

STANLEY DEPTH OF THE PATH IDEAL ASSOCIATED TO A LINE GRAPH

MIRCEA CIMPOEAȘ

Communicated by Vasile Brînzănescu

We consider the path ideal associated to a line graph, we compute \mathbf{sdepth} for its quotient ring and note that it is equal with its \mathbf{depth} . In particular, it satisfies the Stanley inequality.

AMS 2010 Subject Classification: Primary 13C15; Secondary 13P10, 13F20.

Key words: Stanley depth, Stanley inequality, path ideal, line graph, simplicial tree.

INTRODUCTION

Let K be a field and $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ the polynomial ring over K . Let M be a \mathbb{Z}^n -graded S -module. A *Stanley decomposition* of M is a direct sum $\mathcal{D} : M = \bigoplus_{i=1}^r m_i K[Z_i]$ as a \mathbb{Z}^n -graded K -vector space, where $m_i \in M$ is homogeneous with respect to \mathbb{Z}^n -grading, $Z_i \subset \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ such that $m_i K[Z_i] = \{um_i : u \in K[Z_i]\} \subset M$ is a free $K[Z_i]$ -submodule of M . We define $\mathbf{sdepth}(\mathcal{D}) = \min_{i=1, \dots, r} |Z_i|$ and $\mathbf{sdepth}_S(M) = \max\{\mathbf{sdepth}(\mathcal{D}) \mid \mathcal{D} \text{ is a Stanley decomposition of } M\}$. The number $\mathbf{sdepth}_S(M)$ is called the *Stanley depth* of M . In [1], J. Apel restated a conjecture firstly given by Stanley in [16], namely that $\mathbf{sdepth}_S(M) \geq \mathbf{depth}_S(M)$ for any \mathbb{Z}^n -graded S -module M . This conjecture proves to be false, in general, for $M = S/I$ and $M = J/I$, where $0 \neq I \subset J \subset S$ are monomial ideals, see [7].

Herzog, Vladoiu and Zheng show in [11] that $\mathbf{sdepth}_S(M)$ can be computed in a finite number of steps if $M = I/J$, where $J \subset I \subset S$ are monomial ideals. In [15], Rinaldo gives a computer implementation for this algorithm, in the computer algebra system *CoCoA* [6]. However, it is difficult to compute this invariant, even in some very particular cases. For instance in [2]

¹ We gratefully acknowledge the use of the computer algebra system *CoCoA* [6] for our experiments.

² The support from grant ID-PCE-2011-1023 of the Romanian Ministry of Education, Research and Innovation is gratefully acknowledged.

Biro *et al.* proved that $\text{sdepth}(\mathbf{m}) = \lceil n/2 \rceil$ where $\mathbf{m} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$. For a friendly introduction on Stanley depth we recommend [12].

Let $\Delta \subset 2^{[n]}$ be a simplicial complex. A face $F \in \Delta$ is called a *facet*, if F is maximal with respect to inclusion. We denote $\mathcal{F}(\Delta)$ the set of facets of Δ . If $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Delta)$, we denote $x_F = \prod_{j \in F} x_j$. Then the *facet ideal* $I(\Delta)$ associated to Δ is the squarefree monomial ideal $I = (x_F : F \in \mathcal{F}(\Delta))$ of S . The facet ideal was studied by Faridi [8] from the **depth** perspective.

A line graph of length n , denoted by L_n , is a graph with the vertex set $V = [n]$ and the edge set $E = \{\{1, 2\}, \{2, 3\}, \dots, \{n-1, n\}\}$. The Stanley depth of the edge ideal associated to L_n (which is in fact the facet ideal of L_n , if we look at L_n as a simplicial complex) was computed by Alin Ştefan in [17].

Let $1 \leq m \leq n$ be an integer and let $\Delta_{n,m}$ be the simplicial complex with the set of facets $\mathcal{F}(\Delta_{n,m}) = \{\{1, 2, \dots, m\}, \{2, 3, \dots, m+1\}, \dots, \{n-m+1, n-m+2, \dots, n\}\}$. We denote $I_{n,m} = (x_1 x_2 \cdots x_m, x_2 x_3 \cdots x_{m+1}, \dots, x_{n-m+1} x_{n-m+2} \cdots x_n)$, the associated facet ideal.

Note that $I_{n,m}$ is the path ideal of the graph L_n , provided with the direction given by $1 < 2 < \dots < n$, see [10] for further details.

