VARIATION OF MIXED HODGE STRUCTURES ASSOCIATED TO AN EQUISINGULAR ONE-DIMENSIONAL FAMILY OF CALABI-YAU 3-FOLDS I
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Abstract. We study the variations of mixed Hodge structures (VMHS) associated to a pencil $X$ (parametrised by an open set $B \subset \mathbb{P}^1$) of equisingular hypersurfaces of degree $d$ in $\mathbb{P}^4$ with exactly $m$ ordinary double points as singularities as well as the variations of Hodge structures (VHS) associated to the desingularization of this family $\tilde{X}$. The case where exactly $l \leq m$ of those double points are in algebraic general position is studied in detail and determine the possible limiting mixed Hodge structures (LMHS) associated to each of the points in $\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus B$. We find that the position of the singular points being in (algebraic) general position is not sufficient to describe the space of first one-adjoint conditions and naturally the notion of a set of singular points being in homologically good position is introduced. By requiring that the set of nodes in (algebraic) general position is also in homologically good position, the $F^2$-term of the Hodge filtration of the desingularization is completely determined. The particular pencil $X$ of quintic hypersurfaces with 100 singular double points with 86 of them in (algebraic) general position which served as the starting point for this paper is treated with particular attention.

INTRODUCTION

In 1941 W.V.D. Hodge proved that for every compact Kähler manifold $X$, its complex de Rham cohomology $H^k(X, \mathbb{C})$ splits as a direct sum of spaces $H^{p,q}(\cong H^q(X, \Omega^p_X))$, where $p+q = k$, called nowadays the Hodge decomposition of $H^k(X, \mathbb{C})$ (see [19]). Remember that $H^k(X, \mathbb{C}) \cong H^k(X, \mathbb{Z}) \otimes \mathbb{C}$. The pair $(H^k(X, \mathbb{Z}), \{H^{p,q}\})$ is called a (pure) Hodge structure of weight $k$. All varieties will be considered algebraic and defined over the complex numbers $\mathbb{C}$. Unless otherwise stated we will be consistent with [9]'s notation.

Another way of looking at a Hodge structure is to consider the associated Hodge...
filtration
\[ F^j H^k(X, \mathbb{C}) \overset{def}{=} \oplus_{p\geq j} H^{p,q} \]
and the pair \((H^k(X, \mathbb{Z}), \{F^j H^k(X, \mathbb{C})\})\).

If \(X\) is projective, smooth of dimension \(n\), then the only interesting cohomology group is \(H^n(X, \mathbb{C})\) and because of Lefschetz’ theorem, we only need to consider the so called primitive cohomology \(PH^n(X, \mathbb{C}) = \{\eta \in H^n(X, \mathbb{C}) \mid \eta \cdot H = 0\}\), where \(H\) is the class of a hyperplane section on the corresponding projective space.

In the particular case of a smooth projective hypersurface, Griffiths studied the (pure) Hodge structure of \(X\) and gave a description of it in terms of its Jacobian ring (see [14]). More precisely, let \(X = V(f) \subset \mathbb{P}^{n+1}\) with \(f\) an homogeneous polynomial of degree \(d\). Then the space
\[ H^k(X) \overset{def}{=} \left\{ \left[ \frac{P\Omega}{f^k} \right] \in A^{n+1}_k \mod dA^{n-1}_k \mid \deg(P) = kd - (n+2) \right\}, \tag{1} \]
of closed \((n+1)-\)forms with a pole of order \(k\) along \(X\), modulo the forms \(d\eta\), where \(\eta\) is a rational \(n-\)form with a pole of order \(k-1\) along \(X\), can be identified via the residue map with the space \(F^{n-k+1}_k PH^n(X, \mathbb{C})\). Here \(PH\) denotes the primitive cohomology and
\[ \Omega = \sum_{i=0}^{n+1} (-1)^i x_i dx_0 \wedge \ldots \wedge \widehat{dx_i} \wedge \ldots \wedge dx_{n+1} \]
which is the fundamental homogeneous differential form obtained by contracting the volume form on \(\mathbb{C}^{n+2}\) with the Euler vector field \(\sum_{i=0}^{n+1} x_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\). Whenever it is clear from the context what is the underlying space, we will write \(H^k_j\) instead of \(H^k_j(X)\).

The natural inclusion \(F^{n-k+1}_k PH^n(X, \mathbb{C}) \subset F^{n-k} PH^n(X, \mathbb{C})\) corresponds to the natural inclusion \(\mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{k+1}\) given by \(\frac{P\Omega}{f^k} \mapsto \frac{fP\Omega}{f^{k+1}}\).

Moreover, if \(J(f)\) is the Jacobian ideal of \(f\), generated by the partial derivatives of \(f\) and \(R_f \overset{def}{=} \mathbb{C}[X_0, \ldots, X_n]/J(f)\) is the Jacobian ring of \(f\), then the above identification induces isomorphisms between \((R_f)_{(k+1)d-n-2}\) the graded submodule of \(R_f\) of degree \((k+1)d-n-2\) and \(PH^{n-k,k}(X, \mathbb{C})\). In particular, the dimension of \(H^n(X, \mathbb{C})\) is independent of \(X\) itself and only depends on \(n\) and on the degree of \(f\).

If we now consider a smooth family \(\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow B \subset \mathbb{P}^1\), over an open set \(B\), then on every fiber \(X_t\) one has a Hodge structure \(F^p H^k(X_t, \mathbb{C})\) and these extend to a global Hodge filtration \(\mathcal{F}^p \mathcal{H}_k\), where \(\mathcal{H}_k \overset{def}{=} R^k \pi_* \mathbb{C} \otimes \mathcal{O}_B\). It is well known that the monodromy of the family gives rise to a connection, called the Gauss-Manin connection (or shortly GM)
\[ \nabla : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_k \otimes \Omega_B \]
which is compatible with the Hodge filtration. More explicitly, the GM-connection satisfies the Griffiths transversality condition (called also the horizontality condition)

\[ \nabla : \mathcal{F}^p \mathcal{H}^k \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}^{p-1} \mathcal{H}^k \otimes \Omega_B. \]

Recall that the associated Higgs bundle is given by \( \mathcal{E} = \oplus_{q=0}^n \mathcal{E}^{n-q,q} \), where

\[ \mathcal{E}^{n-q,q} \overset{def}{=} \mathcal{F}^q / \mathcal{F}^{q+1}, \]

induces by means of the GM-connection \( \mathcal{O}_B \) linear homomorphisms:

\[ \nabla : \mathcal{E}^{n-q,q} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}^{n-q+1,q-1} \otimes \Omega_B. \]

and fibrewise homomorphisms

\[ \mathcal{E}^{n-q,q}_t \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}^{n-q+1,q-1}_t. \]

which are of bidegree \((1, -1)\) (See [10] part I section 5).

For singular varieties, Deligne developed in 1971 the theory of mixed Hodge structures (see [9]), which involves in general the existence of a good desingularization due to Hironaka.

Griffiths and others have tried to give an alternative description for the mixed Hodge structure of a singular variety in some cases. The most important case for us is that of a singular projective hypersurface on the projective space with isolated singularities, the simplest of which is only nodes as singularities. For hypersurfaces of dimension less than or equal to 3, Griffiths [15] (who considers three dimensional hypersurfaces with one ordinary double point) and later on Steenbrik [25] (who considers surfaces with isolated singularities) gave a description of the relevant cohomology group of its proper transform under normalization in terms of the Jacobian ring of the polynomial defining it. More precisely, let \( X = V(f) \subset \mathbb{P}^{n+1} \) be a hypersurface, with \( f \) an homogeneous polynomial of degree \( d \); \( \Sigma \overset{def}{=} \text{Sing}(X) \) its singular locus and assume \( \Sigma \) consist only of \( m \geq 1 \) ordinary nodes as singularities and let \( \tilde{X} \) be its proper transform under normalization. Then the vector space

\[ (3) \quad \mathcal{H}_1 = \left\{ \left[ \frac{P \Omega}{f} \right] \in A_1^{n+1} \mid \deg(P) = d - (n + 2) \right\}, \]

(see equation [1]) can be identified with \( F^n PH^n(\tilde{X}, \mathbb{C}) \) via the residue map, whereas the space

\[ \mathcal{H}_2 \overset{def}{=} \left\{ \left[ \frac{P \Omega}{f^2} \right] \in A_2^{n+1} \mid \deg(P) = 2d - (n + 2) \text{ and } P(Q) = 0 \forall Q \in \Sigma \right\}, \]

given by the first adjunction condition on \( A_2^{n+1} \), can be identified with \( F^{n-1} PH^n(\tilde{X}, \mathbb{C}) \) via \( \pi : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X \). The inclusion \( F^n PH^n(\tilde{X}, \mathbb{C}) \subset F^{n-1} PH^n(\tilde{X}, \mathbb{C}) \) corresponds to the natural map

\[ \mathcal{H}_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_2. \]

\(^1\)Note that this is not the usual bidegree to be found in the literature.
given by $\frac{P\Omega}{f} \mapsto \frac{fP\Omega}{f^2}$. Indeed a direct generalisation of [15]'s result for $m \geq 2$ is not so straightforward as it may seem and we show in lemma 8 part 2) that the condition that $l$ points of $\Sigma$ are in (algebraic) general position is not enough, so further imposing the condition that $\Sigma$ is a hg set (see our definition 9) gives the expected generalization as we have proven in remark 11 and in corollary 12.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 1, we generalize the classical definition of adjointness of $H^1_2$ to isolated singularities of higher order, this allows us to formulate sheaf theoretically the notion of adjointness with pole order conditions culminating with a generalization of [15]'s computation for the case of one node. In section 2, we define the notion of homologically good sets and study its relations to the notion of points in algebraic general position, in particular we recover a result from [15] in our situation (see lemma 8). In section 3, we recall the definition of generalized Hodge numbers in [5] and compute the generalized Euler characteristic polynomial of $X$ and $\tilde{X}$. In section 4, using the technique of cubical hyperresolutions of [21] we compute the Mixed Hodge structure of a nodal 3-fold and apply this to a very specific example where we actually compute the number of points in algebraic general position. We conclude this section by finding an exact relation between the defect and the failure of $\Sigma$ to impose linearly independent conditions on polynomials of degree $2d - 5$. In the last section, we consider the VMHS associated to an equisingular family of nodal 3-folds and show that this is indeed a geometric and admissible VMHS in the sense of [26].

