

REAL STRUCTURES AND THE $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -MONOPOLE EQUATIONS

NOBUHIRO NAKAMURA

ABSTRACT. We investigate the $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole invariants of symplectic 4-manifolds and Kähler surfaces with real structures. We prove a nonvanishing theorem for real symplectic 4-manifolds which is an analogue of Taubes' nonvanishing theorem of the Seiberg–Witten invariants for symplectic 4-manifolds. Furthermore, the Kobayashi–Hitchin type correspondence for real Kähler surfaces is given.

1. Introduction

In the study of the Seiberg–Witten invariants, the computations of the invariants of Kähler surfaces are fundamental [3, 6, 7, 16, 27], and they are based on a certain type of Kobayashi–Hitchin correspondence. On the other hand, Taubes' works [23–26] on the Seiberg–Witten theory on symplectic 4-manifolds begin with the nontriviality theorem [23] for the canonical Spin^c structure.

The purpose of this paper is to prove the theorems for $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole invariants [18] parallel to the above results. The $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole equations [17, 18] are a variant of the Seiberg–Witten equations twisted along a local system associated with a double covering $X \rightarrow \hat{X}$. In fact, an anti-linear involution I on a Spin^c structure \mathfrak{s} on the double cover X is defined, and the $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole theory on \hat{X} can be identified with the I -invariant part of the Seiberg–Witten theory on (X, \mathfrak{s}) . We study Kähler surfaces and symplectic 4-manifolds with *real structure*. Our starting point is to understand the aforementioned I -action through the real structure.

Let us state our results more precisely. Let (X, ω, ι) be a closed *real symplectic 4-manifold*, where X is a closed smooth 4-manifold, ω is a symplectic form and ι is an involution on X such that $\iota^*\omega = -\omega$. Let J be a compatible almost complex structure such that $\iota_* \circ J = -J \circ \iota_*$. Let K be the canonical complex line bundle associated with J . We assume (X, ω, ι) has *empty real part*, that is, the involution ι is *free*. Let \hat{X} be the quotient manifold X/ι and $\pi: X \rightarrow \hat{X}$ the projection. Since ι induces an anti-linear involution on K , the quotient bundle $\hat{K} := K/\iota$ is a nonorientable \mathbb{R}^2 bundle. Let $\ell = X \times_{\{\pm 1\}} \mathbb{Z}$ be the local system associated to the double cover $X \rightarrow \hat{X}$. Let $\ell_{\mathbb{R}} := \ell \otimes \mathbb{R} = \det \hat{K}$.

The $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole equations are defined on a Spin^{c-} structure, which is a $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -analogue of Spin^c structure. In the above situation, we define the *canonical Spin^{c-} structure* $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0$ associated with the real structure (§2.2). The following theorem is an analogue of Taubes' nonvanishing theorem [23].

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 57R57, 53C55, 53D05.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose*

- (1) $w_2(\hat{X}) + w_2(\hat{K}) + w_1(\ell_{\mathbb{R}})^2 = 0$,
- (2) $\pi^*: H^1(\hat{X}; \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow H^1(X; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ *is surjective.*

Then there exists a unique canonical Spin^{c-} structure $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0$ on $X \rightarrow \hat{X}$. Furthermore, suppose $b_+^\ell = \dim H^+(\hat{X}; \ell_{\mathbb{R}}) \geq 2$. Then the $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole invariant $\text{SW}^{\text{Pin}}(\hat{X}, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0)$ is ± 1 .

Remark 1.2. We refer the readers to [17, 18] for the generality of the $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole theory. In general, the $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole invariant is a \mathbb{Z}_2 -valued invariant. We can define its \mathbb{Z} -valued refinement in some cases, e.g., when the moduli space is 0-dimensional and orientable. The statement that $\text{SW}^{\text{Pin}}(\hat{X}, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0) = \pm 1$ means that the invariant is nonzero anyway, and if its \mathbb{Z} -valued refinement is defined, then its value is ± 1 .

Like the ordinary Seiberg–Witten theory, the $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole theory has a symmetry of conjugation (§2.3). The conjugate of the canonical Spin^{c-} structure $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0$ is the *anti-canonical* Spin^{c-} structure $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0 \hat{\otimes} \hat{K}$ which is obtained by twisting $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0$ by \hat{K} . Theorem 1.1 with Corollary 2.14 implies the following.

