

## FOOTNOTES TO A THEOREM OF I. REIDER

Fabrizio Catanese \*  
Dipartimento di Matematica dell' Università di Pisa  
via Buonarroti 2, 56100 PISA

### Introduction.

— After the suggestion of one of the editors of these Proceedings, we publish this article which essentially reproduces a letter I wrote to Igor Reider on november 1986, after giving a seminar at the Institute Mittag-Leffler on Reider's results which have appeared in [Rei].

§1 is devoted to giving a more general and precise version of a result stated in an article by Griffiths and Harris ( [G-H] , [Rei] ), applying a construction due to Serre to construct vector bundles on algebraic surfaces starting from 0-dimensional subschemes failing to impose independent conditions to certain linear systems ; this version has not been superseded by the results appearing in Tjurin's new article ([Tju]) .

§2 supplies instead details for the proof ( proposition 3 of [Rei] ) that  $m$ -canonical systems , if  $m$  is at least 3 , give ( in characteristic 0 , and with a couple of exceptions ) embeddings of the canonical models of surfaces of general type ; for these details Reider defers the reader to the above quoted letter , and this result is due to cooperation with Torsten Ekedahl who in fact devised the final trick to solve the combinatorial problem to which the proof had been reduced ( [Ek] ).

It is a pleasure to acknowledge the warm hospitality and stimulating atmosphere I found at the Mittag-Leffler Institute in september '86 , and to thank the organizers of the Conference for their kind invitation .

### §1 ZERO CYCLES ON SURFACES AND RANK 2 BUNDLES.

In this section  $X$  shall be a projective normal Gorenstein surface over an

---

\*) Partly supported by 40% MPI , and a member of GNSAGA of CNR

algebraically closed field  $k$ , i.e.  $X$  is normal and Cohen-Macaulay and  $\omega_X$ , the dualizing sheaf of  $X$ , is an invertible sheaf; we shall denote by  $K$  a Cartier divisor associated to  $\omega_X$ .

We let  $Z$  be a purely 0-dimensional subscheme of  $X$ ;  $Z$  shall also be called a 0-cycle.

If we assume further that  $Z$  is a local complete intersection (l.c.i., for short), then, denoting, for  $p \in \text{supp}(Z)$ , by  $R_p$  the local ring  $\mathcal{O}_{Z,p}$  of  $Z$  at  $p$ , and by  $R(Z)$  the direct sum of the  $R_p$ 's, we have that

(1.1)  $R = R_p$  is a 0-dimensional Gorenstein ring, in other terms, there is a non-degenerate pairing  $R \times R \longrightarrow k$  given by local duality.

(1.2)  $R = R_p$  has a natural decreasing filtration, given by the powers of the maximal ideal of  $p$ , and the last non zero term of this filtration is called the socle of  $R$ , and shall be denoted by  $S = S_p$ . The condition that  $R$  be a Gorenstein ring implies that  $S$  is a 1-dimensional  $k$ -vector space.

(1.3) We recall moreover that the pairing (1.1) is compatible with the algebra structure on  $R$ , i.e., for  $f, g \in R$ ,  $\langle f, g \rangle = \langle 1, fg \rangle$ , and therefore the socle  $S$  is just the annihilator of the maximal ideal  $\mathcal{M}_p$  of  $R = R_p$ .

In the sequel, given a  $k$ -vector space  $V$ , we shall denote by  $V^V$  its dual.

#### Theorem 1.4

Let  $X$  be a Gorenstein surface and  $Z$  a 0-cycle on  $X$ ; let  $L$  be a Cartier divisor on  $X$  and  $[L]$  the invertible sheaf associated to the Cartier divisor.

If  $J_Z$  denotes the ideal sheaf of  $Z$ , we may consider the exact sequence

$$(*) \quad H^0([K+L]) \xrightarrow{r} H^0([K+L]|_Z) \longrightarrow H^1(J_Z[K+L]),$$

and consider an isomorphism of the middle term with  $R(Z)$  (given by some local trivialization of  $[K+L]$ ).