1. Generalized adjointness conditions

Let $\Omega_4^k(kX)$ be the sheaf on $\mathbb{P}^4$ of four-rational forms with a pole of order $k$ along the hypersurface $X$ or shortly $\Omega_4^k(k)$ and for a polynomial $F$ we denote by $\mu_p(F)$ the multiplicity of $F$ in $P$ (see [13]). Let $T \subset X$ be a subset and $\Omega_4^k(kX,sT)$ be the subsheaf of $\Omega_4^k(k)$ of four-rational forms with a pole of order $k$ on $X$ and multiplicity equal to $s$ on every point $P \in T$. It follows that $H^0(\mathbb{P}^4, \Omega_4^k(k)) = A_k^4(X)$.

Definition 1. Given $f \in \mathbb{C}[y_0, \ldots, y_n]$ the $s$-adjoint condition on $f$ relative to $T$ is given by $\mu_p(f) = s$ for all $p \in T$. Note that if $s = 1$ we have only one condition, namely $f|_T = 0$ which is equivalent to $T \subset V(f)$.

Definition 2. The space of four-rational forms with poles of order $k$ along $X$ and $s$-adjoint to $T$ is defined as follows:

$$A_k^4(X, sT) = \{ \psi \in A_k^4(X) | \psi = \frac{h\Omega}{f} \text{, } h \text{ is } s \text{-adjoint relative to } T \}$$

In particular, if $T = \Sigma = \text{Sing}(X)$, it follows that $H^0(\mathbb{P}, \Omega_4^k(kX, s\Sigma)) = A_k^4(X, s\Sigma)$. Clearly $s \leq d = \text{deg}(f)$. We have already defined the vector spaces $\mathcal{H}_k$ and it is clear that for $s = 1$ and $k = 2$ one has: $\mathcal{H}_2 = A_2^4(X, \Sigma)/dA_1^4(X) = \mathcal{H}_2(\Sigma)$ in [13]'s notation. If $\Sigma$ consists of ordinary double points then trivially $dA_1^3(X) \subset A_3^2(X, \Sigma)$ but in general it is not even possible to compare $dA_3^2(X)$ with $A_k^4(X, (k - 1)\Sigma)$.
Hence we can define the following quotient: \( \mathcal{H}_k^s = \frac{A_k^4(X, s\Sigma)}{dA_{k-1}^4 \cap A_k^4(X, s\Sigma)} \), which is the vector space of top rational forms with poles of order \( k \) along \( X \) and satisfying the \( s \)-adjoint condition relative to \( \Sigma \), naturally generalising one-adjointness relative to \( \Sigma \) given by \([15]\).

**Remark 3.** In this sense given \( G \) a finite subset of polynomials one can generalize the adjointness condition relative to \( T \) if for all \( h \in G \) the \( s \)-adjoint condition is satisfied on \( h \).

In fact:

**Remark 4.** If \( T = \Sigma \) the set \( \{ \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_0}, \ldots, \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_n} \} \) is one-adjoint relative to \( \Sigma \) iff \( \Sigma \) consists of ordinary double points.

Let us return to the sheaf theoretic version of forms with pole order and adjointness conditions:

**Definition 5.** As a shorthand notation for \( \Omega_P^4(kX, s\Sigma) \) write instead \( \Omega_P^4(k, s) \) which is the subsheaf on \( \mathbb{P}^4 \) of four-rational forms with a pole of order \( k \) on \( X \) and \( s \)-adjoint relative to \( \Sigma \).

**Proposition 6.** For \( N = 2k - 3 \) positive and \( s \geq N \) then \( \pi^*(\Omega_P^4(k, s)) \subset \Omega_X(k) \) for \( s \geq N \) where \( \pi : \tilde{X} \to X \) is the blow-up of \( X \) along the center \( \Sigma \).

**Proof.** This is a local computation; for that we introduce the following notation. We define a local chart in \( \mathbb{A}^4 \) with coordinates \( z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4 \) in a polydisc \( D_\varepsilon \) and fix a point \( P \in D_\varepsilon \cap \Sigma_4 \). It is easy to see that locally around this \( D_\varepsilon \), we can assume that \( X = \{ z : z \cdot z = 0 \} \). We can also assume that in this affine chart \( P = (0, 0, 0, 0) \).

Moreover, let \( \xi = (\xi_1 : \xi_2 : \xi_3 : \xi_4) \). Note that \( D_\varepsilon \subset \mathbb{P}_3 \) where \( \mathbb{P}_3 = \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{A}^4) \) gives rise to the strict transform: \( D_\varepsilon = \text{Bl}_p(D_\varepsilon) = \pi^{-1}(D_\varepsilon) \), where \( \pi : \tilde{D}_\varepsilon \to D_\varepsilon \) is the projection in the first coordinate, namely \( (z, \xi) \mapsto z \). In order to give a local description for \( \pi \) we blow up the polydisc and obtain \( \tilde{D}_\varepsilon = \{ (z, \xi) \in D_\varepsilon \times \mathbb{P}_3 | z_4\xi_j - z_j\xi_4 = 0 \} \). Also wlog \( \xi_4 \neq 0 \) and in fact \( z_i = z_4\xi_i^{\frac{1}{\xi_4}} \) for \( i = 1, 2, 3, 4 \). We further define \( u = z_4 \) and \( v_i = \frac{z_i}{\xi_i} \) hence:

\[
\begin{align*}
z_1 &= v_1 u, \\
z_2 &= v_2 u, \\
z_3 &= v_3 u, \\
z_4 &= u.
\end{align*}
\]

With our local description: \( \pi(uv, v) = uv \) where \( v = (v_1, v_2, v_3, 1) \) (Note that \([15]\) on page 523 writes incorrectly \( \pi(u, v) \)).

Let \( \phi \in A_k^4(X, s\Sigma) \), in particular \( \phi(z) = \frac{F(z)}{(z \cdot z)^k} \) such that \( F \) is \( s \)-adjoint relative to \( \Sigma \). Note that \( (z \cdot z)^k = u^{2k}(1 + v \cdot v)^k \) and

\[
\pi^*(\phi)(u, v) = \phi(\pi(uv, v)) = \frac{u^{3-2k}F(uv_1, uv_2, uv_3, u)dvdv_1}{(1 + v \cdot v)^k}.
\]

Since \( \mu_p(F) \geq 2k - 3 = N \) then \( \pi^*(\phi) \) has no poles along the exceptional divisor \( \tilde{H} = \{ u = 0 \} \) and has poles of order \( k \) along \( \tilde{X} \). It is illustrative to compute just the following values for \( k, N \):
and obtain [15]'s remark on p. 522 for \( k = 2 \) and \( s = 1 \) as a particular case of the definition given here for \( N \). Q.E.D.

2. Elementary results for nodal hypersurfaces on \( \mathbb{P}^4 \)

Given a projective variety \( X \), we will say that a finite set \( T \subset X \) is a set of points in *algebraic general position* or shortly *in general position* if they impose \( |T| \) conditions on polynomials of degree \( d \) passing through all of them, for all \( d \geq 1 \).

**Lemma 7.** For any scheme \( X \) of dimension \( n > 0 \), any locally free sheaf \( \mathcal{E} \) of finite rank and any non-singular closed point \( p \in X \), we have \( H^i_p(X, \mathcal{E}) = 0 \) for all \( i < n \).

**Proof.** By excision, \( H^i_p(X, \mathcal{E}) = H^i_p(U, \mathcal{E}|_U) \) for any open set \( U \subset X \) which contains \( p \), therefore we can assume that \( X = \text{Spec } A \), \( p \) is a prime ideal \( p \) and \( \mathcal{E} \) is free, but then we can restrict ourselves to the case \( \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{O} \). Since \( p \) is non-singular, then \( \mathcal{O}_p = A_p \) is a regular local ring and therefore depth \( A_p = \dim X = n \) and the claim follows from the fact that \( H^i_p(\text{Spec } A, \mathcal{O}) = H^i_p(A) = 0 \) if \( i < \text{depth } A_p \). Q.E.D.

Assume now that \( X \) is a 3-fold on \( \mathbb{P}^4 \) of degree \( \geq 5 \) with \( m \) nodes, where precisely \( l \leq m \) are in general position. Keeping the notation of the previous sections we have:

**Lemma 8.**

1. \( \mathcal{H}_1 \xrightarrow{\pi^*} H^{3,0}(\tilde{X}) \) is an isomorphism and

2. \( \mathcal{H}_2 \xrightarrow{\pi^*} F^2H^3(\tilde{X}, \mathbb{C}) \) is injective.

**Proof.** As for 1), it follows immediately since the non-trivial class of \( \Omega_f \) generates via \( \pi^* \) the one-dimensional space \( H^{3,0}(\tilde{X}) \).

As for 2): if we denote by \( d \) the total differential then we have the following commutative diagram:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A_1^3(X) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\pi}_1^*} & A_1^3(\tilde{X}) \\
\downarrow d & & \downarrow \tilde{d} \\
A_2^4(X, \Sigma) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\pi}^*} & A_2^4(\tilde{X}) \\
\downarrow p & & \downarrow q \\
\mathcal{H}_2^1 & \xrightarrow{[\tilde{\pi}^*]} & \mathcal{H}_2(\tilde{X})
\end{array}
\]

where \( p \) and \( q \) are the natural quotient maps and in fact \( \text{Coker}(d) = \mathcal{H}_2^1 \) and similarly \( \text{Coker}(\tilde{d}) = \mathcal{H}_2(\tilde{X}) \) and the last horizontal arrow \( [\tilde{\pi}^*] \) is induced by the universal property of the quotient. Moreover, \( \tilde{\pi}_1^* \) is injective since for poles of order
one the numerator is zero if the quotient is zero. For higher order poles this is \textit{not in general true} since we have in particular pole order reduction.

\textbf{Claim 1.} \( \tilde{\pi}_1^* \) is surjective.
\textbf{Proof.} (of claim 1.)