Corollary 1.3. $\text{SW}^{\text{Pin}}(\hat{X}, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0 \hat{\otimes} \hat{K}) = \pm 1$.

An $\text{O}(2)$ bundle \hat{L} called *characteristic bundle* is associated with a Spin^{c-} structure. Let $\tilde{c}_1(\hat{L}) \in H^2(\hat{X}; \ell)$ be its ℓ -coefficient Euler class. Since $\iota^*\omega = -\omega$, there is a $\ell_{\mathbb{R}}$ -valued self-dual closed 2-form $\hat{\omega} \in \Omega^2(X; \ell_{\mathbb{R}})$ such that $\pi^*\hat{\omega} = \omega$. The following is an analogue of [24, Theorem 2].

Theorem 1.4. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, if the $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole invariant for a Spin^{c-} structure $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}$ on $X \rightarrow \hat{X}$ is nonzero, then its characteristic bundle \hat{L} satisfies*

$$(1.5) \quad \left| \tilde{c}_1(\hat{L}) \cdot [\hat{\omega}] \right| \leq \tilde{c}_1(\hat{K}) \cdot [\hat{\omega}],$$

and the virtual dimension $d(\hat{\mathfrak{s}})$ of the moduli space is 0.

Suppose further that (X, ω) is a compact Kähler surface and ι is an antiholomorphic free involution. In such a case, we prove a certain kind of Kobayashi–Hitchin correspondence (§4). In fact, the $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole moduli space for \hat{X} can be identified with the I -invariant part of the space of simple holomorphic pairs of holomorphic structures on a line bundle with nonzero holomorphic sections. (Furthermore, a simple holomorphic pair is identified with an effective divisor on X .) By using this description, we can compute the $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole invariants for the quotient manifolds of several kinds of Kähler surfaces. The following is an analogue of [16, Theorem 7.4.1].

Theorem 1.6. *Let X be a minimal Kähler surface of general type. Suppose $\iota: X \rightarrow X$ is an anti-holomorphic involution without fixed points satisfying the assumptions in Theorem 1.1. Then*

$$\text{SW}^{\text{Pin}}(\hat{X}, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}) = \begin{cases} \pm 1 & \hat{\mathfrak{s}} = \hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0 \text{ or } \hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0 \hat{\otimes} \hat{K} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The hypersurfaces in \mathbb{CP}^3 with complex conjugation satisfy the conditions of Theorem 1.6 (§5.1). We also compute the invariants of elliptic surfaces in §5.2.

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank the referee for his comments on the earlier version of the paper. The author is supported in part by JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) 25400096 and 19K03506.

2. Spin^c - structures induced from the real structure

2.1. Reduction of the frame bundle. Recall the isomorphism $U(2) \cong (U(1) \times SU(2))/\{\pm 1\}$. Define the group $\hat{U}(2)$ by

$$\hat{U}(2) = (\text{Pin}^-(2) \times SU(2))/\{\pm 1\}.$$

Then $\hat{U}(2)/\text{Pin}^-(2) = \text{SO}(3)$, $\hat{U}(2)/SU(2) = \text{O}(2)$, the identity component of $\hat{U}(2)$ is $U(2)$, and $\hat{U}(2)/U(2) = \{\pm 1\}$. We have an exact sequence

$$(2.1) \quad 1 \rightarrow \{\pm 1\} \rightarrow \hat{U}(2) \xrightarrow{\sigma} \text{O}(2) \times \text{SO}(3) \rightarrow 1.$$

Note that $\hat{U}(2)$ is embedded in $\text{SO}(4)$ as

$$(2.2) \quad \hat{U}(2) = \frac{\text{Pin}^-(2) \times SU(2)}{\{\pm 1\}} \subset \frac{SU(2) \times SU(2)}{\{\pm 1\}} = \text{SO}(4).$$

