frac{x_1 \cdots x_5}{x_2 x_5}, \frac{x_1 \cdots x_5}{x_1 x_2 x_3}, \frac{x_1 \cdots x_5}{x_3 x_4 x_5} \right\rangle = \langle x_2 x_3 x_5, x_1 x_3 x_4, x_4 x_5, x_1 x_2 \rangle.$$

The next lemma is key to understanding how the  $f$ -vector behaves under the duality.

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $I \subseteq R = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  be a square-free monomial ideal. For all integers  $j = -1, \dots, n-1$ , there is a bijection*

$$\begin{aligned} & \{m \in R_{j+1} \mid m \text{ a square-free monomial that divides some } p \in \mathcal{G}(I)\} \\ & \leftrightarrow \left\{ m \in \widehat{I}_{n-j-1} \mid m \text{ a square-free monomial} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Fix a  $j \in \{-1, \dots, n-1\}$  and let  $A$  denote the first set, and let  $B$  denote the second set. We claim that the map  $\varphi : A \rightarrow B$  given by

$$\varphi(m) = \frac{x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n}{m}$$

gives the desired bijection. This map is defined because if  $m \in A$ , there is a generator  $p \in \mathcal{G}(I)$  such that  $m \mid p$ . But that then means that  $\frac{x_1 \cdots x_n}{p}$  divides  $\varphi(m) = \frac{x_1 \cdots x_n}{m}$ , and consequently,  $\varphi(m) \in \widehat{I}$ . Moreover, since  $\deg(m) = j+1$ , we have  $\deg(\varphi(m)) = n-j-1$ . Finally, since  $m$  is a square-free monomial, so is  $\varphi(m)$ .

It is immediate that the map is injective. For surjectivity, let  $m \in B$ . It suffices to show that the square-free monomial  $m' = \frac{x_1 \cdots x_n}{m} \in A$  since  $\varphi(m') = m$ . By our construction of  $m'$  it follows that  $\deg(m') = j+1$ . Also, because  $m \in B$ , there is some  $p \in \mathcal{G}(I)$  such that  $\frac{x_1 \cdots x_n}{p}$  divides  $m$ . But this then means that  $m'$  divides  $p$ , i.e.,  $m' \in A$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.5.** Using the notation introduced before Lemma 2.5, Lemma 3.4 gives a bijection between  $B_{j+1}(I) \sqcup C_{j+1}(I)$  and  $C_{n-j-1}(\widehat{I}) \sqcup D_{n-j-1}(\widehat{I})$  for all  $j = -1, \dots, n-1$ .

Lemma 3.4 can be used to relate the  $f$ -vectors of  $\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I)$ ,  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)$ ,  $\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(\widehat{I})$ , and  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(\widehat{I})$ .

**Corollary 3.6.** *Let  $I \subseteq R = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  be a square-free monomial ideal.*

(i) *If  $f(\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)) = (f_{-1}, f_0, \dots, f_d)$ , then*

$$f(\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(\widehat{I})) = \left( \binom{n}{0} - f_{n-1}, \dots, \binom{n}{i} - f_{n-i-1}, \dots, \binom{n}{n-1} - f_0, \binom{n}{n} - f_{-1} \right).$$

(ii) *If  $f(\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I)) = (f_{-1}, f_0, \dots, f_d)$ , then*

$$f(\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(\widehat{I})) = \left( \binom{n}{0} - f_{n-1}, \dots, \binom{n}{i} - f_{n-i-1}, \dots, \binom{n}{n-1} - f_0, \binom{n}{n} - f_{-1} \right).$$

*In both cases,  $f_i = 0$  if  $i > d$ .*

*Proof.* (i). Fix some  $j \in \{-1, 0, \dots, n-1\}$ . By Remark 2.4 and Lemma 3.4 we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_j(\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)) &= \#\{m \in R_{j+1} \mid m \text{ a square-free monomial that divides some } p \in \mathcal{G}(I)\} \\ &= \#\left\{m \in \widehat{I}_{n-j-1} \mid m \text{ a square-free monomial}\right\} \\ &= \#\{m \in R_{n-j-1} \mid m \text{ a square-free monomial}\} \\ &\quad - \#\left\{m \notin \widehat{I}_{n-j-1} \mid m \text{ a square-free monomial}\right\} \\ &= \binom{n}{n-j-1} - f_{n-j-2}(\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(\widehat{I})). \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging, and letting  $l = n - j - 2$  gives

$$f_l(\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(\widehat{I})) = \binom{n}{l+1} - f_{n-l-2}(\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)) \text{ for } l = -1, \dots, n-1,$$

as desired.