Let \( U = \mathbb{P}^4 \setminus \Sigma \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^4 \) and \( \hat{U} = \mathbb{P}^4 \setminus \Sigma \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^4 \), then \( \tilde{\pi} : \hat{U} \to U \) is an isomorphism, in particular we have a commutative diagram

\[
\begin{array}{c}
0 \longrightarrow H^0_{\Sigma}(\mathbb{P}^4, \Omega^3_{\mathbb{P}^4}(\hat{X})) \longrightarrow H^0(\mathbb{P}^4, \Omega^3_{\hat{X}}(\hat{X})) \longrightarrow j^* \longrightarrow H^0(\mathbb{P}^4, \Omega^3_{\mathbb{P}^4}(\hat{X})) \\
| \tilde{\pi}^* | \\
0 \longrightarrow H^0_{\Sigma}(\mathbb{P}^4, \Omega^3_{\mathbb{P}^4}(\hat{X})) \longrightarrow H^0(\mathbb{P}^4, \Omega^3_{\hat{X}}(\hat{X})) \longrightarrow j^* \longrightarrow H^0(\mathbb{P}^4, \Omega^3_{\mathbb{P}^4}(\hat{X}))
\end{array}
\]

where the map \( \pi^*|_U \) is an isomorphism.

Given \( h \in H^0(\mathbb{P}^4, \Omega^3_{\mathbb{P}^4}(\hat{X})) \), its restriction \( j^*(h) \) to \( \hat{U} \) admits a unique preimage \( \beta' \in H^0(U, \Omega^3_{\mathbb{P}^4}(X)) \) via the isomorphism \( \tilde{\pi}^*|_U \). The Mayer-Vietoris sequence for cohomology with support tell us that

\[
H^2_{\Sigma}(\mathbb{P}^4, \Omega^3_{\mathbb{P}^4}(X)) \cong \oplus_{P \in \Sigma} H^0_P(\mathbb{P}^4, \Omega^3_{\mathbb{P}^4}(X))
\]

since \( \Sigma \) is the disjoint union of \( P \in \Sigma \), but since every point \( P \in \Sigma \) is a regular closed point in the four dimensional variety \( \mathbb{P}^4 \) and the sheaf \( \Omega^3_{\mathbb{P}^4}(X) \) is locally free, then by lemma \( \tilde{\pi}^* \) we have that \( H^0_P(\mathbb{P}^4, \Omega^3_{\mathbb{P}^4}(X)) = 0 \) for all \( j < 4 \), in particular the restriction map \( j^* \) is an isomorphism and there exist a unique lifting \( \hat{\beta} \in H^0(\mathbb{P}^4, \Omega^3_{\mathbb{P}^4}(X)) \) whose restriction to \( j^*(\beta) \) equals \( \beta' \). Since the diagram above is commutative, then we have \( j^*(\tilde{\pi}^*(\beta)) = \tilde{\pi}^*|_U(j^*(\beta)) = \tilde{\pi}^*|_U(\beta') = j^*(h) \).

On the other hand, the restriction \( j^* \) from \( \hat{\mathbb{P}}^4 \) to \( \hat{U} \) is injective, since the zero locus of any section of \( \Omega^3_{\mathbb{P}^4}(\tilde{X}) \) is a closed subvariety of \( \hat{\mathbb{P}}^4 \) and therefore the restriction \( j^*h = 0 \) if and only if \( h = 0 \) (because \( (h)_0 \) would be a closed subvariety of \( \hat{\mathbb{P}}^4 \) which contains an open dense subset) \(^2\) and so \( \tilde{\pi}^*(\beta) = h \).

\textbf{Claim 2.} \( \tilde{\pi}^* \) is injective.
\textbf{Proof.} (of claim 2.)

Consider the sheaf \( \Omega^4_{\mathbb{P}^4}(2, 1) \) of rational 4-forms on \( \mathbb{P}^4 \) with poles of order 2 along \( X \) and satisfying the first adjoint condition relative to \( \Sigma \). The pullback \( \tilde{\pi}^* \) defines a morphism of sheaves \( \tilde{\pi}^* : \Omega^4_{\mathbb{P}^4}(2, 1) \to \tilde{\pi}^*_* \Omega^4_{\mathbb{P}^4}(2) \) to the direct image of the sheaf of rational 4-forms on \( \hat{\mathbb{P}}^4 \) with poles of order 2 along \( \tilde{X} \). Since the injectivity of the

\(^2\)One could also argue that \( \hat{\mathbb{P}}^4 \) is regular in codimension 1 and \( \hat{\Sigma} \) is a disjoint union of exceptional divisors, so that

\[
H^0_{\Sigma}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}^4, \Omega^3_{\hat{\mathbb{P}}^4}(\hat{X})) \cong \oplus_{P \in \Sigma} H^0_P(\mathbb{P}^4, \Omega^3_{\mathbb{P}^4}(\hat{X})), \text{ where } E_P \text{ is the exceptional divisor above } P, \text{ and the regularity in codimension 1 implies that the last groups are zero.}
morphism is of local nature, it is enough to show it for the stalk at every point.

If \( \hat{U} \) is an open set on \( \hat{\mathbb{P}}^4 \) whose intersection with \( \hat{\Sigma} \) is empty, then \( \hat{\pi} \) is an isomorphism from \( \hat{U} \) to \( U = \hat{\pi}(\hat{U}) \) and so \( \hat{\pi}^* : \Omega^4_{\hat{\mathbb{P}}^4}(2,1)(U) \to \hat{\pi}_* \Omega^4_{\hat{\mathbb{P}}^4}(2)(\hat{U}) \) is an isomorphism. Now let us consider an open set \( U \subset \mathbb{P}^4 \) containing just the point \( P \in \Sigma \), then any rational 4-form \( \omega \) on \( \mathbb{P}^4 \) with poles of order 2 along \( X \) can be written in the form \( \frac{F_0(z)dz}{(z - z_0)^2} \), where \( z = (z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4) \) are local coordinates and \( z \cdot z \) is a local equation defining \( X \) on \( U \). The form \( \omega \) satisfies the first adjoint condition relative to \( \Sigma \) in \( U \) if and only if \( F(P) = 0 \). But in this case,

\[
\hat{\pi}^*(\omega)(u, v) = \frac{u^3F(uv, u) du dv}{u^4(1 + v \cdot v)^2} = \frac{F(uv, u) du dv}{u(1 + v \cdot v)^2}
\]

see equation \( (4) \). Since the zero set of a non constant holomorphic function is a hypersurface on \( U \) and \( \hat{\pi} \) is a birational morphism, \( \hat{\pi}^*(\omega) = 0 \) if and only if \( \hat{\pi}(\hat{U}) \subset V(F) \cap U \) if and only if \( F \equiv 0 \).

Claim 3. \([\hat{\pi}^*] \) is monomorphism.

Proof. ( Of claim 3.)

Assume \( \varphi \in \mathcal{H}_2^1 \) satisfies \( [\hat{\pi}^*](\varphi) = 0 \) and let \( \varphi \in A^1_4(X, \Sigma) \) be any representative of \( \varphi \). Then \( \hat{\pi}^*(\varphi) = d \mathfrak{h} \) for some \( \mathfrak{h} \in A^1_4(\hat{X}) \) and by claim 1 there exist some \( \beta \in A^1_4(X) \) such that \( \hat{\pi}^*_1 \beta = \mathfrak{h} \), therefore

\[
\hat{\pi}^*(d \beta) = d(\hat{\pi}^*_1 \beta) = d \mathfrak{h} = \hat{\pi}^*(\varphi)
\]

and the injectivity of \( \hat{\pi}^* \) implies that \( \varphi = d \beta \in d A^1_4(X) \), i.e. \( \varphi = 0 \in \mathcal{H}_2^1 \).

The proposition now follows from the fact that \( \mathcal{H}_2^1(\hat{X}) \xrightarrow{F^2H^3} \mathcal{H}_2^1(\hat{X}, \mathbb{C}) \) as proven e.g. in [15] prop.16.3 equation (16.10).

Q.E.D.

Let \( X \subset \mathbb{P}^4 \) be a nodal hypersurface of degree \( d \) with \( m \) nodes and let \( P \) be a node on \( X \). Then in an analytic neighborhood \( U \) of \( P \) in \( \mathbb{P}^4 \) we can write \( X \cap U = V(z \cdot z) \), where \( z = (z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4) \in \mathbb{C}^4 \) and \( z_i = x_i + \sqrt{-1}y_i \) for \( i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \). With this notation \( z \cdot z = x \cdot x - y \cdot y + 2\sqrt{-1}(x \cdot y) \) and following the technique of continous deformation used in [15] ( in particular the notation before equation (15.3)) we can consider a family \( X_\epsilon \) of hypersurfaces with \( m - 1 \) nodes that degenerate to \( X \), that is to say that \( X - U \cong X_\epsilon - U \). Note that the three-dimensional real spheres \( \delta_\epsilon = \{x \cdot x = \epsilon, y = 0\} \) are contained in the \( X_\epsilon \cap U = \{z \cdot z = \epsilon\} \) so the family of hypersurfaces \( \{X_\epsilon\} \) degenerates to \( X \) and the latter is a singular hypersurface with \( m \) double points. Observe that there exists a 3-cell \( \theta_\epsilon(P) \) on \( U \times X_\epsilon \) such that \( \theta_\epsilon(P) \cdot \delta_\epsilon(P) = 1 \) as shown in [15]. The sphere \( \delta_0(P) \overset{def}{=} \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \delta_\epsilon(P) \) is contractible to a point in \( X \) while the 3-cell \( \theta_0(P) \overset{def}{=} \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \theta_\epsilon(P) \) gives a non-zero element of \( H_3(X, \mathbb{Z}) \otimes \mathbb{Q} \). However it may happen that \( \theta_0(P) \) belongs to the subspace of
Since for every point in a hg set $H \dim$ vanishing cycle of $m$

Remark 13. In particular lemma 8 implies that the map $H\ dim$ on $Y$ is a homologically good set of elements in $H_3(X, \mathbb{Z}) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ and $T$ is maximal with this property. In particular, there will be a vanishing cycle $\delta_0(P)$ for every node in $T$.

Remark 10. Let $X$, $U$ and $X_\epsilon$ be as above, $T$ be a homologically good set of nodes on $X$, $P \in T$ and $\tilde{X}$ is the strict transform of $X$ under the blow-up of $X$ on $P$. The strict transform of $\theta_0(P)$ does no longer represent an element in the homology of $\tilde{X}$ since it is no longer a cycle in $\tilde{X}$, and $\delta_0(P)$ is contractible to a point already in $X$, therefore

$$\text{rank } H_3(\tilde{X}, \mathbb{Z}) \leq \text{rank } H_3(X_\epsilon, \mathbb{Z}) - 2$$

In what follows, we will assume that $X \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ is a nodal hypersurface of degree $d$ with $m$ nodes, $l \leq m$ of which are in general position. Further, let $Y \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ be a smooth hypersurface of the same degree and let $a = \dim H^{0,3}(Y) = \dim H^{3,0}(Y)$ and $b = \dim H^{1,2}(Y) = \dim H^{2,1}(Y)$. Then we can rephrase lemma 8 as follows:

Remark 11. If $X$, $\tilde{X}$ and $Y$ are as before, then

$$a + b - l = \frac{1}{2} \dim H^3(Y, \mathbb{C}) - l = \dim \mathcal{H}_2(Y) - l = \dim \mathcal{H}_2^1 \leq \dim F^2 H^3(\tilde{X}, \mathbb{C}),$$

and therefore $\text{rank } H_3(\tilde{X}, \mathbb{Z}) \geq 2a + 2b - 2l$.