According to [10, Theorem 1.2],

$$\text{pd}(S/I_{n,m}) = \begin{cases} \frac{2(n-d)}{m+1}, & n \equiv d \pmod{m+1} \text{ with } 0 \leq d \leq m-1, \\ \frac{2n-m+1}{m+1}, & n \equiv m \pmod{m+1}. \end{cases}$$

By Auslander-Buchsbaum formula (see [18]), it follows that $\text{depth}(S/I_{n,m}) = n - \text{pd}(S/I_{n,m})$ and, by a straightforward computation, we can see $\text{depth}(S/I_{n,m}) = n + 1 - \left\lfloor \frac{n+1}{m+1} \right\rfloor - \left\lceil \frac{n+1}{m+1} \right\rceil$.

We prove that $\text{sdepth}(S/I_{n,m}) = \text{depth}(S/I_{n,m}) = n + 1 - \left\lfloor \frac{n+1}{m+1} \right\rfloor - \left\lceil \frac{n+1}{m+1} \right\rceil$, see Theorem 1.3. In particular, we give another prove for the result of [10, Theorem 1.2]. Also, our result generalizes [17, Lemma 4].

We recall some notions introduced by Faridi in [8]. Let Δ be a simplicial complex. A facet F of Δ is called a *leaf*, if either F is the only facet of Δ , or there exists a facet G in Δ , $G \neq F$, such that $F \cap F' \subseteq F \cap G$ for all $F' \in \Delta$ with $F' \neq F$. A connected simplicial complex Δ is called a *tree*, if every nonempty connected subcomplex of Δ has a leaf. This notion generalizes trees from graph theory. Note that $\Delta_{n,m}$ is a tree, in the sense of the above definition.

According to [9, Corollary 1.6], if I is the facet ideal associated to a tree (which is the case for $I_{n,m}$), it follows that S/I would be pretty clean. However, there is a mistake in the second line of the proof of [9, Proposition 1.4], and therefore, this result might be wrong in general. On the other hand, if $I \subset S$

is a pretty clean monomial ideal, it is known that $\text{sdepth}(S/I) = \text{depth}(S/I)$, see [12, Proposition 18] for further details.

1. MAIN RESULTS

We recall the well-known Depth Lemma, see for instance [18, Lemma 1.3.9].

LEMMA 1.1 (Depth Lemma). *If $0 \rightarrow U \rightarrow M \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$ is a short exact sequence of modules over a local ring S , or a Noetherian graded ring with S_0 local, then*

- a) $\text{depth } M \geq \min\{\text{depth } N, \text{depth } U\}$.
- b) $\text{depth } U \geq \min\{\text{depth } M, \text{depth } N + 1\}$.
- c) $\text{depth } N \geq \min\{\text{depth } U - 1, \text{depth } M\}$.

In [14], Asia Rauf proved the analog of Lemma 1.1(a) for sdepth :

LEMMA 1.2. *Let $0 \rightarrow U \rightarrow M \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$ be a short exact sequence of \mathbb{Z}^n -graded S -modules. Then:*

$$\text{sdepth}(M) \geq \min\{\text{sdepth}(U), \text{sdepth}(N)\}.$$

Our main result is the following theorem.

THEOREM 1.3. $\text{sdepth}(S/I_{n,m}) = \text{depth}(S/I_{n,m}) = n + 1 - \left\lfloor \frac{n+1}{m+1} \right\rfloor - \left\lceil \frac{n+1}{m+1} \right\rceil$.

Proof. We use induction on $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq m$. The case $m = 1$ is trivial. The case $m = 2$ follows from [13, Lemma 2.8] and [17, Lemma 4].

We assume $m \geq 3$. If $n = m$, then $\text{sdepth}(S/I_{n,m}) = \text{depth}(S/I_{n,m}) = m - 1$, since $I_{n,n} = (x_1 \cdots x_n)$ is principal. Assume $m + 1 \leq n \leq 2m - 1$. Note that $I_{n,m} = x_m(I_{n,m} : x_m)$. We have $\text{sdepth}(S/I_{n,m}) = \text{sdepth}(S/(I_{n,m} : x_m))$, by [3, Theorem 1.4].