Suppose we have a manifold \hat{Y} with a double covering $Y \rightarrow \hat{Y}$ and a principal $\hat{U}(2)$ -bundle P over \hat{Y} such that $P/U(2) \cong Y$. Then we have an $\text{O}(2)$ -bundle $P_O := P/SU(2)$ such that $P_O/\text{SO}(2) \cong Y$ and an $\text{SO}(3)$ -bundle $P_S := P/\text{Pin}^-(2)$. Conversely, the following holds

Proposition 2.3. *For a double covering $Y \rightarrow \hat{Y}$, let $\ell_{\mathbb{R}} = Y \times_{\{\pm 1\}} \mathbb{R}$ and suppose an $\text{O}(2)$ -bundle P_O such that $P_O/\text{SO}(2) \cong Y$ and an $\text{SO}(3)$ -bundle P_S are given. If $w_2(P_O) + w_1(\ell_{\mathbb{R}})^2 = w_2(P_S)$, then there exists a $\hat{U}(2)$ -bundle P such that*

$$P/\text{Pin}^-(2) \cong P_S, \quad P/SU(2) \cong P_O, \quad P/U(2) \cong Y.$$

Proof. (Cf. [17, Proposition 11].) Note that the image of $\text{Pin}^-(2) \subset \text{Sp}(1) = \text{Spin}(3)$ by the canonical homomorphism $\text{Spin}(3) \rightarrow \text{SO}(3)$ is a copy of $\text{O}(2)$ embedded in $\text{SO}(3)$. The embedding $\text{O}(2) \subset \text{SO}(3)$ is given by $A \mapsto A \oplus \det A$. Embed $\text{O}(2) \times \text{SO}(3)$ into $\text{SO}(6)$ by using this embedding. Then we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 1 & \longrightarrow & \{\pm 1\} & \longrightarrow & \hat{U}(2) & \longrightarrow & \text{O}(2) \times \text{SO}(3) \longrightarrow 1 \\ & & \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 1 & \longrightarrow & \{\pm 1\} & \longrightarrow & \text{Spin}(6) & \longrightarrow & \text{SO}(6) \longrightarrow 1. \end{array}$$

The diagram leads to a commutative diagram of fibrations

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} K(\mathbb{Z}_2, 1) & \longrightarrow & B\hat{U}(2) & \longrightarrow & B\text{O}(2) \times B\text{SO}(3) & \longrightarrow & K(\mathbb{Z}_2, 2) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ K(\mathbb{Z}_2, 1) & \longrightarrow & B\text{Spin}(6) & \longrightarrow & B\text{SO}(6) & \xrightarrow{w_2} & K(\mathbb{Z}_2, 2). \end{array}$$

From these, we see that

$$w_2(P_S \oplus P_O \oplus \det P_O) = w_2(P_S) + w_2(P_O) + w_1(\ell_{\mathbb{R}})^2 = 0$$

is the required condition. \square

Remark 2.4. The choice of P is not unique. The possibility of P is parametrized by $H^1(\hat{Y}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$.

Recall the embedding

$$\mathrm{U}(2) = (\mathrm{U}(1) \times \mathrm{SU}(2))/\{\pm 1\} \subset (\mathrm{SU}(2) \times \mathrm{SU}(2))/\{\pm 1\} = \mathrm{SO}(4)$$

and a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 1 & \longrightarrow & \{\pm 1\} & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{U}(2) & \xrightarrow{\sigma'} & \mathrm{U}(1) \times \mathrm{SO}(3) & \longrightarrow & 1 \\ & & \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 1 & \longrightarrow & \{\pm 1\} & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{SO}(4) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{SO}(3) \times \mathrm{SO}(3) & \longrightarrow & 1. \end{array}$$