Then there is an isomorphism between

i) the group of extensions  $0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \longrightarrow E \longrightarrow J_Z[L] \longrightarrow 0$ ,  
 modulo the subgroup of extensions  $0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \longrightarrow E' \longrightarrow [L] \longrightarrow 0$   
 (giving  $E$  as the subsheaf of  $E'$  defined as the preimage of  $J_Z[L]$ ).

ii) the group of linear forms  $\alpha \in R(Z)^{\vee}$  vanishing on the image of  $H^0([K+L])$ .

Moreover, in the above isomorphism,  $E$  is locally free if and only if  $Z$  is a l.c.i. and, writing  $\alpha_p$  for the restriction of  $\alpha$  to  $R_p$ ,  $\alpha_p$  does not vanish on the socle  $S_p$  of  $R_p$ .

Proof. Dualizing the exact sequence (\*), we obtain that the group of linear forms  $\alpha$  as in ii) is isomorphic to the space  $H^1(J_Z[K+L])^{\vee}$

modulo the subspace  $H^1([K+L])^{\vee}$ , and we conclude for the first assertion since these two vector spaces are naturally isomorphic to  $\text{Ext}^1(J_Z[L], \mathcal{O}_X)$ , resp. to  $\text{Ext}^1([L], \mathcal{O}_X)$ .

We denote by  $\alpha^*$  an extension in  $\text{Ext}^1(J_Z[L], \mathcal{O}_X)$  inducing  $\alpha$ .

We have to see when does the extension  $\alpha^*$  give a locally free sheaf  $E$ . First of all, since  $E$  has rank 2, if  $E$  is locally free, then  $Z$  is locally defined by two equations, so  $Z$  must be a l.c.i. Moreover, the local to global spectral sequence for  $\text{Ext}$  provides a natural map:

$$\text{Ext}^1(J_Z[L], \mathcal{O}_X) \longrightarrow H^0(\text{Ext}^1(J_Z[L], \mathcal{O}_X) \cong H^0(\text{Ext}^2(\mathcal{O}_Z[L], \mathcal{O}_X) \cong \text{Ext}^2(\mathcal{O}_Z[K+L], [K]) \cong H^0([K+L]|_Z)^{\vee} \cong R(Z)^{\vee}$$

(the last two isomorphisms being respectively given by Serre duality on  $X$  and by the chosen trivialization of  $[K+L]$  around  $Z$ ).

The given extension  $\alpha^*$  thus naturally maps to  $\alpha$ , with  $\alpha_p$  giving a local extension  $0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{X,p} \longrightarrow E_p \longrightarrow J_{Z,p} \longrightarrow 0$  as follows.

Using local duality we can identify  $R_p^{\vee}$  with  $R_p$ , hence we can pick a function  $g$  around  $p$  whose class in  $R_p$  represents  $\alpha_p$ .

Moreover, since  $Z$  is a l.c.i., the ideal  $J_Z$  is locally generated by two functions  $h_1, h_2$ , and then  $E_p$  is given as the cokernel of the homomorphism of free sheaves associated to the transpose of the row

$(g, h_1, h_2)$  so that we have an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{X,p} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{X,p}^3 \longrightarrow E_p \longrightarrow 0$$

and the embedding of  $\mathcal{O}_{X,p}$  in  $E_p$  is induced by the isomorphism of  $\mathcal{O}_{X,p}$  with the first factor of  $\mathcal{O}_{X,p}^3$  (hence the quotient of  $E_p$  by  $\mathcal{O}_{X,p}$ , if  $h$  is the column with coefficients  $h_1, h_2$ , is isomorphic to

$\mathcal{O}_{X,p}^2 / \mathfrak{h}^0_{X,p}$ , and thus to  $J_{Z,p}$  as desired).

It is now clear that  $E_p$  is locally free if and only if  $g$  does not vanish at  $p$ , i.e. its class does not annihilate the socle  $S_p$  of  $R_p$ .

Q.E.D.

Remark 1.5. If  $H^1([K+L]) = 0$ , then for each  $\alpha \in R(Z)^V$  there is a unique extension  $\alpha^*$  inducing  $\alpha$ .