Since for every point in a hg set $T$ the rank of $H_3(\tilde{X}, \mathbb{Z})$ drops off by two with respect to the rank of $H_3(Y, \mathbb{Z})$, the inequality above imposes an upper bound for the number of nodes in hg. In particular lemma 8 shows that the number of vanishing cycles is at most $l$, i.e., there can not be more nodes forming a hg set on $X$ than the number of nodes in general position.

If the $l$ nodes in general position form a hg set on $X$ we actually have

$$\dim \mathcal{H}_2^1 = \dim \mathcal{H}_2(Y) - l = \dim F^2 H^3(Y, \mathbb{C}) - l = \frac{1}{2} \dim H^3(Y, \mathbb{C}) - l = a + b - l,$$

so that, in this case, lemma 8 implies that the map $\mathcal{H}_2^1 \to F^2 H^3(\tilde{X}, \mathbb{C})$ is in fact an isomorphism.

Corollary 12. If $X \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ is a nodal hypersurface of degree $d$, where $\Sigma$ consist of $m$ nodes in general position and is a hg set on $X$, then $\dim H^{2,1}(\tilde{X}) = b - m$, $\dim H^3(\tilde{X}, \mathbb{C}) = \text{rank } H_3(\tilde{X}, \mathbb{Z}) = 2a + 2b - 2m$. In particular $m \leq h^{2,1}(Y)$, where $Y \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ is a smooth hypersurface of degree $d$.

Remark 13. In particular for a quintic hypersurface $X$ on $\mathbb{P}^4$ we obtain the nice bound $m \leq 101$ for the number of nodes in general position which are also in hg. In this case (see [1], [22] and [27]) this bound is almost sharp. Observe that the maximal
number of nodes for a quintic hypersurface is expected to lie between 130 and 135, but they do not lie in general position (i.e., they impose less than 130 conditions, illustrating one form of the Cayley-Bacarach theorem). If $\Sigma$ is a finite set of nodes, how many independent conditions does $\Sigma$ impose on homogeneous polynomials of degree $d$ passing through $\Sigma$ and how many of them form a hg set? This is not the original formulation of the Cayley-Bacharach theorem but a form of this type of theorem (see also [13] p. 297). The exact relation will be given by the defect of $X$ considered in corollary 20 of §4.

With the same techniques, one can prove a similar result for surfaces on $\mathbb{P}^3$ and curves on $\mathbb{P}^2$.

3. Generalized Hodge numbers

Following Danilov and Khovanskii (see [5] §1, in particular definition 1.5 proposition 1.8, corollary 1.9 and 1.10), we define the generalized Hodge numbers:

$$e^{p,q} = e^{p,q}(X) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sum_k (-1)^k h^{p,q}(H^k_c(X))$$

as well as the generalized Euler characteristic polynomial

$$e(X; x, \bar{x}) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{p,q} e^{p,q}(X) x^p \bar{x}^q$$

which in the sequel we will simply write $e(X)$ and $\text{coeff}_e(X)()$ is the coefficient of the term in parenthesis. We summarize some well known results about this polynomial (see [5]) in a single lemma.

Lemma 14.

- Suppose $X$ is a disjoint union of a finite number of locally closed subvarieties $X_i, \ i \in I$. Then $e(X) = \sum_i e(X_i)$.

- If $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ is a bundle with fiber $F$ which is locally trivial in the Zariski topology, then $e(X) = e(Y) \times e(F)$.

- If $X$ is a point, then $e(X) = 1$.

- $e(\mathbb{P}^1) = 1 + x\bar{x}$.

- $e(\mathbb{P}^n) = 1 + x\bar{x} + \ldots + (x\bar{x})^n$. 
• Let \( \pi : \tilde{X} \longrightarrow X \) be the blow up of \( X \) along a subvariety \( Y \) of codimension \( r + 1 \) in \( X \). Then

\[
e(\tilde{X}) = e(X) + e(Y)[x\bar{x} + \cdots + (x\bar{x})^r].
\]

As an application of the above lemma we will compute the generalized Euler polynomial of \( X \) for a projective hypersurface on \( \mathbb{P}^d \) of degree \( d \) with precisely \( m \) nodes (\( l \) of which are in general position) as the singular locus \( \Sigma \). To fix notation, let \( \mathbb{P}^d \) be the blow up of \( \mathbb{P}^d \) along \( \Sigma \), \( \tilde{X} \) be the inverse image of \( X \) on \( \mathbb{P}^d \) and \( \tilde{X} \) be the strict transform of \( X \) and \( Y \) a non-singular hypersurface of degree \( d \) on \( \mathbb{P}^4 \). Further, let \( \tilde{\Sigma} \) be the inverse image of \( \Sigma \) and \( \tilde{\Sigma} = \tilde{\Sigma} \cap \tilde{X} \).

Outside the singular locus the blowup is an isomorphism, therefore one has the following quasi-projective varieties:

\[
X - \Sigma \overset{\text{def}}{=} W \cong \tilde{W} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \tilde{X} - \tilde{\Sigma} \cong \tilde{X} - \tilde{\Sigma} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \tilde{W}.
\]

Now, we recall Bott’s theorem on the particular situation of \( \mathbb{P}^n \) ([2] theorems IV and IV’):

\[
H^p(\mathbb{P}^n, \Omega^q) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } p \ne q, \\ \mathbb{C} & \text{for } p = q \leq n \end{cases}
\]

and in particular for \( n = 4 \): \( e(\mathbb{P}^4) = 1 + x\bar{x} + x^2\bar{x}^2 + x^3\bar{x}^3 + x^4\bar{x}^4 \). It follows immediately that \( \text{Gr}^2_F H^4(\mathbb{P}^4) = H^{2,2}(\mathbb{P}^4) \) and the only non-zero graded part is when \( \text{coeff}_{e(\mathbb{P}^4)}(x^2\bar{x}^{n-4}) = 1 \) hence

\[
\text{Gr}^2_F H^4(\mathbb{P}^4) = H^{2,2} = \mathbb{C}.
\]

Also

\[
e(\bar{\mathbb{P}}^4) = e(\mathbb{P}^4) + e(\Sigma)(x\bar{x} + \cdots + (x\bar{x})^3)
\]

using that \( e(\Sigma) = m \) and substituting in the above formula:

\[
h^{p,q}(\mathbb{P}^4) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } p \ne q, \\ 1 & \text{if } p = q = 0, \\ m + 1 & \text{if } 1 \leq p = q \leq 3, \\ 1 & \text{if } p = q = 4. \end{cases}
\]

It follows that \( h^{1,1}(\mathbb{P}^4) = h^{2,2}(\mathbb{P}^4) = h^{3,3}(\mathbb{P}^4) = m + 1 \). After these basic preliminaries, we finally compute:

**Lemma 15.** Let \( X, \tilde{X} \) and \( Y \) as above, then

\[
e(\tilde{X}) = 1 + (m + 1)x\bar{x} - ax^3 - (b - l)x^2\bar{x} - (b - l)x\bar{x}^2 - a\bar{x}^3 + (1 + m)x^2\bar{x}^2 + x^3\bar{x}^3
\]

and

\[
e(X) = 1 + (1 - m)x\bar{x} - ax^3 - (b - l)x^2\bar{x} - (b - l)x\bar{x}^2 - a\bar{x}^3 + x^2\bar{x}^2 + x^3\bar{x}^3,
\]

where \( a = h^{3,0}(Y), b = h^{2,1}(Y) \).
Proof. Observe that $\hat{\Sigma} = \bigcup_{x \in \Sigma} E_x$ and by cutting each $E_x$ with $\tilde{X}$ we obtain a quadric surface $Q_x$ hence $e(\hat{\Sigma}) = \Sigma_e e(Q_x)$ but each summand is equal to

$$e(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1) = e(\mathbb{P}^1)^2 = 1 + 2ax - ax^2;$$

so

$$e(\hat{\Sigma}) = m \left(1 + 2ax + x^2\right).$$

Moreover, $e^{p,q}(\hat{W}) = e^{p,q}(\tilde{X}) - e^{p,q}(\hat{\Sigma})$ and

$$e^{p,q}(X) = e^{p,q}(W) + e^{p,q}(\hat{\Sigma}) = e^{p,q}(\tilde{X}) + e^{p,q}(\hat{\Sigma}) + e^{p,q}(\Sigma).$$

Since $h^3(\tilde{X}) = 2a + 2b - 2l$ (see corollary [12], Lefschetz Hyperplane Theorem tell us that:

$$e(\tilde{X}) = 1 + (m + 1)ax - ax^3 - (b - l)x^2\bar{x} - (b - l)x\bar{x}^2 - ax^3 + (1 + m)x^2\bar{x}^2 + x^3\bar{x}.$$ 

Finally, $e(X) = e(\tilde{X}) - (m + 2mx\bar{x} + mx^2\bar{x}) + m$. The result follows directly by substituting the value of $e(\tilde{X})$ in equation (10).

Q.E.D.

Using the Hodge numbers of the total transform $\hat{\mathbb{P}}^4$ given by equation (8) we can conclude:

**Corollary 16.** In lemma [8] of [21] in diagram [2]: $d(A^3_1(X)) = \tilde{d}(A^3_1(\tilde{X})) = 0$ hence $\text{Coker}(d) = \mathcal{H}_2^1 = A^1_2(X, \Sigma)$ and $\text{Coker}(\hat{d}) = \mathcal{H}_2(\tilde{X}) = A^1_2(\tilde{X})$.