(ii) The proof is similar to (i). Indeed, if we replace  $I$  with  $\widehat{I}$  we showed that

$$f_j(\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(\widehat{I})) = \binom{n}{n-j-1} - f_{n-j-2}(\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I)) = \binom{n}{j+1} - f_{n-j-2}(\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I))$$

for all  $j \in \{-1, 0, \dots, n-1\}$ . □

We end this section with some consequences related to the Kruskal-Katona theorem; although we do not use this result in the sequel, we feel it is of independent interest.

We follow the notation of Herzog-Hibi [11, Section 6.4]. The *Macaulay expansion* of  $a$  with respect to  $j$  is the expansion

$$a = \binom{a_j}{j} + \binom{a_{j-1}}{j-1} + \dots + \binom{a_k}{k}$$

where  $a_j > a_{j-1} > \dots > a_k \geq k \geq 1$ . This expansion is unique (see [11, Lemma 6.3.4]). For a fixed  $a$  and  $j$ , we use the Macaulay expansion of  $a$  with respect to  $j$  to define

$$a^{(j)} = \binom{a_j}{j+1} + \binom{a_{j-1}}{j} + \dots + \binom{a_k}{k+1}.$$

Kruskal-Katona's theorem [12, 13] then classifies what vectors can be the  $f$ -vector of a simplicial complex using the Macaulay expansion operation. This equivalence, plus two new equivalent statements which use the complementary dual, are given below.

**Theorem 3.7.** *Let  $(f_{-1}, f_0, \dots, f_d) \in \mathbb{N}_+^{d+2}$  with  $f_{-1} = 1$ . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $(f_{-1}, f_0, f_1, \dots, f_d)$  is the  $f$ -vector of a simplicial complex on  $n = f_0$  vertices.
- (ii)  $f_t \leq f_{t-1}^{(t)}$  for all  $1 \leq t \leq d$ .
- (iii)

$$\left(\binom{n}{0} - f_{n-1}, \dots, \binom{n}{i} - f_{n-i-1}, \dots, \binom{n}{n-1} - f_0, \binom{n}{n} - f_{-1}\right)$$

is the  $f$ -vector of a simplicial complex on  $\binom{n}{1} - f_{n-2}$  vertices (where  $f_i = 0$  if  $i > d$ ).

(iv)

$$\binom{n}{t+1} - \left[ \binom{n}{t+2} - f_{t+1} \right]^{(n-t-2)} \leq f_t \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq t \leq d-1.$$

*Proof.* (i)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (ii). This equivalence is the Kruskal-Katona theorem (see [12, 13]).

(i)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (iii). This equivalence follows from Corollary 3.6 and the Kruskal-Katona equivalence of (i)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (ii). In particular, one lets  $I$  be the square-free monomial ideal with  $f(\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I)) = (f_{-1}, f_0, \dots, f_d)$ , and then one uses Corollary 3.6 to show that (iii) is a valid  $f$ -vector. The duality of  $I$  and  $\widehat{I}$  is used to show the reverse direction.

(iii)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (iv). Corollary 3.6 and the equivalence of (i)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (ii) implies that the vector of (iii) is an  $f$ -vector of a simplicial complex if and only if, for each  $0 \leq i \leq n-2$ ,

$$\binom{n}{i+2} - f_{n-i-3} \leq \left[ \binom{n}{i+1} - f_{n-i-2} \right]^{(i+1)}.$$

The result now follows if we take  $i = n-3-t$  and rearrange the above equation.  $\square$

**Discussion 3.8.** It is prudent to make some observations about the Alexander dual, although this material is not required for our paper. Recall that for any simplicial complex  $\Delta$  on a vertex set  $X$ , the *Alexander dual* of  $\Delta$  is the simplicial complex on  $X$  given by

$$\Delta^\vee = \{F \subseteq X \mid X \setminus F \notin \Delta\}.$$

It is well-known (for example, see [11, Corollary 1.5.5]) that if  $\Delta = \langle F_1, \dots, F_s \rangle$ , then  $\mathcal{N}(\Delta^\vee)$ , the non-face ideal of  $\Delta^\vee$  (i.e., the ideal generated by the square-free monomials  $x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_j}$  where  $\{x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_j}\} \notin \Delta$ ) is given by