Also, we obviously have $\text{depth}(S/I_{n,m}) = \text{depth}(S/(I_{n,m} : x_m))$. On the other hand, $S/(I_{n,m} : x_m)$ is isomorphic to $S'/(I_{n-1,m-1})[y]$, where $S' = K[x_1, \dots, x_{m-1}, x_{m+1}, \dots, x_n]$ and thus, by induction hypothesis and [11, Lemma 3.6], $\text{sdepth}(S/I_{n,m}) = \text{depth}(S/I_{n,m}) = 1 + (n - \lfloor \frac{n}{m} \rfloor - \lceil \frac{n}{m} \rceil) = 1 + n - 3 = n - 2$, as required.

It remains to consider the case $m \geq 3$ and $n \geq 2m$. Let $k := \left\lfloor \frac{n+1}{m+1} \right\rfloor$ and $a = n + 1 - k(m + 1)$. We denote $\varphi(n, m) := n + 1 - \left\lfloor \frac{n+1}{m+1} \right\rfloor - \left\lceil \frac{n+1}{m+1} \right\rceil$. One can easily see that $\varphi(n, m) = \begin{cases} n + 1 - 2k, & a = 0 \\ n - 2k, & a \neq 0 \end{cases}$.

We consider the ideals $L_0 := I_{n,m}$ and $L_j := (L_{j-1} : x_{j(m+1)-1})$, where $1 \leq j \leq k$. We denote $U_j := (L_{j-1}, x_{j(m+1)-1})$ for all $1 \leq j \leq k$. We have the following short exact sequences:

$$(\mathcal{S}_k) : 0 \longrightarrow S/L_j \xrightarrow{x_{j(m+1)-1}^{-1}} S/L_{j-1} \longrightarrow S/U_j \longrightarrow 0, \quad 1 \leq j \leq k.$$

We denote $u_i := x_i \cdots x_{i+m-1}$, for $1 \leq i \leq n-m+1$. Note that $G(L_0) = \{u_1, \dots, u_{n-m+1}\}$, $G(L_1) = \{\frac{u_1}{x_m}, \dots, \frac{u_m}{x_m}, u_{m+2}, \dots, u_{n-m+1}\}$, because $u_{m+1} \in (u_m/x_m)$, and, also, $G(U_1) = \{x_m, u_{m+1}, \dots, u_{n-m+1}\}$. Moreover, one can easily check that:

$$L_j = \left(\frac{u_1}{x_m}, \dots, \frac{u_m}{x_m}, \frac{u_{m+2}}{x_{2m+1}}, \dots, \frac{u_{2m+1}}{x_{2m+1}}, \dots, \frac{u_{(m+1)j-m}}{x_{(m+1)j-1}}, \dots, \frac{u_{(m+1)j-1}}{x_{(m+1)j-1}}, \right. \\ \left. u_{(m+1)j+1}, \dots, u_{n-m+1} \right),$$

for all $1 \leq j \leq k-1$. It follows that:

$$U_{j+1} = \left(\frac{u_1}{x_m}, \dots, \frac{u_m}{x_m}, \dots, \frac{u_{(m+1)j-m}}{x_{(m+1)j-1}}, \dots, \frac{u_{(m+1)j-1}}{x_{(m+1)j-1}}, x_{(m+1)(j+1)-1}, \right. \\ \left. u_{(m+1)(j+1)}, \dots, u_{n-m+1} \right),$$

for all $1 \leq j \leq k-1$. Also, we have:

$$L_k = \left(\frac{u_1}{x_m}, \dots, \frac{u_m}{x_m}, \dots, \frac{u_{(m+1)(k-1)-m}}{x_{(m+1)(k-1)-1}}, \dots, \frac{u_{(m+1)(k-1)-1}}{x_{(m+1)(k-1)-1}}, \frac{u_{(m+1)k-m}}{x_{(m+1)k-1}}, \dots, \right. \\ \left. \frac{u_t}{x_{(m+1)k-1}} \right),$$

where $t = n-m$ if $a = m$, or $t = n-m+1$ otherwise.

Note that $|G(L_k)| = m(k-1) + (t+1) - (m+1)k + m = t+1-k$ and, moreover, $L_k \cong I_{t+m-k-1, m-1}S$. Thus, by induction hypothesis and [11, Lemma 3.6], we have $\text{depth}(S/L_k) = \text{sdepth}(S/L_k) = n - (t+m-k-1) + \varphi(t+m-k-1, m-1) = n+1 - \lfloor \frac{t+m-k}{m} \rfloor - \lceil \frac{t+m-k}{m} \rceil$.