Proof. Since $\tilde{X}$ is smooth, then the hodge numbers $e^{p,q}(\tilde{X}) = (-1)^{p+q} h^{p,q}(\tilde{X})$, in particular $h^{2,0} = h^{0,2} = 0$ by the computation above. This implies that $H^0(\tilde{X}, \hat{\Omega}_X^2) \subset H^0(\tilde{X}, \Omega_X^2) = 0$. Recall the exact sequence of residues in [15] Lemma 10.9 ii):

$$0 \to \hat{\Omega}_{\tilde{X}}^q \to \hat{\Omega}_{\tilde{X}}^q(1) \to \hat{\Omega}_{\tilde{X}}^{q-1} \to 0$$

and its associated long sequence for $q = 3$:

$$0 \to H^0(\tilde{X}, \hat{\Omega}_X^3) \to H^0(\tilde{X}, \hat{\Omega}_X^3(1)) \to H^0(\tilde{X}, \hat{\Omega}_X^2) \to \cdots$$

also $H^0(\tilde{X}, \hat{\Omega}_X^3) \subset H^0(\tilde{X}, \Omega_X^2) = 0$ (see equation [8] above) since the last term for the above sequence is already zero so must be the middle term. In particular, $d(A^3_1(X)) \subset \tilde{d}(A^3_1(\tilde{X})) = 0$.

Q.E.D.

4. **Mixed Hodge structure of a nodal 3-fold**

Given a singular scheme $X$ defined over $\mathbb{C}$, Guillen, Navarro et. al. defined a **cubical hyperresolution** $X_*$ of $X$ (see [21], Exposé III, proposition 3.3) which induces a spectral sequence

$$E_1^{p,q} = H^q(X_p, \mathbb{C}) \Rightarrow H^{p+q}(X, \mathbb{C})$$

providing a natural Mixed Hodge Structure on $H^{p+q}(X, \mathbb{C})$ (we set $X_p \overset{def}{=} \bigsqcup_{|\alpha|=p+1} X_\alpha$).
In our situation, a cubical hyperresolution can be constructed from the following pullback diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\Sigma & \times_X \tilde{X} & \tilde{X} \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\Sigma & \rightarrow & X
\end{array}
\]

Since \( \Sigma \times_X \tilde{X} \cong \tilde{\Sigma} \), the projection to the first factor gets identified with \( \pi_1 \), the restriction of \( \pi \) to \( \tilde{\Sigma} \), while the projection to the second factor gets identified with the natural inclusion \( i : \tilde{\Sigma} \hookrightarrow \tilde{X} \), yielding the cubical hyperresolution

\[
X_1 \overset{i}{\longrightarrow} X_0 \longrightarrow X,
\]

where \( X_1 = \tilde{\Sigma} \) and \( X_0 = \tilde{X} \sqcup \Sigma \). Therefore \( E_1^{0,q} = H^q(X_0, \mathbb{C}) \), \( E_1^{1,q} = H^q(X_1, \mathbb{C}) \) and \( E_1^{p,q} = 0 \) for all \( p \geq 2 \). Clearly this spectral sequence degenerates at \( E_2 \), so we have

\[
H^3(X, \mathbb{C}) = E_2^{0,3} \oplus E_2^{1,2},
\]

where

\[
E_2^{0,3} = \text{Ker}(\pi^* \circ i^* : H^3(X, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^3(X_1, \mathbb{C}))
\]

and

\[
E_2^{1,2} = H^2(X_1, \mathbb{C})/\text{Im}(\pi^* \circ i^* : H^2(X_0, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^2(X_1, \mathbb{C})).
\]

Since \( H^3(X_0, \mathbb{C}) = H^3(\tilde{X}, \mathbb{C}) \) and \( H^3(X_1, \mathbb{C}) = 0 \), then \( E_2^{0,3} = H^3(\tilde{X}, \mathbb{C}) \) is a pure Hodge structure of weight 3.

Similarly, \( H^2(X_0, \mathbb{C}) = H^2(\tilde{X}, \mathbb{C}) \cong \mathbb{C}^m \) and \( H^2(X_1, \mathbb{C}) = H^2(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbb{C}) \cong \mathbb{C}^{2m} \), so \( E_2^{1,2} \cong \mathbb{C}^m \) is a pure Hodge structure of weight 2 and we recover the Clemens-Schmidt exact sequence

\[
0 \longrightarrow W_2 H^3(X, \mathbb{C}) \longrightarrow H^3(X, \mathbb{C}) \longrightarrow H^3(\tilde{X}, C) \longrightarrow 0
\]

with \( W_2 H^3(X, \mathbb{C}) = E_2^{1,2} \cong \mathbb{C}^m \), which is to be expected for a cubical hyperresolution, as pointed out in \[23\], Corollary 5.42.

Remember that, in virtue of lemma \[15\], if \( \Sigma \) consists of \( m \) nodes, where precisely \( l \) of them are in general position (and assuming they are also in homologically good position), one has

1. \( \dim H^3(\tilde{X}, \mathbb{C}) = 2a + 2b - 2l \)
2. \( H^3(\tilde{X}, \mathbb{C}) \cong \oplus E^{i,j} \), where \( \dim E^{0,3} = \dim E^{3,0} = a \) and \( \dim E^{1,2} = \dim E^{2,1} = b - l \).
3. \( \dim H^3(X, \mathbb{C}) = 2a + 2b - 2l + m \).

Moreover, in this situation we have:
Corollary 17.
\[ \text{Gr}_F^k H^3(X, \mathbb{C}) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{C} & \text{if } k = 0, 3, \\ \mathbb{C}^{b-l+m} & \text{if } k = 1, \\ \mathbb{C}^{b-l} & \text{if } k = 2. \end{cases} \]

Observe that \( m - 1 \) is precisely the failure of \( \Sigma \) to impose independent conditions on homogeneous polynomials of degree 5 (see remark 13).

Example 18. Let \( X \) be the quintic 3-fold on \( \mathbb{P}^5 \) defined by the equations \( p_4 = 0 \) and \( 4p_5 - 15p_2p_3 = 0 \), where \( p_k = \sum_{i=0}^{5} x_i^k \) is the \( k \)-th power symmetric function. Then the singular locus of \( X \) consists of precisely 100 nodes which are the orbits of \( (1: -1: 1: -1: 1: -1) \) and of \( (1: -1: 1: -1: z: -z) \) under the symmetric group on six letters \( S_6 \), where \( 7z^2 + 16 = 0 \). For this quintic 3-fold, using the kernel extension PLURAL of SINGULAR 2-0-6 (see 6) we have written a program that allows us to conclude that the 100 nodes impose only 86 conditions on the space of quintics passing through them, so in this case \( l = 86 < 100 = m \). It is not difficult to see that this quintic 3-fold is actually a singular Calabi-Yau threefold on \( H = V(p_4) \cong \mathbb{P}^4 \).

As Candelas, de la Ossa et al. have shown in 3, \( \dim H^3(Y, \mathbb{C}) = 204 \) for a smooth quintic 3-fold on \( \mathbb{P}^4 \), and if additionally the nodes in general position form an hg set, then corollary 17 can be written as:

\[ \text{Gr}_F^k H^3(X, \mathbb{C}) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{C} & \text{if } k = 0, 3, \\ \mathbb{C}^{115} & \text{if } k = 1, \\ \mathbb{C}^{15} & \text{if } k = 2. \end{cases} \]

and \( \dim W_2 H^3(X, \mathbb{C}) = 100. \)

Recall that we have a commutative diagram of long exact sequences with compact support:

\[ \ldots \rightarrow H_c^i(U) \xrightarrow{\pi^*} H^i(X) \xrightarrow{H_c^i} H_c^{i+1}(U) \xrightarrow{\pi^*} \ldots \]

Since \( \Sigma \) is zero dimensional, then \( H_c^i(\Sigma) = 0 \) for all \( i > 0 \). In particular:

\[ \begin{align*}
0 & \rightarrow H_c^1(U) \xrightarrow{\pi^*} H^4(X) \xrightarrow{H_c^5} 0 \rightarrow H_c^5(U) \xrightarrow{\pi^*} H^5(X) \xrightarrow{\pi^*} 0 \\
\approx & \rightarrow H_c^1(\bar{U}) \rightarrow H^4(\bar{X}) \rightarrow H_c^4(\bar{\Sigma}) \rightarrow H_c^4(\bar{\bar{U}}) \rightarrow H^5(\bar{\bar{X}}) \rightarrow 0
\end{align*} \]

is exact and commutative. From the generalized Hodge numbers, equations (9) and (10), we have: \( H^i(\Sigma) = 0 \) for \( i > 4 \), \( H^4(\Sigma) = 0 \), \( H_4(\Sigma) \cong \mathbb{C}^m \), \( H^4(\bar{X}) \cong \mathbb{C}^{m+1} \) and \( H^5(\bar{\bar{X}}) = 0 \). Therefore the second row of the above diagram simplifies to:

\[ 0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\beta \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{m+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^r \rightarrow 0 \]

where \( \beta \) is the fourth Betti number of \( X \). Applying the Euler characteristic to this exact sequence: \( \beta - (m + 1) + m - r = 0 \) hence \( r = \beta - 1. \) It follows that
On the other hand, Clemens in [4] and later Werner in [29] have introduced the following Mayer-Vietoris type exact sequence:

\[
0 \to H_4(Y) \to H_4(X) \xrightarrow{k} \mathcal{M} \xrightarrow{b} H_3(Y) \xrightarrow{\gamma} H_3(X) \to 0
\]

where \( Y \) is a smooth three-fold of the same degree as \( X \) and \( \mathcal{M} \) is a free \( \mathbb{Z} \)-module of rank \( m = |\Sigma| \). This allows us to compute the defect of \( X \) as \( \delta \overset{\text{def}}{=} \text{rank}(\text{Im}(k)). \)

As a consequence of their definition they show that \( \beta_2(X) = 1 \) and \( \delta = \beta - 1. \)

**Corollary 19.** If the \( l \) double points are in general position (resp. form a hg set) then \( \delta \geq 2(m-l) \) (resp. \( \delta = 2(m-l) \)). In particular, \( l \geq \frac{m}{2} \).

**Proof.** If the \( l \) points are in (algebraic) general position then \( \dim H^3(X) \geq a+b-l \) and by equation (11): \( \dim H^3(X) = m + \dim H^3(X) \geq 2(a+b-l) + m, \) but \( \text{rank}(\text{Im}(b)) = h^3(Y) - h^3(X) = 2(a+b) - h^3(X) \leq 2(a+b) - 2(a+b-l) - m = 2l - m \) (inequality is an equality if all the double points form a hg set). Hence \( \delta = \text{rank}(\text{Ker}(k)) = m - \text{rank}(\text{Im}(b)) \geq m - (2l - m) = 2(m-l) \) and \( m + 1 \geq \beta = \delta + 1 \geq 2(m-l) + 1. \) Therefore \( m \leq 2l. \) Q.E.D.