$$\mathcal{N}(\Delta^\vee) = \langle m_{F_1^c}, \dots, m_{F_s^c} \rangle$$

where  $m_{F_i^c} = \prod_{x \in F_i^c} x$  with  $F_i^c = X \setminus F_i$ . But we can also write  $m_{F_i^c} = (\prod_{x \in X} x) / m_{F_i} = \frac{x_1 \cdots x_n}{m_{F_i}}$ . Now tracing through the definitions, if  $I$  is square-free monomial ideal, then

$$\widehat{I} = \mathcal{N}((\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I))^\vee),$$

i.e., the complementary dual of  $I$  is the non-face ideal of the Alexander dual of the facet complex of  $I$ . This, in turn, implies that  $\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(\widehat{I}) = \delta_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{N}((\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I))^\vee)) = (\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I))^\vee$ .

#### 4. $f$ -IDEALS AND APPLICATIONS

We use the tools of the previous sections to prove our main theorem about  $f$ -ideals and to deduce some new consequences about this class of ideals. Our main theorem is an immediate application of Corollary 3.6.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $I$  be a square-free monomial ideal of  $R = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ . Then  $I$  is an  $f$ -ideal if and only if  $\widehat{I}$  is an  $f$ -ideal.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $f(\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I)) = f(\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)) = (f_{-1}, f_0, \dots, f_d)$ . Then by Corollary 3.6, both  $\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(\widehat{I})$  and  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(\widehat{I})$  will have the same  $f$ -vector. For the reverse direction, simply replace  $I$  with  $\widehat{I}$  and use the same corollary.  $\square$

**Remark 4.2.** Theorem 4.1 was first proved by the first author (see [4]) using the characterization of  $f$ -ideals of [9]. The proof presented here avoids the machinery of [9].

**Example 4.3.** In Example 3.3 we computed the ideal  $\widehat{I}$  of the ideal  $I$  in Example 2.2. By Theorem 4.1 the ideal  $\widehat{I}$  is an  $f$ -ideal. Indeed, the simplicial complexes  $\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(\widehat{I})$  and  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(\widehat{I})$  are given in Figure 2, and both simplicial complexes have  $f$ -vector  $(1, 5, 8, 2)$ . Note that  $f$ -vector of  $\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I)$  and  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)$  was  $(1, 5, 8, 2)$ , so by Corollary 3.6

$$\begin{aligned} f(\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(\widehat{I})) = f(\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(\widehat{I})) &= \left( \binom{5}{0} - 0, \binom{5}{1} - 0, \binom{5}{2} - 2, \binom{5}{3} - 8, \binom{5}{4} - 5, \binom{5}{5} - 1 \right) \\ &= (1, 5, 8, 2). \end{aligned}$$




FIGURE 2. Facet and non-face complexes of  $\widehat{I} = \langle x_1x_2, x_4x_5, x_1x_3x_4, x_2x_3x_5 \rangle$ .

Theorem 4.1 implies that  $f$ -ideals come in “pairs”. This observation allows us to extend many known results about  $f$ -ideals to their complementary duals. For example, we can now classify the  $f$ -ideals that are equigenerated in degree  $n - 2$ .

**Theorem 4.4.** *Let  $I$  be a square-free monomial of  $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  equigenerated in degree  $n - 2$ . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $I$  is an  $f$ -ideal.
- (ii)  $\widehat{I}$  is an  $f$ -ideal.
- (iii)  $\widehat{I}$  is an unmixed ideal of height  $n - 2$  (i.e., all of the associated primes of  $I$  have height  $n - 2$ ) with  $p = \frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{2}$ .

*Proof.* The equivalence of (i) and (ii) is Theorem 4.1. Because the ideal  $\widehat{I}$  is equigenerated in degree two, the equivalence of (ii) and (iii) is [1, Theorem 3.5].  $\square$

Following Guo, Wu, and Liu [9], let  $V(n, d)$  denote the set of  $f$ -ideals of  $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  that are equigenerated in degree  $d$ . We can now extend Guo, et al.’s results.

**Theorem 4.5.** *Using the notation above, we have*

- (i) For all  $1 \leq d \leq n - 1$ ,  $|V(n, d)| = |V(n, n - d)|$ .