Example 1.6 If  $Z$  is a cycle of length 2 supported at a smooth point  $p$  of  $X$ , then there do exist local coordinates  $(x, y)$  such that  $J_Z$  is generated by  $(x^2, y)$ . The socle  $S$  coincides with the maximal ideal of  $R$ , and such a locally free extension exists if and only if  $S$  is not contained in the image of the restriction map  $r$  from  $H^0([K+L])$ . I.e., either  $p$  is a base point and  $\text{Im}(r) = 0$ , or  $p$  is not a base point and  $r$  is not onto.

Example 1.7. If  $Z$  consists of  $m$  distinct smooth points  $p_1, \dots, p_m$ , then  $E$  is locally free iff  $\alpha_p$  is non zero for each  $p = p_1, \dots, p_m$ .

In this case we have a non trivial extension (by which we mean, not obtained from an extension  $0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \longrightarrow E' \longrightarrow [L] \longrightarrow 0$ ) if and

only if the points  $p_i$  are projectively dependent via the rational map

associated to the linear system  $|K+L|$ , or, more precisely, if the linear functionals  $e_i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , given by evaluation at  $p_i$  (and in fact only

defined up to a scalar multiple) are linearly dependent; this is in fact the condition that  $r$  be not surjective.

We obtain a locally free sheaf if no  $p_i$  is a base point of  $|K+L|$  and if,  $q_i$  being the image point of  $p_i$ , there does exist among the  $q_i$ 's a relation of linear dependence with all the coefficients different from zero.

To understand what this geometrical condition means, we may assume that  $q_1, \dots, q_h$  is a maximal set of linearly independent elements among the  $q_i$ 's: then, since the given field  $k$  is infinite, such a relation of linear dependence exists if and only if  $h < m$  and the remaining  $q_j$ 's do not all lie in one of the coordinate hyperplanes of the projective space of dimension  $(h-1)$  spanned by the points  $q_1, \dots, q_h$ .

Remark 1.8. The following observation came out in a conversation I had with Mauro Beltrametti. Assume that  $X$  is smooth and that  $Z$  is a 0-cycle for which the restriction map  $r$  is not onto, whereas for each subscheme  $Z'$  of  $Z$  the restriction map  $r'$  is onto. Then the image of  $r$  is a hyperplane in  $R(Z)$ , hence there is a unique nonzero linear form  $\alpha$  vanishing on  $\text{Im}(r)$ ,

and a corresponding extension  $E$  is locally free (implying that  $Z$  must be a l.c.i.). In fact, otherwise  $E$  is contained in its double dual  $E'$  which is locally free, and gives an extension  $0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \longrightarrow E' \longrightarrow J_Z'[L] \longrightarrow 0$  where now  $Z'$  is a proper subscheme of  $Z$ . By assumption this sequence is split locally at  $Z$ , hence also the extension giving  $E$  is locally split, a contradiction.

The following lemma is essential in order to be able to prove that the adjoint linear systems  $|K + L|$  give embeddings of  $X$ .

Lemma 1.9. If  $p$  is a smooth point of  $X$  and  $H^0([L])$  surjects onto  $\mathcal{O}_Z$  for each l.c.i. 0-cycle  $Z$  of length 2 supported at  $p$ , then  $|L|$  gives an embedding at  $p$ .

Proof. Let  $\mathcal{M}_p$  be the maximal ideal of the local ring  $\mathcal{O}_{X,p}$ : if  $H^0([L])$  does not surject onto  $\mathcal{O}_{X,p} / \mathcal{M}_p^2$ , by our assumption, the image is 2-dimensional and intersects  $\mathcal{M}_p / \mathcal{M}_p^2$  in a 1-dimensional subspace  $W$ . Thus we obtain a contradiction by considering the length 2 cycle  $Z$  defined by  $\mathcal{M}_p^2$  and by  $W$ .

Q.E.D.

Remark 1.10. The lemma does not hold already for a  $A_1$  singularity. In fact, if  $H^0(\mathcal{M}_p[L])$  does not surject onto  $\mathcal{M}_p / \mathcal{M}_p^2$ , then the image is contained in a 2-plane  $W$  in  $\mathcal{M}_p / \mathcal{M}_p^2$ . Unfortunately  $W$  and  $\mathcal{M}_p^2$  generate a length 2, but not a l.c.i. cycle, because if the line  $W^V$  in the Zariski tangent space is tangent to  $X$ , then  $J_Z$  is not locally generated by two elements.