In order to find an exact relation between \( \delta \) and the failure of \( \Sigma \) to impose linearly independent conditions on polynomials of degree \( 2d-5 \) (compare with remark 13 of §2) we shall use and prove the following:

**Lemma 20.** If the \( l \) double points are in (algebraic) general position and form an hg set, then

\[
\delta = m - l + a + b - \binom{2d-1}{4}.
\]

**Proof.** By [29] (see Satz Kap. IV p.27) \( \delta = m - \binom{2d-1}{4} + \dim(A^4_2(X, \Sigma)). \) By corollary [16] the last term \( A^4_2(X, \Sigma) = H^1_c \) and by the assumption on \( \Sigma \) the dimension of the latter is equal to \( a + b - l. \) Q.E.D.

**Remark 21.** The significance of the last corollary is that the difference between the defect and the failure of \( \Sigma \) to impose conditions on polynomials of degree \( 2d-5 \) is equal to \( a + b - \binom{2d-1}{4} \) which depends only on the degree of \( X \) and the dimensions \( h^3, h^2 \) of a smooth \( Y \) of the same degree as \( X. \)

5. **Equisingular families**

Let

\[
\bar{X} = V(uF - vG) \to \mathbb{P}^4 \times \mathbb{P}^1
\]

be a family of hypersurfaces on \( \mathbb{P}^4 \), with \( F \) and \( G \) homogeneous polynomials of degree \( d \) and assume that there is a maximal non empty open subset \( B \subset \mathbb{P}^1 \) over
which the family
\[
\mathcal{X} = f^{-1}(B) \hookrightarrow \bar{\mathcal{X}}
\]
\[
\downarrow f \quad \downarrow \bar{f}
\]
\[
B \quad \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^1
\]
is real analitically trivial and such that the singular locus \( \Sigma_t \) of every fiber \( X_t \) consists of exactly \( m \) nodes. Then the higher direct image sheaf \( R^3f_*\mathbb{C} \) is a local system, with fiber \( H^3(X_t, \mathbb{C}) \). It is well known that the Hodge filtration associated to the fibers extend to a Hodge filtration of the sheaf \( H^3 = R^3f_*\mathbb{C} \otimes \mathcal{O}_B \).

For a fixed \( t \in B \), let \( \hat{\mathbb{P}}^4 \) be the blow up of \( \mathbb{P}^4 \) along \( \Sigma_t \) and \( \bar{X}_t \) be the strict transform of \( X_t \). Further, let \( \hat{\Sigma}_t \) be the inverse image of \( \Sigma_t \) (i.e., the disjoint union of the exceptional divisors along the \( m \) nodes) and \( \bar{\Sigma}_t = \hat{\Sigma}_t \cap \bar{X}_t \). Since the multiplicity of every point in \( \Sigma_t \) is 2, then \( \bar{X}_t \) is a projective, non singular variety and we have a diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\Sigma_t & \hookrightarrow & X_t \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_4 \\
\downarrow \pi & & \downarrow \pi \\
\hat{\Sigma}_t & \hookrightarrow & \bar{X}_t \hookrightarrow \hat{\mathbb{P}}^4
\end{array}
\]

Let \( \bar{\mathcal{X}} \xrightarrow{\bar{f}} B \) be the smooth family formed by the union of \( \bar{X}_t \) along \( B \). Then the higher direct image \( R^3\bar{f}_*\mathbb{C} \) is also a local system on \( B \), the Hodge filtration associated to the fibers extend to a Hodge filtration of the sheaf \( \check{\mathcal{H}}^3 = R^3\bar{f}_*\mathbb{C} \otimes \mathcal{O}_B \) and by the Riemann-Hilbert (RH) correspondence, there is a GM-connection

\[
\check{\nabla}^{GM} : \check{\mathcal{H}}^3 \to \check{\mathcal{H}}^3 \otimes \Omega^1_B.
\]

As \( \bar{X}_t \) is smooth for every \( t \), the nilpotent part of \( \check{\nabla}^{GM} \) induces fibrewise homomorphisms

\[
\check{N}_t : \check{\mathcal{E}}^{n-q,q}_t \longrightarrow \check{\mathcal{E}}^{n-q+1,q-1}_t
\]
as seen in the introduction. In fact, if we denote by \( \check{\mathcal{E}}_t = \check{\mathcal{E}}^{0,3}_t \oplus \check{\mathcal{E}}^{1,2}_t \oplus \check{\mathcal{E}}^{2,1}_t \oplus \check{\mathcal{E}}^{3,0}_t \) then \( \check{N}_t : \check{\mathcal{E}}_t \rightarrow \check{\mathcal{E}}_t \). In what follows the subindex \( t \) will be omitted and we have an induced monodromy operator \( \check{N} : \check{\mathcal{E}} \rightarrow \check{\mathcal{E}} \). The monodromy theorem in this case tells us that \( \check{N}^4 = 0 \).

**Example 22.** It is not difficult to see, using the above description and the notation on [17] that for a smooth quintic 3-fold \( X \subset \mathbb{P}^4 \) one has \( a = 1 \) and \( b = 101 \) (see [8]). Moreover, if \( X_t \) is a smooth family of quintic 3-folds in \( \mathbb{P}^4 \) it is possible to show that the GM-connection induces a maximal unipotent map on \( H^3(X_t, \mathbb{C}) \), for any \( t \), whose nilpotent part \( N \) satisfies \( N(H^3-p;p) \subset H^3-p^{p+1}p-1 \) for \( 0 \leq p \leq 3 \) with \( N^3 \neq 0 \) but \( N^4 = 0 \). In particular one has an splitting of the Hodge structure:

\[
H^3(X_t, \mathbb{C}) = H \oplus_{i=1}^{100} V_i(1)
\]
where $H$ is a weight 3 Hodge structure of type $(1, 1, 1, 1)$ and each $V_t(1)$ is a weight 3 Hodge structure of type $(0, 1, 1, 0)$, associated to a weight one Hodge structure $V$ of type $(1, 1)$ (see also [27] for the quintic family of 3-folds in connection with mirror symmetry). Here, as usual, $V_t(1) = V_t \otimes \mathbb{Z}(-1)$ and $\mathbb{Z}(-1)$ is the Tate-Hodge structure of weight 2.

**Example 23.** More generally, for a pencil of Calabi-Yau 3-folds on $\mathbb{P}^4$ we have

$$\dim(\mathcal{E}^{0,3}) = \dim(\mathcal{E}^{3,0}) = 1$$

and $k = \dim(\mathcal{E}^{1,2}) = \dim(\mathcal{E}^{2,1})$ hence $\mathcal{E} \cong \mathbb{C}^{2k+2}$.

In the same spirit as the example given in [3] and example [18] keeping the notation there, one can define the standard hyperplane $H = V(p_1) \subset \mathbb{P}^n$. Let us restrict to the case $n = 5$ and introduce the pencil of quintic hypersurfaces in $H = \mathbb{P}^4$ defined by

$$f_{(\alpha, \beta)} = \alpha p_5 - \frac{5(\alpha + \beta)}{6} p_2 p_3.$$

Let $\mathcal{M} \subset H \times \mathbb{P}^1$ be the corresponding incidence family. Clearly, for each $(\alpha : \beta)$ we have a quintic $\mathcal{M}_{(\alpha, \beta)} \subset \mathbb{P}^4$. This family has already been introduced and studied by Van Straten in [27]. In loc.cit (see Theorem 2), he shows that for a general value of $(\alpha : \beta) = (\frac{5}{3} : 1)$ (for $\beta = 0$ corresponds to $\infty$), except for the 6 points given as:

$$q_1 = 25, q_2 = 1, q_3 = -3, q_4 = 0, q_5 = -2, q_6 = \infty$$

with singular locus, $\Sigma = \text{Sing}(\mathcal{M}_t)$ and $m = |\Sigma| = 100$ nodes with local coordinate $t \overset{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\alpha}{\beta}$ (compare with the bound $m \leq 101$ computed in remark [13]). In example [18] we have seen that only 86 of this nodes are in general position, therefore for this family we have $\dim H^3(X_t) = 132$ and

$$Gr^k F H^3(X_t, \mathbb{C}) \cong \begin{cases} \mathbb{C} & \text{if } k = 0, 3, \\ \mathbb{C}^{115} & \text{if } k = 1, \\ \mathbb{C}^{15} & \text{if } k = 2. \end{cases}$$

while $\dim H^3(\tilde{X}_t) = 32$ and

$$\text{rank } \mathcal{E}^{k,3-k} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k = 0, 3, \\ 15 & \text{if } k = 1, 2. \end{cases}$$

Before we study the LMHS associated to the family $\tilde{X}$ over $B$ we introduce a very well known inductive method to calculate the weight filtration and advise the reader interested in the main result to skip to proposition [27]. For that let $m$ be an integer, $H_Q$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-vector space and $N : H_Q \to H_Q$ be a nilpotent endomorphism such that $N^{m+1} = 0$. Following Donagi (see [16], remark on page 69), we can introduce the following $\mathbb{Q}$-spaces for $r, s$ positive integers satisfying $r \leq m+1, s \leq m$:

$$N^{r,s} = \text{Im } N^r \cap \text{Ker } N^{m-s}.$$  
These spaces satisfy the following relations: $N^{0,s} \supset N^{1,s} \supset \ldots \supset N^{m,s} \supset 0$ and similarly $N^{r,0} \supset N^{r,1} \supset \ldots \supset N^{r,m} = 0$. Observe that the nilpotent operator $N$ admits a natural extension to $N : H_\mathbb{C} \to H_\mathbb{C}$.
Example 24. For \( m = 3 \) one has the lattice of the \( N^{r,q} \)'s visualized as:

\[
\begin{align*}
N^{0,0} & \supset N^{0,1} \supset N^{0,2} \\
\cup & \quad \cup \quad \cup \\
N^{1,0} & \supset N^{1,1} \supset N^{1,2} \\
\cup & \quad \cup \quad \cup \\
N^{2,0} & \supset N^{2,1} \supset N^{2,2} \\
\cup & \quad \cup \quad \cup \\
N^{3,0} & = N^{3,1} = N^{3,2}
\end{align*}
\]

Consider an increasing filtration on \( H_Q \) given by the \( \mathbb{Q} \)-vector spaces:

\[
W_q \overset{\text{def}}{=} \langle \sum_{2m-q-1=r+s} N^{r,s} \rangle,
\]

for \( 0 \leq q \leq 2m \), constructed from the \( N^{r,s} \)'s.