- (ii) If  $n \neq 2$ , then  $V(n, 1) = V(n, n - 1) = \emptyset$ . If  $n = 2$ , then  $|V(2, 1)| = 2$ .  
 (iii)  $V(n, n - 2) \neq \emptyset$  if and only if  $n \equiv 0$  or  $1 \pmod{4}$ .

*Proof.* (i) By Theorem 4.1, the complementary dual gives a bijection between the sets  $V(n, d)$  and  $V(n, n - d)$ .

(ii) Suppose that  $I \in V(n, 1)$ , i.e.,  $I$  is an  $f$ -ideal generated by a subset of the variables. So, the facets of  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)$  are vertices, while  $\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I)$  is a simplex. Then  $f_0(\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I))$ , the number of variables that generate  $I$ , must be the same as  $f_0(\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I))$ , the number of variables not in  $I$ . This implies that  $n$  cannot be odd. Furthermore, if  $n \geq 4$  is even, then  $\dim \delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I) = 0$ , but  $\dim \delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I) = \frac{n}{2} - 1 \geq 1$ , contradicting the fact that  $I$  is an  $f$ -ideal.

When  $n = 2$ , then  $I_1 = \langle x_1 \rangle$  and  $I_2 = \langle x_2 \rangle$  are  $f$ -ideals of  $k[x_1, x_2]$ .

(iii) By (i),  $|V(n, n - 2)| \neq 0$  if and only if  $|V(n, 2)| \neq 0$ . Now [9, Proposition 3.4] shows that  $V(n, 2) \neq \emptyset$  if and only if  $n \equiv 0, 1 \pmod{4}$ .  $\square$

**Remark 4.6.** [9, Proposition 4.10] gives an explicit formula for  $|V(n, 2)|$ , which we will not present here. So by Theorem 4.5 (i) there is an explicit formula for  $|V(n, n - 2)|$ .

We now explore some necessary conditions on the  $f$ -vector of  $\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I)$  (equivalently,  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)$ ) when  $I$  is an  $f$ -ideal. We also give a necessary condition on the generators of an  $f$ -ideal. As we shall see, Theorem 4.1 plays a role in some of our proofs.

We first recall some notation. If  $I \subseteq R$  is a square-free monomial ideal, then we let

$$\alpha(I) = \min\{\deg(m) \mid m \in \mathcal{G}(I)\} \text{ and } \omega(I) = \max\{\deg(m) \mid m \in \mathcal{G}(I)\}.$$

We present some conditions on the  $f$ -vector; some of these results were known.

**Theorem 4.7.** *Suppose that  $I$  is an  $f$ -ideal in  $R = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  with associated  $f$ -vector  $f = f(\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)) = f(\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I))$ . Let  $\alpha = \alpha(I)$  and  $\omega = \omega(I)$ . Then*

- (i)  $f_i = \binom{n}{i+1}$  for  $i = 0, \dots, \alpha - 2$ .  
 (ii)  $f_{\alpha-1} \geq \frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{\alpha}$ .  
 (iii)  $f_{\omega-1} \leq \frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{\omega}$ .  
 (iv) if  $\alpha = \omega$  (i.e.,  $I$  is equigenerated), then  $f_{\alpha-1} = \frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{\alpha}$ .  
 (v)  $\dim \delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I) = \dim \delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I) = \omega - 1 \leq n - 2$ .

*Proof.* (i) See [3, Lemma 3.7].

(ii) If  $I$  is generated by monomials of degree  $\alpha$  or larger, then (2.1) becomes

$$M_{\alpha} = A_{\alpha}(I) \sqcup B_{\alpha}(I) \sqcup C_{\alpha}(I) \text{ since } D_{\alpha}(I) = \emptyset.$$

Suppose  $f_{\alpha-1} < \frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{\alpha}$ . Because  $f_{\alpha-1}(\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I)) = |A_{\alpha}(I)| + |B_{\alpha}(I)|$ , we have  $|C_{\alpha}(I)| > \frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{\alpha}$ . But since  $I$  is an  $f$ -ideal, by Lemma 2.5 we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{\alpha} > f_{\alpha-1}(\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I)) \geq |A_{\alpha}(I)| = |C_{\alpha}(I)| > \frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{\alpha}.$$

We now have the desired contradiction.