## § 2 PLURICANONICAL EMBEDDINGS OF SURFACES OF GENERAL TYPE

In this section  $k$  is an algebraically closed field of characteristic 0 and  $X$  is the canonical model of a surface of general type: thus  $X$  is a normal Gorenstein projective surface with  $\omega_X$  ample, and if  $S$  is a minimal resolution of singularities of  $X$ ,  $S$  is a minimal surface of general type.

To a singular point  $p$  of  $X$  there corresponds a divisor  $E$  on  $S$ , called a fundamental cycle, and consisting, with suitable multiplicities, of all the curves mapping down to  $p$  (hence these are all curves which have 0 intersection number with  $K$ ). The main property we want to mention

here ( cf. [ Ar ] for more details ) is that there is a natural isomorphism ( given by pull -back ) between  $\mathcal{O}_{X,p} / \mathcal{M}_p^2$  and  $H^0 ( \mathcal{O}_{2E} ) \cong H^0 ( \mathcal{O}_{2E} ( mK ) )$  , and therefore a pluricanonical system  $|\omega_X^m|$  gives an embedding at  $p$  if and only if the sequence

$$(2.1.) \quad 0 \longrightarrow H^0 ( [ mK - 2E ] ) \longrightarrow H^0 ( [ mK ] ) \longrightarrow H^0 ( \mathcal{O}_{2E} ( mK ) ) \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact .

Assume that  $m > 1$  : then  $H^1 ( [ mK ] ) = 0$  ( cf . [ Bom ] ) , and the exactness of (2.1.) amounts to the vanishing  $H^1 ( [ mK - 2E ] ) = 0$  .

Lemma 2.2. If  $E$  is a fundamental cycle on a minimal surface of general type  $S$  , then  $H^1 ( [ mK - 2E ] ) = 0$  , provided  $m > 3$  , or  $m=3$  ,  $K^2 > 2$  .

Proof. At page 188 of [ Bom ] ( proof of theorem 3 , where  $E$  is though denoted  $Z$  ) , it is shown that the desired vanishing holds if  $H^0 ( [ (m-1)K - 2E ] )$  is not zero , and one has moreover  $m^2 K^2 > 9$  ,  $m + K^2 > 4$  .

We can therefore assume that  $H^0 ( [ (m-1)K - 2E ] ) = 0$  .

Since also  $H^2 ( [ (m-1)K - 2E ] ) = 0$  ( in fact the dual space is  $H^0 ( [ (2-m)K + 2E ] )$  , which is zero for  $m > 2$  , otherwise we would have an effective divisor with negative intersection number with  $K$  ) , the conclusion is that , by the Riemann-Roch formula ,  $1/2 (m-1)(m-2) K^2 - 4 + \chi$  is non-positive.

Since  $K^2 > 2$  ,  $m > 2$  ,  $\chi > 0$  , the only possibility is that  $m = K^2 = 3$  ,  $\chi = 1$  .

If  $H^1 ( [ mK - 2E ] )$  is non zero , recalling that  $m = 3$  , we have a non-trivial extension

$$(\textcircled{a}) \quad 0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_S \longrightarrow E \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_S ( 2K - 2E ) \longrightarrow 0 .$$

We obtain immediately that  $H^0 ( E )$  has dimension 1 , whereas  $c_1^2 ( E ) = 4$  and  $c_2 ( E ) = 0$  , hence  $E$  is numerically unstable ( cf. [Bog] , [Rei] ) and we have a Bogomolov destabilizing extension

$$(\textcircled{\#}) \quad 0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_S ( M ) \longrightarrow E \longrightarrow J_Z ( D ) \longrightarrow 0 ,$$

where  $Z$  is a 0-cycle , and the divisor  $M - D$  is in the positive cone .

Recall also that  $M + D$  is linearly equivalent to  $2K - 2E$  .

Therefore  $K ( M - D ) > 0$  , and  $K M + K D = 2 K^2 = 6$  , hence  $K M > 3$  ,

while  $KE < 3$ .