Example 25. Once again we consider the example above for \( m = 3 \) and obtain the following increasing filtration:

\[
\begin{align*}
W_0 &= \langle N^{3,0} \rangle, & W_1 &= \langle N^{2,2} \rangle, & W_2 &= \langle N^{1,2} + N^{2,1} \rangle, \\
W_3 &= \langle N^{0,2} + N^{1,1} \rangle, & W_4 &= \langle N^{1,0} + N^{0,1} \rangle, & W_5 &= \langle N^{0,0} \rangle.
\end{align*}
\]

Note that \( N^{2,0} \subset N^{1,1} \) resp. \( N^{3,0} \subset N^{2,1} \) and therefore these summands do not appear in \( W_3 \) resp. \( W_2 \). To visualize the summands in the formula for \( W_q \) we can construct from the lattice the \( W_q \)'s as follows. The integer \( 2m - q - 1 \) in the formula for \( W_q \), is the slope of the segment contains the pairs of indices appearing in the summands allowed by the formula. For example, for \( q = 3 \) take the segment with summands in the lattice with slope \( 2 \cdot 3 - 2 - 1 = 2 \). This re-interpretation is completely independent of the weight and can be done for any other weight in the same way.

Lemma 26. The filtration defined above satisfies Morrison’s characterization of the weight filtration on \( H_Q \) associated to \( N \). ³ (see [16], pages 106 - 107):

1. \( N(W_k) \subset W_{k-2} \),
2. \( W_{m-t}/W_{m-t-1} = \text{Im}(N^t|_{W_{m+t}/W_{m-t-1}}) \),
3. \( W_{m+t-1}/W_{m-t-1} = \text{Ker}(N^t|_{W_{m+t}/W_{m-t-1}}) \).

Proof. It is helpful to visualize the action of \( N^t \) on the Lattice formed by the \( N^{r,s} \) as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
N^{m-t-j+1} & \supset \cdots \supset N^{m-t-j+1} \\
\cup & \quad \cup \\
\vdots & \quad \vdots \\
\cup & \quad \cup \\
N^{m-t-j-1} & \supset \cdots \supset N^{m-t-j-1}
\end{align*}
\]

³The formula for \( W_k \) given in [16], page 69 is incomplete. The procedure there described is correct, however the formula has a misprint. Here we include a more accurate formula in both cases for lack of another suitable reference.
1) Obviously \(N(N^{a,b}) = N(\text{Im } N^a \cap \text{Ker } N^{m-b}) \subset \text{Im } N^{a+1} \cap \text{Ker } N^{m-(b+1)} = N^{a+1,b+1} \).

2) Observe that \(W_{m-t} = N^{m,t-1} + \cdots + N^{t,m} \), since \(N^{m+1} = 0 \) and \(\text{Ker } N^0 = 0 \). We claim that \(N^{t}(N^{m-j-t,j-1}) = N^{m-j,t+1} \). Indeed, the first inclusion is the content of the proof above for 1). For the equality, let \(x \in N^{m-j,t+1} \), hence \(x \in \text{Ker } N^{m-j-t+1} \) and \(x = N^{m-j}(y) \) for some \(y \in V_0 \). Let \(z = N^{m-j-t}(y) \), therefore \(N^{t}(z) = N^{m-j}(y) = x \) and \(0 = N^{m-j-t+1}(x) = N^{m-j+1}(z) \), i.e. \(z \in N^{m-j-t,j-1} \). It follows that \(N^{t}(W_{m+t}) = W_{m-t} \) since \(N^{m,t-1} = \text{Im } N^m \subset N^{m-1,t} \) and \(N^{t-1,m} = 0 \).

3) As a biproduct of 2) it follows that \(W_{m+t-1}/W_{m-t-1} \subset \text{Ker } (N^t|_{W_{m+t}/W_{m-t-1}}) \). For the other inclusion it is enough to proof that \((N^{t})^{-1}(W_{m-t-1}) \cap W_{m+t} \subset W_{m+t-1} \). We can be even more precise and show that \((N^{t})^{-1}(N_{m-3,t+a}) \cap W_{m+t} \subset N_{m-3,t-2,a} \). Observe that if \(z \in (N^{t})^{-1}(N_{m-3,t+a}) \cap W_{m+t} \), then \(0 \leq a \leq m-t-1 \) and \(N^{t}(z) \in \text{Im } N^a \cap \text{Ker } N^{m-3(t+a)} = \text{Im } N^a \cap \text{Ker } N^{a-t} \), hence \(a - t \geq 0 \) since otherwise the Kernel is zero. In particular \(t \leq a \). Also, \(N^{t}(z) = N^{a}(w) \) hence \(N^{t}(z - N^{a-t}(w)) = 0 \). Since \(N^{t}(z) \in \text{Ker } N^{a-t} \) then \(0 = N^{a-t}(N^{t}(z)) = N^{a}(z) \), i.e. \(z \in \text{Ker } N^{a} \). Therefore \(z \in (\text{Ker } N^{t} + \text{Im } N^{a-t}) \cap \text{Ker } N^{a} = \text{Ker } N^{t} + \text{Im } N^{a-t} \cap \text{Ker } N^{a} \), hence \(z \in N^{a,m-t} + N^{a-t,m-a} \subset W_{m+t-1} \). Q.E.D.

Recall the situation of example 23 as well as the notation there introduced for the Higgs bundle (see equation (2) in the introduction). We want to simplify further our notation omitting the lower indices as well as the tildes. Hence we have the nilpotent \(\mathbb{C}\)-linear map \(N : \mathcal{E} = \mathbb{C}^{2k+2} \rightarrow \mathcal{E} = \mathbb{C}^{2k+2} \) of \(\mathbb{C}\)-vector spaces such that \(N^4 = 0 \) and a (not necessarily exact) short sequence of linear vector space maps \(\{N_i\}_{i \in 1,2,3} : \)

\[
\mathcal{E}^{0,3} = \mathbb{C} \rightarrow N_i \mathcal{E}^{1,2} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \rightarrow N_j \mathcal{E}^{2,1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \rightarrow N_k \mathcal{E}^{3,0} = \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \rightarrow 0
\]

and let also \(n_i \overset{\text{def}}{=} \dim(\text{Im } N_i) \), \(m_i \overset{\text{def}}{=} \dim(\text{Ker } N_i) \) and \(o \overset{\text{def}}{=} \dim(\text{Im } (N) \cap \text{Ker } (N)) \) for \(i \in \{1,2,3\} \). We want to apply the formula obtained in example 23 and the fact that \(N^r : \text{Gr}_{W+r} \simeq \text{Gr}_{W-r} \) for all \(r \) for the weight filtration centered at \(n \). We also determine the limit mixed Hodge structure for the given rank of \(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{r,3-k} \) (for \(k \in \{1,2\} \)) but the techniques are independent of it.

**Proposition 27.** The limit Hodge filtration \((W_r, F_r)\) for the family \(\mathcal{X} \) can be described in the following cases:

1. \(N = 0 \) and it is pure of weight three.
2. \(N \neq 0, N^2 = 0 \) there are two cases:
   a. \(N_1 \neq 0, N_3 \neq 0 \) such that \(N_2 \circ N_1 = N_3 \circ N_2 \neq 0 \),
   b. \(N_1 = N_3 = 0 \) with \(N_2 \neq 0 \).
For these cases stated simply as a) and b) the weight filtration centered at three is:

\[
\text{Gr}_i^W(H_\mathbb{Q}) = \begin{cases} 
0 & i = 0, 1, 5, 6 \\
\mathbb{C}^{n_2+2} & i = 2, 4 \quad (a), \\
\mathbb{C}^{n_2} & i = 2, 4 \quad (b), \\
\mathbb{C}^{2(m_2-1)} & i = 3 \quad (a), \\
\mathbb{C}^{2(m_2+1)} & i = 3 \quad (b).
\end{cases}
\]

(3) \(N^2 \neq 0, N^3 = 0\).

\[
\text{Gr}_i^W(H_\mathbb{Q}) = \begin{cases} 
0 & i = 0, 6 \\
\mathbb{C}^2 & i = 1, 5 \\
\mathbb{C}^{0-2} & i = 2, 4 \\
\mathbb{C}^{2(k+1-o)} & i = 3.
\end{cases}
\]

Proof.

(1) \(N = 0\); the weight filtration centered at three is: \(W_i = 0\) for \(i \in \{0, 1, 2\}\) and otherwise \(W_j = H_\mathbb{Q}\). This means trivially that \(Gr_3(H_\mathbb{Q}) = H_\mathbb{Q}\).

(2) Assume that \(N \neq 0, N^2 = 0\). We have the following auxiliary general decompositions for the kernel, the image of \(N\) and the image of \(N^2\), namely:

\[
\text{Ker} N = \oplus_{i=1}^3 \text{Ker} N_i \oplus \mathcal{E}^{3,0}, \quad \text{Im} N = \oplus_{i=1}^3 \text{Im} N_i \\
\text{Im} N^2 = \text{Im} N_2 \circ N_1 \oplus \text{Im} N_3 \circ N_2
\]

and in both cases the weight filtration is given as:

\(W_0 = W_1 = 0, W_2 = \text{Im} N, W_3 = \text{Ker} N, W_4 = \text{Ker} N^2, W_5 = W_6 = H_\mathbb{Q}\).