Let (X, ω, J) be a symplectic 4-manifold with compatible almost complex structure J . Fixing a Hermitian metric on TX , we obtain a $\mathrm{U}(2)$ reduction P_F of the $\mathrm{SO}(4)$ -frame bundle. Then we have a $\mathrm{U}(1)$ -bundle $P_K := P_F/\mathrm{SU}(2)$ and an $\mathrm{SO}(3)$ -bundle $P_S := P_F/\mathrm{U}(1)$. Let $K = \Lambda^{2,0}(X)$ and $K^{-1} = \Lambda^{0,2}(X)$ be respectively the canonical and anti-canonical line bundles associated with the almost complex structure J . Note that $\Lambda^+(X) \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{C} \cong \mathbb{C}\omega \oplus K \oplus K^{-1}$. Then we can identify

$$P_K \times_{\mathrm{U}(1)} \mathbb{C} \cong K \cong K^{-1}$$

as *real* vector bundles. We assume $P_K \times_{\mathrm{U}(1)} \mathbb{C} = K$. On the other hand,

$$\Lambda^-(X) \cong P_S \times_{\mathrm{SO}(3)} \mathbb{R}^3.$$

Let (X, ω, ι) be a closed real symplectic 4-manifold without real part. Then X admits an almost complex structure J compatible to ω such that $\iota_* \circ J = -J \circ \iota_*$. Fixing such a J , we have a $\mathrm{U}(2)$ reduction P_F of the $\mathrm{SO}(4)$ -frame bundle. Let P_K and P_S be the induced $\mathrm{U}(1)$ and $\mathrm{SO}(3)$ bundles. Let \hat{X} be the quotient manifold $\hat{X} = X/\iota$ and $\ell_{\mathbb{R}} = X \times_{\{\pm 1\}} \mathbb{R}$. The involution ι induces a bundle automorphism $\tilde{\iota}$ of P_S such that $\tilde{\iota}^2 = 1$, and its quotient bundle $\hat{P}_S = P_S/\tilde{\iota}$ over \hat{X} has the property that

$$\hat{P}_S \times_{\mathrm{SO}(3)} \mathbb{R}^3 = \Lambda^-(\hat{X}).$$

On the other hand, ι does not induce a bundle automorphism on P_K since ι is not complex linear. However ι induces an anti-linear involution on the canonical bundle $K = P_K \times_{\mathrm{U}(1)} \mathbb{C}$. Then the quotient bundle $\hat{K} = K/\iota$ is a nonorientable \mathbb{R}^2 bundle over \hat{X} such that $\det \hat{K} = \ell_{\mathbb{R}}$. Let \hat{P}_K be the $\mathrm{O}(2)$ -bundle over \hat{X} of orthogonal frames on \hat{K} . By Proposition 2.3, we have a $\hat{\mathrm{U}}(2)$ -bundle \hat{P} which induces \hat{P}_S and \hat{P}_K if $w_2(\hat{X}) = w_2(\hat{K}) + w_1(\ell_{\mathbb{R}})^2$. Note that the $\{\pm 1\}$ -bundle $\hat{P}/\mathrm{U}(2) \rightarrow \hat{X}$ is isomorphic to $\pi: X \rightarrow \hat{X}$. Fix an isomorphism between them. Then $\hat{P} \rightarrow \hat{P}/\mathrm{U}(2)$ can be considered as a $\mathrm{U}(2)$ -bundle over X . This $\mathrm{U}(2)$ -bundle $\hat{P} \rightarrow \hat{P}/\mathrm{U}(2) = X$ is denoted by P' .

Proposition 2.5. *Suppose*

$$(1) \quad w_2(\hat{X}) + w_2(\hat{K}) + w_1(\ell_{\mathbb{R}})^2 = 0,$$

(2) $\pi^*: H^1(\hat{X}; \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow H^1(X; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is surjective.

Then we can take a $\hat{U}(2)$ -bundle $\hat{P} \rightarrow \hat{X}$ such that

$$(2.6) \quad \hat{P}/\text{Pin}^-(2) \cong \hat{P}_S, \quad \hat{P}/\text{SU}(2) \cong \hat{P}_K, \quad \hat{P}/\text{U}(2) \cong X, \quad P' \cong P_F.$$

Furthermore $\hat{T} = \hat{P} \times_{\hat{U}(2)} \mathbb{R}^4$ is isomorphic to $T\hat{X}$, where \hat{T} is defined via the embedding (2.2).