(iii) Suppose that  $f_{\omega-1}(\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)) > \frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{\omega} = \frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{n-\omega}$ . Since  $\omega = \omega(I)$ , we must have that  $\alpha(\widehat{I}) = n - \omega$ . Since  $\widehat{I}$  is also an  $f$ -ideal by Theorem 4.1, (ii) implies that  $f_{n-\omega-1}(\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(\widehat{I})) \geq$

$\frac{1}{2}\binom{n}{n-\omega}$ . But by Corollary 3.6, and since  $\widehat{I}$  is an  $f$ -ideal,

$$f_{n-\omega-1}(\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(\widehat{I})) = f_{n-\omega-1}(\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(\widehat{I})) = \binom{n}{n-\omega} - f_{\omega-1}(\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)) < \frac{1}{2}\binom{n}{n-\omega}.$$

This gives the desired contradiction.

(iv) We simply combine the inequalities of (ii) and (iii).

(v) Since  $\omega = \omega(I)$ , there is a generator  $m$  of  $I$  of degree  $\omega$ , and furthermore, every other generator has smaller degree. So, the facet of  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)$  of largest dimension has dimension  $\omega - 1$ . Since  $I$  is an  $f$ -ideal, this also forces  $\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I)$  to have a facet of dimension of  $\omega - 1$ . Note that  $\omega(I) \leq n - 1$  since no  $f$ -ideal has  $x_1 \cdots x_n$  as a generator.  $\square$

Our final result shows that if  $I$  is not an equigenerated  $f$ -ideal, then in some cases we can deduce the existence of generators of other degrees.

**Theorem 4.8.** *Suppose that  $I$  is an  $f$ -ideal of  $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  with  $\alpha = \alpha(I) < \omega(I) = \omega$ , and let  $f = f(\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(I)) = f(\delta_{\mathcal{N}}(I))$ .*

- (i) *If  $f_{\alpha-1} > \binom{n}{\alpha} - n + \alpha$ , then  $I$  also has a generator of degree  $\alpha + 1$ .*
- (ii) *If  $f_{\omega-1} < \omega$ , then  $I$  also has a generator of degree  $\omega - 1$ .*

*Proof.* To prove (i), it is enough to prove (ii) and apply Theorem 4.1. Indeed, suppose that  $f_{\alpha-1} > \binom{n}{\alpha} - n + \alpha$ . Then the ideal  $\widehat{I}$  is an  $f$ -ideal with  $\omega(\widehat{I}) = n - \alpha$  and

$$f_{\omega(\widehat{I})-1}(\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(\widehat{I})) = \binom{n}{n-\alpha} - f_{\alpha-1} < n - \alpha = \omega(\widehat{I}).$$

So by (ii) the ideal  $\widehat{I}$  will have a generator of degree  $\omega(\widehat{I}) - 1$ , which implies that  $I$  has a generator of degree  $\alpha + 1$ .

(ii) Note that if  $\alpha = \omega - 1$ , then the conclusion immediately follows. So suppose that  $\alpha < \omega - 1$ . We use the partition (2.1). Since  $I$  is generated in degrees  $\leq \omega$ , we have  $B_{\omega}(I) = \emptyset$ . It then follows by Lemma 2.5 and Remark 2.4 that

$$f_{\omega-1} = |A_{\omega}(I)| = |C_{\omega}(I)| < \omega.$$

Now suppose that  $I$  has no generators of degree  $\omega - 1$ . So  $|C_{\omega-1}(I)| = 0$ , and consequently,  $|A_{\omega-1}(I)| = 0$  because  $I$  is an  $f$ -ideal. Because  $\alpha < \omega - 1$ , we have  $D_{\omega-1}(I) \neq \emptyset$ . Then, again by Lemma 2.5 and Remark 2.4, we must have  $f_{\omega-2} = |B_{\omega-1}(I)|$ . Let  $m \in A_{\omega}(I)$ . After relabeling, we can assume that  $m = x_1 x_2 \cdots x_{\omega}$ . Note that  $m/x_i \notin I$  for  $i = 1, \dots, \omega$ . Indeed, if  $m/x_i \in I$ , this implies that  $m \in I$ , contradicting the fact that all elements of  $A_{\omega}(I)$  are not in  $I$ . So  $m/x_i \in B_{\omega-1}(I)$  for all  $i$ . By definition, every element of  $B_{\omega-1}(I)$  must divide an element of  $C_{\omega}(I)$  (since  $B_{\omega}(I) = \emptyset$ ). Because  $|C_{\omega}(I)| < \omega$ , there is one monomial  $z \in C_{\omega}(I)$  such that  $m/x_i$  and  $m/x_j$  both divide  $z$ . But since  $\deg z = \omega$ , this forces  $m = z$ . We now arrive at a contradiction since  $m \in A_{\omega}(I) \cap C_{\omega}(I)$ , but these two sets are disjoint.  $\square$