If $a = m$, then $t = n-m$, $n = k(m+1) + m - 1$, $t+m-k = n-k = (k+1)m - 1$ and thus $\text{depth}(S/L_k) = \text{sdepth}(S/L_k) = n+1-k - (k+1) = n-2k = \varphi(n, m)$. If $a = 0$, then $t+m-k = km$ and thus $\text{depth}(S/L_k) = \text{sdepth}(S/L_k) = n+1-2k$.

If $0 < a < m$, then $t+m-k = km+a$ and thus $\text{depth}(S/L_k) = \text{sdepth}(S/L_k) = n-2k$. In all the cases, we have $\text{depth}(S/L_k) = \text{sdepth}(S/L_k) = \varphi(n, m)$.

Note that $S/U_1 \cong K[x_{m+1}, \dots, x_n]/(u_{m+1}, \dots, u_{n-m+1})[x_1, \dots, x_{m-1}]$ and therefore, by induction hypothesis, $\text{depth}(S/U_1) = \text{sdepth}(S/U_1) = m-1 + \varphi(n-m, m) = n - \lfloor \frac{n-m+1}{m+1} \rfloor - \lceil \frac{n-m+1}{m+1} \rceil$. Note that $\frac{n-m+1}{m+1} = k-1 + \frac{a+1}{m+1}$ and

therefore $\left\lfloor \frac{n-m+1}{m+1} \right\rfloor = k$. On the other hand, if $a < m$ then $\left\lfloor \frac{n-m+1}{m+1} \right\rfloor = k-1$ and if $a = m$ then $\left\lfloor \frac{n-m+1}{m+1} \right\rfloor = k$. It follows that $\text{depth}(S/U_1) = \text{sdepth}(S/U_1) = \begin{cases} n+1-2k, & a < m \\ n-2k, & a = m \end{cases} \geq \varphi(n, m)$.

Moreover, $\text{depth}(S/U_1) = \text{sdepth}(S/U_1) = \varphi(n, m)$ if and only if $a = 0$ or $a = m$. Otherwise, $\text{depth}(S/U_1) = \text{sdepth}(S/U_1) = \varphi(n, m) + 1$.

Assume $a = 0$ or $a = m$. From the exact sequence $(S_1)0 \rightarrow S/L_1 \rightarrow S/L_0 \rightarrow S/U_1 \rightarrow 0$, Lemma 1.1 and Lemma 1.2, it follows that $\text{sdepth}(S/L_0) \geq \text{depth}(S/L_0) = \varphi(n, m)$. On the other hand, since $L_k = (L_0 : x_m x_{2m+1} \cdots x_{k(m+1)-1})$, for example by [5, Proposition 2.7], $\varphi(n, m) = \text{sdepth}(S/L_k) \geq \text{sdepth}(S/L_0) \geq \varphi(n, m)$. Thus, $\text{sdepth}(S/L_k) = \varphi(n, m)$.

It remains to consider the case when $1 < a < m - 1$. We claim that:

$$(*) \text{sdepth}(S/U_j) \geq \text{depth}(S/U_j) \geq \varphi(n, m) \text{ for all } 2 \leq j \leq k.$$

Assume this is the case. Using 1.1, 1.2 and the short exact sequences (S_k) , we get, inductively, that $\text{sdepth}(S/L_j) \geq \text{depth}(S/L_j) = \varphi(n, m)$ for all $j < k-1$. Again, using for example [5, Proposition 2.7], we get $\text{sdepth}(S/L_0) = \varphi(n, m)$.

In order to complete the proof, we need to show $(*)$. Note that $U_k = (V_k, x_{(m+1)k-1})$, where $V_k = (\frac{u_1}{x_m}, \dots, \frac{u_m}{x_m}, \dots, \frac{u_{(m+1)j-m}}{x_{(m+1)j-1}}, \dots, \frac{u_{(m+1)(k-1)-1}}{x_{(m+1)(k-1)-1}}) \cong I_{mk-2, m-1}S$. By induction hypothesis and [11, Lemma 3.6], it follows that $\text{sdepth}(S/U_k) = \text{depth}(S/U_k) = n - (mk - 2) - 1 + \varphi(mk - 2, m - 1) = n - \left\lfloor \frac{mk-1}{m} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{mk-1}{m} \right\rfloor = n - (k-1) - k = n - 2k + 1 = \varphi(n, m) + 1$.