Proof. By the proof of Proposition 2.3, we see that the set of isomorphism classes of $\hat{U}(2)$ -bundle \hat{P} which induces the same \hat{P}_K and \hat{P}_S is parametrized by $H^1(\hat{X}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. If a choice of \hat{P} is given, then every other choice is obtained by tensoring a real line bundle. Similarly, the set of isomorphism classes of $\text{U}(2)$ -bundle P_F which induces the same P_K and P_S is parametrized by $H^1(X; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. Now choose \hat{P} which induces \hat{P}_K and \hat{P}_S . Then it follows from the construction that the $\text{U}(2)$ -bundle P' induces P_K and P_S . Thus the difference between P_F and P' is given by an element of $H^1(X; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. Under the assumption, the difference can be annihilated by tensoring an appropriate real line bundle over \hat{X} with \hat{P} .

Since $\pi^*\hat{P} \times_{\hat{U}(2)} \mathbb{R}^4 = P' \times_{\text{U}(2)} \mathbb{R}^4 = P_F \times_{\text{U}(2)} \mathbb{R}^4 = TX$, we have $\pi^*\hat{T} \cong TX \cong \pi^*T\hat{X}$. From this, it follows that $e(\hat{T}) = e(T\hat{X})$ and $p_1(\hat{T}) = p_1(T\hat{X})$. Consider the homomorphisms $\hat{U}(2) \xrightarrow{\sigma} \text{O}(2) \times \text{SO}(3) \xrightarrow{p} \text{SO}(3)$ where p is the projection to the second factor. Then the composite map $p \circ \sigma: \hat{U}(2) \rightarrow \text{SO}(3)$ factors through $\hat{U}(2) \hookrightarrow \text{SO}(4) \rightarrow \text{SO}(3)$. Then we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B\hat{U}(2) & \longrightarrow & B\text{SO}(3) \\ & \searrow & \uparrow \\ & & B\text{SO}(4) \end{array}$$

From this, it follows that $w_2(\hat{T}) = w_2(\hat{P}_S) = w_2(\hat{X})$. Therefore $\hat{T} \cong T\hat{X}$. \square

Remark 2.7. The choice of \hat{P} is not unique. The possibility of \hat{P} is parametrized by $\ker(\pi^*: H^1(\hat{X}; \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow H^1(X; \mathbb{Z}_2))$.

2.2. Canonical Spin^{c-} structure. Recall that the canonical Spin^c structure \mathfrak{s}_0 over X with respect to the almost complex structure J is defined from the $\text{U}(2)$ -reduction P_F , and it has the positive spinor bundle W_0^+ of the form $W_0^+ = \underline{\mathbb{C}} \oplus K^{-1}$. In this subsection, we define the canonical Spin^{c-} structure over $X \rightarrow \hat{X}$ induced from the real structure on X .

Recall that

$$\text{Spin}^{c-}(4) = \frac{\text{SU}(2) \times \text{SU}(2) \times \text{Pin}^-(2)}{\{\pm 1\}} = \frac{\text{Sp}(1) \times \text{Sp}(1) \times \text{Pin}^-(2)}{\{\pm 1\}}.$$

A Spin^{c-} structure $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}$ on $X \rightarrow \hat{X}$ consists of a $\text{Spin}^{c-}(4)$ -bundle Q over \hat{X} , an isomorphism of $\mathbb{Z}/2$ -bundles $Q/\text{Spin}^{c-}(4) \cong X$, and an isomorphism between the $\text{SO}(4)$ -frame bundle and $Q/\text{Pin}^-(2)$. The $\text{O}(2)$ -bundle $\hat{L} = Q/\text{Spin}(4)$ is called the *characteristic bundle* of $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}$. The bundle \hat{L} has a ℓ -coefficient orientation and its Euler class is denoted by $\tilde{c}_1(\hat{L}) \in H^2(\hat{X}; \ell)$. We often

make no distinction between \hat{L} and its associated \mathbb{R}^2 -bundle. Let \mathbb{H}_\pm be the $\text{Spin}^{c-}(4)$ modules which are copies of \mathbb{H} as vector spaces such that the action of $[q_+, q_-, u] \in \text{Spin}^{c-}(4) = (\text{Sp}(1) \times \text{Sp}(1) \times \text{Pin}^-(2))/\{\pm 1\}$ on $\phi \in \mathbb{H}_\pm$ is given by $q_\pm \phi u^{-1}$. Then the associated bundles $W_\pm = Q \times_{\text{Spin}^{c-}(4)} \mathbb{H}_\pm$ are the spinor bundles of $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}$.