As a consequence we get  $H^0([-M]) = 0$  : tensoring both exact sequences  $(@)$  and  $(\#)$  by  $\mathcal{O}_S(-M)$ , we obtain that  $H^0(E(-M))$  is at least

1-dimensional and is a subspace of  $H^0([D])$ , so that we may assume  $D$  is an effective divisor.

Recall though that by our assumption  $H^0([M+D]) = 0$ , hence  $H^0([M]) = 0$  too. We noticed that  $3 = K^2 < KM$ , hence  $H^0([K-M]) = 0$ , and dually  $H^2([M]) = 0$ , so that the Riemann-Roch formula gives us that

$1/2(M^2 - MK) + 1$  is a nonpositive number, i.e.  $M^2 < KM - 1$ . We have  $(M+D)^2 = 4(K-E)^2 = 4(K^2 + E^2) = 4 = D^2 + 2MD + M^2 < D^2 + 2MD + KM - 1$ ; since  $KM + KD = 6$ , we obtain

$$(2.3) \quad KD < 2MD + D^2 + 1.$$

Claim 2.4.  $D = 0$ .

Proof of the claim. By the Index theorem  $3D^2 = K^2D^2$  is less than or equal to  $(KD)^2$  which is in turn at most 4, by a previously obtained inequality, thus  $D^2$  is at most 1.

Observe now that  $c_2(E) = 0$ , thus  $\deg(Z) + MD = 0$ , and  $MD$  is non positive. Looking at (2.3), since  $KD$  is non negative, we immediately obtain that  $MD = 0 = \deg(Z)$ . Again, (2.3) gives that  $KD$  is at most 1, hence  $3D^2$  is bounded by  $(KD)^2$  which is at most 1, hence  $D^2$  is nonpositive. Once again (2.3) gives  $KD = D^2 = 0$ , and we conclude that  $D = 0$  since the selfintersection form is strictly negative definite for the effective divisors orthogonal to  $K$ .

Q.E.D. for the claim

By the claim (we noticed also that  $\deg Z = 0$ ),  $(\#)$  reduces to an extension of the following form

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_S(2K - 2E) \longrightarrow E \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_S \longrightarrow 0.$$

Since the first term of the above sequence has no global sections, by our assumption, the above sequence is easily seen to give a splitting of  $(@)$ , a contradiction.

Q.E.D. for Lemma 2.2

Corollary 2.5. If  $X$  is the canonical model of a surface of general type, then the  $m^{\text{th}}$  pluricanonical system  $|\omega_X^m|$  gives an embedding of  $X$  whenever  $m > 4$ , or  $m=4$ ,  $K^2 > 1$ ,  $m=3$  and  $K^2 > 2$ .

Proof. The proof follows theorem 1 of [ Rei ], lemma 1.9. , and lemma 2.2..

Q.E.D.

---

#### REFERENCES.

- [ Ar ] - Artin, M. : On isolated rational singularities of surfaces , *Amer. Jour Math.* , 88, ( 1966 ) , 129 - 136.
- [ Bog ] - Bogomolov, F.A. : Holomorphic tensors and vector bundles on projective varieties, (translated in) *Math.U.S.S.R. Izvestija*, 13, (1979), 499-555.
- [ Bom ] - Bombieri, E. : Canonical models of surfaces of general type , *Publ. Math.I.H.E.S.* , 42, ( 1973 ) , 171-219.
- [ Cat ] - Catanese, F. : Canonical rings and "special" surfaces of general type, *Proc.of Symp. in Pure Math.*, 46, ( 1987 ) , 175-194.
- [ Ek ] - Ekedahl, T. : Letter to the author, october 1986 .
- [ G-H ] - Griffiths, P.-Harris, J. : Residues and zero-cycles on algebraic varieties, *Ann. of Math.*(2) , 108 ,( 1978 ) , 461-505.
- [ Rei ] - Reider, I. : Vector bundles of rank 2 and linear systems on algebraic surfaces, *Ann. of Math.* , 127 , ( 1988 ) , 309-316.
- [ Tju ] - Tjurin, A. : Cycles, curves and vector bundles on an algebraic surface, *Duke Math. Jour.* , 54 ,( 1987 ) , 1-26.