If $1 \leq j < k$, we have $S/U_j \cong (S/V_j \otimes_S S/W_j S) / (x_{(m+1)j-1})(S/V_j \otimes_S S/W_j S)$, where $V_j = (\frac{u_1}{x_m}, \dots, \frac{u_m}{x_m}, \dots, \frac{u_{(m+1)j-m}}{x_{(m+1)j-1}}, \dots, \frac{u_{(m+1)j-1}}{x_{(m+1)j-1}})$ and $W_j = (u_{(m+1)(j+1)}, \dots, u_{n-m+1})$. Since $x_{(m+1)j-1}$ is regular on $S/V_j \otimes_S S/W_j$ by [14, Corollary 1.12] and [14, Theorem 3.1] or [5, Theorem 1.2], it follows that $\text{depth}(S/U_j) = \text{depth}(S/V_j \otimes_S S/W_j) - 1 = \text{depth}(S/V_j) + \text{depth}(S/W_j) - n - 1$ and $\text{sdepth}(S/U_j) = \text{sdepth}(S/V_j \otimes_S S/W_j) - 1 \geq \text{sdepth}(S/V_j) + \text{sdepth}(S/W_j) - n - 1$.

On the other hand, $V_j \cong I_{m(j+1)-2, m-1}S$ and thus, by induction hypothesis, $\text{sdepth}(S/V_j) = \text{depth}(S/V_j) = n + 1 - \left\lfloor \frac{m(j+1)-1}{m} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{m(j+1)-1}{m} \right\rfloor = n - 2j$. Also, $W_j \cong I_{n-(m+1)(j+1)+1, m}$ and, by induction hypothesis, we have $\text{sdepth}(S/W_j) = \text{depth}(S/W_j) = n + 1 - \left\lfloor \frac{n-(m+1)(j+1)+2}{m+1} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{n-(m+1)(j+1)+2}{m+1} \right\rfloor = n + 1 + 2(j+1) - \left\lfloor \frac{n+2}{m+1} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{n+2}{m+1} \right\rfloor$.

It follows that $\text{sdepth}(S/U_j) = \text{depth}(S/U_j) = n + 2 - \left\lfloor \frac{n+2}{m+1} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{n+2}{m+1} \right\rfloor \geq$

$\varphi(n, m)$, since either $\lfloor \frac{n+2}{m+1} \rfloor = \lfloor \frac{n+1}{m+1} \rfloor$ and $\lceil \frac{n+2}{m+1} \rceil = \lceil \frac{n+1}{m+1} \rceil$, either $\lfloor \frac{n+2}{m+1} \rfloor = \lfloor \frac{n+1}{m+1} \rfloor + 1$ and $\lceil \frac{n+2}{m+1} \rceil = \lceil \frac{n+1}{m+1} \rceil$ or either $\lfloor \frac{n+2}{m+1} \rfloor = \lfloor \frac{n+1}{m+1} \rfloor$ and $\lceil \frac{n+2}{m+1} \rceil = \lceil \frac{n+1}{m+1} \rceil + 1$. \square

Example 1.4. Let $I_{6,3} = (x_1x_2x_3, x_2x_3x_4, x_3x_4x_5, x_4x_5x_6) \subset S := K[x_1, \dots, x_6]$. Note that $\varphi(7, 4) = 7 - \lfloor \frac{7}{4} \rfloor - \lceil \frac{7}{4} \rceil = 4$. Let $L_0 = I_{6,3}$, $L_1 = (L_0 : x_3) = (x_1x_2, x_2x_4, x_4x_5)$ and $U_1 = (L_0, x_3) = (x_3, x_4x_5x_6)$. Since $L_1 \cong I_{4,2}S$, it follows that $\text{depth}(S/L_1) = \text{sdepth}(S/L_1) = \text{depth}(S/I_{4,2}S) = 2 + \text{depth}(K[x_1, \dots, x_4]/I_{4,2}) = 2 + \varphi(4, 2) = 4$.