Note that the embedding $\hat{\text{U}}(2) \hookrightarrow \text{SO}(4)$ factors through another embedding $\varepsilon: \hat{\text{U}}(2) \rightarrow \text{Spin}^{c-}(4)$ which is defined by

$$\varepsilon: \hat{\text{U}}(2) = \frac{\text{Pin}^-(2) \times \text{SU}(2)}{\{\pm 1\}} \rightarrow \frac{\text{SU}(2) \times \text{SU}(2) \times \text{Pin}^-(2)}{\{\pm 1\}} = \text{Spin}^{c-}(4),$$

$$(u, q) \mapsto (u, q, u).$$

When we have a $\hat{\text{U}}(2)$ -bundle \hat{P} as in Proposition 2.5, a Spin^{c-} structure $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}$ over X is defined via the embedding ε . The $\text{Spin}^{c-}(4)$ -bundle Q of $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}$ is given by

$$Q = \hat{P} \times_{\hat{\text{U}}(2)} \text{Spin}^{c-}(4),$$

Note that the characteristic $\text{O}(2)$ -bundle of $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}$ is \hat{P}_K . The positive spinor bundle \hat{W}^+ is defined by the adjoint action of $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ on the space of quaternions $\mathbb{H} = \mathbb{C} \oplus j\mathbb{C}$:

$$W^+ = Q \times_{\text{Spin}^{c-}(4)} \mathbb{H}_+ = \hat{P} \times_{\text{Pin}^-(2)} \mathbb{H}.$$

For $u \in \text{U}(1)$ and $z \in \mathbb{C}$, the adjoint action is given by

$$(2.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{ad}_u(z) &= uzu^{-1} = z, \\ \text{ad}_{ju}(z) &= juzu^{-1}j^{-1} = \bar{z}, \\ \text{ad}_u(jz) &= u^2 jz = u^2 \bar{z}j, \\ \text{ad}_{ju}(jz) &= u^{-2} j\bar{z} = u^{-2} zj. \end{aligned}$$

This action preserves the components \mathbb{C} and $j\mathbb{C}$. It follows from (2.8) that \hat{W}^+ is decomposed into the direct sum of two \mathbb{R}^2 bundles as $\hat{W}^+ = \hat{E}_1 \oplus \hat{E}_2$ such that $\det \hat{E}_1 = \det \hat{E}_2 = \ell_{\mathbb{R}}$. Define the \mathbb{R}^2 -bundle $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ by $\hat{\mathbb{C}} = X \times_{\{\pm 1\}} \mathbb{C}$, where $\{\pm 1\}$ acts on \mathbb{C} by complex conjugation. Note that $\hat{\mathbb{C}} = \underline{\mathbb{R}} \oplus \ell_{\mathbb{R}}$. Since $\pi^* \hat{W}^+ = W_0^+ = \underline{\mathbb{C}} \oplus K^{-1}$, we see that \hat{W}^+ has a form of

$$\hat{W}^+ = (\hat{\mathbb{C}} \oplus \hat{K}^{-1}) \otimes \lambda',$$

where $\hat{K}^{-1} = (K^{-1})/\iota$ (which is the characteristic bundle of the Spin^{c-} structure) and λ' is a real line bundle over \hat{X} with $\pi^* \lambda'$ trivial. Note that tensoring λ' to \hat{P} changes \hat{W}^+ into $\hat{W}_0^+ = \hat{\mathbb{C}} \oplus \hat{K}^{-1}$. Now we define the canonical Spin^{c-} structure.

Definition 2.9. A Spin^{c-} structure \mathfrak{s}_0 on $X \rightarrow \hat{X}$ is *canonical* if it is defined from a $\hat{\text{U}}(2)$ -bundle \hat{P} satisfying (2.6) and its positive spinor bundle \hat{W}_0^+ has a form of

$$\hat{W}_0^+ = \hat{\mathbb{C}} \oplus \hat{K}^{-1}.$$

The above discussion implies the following.

Corollary 2.10. Suppose (1) and (2) in Theorem 1.1. Then there exists a unique canonical Spin^{c-} structure on $X \rightarrow \hat{X}$.