**Remark 4.9.** The ideal  $I$  of Example 2.2 is an  $f$ -ideal with  $\alpha = \alpha(I) = 2$ , and  $f_{2-1} = 8 > \binom{5}{2} - 5 + 2 = 7$ . So by Theorem 4.8, the ideal  $I$  should have a generator of degree

$\alpha + 1 = 3$ , which it does. Alternatively, we could have deduced that  $I$  has a generator of degree 2 from the fact that  $\omega(I) = 3$  and  $f_{3-1} = 2$ .

In our computer experiments, we only found  $f$ -ideals which had either  $\alpha(I) = \omega(I)$ , i.e., the  $f$ -ideals were equigenerated, or  $\alpha(I) + 1 = \omega(I)$ . It would be interesting to determine the existence of  $f$ -ideals with the property that  $\alpha(I) + d = \omega(I)$  for any  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ . Theorem 4.8 would imply a necessary condition on the generators of these ideals.

## REFERENCES

- [1] G.Q. Abbasi, S. Ahmad, I. Anwar, W.A. Baig,  $f$ -Ideals of degree 2. *Algebra Colloq.* **19** (2012), 921–926.
- [2] K. Analdi, K. Lin, Y. Shen, Generalized Newton complementary duals of monomial ideals. Preprint (2017). [arXiv:1702.00519v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/1702.00519v1)
- [3] I. Anwar, H. Mahmood, M.A. Binyamin, M.K. Zafar, On the characterization of  $f$ -ideals. *Comm. Algebra* **42** (2014), 3736–3741.
- [4] S. Budd, An introduction to  $f$ -ideals and their complements. MSc Project, McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada, 2017.
- [5] B. Costa, A. Simis, New constructions of Cremona maps. *Math. Res. Lett.* **20** (2013), 629–645.
- [6] A. Dória, A. Simis, The Newton complementary dual revisited. *J. Algebra Appl.* **17** (2018), 1850004, 16 pp.
- [7] S. Faridi, The facet ideal of a simplicial complex. *Manuscripta Math.* **109** (2002), 159–174.
- [8] D. R. Grayson, M. E. Stillman, Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry. <http://www.math.uiuc.edu/Macaulay2/>
- [9] J. Guo, T. Wu, Q. Liu,  $F$ -Ideals and  $f$ -Graphs. *Comm. Algebra* **45** (2016), 3207–3220.
- [10] J. Guo, T. Wu, On the  $(n, d)^{th}$   $f$ -Ideals. *J. Korean Math. Soc.* **52** (2015), 685–697.
- [11] J. Herzog, T. Hibi, *Monomial Ideals*. Graduate Texts in Math. **260**, Springer, London, 2011.
- [12] Katona, G. A theorem of finite sets. *Theory of graphs (Proc. Colloq., Tihany, 1966)*, pp. 187–207. Academic Press, New York, 1968.
- [13] J. B. Kruskal, The number of simplices in a complex. *Mathematical optimization techniques*, pp. 251–278. Univ. of California Press, Berkeley, Calif, 1963.
- [14] H. Mahmood, I. Anwar, M.K., Zafar, A construction of Cohen-Macaulay  $f$ -graphs. *J. Algebra Appl.* **13** (2014), 1450012, 7 pp.
- [15] H. Mahmood, I. Anwar, M.A. Binyamin, S. Yasmeen, On the connectedness of  $f$ -simplicial complexes. *J. Algebra Appl.* **16** (2017), 1750017, 9 pp.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, MCMASTER UNIVERSITY, HAMILTON, ON, L8S 4L8

*Current address:* 2061 Oliver Road, Thunder Bay, ON, P7G 1P7

*E-mail address:* [budds2@mcmaster.ca](mailto:budds2@mcmaster.ca), [sjbudd3@gmail.com](mailto:sjbudd3@gmail.com)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, MCMASTER UNIVERSITY, HAMILTON, ON, L8S 4L8

*E-mail address:* [vantuy1@math.mcmaster.ca](mailto:vantuy1@math.mcmaster.ca)