On the other hand, since U_1 is a complete intersection, $\text{depth}(S/U_1) = \text{sdepth}(S/U_1) = 4$. We consider the short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow S/L_1 \rightarrow S/L_0 \rightarrow S/U_1 \rightarrow 0$. By Lemma 1.2, it follows that $\text{sdepth}(S/L_0) \geq 4$. On the other hand, since $L_1 = (L_0 : x_3)$, one has $\text{sdepth}(S/L_0) \leq \text{sdepth}(S/L_1) = 4$. Thus $\text{sdepth}(S/L_0) = 4$. Also, by Lemma 1.1, $\text{depth}(S/L_0) = 4$.

In the following, we present another way to prove that $\text{sdepth}(S/I_{n,m}) \leq \varphi(n, m)$.

Let $\mathcal{P} \subset 2^{[n]}$ be a poset. If $C, D \subset [n]$, the *interval* $[C, D]$ consist in all the subsets X of $[n]$ such that $C \subset X \subset D$. Let $\mathbf{P} : \mathcal{P} = \bigcup_{i=1}^r [F_i, G_i]$ be a partition of \mathcal{P} , i.e. $[F_i, G_i] \cap [F_j, G_j] = \emptyset$ for all $i \neq j$. We denote $\text{sdepth}(\mathbf{P}) := \min_{i \in [r]} |D_i|$. Also, we define the Stanley depth of \mathcal{P} , to be the number

$$\text{sdepth}(\mathcal{P}) = \max\{\text{sdepth}(\mathbf{P}) : \mathbf{P} \text{ is a partition of } \mathcal{P}\}.$$

Now, for $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}$, we denote

$$\mathcal{P}_d = \{\tau \in \mathcal{P} : |\tau| = d\}, \mathcal{P}_{d,\sigma} = \{\tau \in \mathcal{P}_d : \sigma \subset \tau\}.$$

Note that if $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\mathcal{P}_{d,\sigma} = \emptyset$, then $\text{sdepth}(\mathcal{P}) < d$. Indeed, let $\mathbf{P} : \mathcal{P} = \bigcup_{i=1}^r [F_i, G_i]$ be a partition of \mathcal{P} with $\text{sdepth}(\mathcal{P}) = \text{sdepth}(\mathbf{P})$. Since $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}$, it follows that $\sigma \in [F_i, G_i]$ for some i . If $|G_i| \geq d$, then it follows that $\mathcal{P}_{d,\sigma} \neq \emptyset$, since there are subsets in the interval $[F_i, G_i]$ of cardinality d which contain σ , a contradiction. Thus, $|G_i| < d$ and therefore $\text{sdepth}(\mathcal{P}) < d$.

We recall the method of Herzog, Vladioiu and Zheng [11] for computing the Stanley depth of S/I and I , where I is a squarefree monomial ideal. Let $G(I) = \{u_1, \dots, u_s\}$ be the set of minimal monomial generators of I . We define the following two posets:

$$\mathcal{P}_I := \{\sigma \subset [n] : u_i | x_\sigma := \prod_{j \in \sigma} x_j \text{ for some } i\} \text{ and } \mathcal{P}_{S/I} := 2^{[n]} \setminus \mathcal{P}_I.$$

Herzog, Vladioiu and Zheng proved in [11] that $\text{sdepth}(I) = \text{sdepth}(\mathcal{P}_I)$ and $\text{sdepth}(S/I) = \text{sdepth}(\mathcal{P}_{S/I})$.

The above method is useful to give upper bounds for the $\text{sdepth}(S/I)$, where $I \subset S$ is a monomial ideal, and, in particular cases, to compute the exact value of $\text{sdepth}(S/I)$. That's exactly the case for $S/I_{n,m}$!

Let $\mathcal{P} := \mathcal{P}_{S/I_{n,m}}$. We denote $k = \left\lfloor \frac{n}{m+1} \right\rfloor$ and we define

$$\sigma = \bigcup_{j=0}^{k-1} \{1 + j(m+1), 2 + j(m+1), \dots, m-1 + j(m+1)\}.$$

We consider two cases.

(a) If $n = (k+1)(m+1) - 1$ or $n = (k+1)(m+1) - 2$, let $\tau = \sigma \cup \{k(m+1)+1, k(m+1)+2, \dots, k(m+1)+m-1\}$. Note that $|\tau| = (k+1)(m-1)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{d,\tau} = \emptyset$, for $d = |\tau| + 1$. Indeed, $u = \prod_{j \in \tau} x_j \notin I_{n,m}$, but $x_i u \in I_{n,m}$ for all $i \notin \tau$.