Recall \mathbb{R}^2 -bundles \hat{E} such that $\det \hat{E} = \ell_{\mathbb{R}}$ with $\ell_{\mathbb{R}}$ -coefficient orientation are classified by $\tilde{c}_1(\hat{E}) \in H^2(\hat{X}; \ell)$. We call an \mathbb{R}^2 -bundle \hat{E} such that $\det \hat{E} = \ell_{\mathbb{R}}$ an \mathbb{R}^2 -bundle twisted along $\ell_{\mathbb{R}}$. For \mathbb{R}^2 -bundles \hat{E}_1 and \hat{E}_2 twisted along $\ell_{\mathbb{R}}$, there exists another \mathbb{R}^2 -bundle \hat{E} twisted along $\ell_{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $\tilde{c}_1(\hat{E}) = \tilde{c}_1(\hat{E}_1) + \tilde{c}_1(\hat{E}_2)$, which can be considered as a “twisted tensor product” of \hat{E}_1 and \hat{E}_2 . We write $\hat{E} = \hat{E}_1 \hat{\otimes} \hat{E}_2$.

If $X \rightarrow \hat{X}$ admits a Spin^{c-} structure, then the set of equivalence classes of Spin^{c-} structures is also parametrized by $H^2(X; \ell)$. Once a Spin^{c-} structure is given, the other Spin^{c-} structures are given by “tensoring” an \mathbb{R}^2 -bundle \hat{E} twisted along $\ell_{\mathbb{R}}$. In fact, when we have a canonical Spin^{c-} structure $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0$, there is a Spin^{c-} structure whose positive spinor bundle is

$$\hat{W} = \hat{E} \oplus (\hat{E} \hat{\otimes} \hat{K}^{-1}).$$

This Spin^{c-} structure is denoted by $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0 \hat{\otimes} \hat{E}$.

Definition 2.11. The Spin^{c-} structure $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0 \hat{\otimes} \hat{K}$ is called the *anti-canonical Spin^{c-} structure*. This has the spinor bundle of the form

$$\hat{W} = \hat{K} \oplus \underline{\hat{K}}.$$

Remark 2.12. For a Spin^{c-} structure $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}$ over $\pi: X \rightarrow \hat{X}$, let $\pi^*\hat{\mathfrak{s}}$ be the Spin^c structure over X which is the pull-back of $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}$. Then $\pi^*\hat{\mathfrak{s}}$ has two Spin^c reductions, and one of them is the *canonical reduction* [18, §2.4]. Then it can be seen that the canonical reduction of the pull-back $\pi^*\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0$ of the canonical Spin^{c-} structure $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0$ is the canonical Spin^c structure \mathfrak{s}_0 on X , and the canonical reduction of $\pi^*(\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0 \hat{\otimes} \hat{K})$ is the anti-canonical Spin^c structure $\mathfrak{s}_0 \otimes K$.

2.3. A symmetry in the $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole theory. It is well-known that there is a symmetry of complex conjugation in the Seiberg–Witten theory [16, §6.8]. We explain a similar symmetry in the $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole theory. The conjugation of a quaternion $z \in \mathbb{H}$ is given by

$$z = a + ib + jc + kd \mapsto \bar{z} = a - ib - jc - kd.$$

Define the conjugation $\alpha: \text{Spin}^{c-}(4) \rightarrow \text{Spin}^{c-}(4)$ by

$$\alpha([q, z]) = [q, \bar{z}] \text{ for } [q, z] \in \text{Spin}^{c-}(4) = \text{Spin}(4) \times_{\{\pm 1\}} \text{Pin}^-(2).$$

For a $\text{Spin}^{c-}(4)$ -bundle P , let P^c be the $\text{Spin}^{c-}(4)$ -bundle such that the total space is same with P , but the action of $\text{Spin}^{c-}(4)$ is given by $p \cdot \alpha(q)$ for $p \in P = P^c$ and $q \in \text{Spin}^{c-}(4)$.

For a Spin^{c-} structure $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}$ with $\text{Spin}^{c-}(4)$ -bundle P , we have a Spin^{c-} structure $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}^c$ whose $\text{Spin}^{c-}(4)$ -bundle is P^c . We call $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}^c$ the *conjugate of $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}$* .