We have two cases:

a) \(N_1 \neq 0\) (and hence \(N_3 \neq 0\) since the polarization is non-degenerate and the GM-connection is compatible with the metric induced by it) with \(N_2 \circ N_1 = N_3 \circ N_2 = 0\). Hence the weight filtration simplifies further to:

\[
0 = W_0 = W_1 \subset \text{Im} N \subset \text{Ker} N \subset W_4 = W_5 = W_6 = H_\mathbb{Q}
\]

and \(\text{dim} W_2 = n_2 + 2, W_3 = \text{Ker} N_2 \oplus \text{Ker} N_3 \oplus \mathcal{E}^{3,0}\) thus \(\text{dim} W_3 = 2k - n_2\), trivially \(\text{dim} \text{Ker} N_3 = k - 1\) and \(\text{dim} N^2 = 2k + 2\).

b) \(N_1 = N_3 = 0\) with \(N_2 \neq 0\). In this case:

\[
\text{Im} N_2 = \text{Im} N \subset \text{Ker} N = \mathcal{E}^{0,3} \oplus \mathcal{E}^{3,0} \oplus \mathcal{E}^{2,1} \oplus \text{Ker} N_2.
\]

Then for both cases above:

\[
W_3 = \text{Ker} N = \begin{cases} 
\text{Ker} N_2 \oplus \text{Ker} N_3 \oplus \mathcal{E}^{3,0} & (a) \\
\mathcal{E}^{2,0} \oplus \mathcal{E}^{3,0} \oplus \mathcal{E}^{2,1} \oplus \text{Ker} N_2 & (b)
\end{cases}
\]

\[
W_2 = \text{Gr}_2^W H_\mathbb{Q} = \text{Im} N = \begin{cases} 
\Sigma_{i=1}^3 \text{Im} N_i = \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}^{n_2} & (a) \\
\text{Im} N_2 = \mathbb{C}^{n_2} & (b)
\end{cases}
\]
To simplify the expression for $\text{Gr}_3^W(H_Q)$ note the following direct isomorphisms:

$$\text{Ker} N_2/\text{Im} N_1 \simeq \mathbb{C}^{m_2-1} \simeq \text{Ker} N_3/\text{Im} N_2, \quad \mathcal{E}^{2,1}/\text{Im} \ N_2 \simeq \mathbb{C}^{m_2}.$$

With these simplifications:

$$\text{Gr}_3^W H_Q = \begin{cases} 
\text{Ker} N_2/\text{Im} N_1 \oplus \text{Ker} N_3/\text{Im} N_2 \oplus \mathcal{E}^{3,0} \simeq \mathbb{C}^{2(m_2-1)} & \text{a)} \\
\mathcal{E}^{0,3} \oplus \mathcal{E}^{3,0} \oplus \mathcal{E}^{2,1}/\text{Im} N_2 \oplus \text{Ker} N_2 \simeq \mathbb{C}^{2(m_2+1)} & \text{b)}
\end{cases}$$

The other remaining cases are easily given because of the remark just before the statement of this proposition.

(3) $N^2 \neq 0, N^3 = 0$ with $N_2 \circ N_1 \neq 0, N_3 \circ N_2 \neq 0$. Trivially $W_0 = 0, W_5 = W_6 = H_Q$. It is enough to describe the $W_1, W_2, W_3$ terms:

$$W_1 = N_2 \circ N_1 (\mathcal{E}^{0,3}) + \mathcal{E}^{3,0} \simeq \mathbb{C}^2;$$
$$W_2 = \text{Im} N_2 \cap \text{Ker} N_3 + \mathcal{E}^{3,0} = \text{Im} N \cap \text{Ker} N \simeq \mathbb{C}^o;$$
$$W_3 = \text{Im} N_1 + \text{Im} N_2 + \mathcal{E}^{3,0} + \text{Ker} N_2 + \text{Ker} N_3 = \text{Im} N + \text{Ker} N \simeq \mathbb{C}^{2k+2-o}.$$

Note that since $\text{Im} (N_3 \circ N_2) = \mathbb{C}$ trivially $\dim (\text{Ker} (N_3 \circ N_2)) = k - 1$ and therefore $W_4 = \text{Ker} (N_2 \circ N_3) + \mathcal{E}^{2,1} + \mathcal{E}^{3,0} \simeq \mathbb{C}^k$ hence the weight filtration centered at three is:

$$0 \subset \mathbb{C}^2 \subset \mathbb{C}^o \subset \mathbb{C}^{2(k+1-o)} \subset \mathbb{C}^k \subset H_Q,$$

from which:

$$\text{Gr}_k^W H_Q = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{for } k = 0, \\
\mathbb{C}^2 & \text{for } k = 1, \\
\mathbb{C}^{o-2} & \text{for } k = 2, \\
\mathbb{C}^{2(k+1-o)} & \text{for } k = 3.
\end{cases}$$

Q.E.D.

We return to the study of the VMHS for the family $\mathcal{X}$ over $B$ considered in the introduction.

By assumption, the family $\mathcal{X} \xrightarrow{f} B \subset \mathbb{P}^1$ is real analytically trivial, i.e. the sheaf $R^3 f_\ast \mathcal{O}$ is a local system on $B$ and indeed it is a quasi-projective morphism of algebraic varieties. Additionally, by the RH-correspondence, there exist a GM-connection $\mathcal{H}^3 \xrightarrow{\nabla^{GM}} \mathcal{H}^3 \otimes \Omega^1_B$. Moreover, the weight filtration on the fibers fits together to form a subbundle $\mathcal{W}_2 R^3 f_\ast Q \subset R^3 f_\ast Q$ and we have a short exact sequence (see also equation (11)):

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{W}_2 R^3 f_\ast Q \longrightarrow R^3 f_\ast Q \xrightarrow{\tilde{\pi}^*} R^3 \tilde{f}_\ast Q \longrightarrow 0$$

A trivialization for $R^3 f_\ast \mathcal{O}$ induces a trivialization for $\mathcal{W}_2 R^3 f_\ast \mathcal{O}$ and so the action of the monodromy on $R^3 f_\ast \mathcal{O}$ is compatible with the action of the monodromy on $\mathcal{W}_2 R^3 f_\ast \mathcal{O}$, in particular the GM-connection on $\mathcal{W}_2 R^3 f_\ast \mathcal{O} \otimes \mathcal{O}_B = \mathcal{W}_2 \mathcal{H}^3$ is just the restriction of $\nabla^{GM}$ on $\mathcal{H}^3$ to $\mathcal{W}_2 \mathcal{H}^3$ and by passing to the quotient the short exact sequence above induces a connection $\nabla^{GM}$ on $\mathcal{H}^3$ with flat sections $R^3 \tilde{f}_\ast \mathcal{O}$. By the
uniqueness of the GM-connection (see prop. 2.16 on [3]), this connection is none other than \( \nabla \) on \( \tilde{\mathcal{H}}^3 \), i.e. we have a short exact sequence which is compatible with the GM-connection:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
0 & \rightarrow & W_2 \mathcal{H}^3 & \rightarrow & \mathcal{H}^3 & \rightarrow & \mathcal{H}^3 & \rightarrow & 0 \\
\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n0 & \rightarrow & W_2 \mathcal{H}^3 \otimes \Omega_B^1 & \rightarrow & \mathcal{H}^3 \otimes \Omega_B^1 & \rightarrow & \tilde{\mathcal{H}}^3 & \rightarrow & 0 \\
\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\
of the corresponding Jordan block matrices. We call such a direct sum of Jordan block matrices simply a Jordan matrix of a Jordan form. If a Jordan block matrix $J(m)$ appears with multiplicity $r$ we denote it by $J(m)^r$.

In the situation of example 23 for general $k$, since $N \neq 0$ is nilpotent then its Jordan matrix is one of the following types (up to matrix conjugation):

- Type (1): $J(4) \oplus J(2)^s$ with $s \leq k - 1$,
- Type (2): $J(3)^2 \oplus J(2)^s$ with $s \leq k - 2$,
- Type (3): $J(2)^s$ where $s \leq k + 1$,
- Type (4): $J(3) \oplus J(2)^s$ with $s \leq \frac{2k-1}{2}$.

**Corollary 30.** The Jordan canonical form of $N$ is of type (1), (2) or (3).

**Proof.**

1. A type (3) Jordan matrix decomposition implies that there are at most $k + 1$ two by two blocks. This implies that $N^2 = 0$.

2. A type (1) Jordan matrix decomposition correspond to the maximal unipotent case, which is known to occur for instance for the family of $\mathbb{Q}$.

3. If $N^3 = 0$ but $N^2 \neq 0$, we know from linear algebra that all Jordan blocks are of size 3 or 2, which correspond to either type (2) or type (4).

A type (4) Jordan Matrix decomposition is not possible. For that recall the abstract situation of example 23, namely:

**Lemma 31.** Recall the notation of proposition 27:

$$V \cong W \cong W' \cong V'$$

such that $V \simeq V' \simeq \mathbb{C}, W \simeq W' \simeq \mathbb{C}^k$ then: $N_1$ is one-to-one $\iff N_3$ is surjective.

**Proof.** (of the lemma). The polarization $Q$ is flat with respect to the connection $N$. Q.E.D.

4. If there exist a three-dimensional $N$-cyclic space $W = \langle w, N(w), N^2(w) \rangle$, then either $w \in V$ or $w \in W$.

(a) If $w \in V$, then $N^2(w) \in W' \setminus \{0\}$ (see equation 12) and $N^3(w) = 0$ (otherwise there would exist a four-dimensional vector space which does not exist by hypothesis). Since $Q$ is non-degenerate there exist a $u \in W' \setminus \{0\}$ such that $Q(u, N^2(w)) = 1$ but $Q(u, N(w)) = 0$ and

$$Q(N(u), N(w)) + Q(u, N^2(w)) = 0$$

therefore $Q(N(u), N(w)) = -Q(u, N^2(w)) = -1$ thus $N(u) \in W' \setminus \{0\}$. Similarly, $Q(N(u), w) = 0$ implies that $0 = Q(N^2(u), w) + Q(N(u), N(w))$ and so $Q(N^2(u), w) = -Q(N(u), N(w)) \neq 0$, i.e., $\tilde{N}^2(u) \in V' \setminus \{0\}$ and we have another 3-dimensional $N$-cyclic space generated by $u$.

(b) Suppose that $w \in W$ then $N^2(w) \in V' \setminus \{0\}$ and suppose that shows that there exists $u \in W$ such that $N(u) \neq 0$ (indeed if $\lambda N(w) = u$ with $\lambda \neq 0$ then $\lambda N^2(w) = N(u) \neq 0$) but this leads to a contradiction hence $u \setminus \lambda N(w) \neq 0$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. Q.E.D.
As for the equisingular and $S_6$-invariant family $\mathcal{M}$ introduced in example 23, we have found the Picard-Fuchs operator for $\mathcal{M}$, $PF_{\mathcal{M}}$ which is an operator of degree four where its behaviour for the whole family $\mathcal{M}$ is described simply as follows. Recall the points $\{q_i\}_{i=1,...,6}$ of example 23. He computes the local solutions around the singular points and finds that the points $q_3$ and $q_6$ have a single Jordan-block of size 2, whereas the point $q_4$ has 2 Jordan-blocks of size 2; this is in accordance with the claim made on p. 864 of his [27]. The point $q^* = 4$ is an apparent singularity of $PF_{\mathcal{M}}$ at which the fibre remains smooth. The precise nature of the variety $\mathcal{M}_4$ as well as each of the points of his claim is a very fruitful and interesting subject and remains to be pursued.
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