(b) If n is not as in the case (a), let $\tau = \sigma \cup \{k(m+1), \dots, n\}$. Note that $n - |\tau| = 2k - 1$ and $\mathcal{P}_{d,\tau} = \emptyset$, for $d = |\tau| + 1$. Indeed, $u = \prod_{j \in \tau} x_j \notin I_{n,m}$, but $x_i u \in I_{n,m}$ for all $i \notin \tau$.

Therefore $\text{sdepth}(S/I_{n,m}) \leq |\tau|$, in both cases. On the other hand, one can easily check that $|\tau| = n+1 - \left\lfloor \frac{n+1}{m+1} \right\rfloor - \left\lceil \frac{n+1}{m+1} \right\rceil$. Therefore $\text{sdepth}(S/I_{n,m}) \leq \varphi(n, m)$.

Remark 1.5. One possible way to generalize Theorem 1.3 and [17, Theorem 6], at the same time, would be to prove that $\text{sdepth}(S/I_{n,m}^k) = \text{depth}(S/I_{n,m}^k)$ for any $k \geq 1$. Furthermore, we might conjecture that if Δ is a simplicial tree, then $\text{sdepth}(S/I(\Delta)^k) = \text{depth}(S/I(\Delta)^k)$ for any $k \geq 1$.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Apel, *On a conjecture of R.P. Stanley; Part II – Quotients Modulo Monomial Ideals*. J. Algebraic Combin. **17** (2003), 57–74.
- [2] C. Biro, D.M. Howard, M.T. Keller, W.T. Trotter and S.J. Young, *Interval partitions and Stanley depth*. J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **117** (2010), 475–482.
- [3] M. Cimpoeaş, *Stanley depth of monomial ideals with small number of generators*. Cent. Eur. J. Math. **7** (2009), 4, 629–634.
- [4] M. Cimpoeaş, *Stanley depth for monomial complete intersection*. Bull. Math. Soc. Sci. Math. Roumanie (N.S.) **51(99)** (2008), 3, 205–211.
- [5] M. Cimpoeaş, *Several inequalities regarding Stanley depth*. Rom. J. Math. Comput. Sci **2(1)** (2012), 28–40.
- [6] CoCoATeam, *CoCoA: a system for doing Computations in Commutative Algebra*. Available at <http://cocoa.dima.unige.it>.
- [7] A.M. Duval, B. Goeckneker, C.J. Klivans and J.L. Martine, *A non-partitionable Cohen-Macaulay simplicial complex*. Adv. Math. **299** (2016), 381–395.
- [8] S. Faridi, *The facet ideal of a simplicial complex*. Manuscripta Math. **109** (2002), 159–174.

- [9] A.S. Jahan and X. Zheng, *Monomial ideals of forest type*. Comm. Algebra **40** (2012), 8, 2786–2797.
- [10] Jing He and Adam Van Tuyl, *Algebraic properties of the path ideal of a tree*. Comm. Algebra **38** (2010), 5, 1725–1742.
- [11] J. Herzog, M. Vladioiu and X. Zheng, *How to compute the Stanley depth of a monomial ideal*. J. Algebra **322**(9) (2009), 3151–3169.
- [12] J. Herzog, *A Survey on Stanley Depth*. Lecture Notes in Math. **2083**, Springer (2013).
- [13] S. Morey, *Depths of powers of the edge ideal of a tree*. Comm. Algebra **38**(11) (2010), 4042–4055.
- [14] A. Rauf, *Depth and sdepth of multigraded module*. Comm. Algebra **38** (2010), 2, 773–784.
- [15] G. Rinaldo, *An algorithm to compute the Stanley depth of monomial ideals*. Matematiche **LXIII** (ii) (2008), 243–256.
- [16] R.P. Stanley, *Linear Diophantine equations and local cohomology*. Invent. Math. **68** (1982), 175–193.
- [17] A. Ştefan, *Stanley depth of powers of the edge ideal*. Preprint 2014, <http://arxiv.org/pdf/1409.6072.pdf>.
- [18] R.H. Villarreal, *Monomial algebras*. Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics **238**, Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, 2001.

Received 2 September 2015

*Simion Stoilow Institute of Mathematics,
Research unit 5, P.O.Box 1-764,
Bucharest 014700, Romania
mircea.cimpoeas@imar.ro*