Recall that $\ell_{\mathbb{R}}$ -oriented \mathbb{R}^2 -bundles \hat{E} twisted along $\ell_{\mathbb{R}}$ are classified by $\tilde{c}_1(\hat{E})$. For such an \hat{E} , let \hat{E}^c be an \mathbb{R}^2 -bundle such that $\tilde{c}_1(\hat{E}^c) = -\tilde{c}_1(\hat{E})$. We collect several facts on conjugate which can be easily seen.

Proposition 2.13. *For a Spin^{c-} structure $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}$ and its conjugate $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}^c$, we have the following:*

- (1) *If \hat{L} is the characteristic bundle for $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}$, then \hat{L}^c can be identified with the characteristic bundle of $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}^c$. In particular, $\tilde{c}_1(\hat{L}^c) = -\tilde{c}_1(\hat{L})$.*

(2) For an \mathbb{R}^2 -bundle E twisted along $\ell_{\mathbb{R}}$,

$$(\hat{\mathfrak{s}} \hat{\otimes} \hat{E})^c = \hat{\mathfrak{s}}^c \hat{\otimes} \hat{E}^c.$$

(3) The conjugate of the canonical Spin^{c-} structure is the anti-canonical Spin^{c-} structure, i.e., $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0^c = \hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0 \hat{\otimes} \hat{K}$.

(4) If \mathfrak{s} is the canonical reduction of $\pi^* \hat{\mathfrak{s}}$, then the canonical reduction of $\pi^* \hat{\mathfrak{s}}^c$ is the complex conjugate $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}$ of \mathfrak{s} .

Let $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}$ be a Spin^{c-} structure on $\pi: X \rightarrow \hat{X}$ and \mathfrak{s} the canonical reduction of $\pi^* \hat{\mathfrak{s}}$. By [17, §4.5] (see also [18, §2.5]), there is an involution I on the Seiberg–Witten theory on (X, \mathfrak{s}) , and a bijective correspondence between the $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole solutions on $(\hat{X}, \hat{\mathfrak{s}})$ and the I -invariant Seiberg–Witten solutions on (X, \mathfrak{s}) . Let us recall the relation between the downstairs $(\hat{X}, \hat{\mathfrak{s}})$ and upstairs (X, \mathfrak{s}) more precisely. Note that $\iota^* \mathfrak{s}$ is isomorphic to the complex conjugation $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}$ of \mathfrak{s} . For a configuration (A, ϕ) on (X, \mathfrak{s}) , $I(A, \phi)$ is defined by

$$I(A, \phi) = (\bar{\iota^* A}, \bar{\iota^* \phi}),$$

where $\bar{\cdot}$ means complex conjugation. For a configuration $(\hat{A}, \hat{\phi})$ on $(\hat{X}, \hat{\mathfrak{s}})$, we have a unique configuration (A, ϕ) on (X, \mathfrak{s}) such that $\phi = \pi^* \hat{\phi}$ and A is the canonical $\text{U}(1)$ reduction of the $\text{O}(2)$ -connection $\pi^* A$ which is the pull-back of \hat{A} . We call (A, ϕ) the lift of $(\hat{A}, \hat{\phi})$. Note that the lift (A, ϕ) is I -invariant.

The gauge transformation group of the $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole theory is given by

$$\hat{\mathcal{G}} = \Gamma(X \times_{\{\pm 1\}} \text{U}(1)),$$

where $\{\pm 1\}$ acts on $\text{U}(1)$ by $u \mapsto u^{-1}$. Then $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ can be identified with the I -invariant gauge transformation group on the upstairs X . That is, the I -action on $\mathcal{G} = C^\infty(X, \text{U}(1))$ is given by $f \mapsto \bar{\iota^* f}$, and we have a natural identification $\hat{\mathcal{G}} = \mathcal{G}^I$.

The $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole moduli space is

$$\hat{\mathcal{M}}(\hat{X}, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}) = \{ \text{Pin}^-(2)\text{-monopole solutions on } \hat{\mathfrak{s}} \} / \hat{\mathcal{G}}.$$

and this is identified with the I -invariant moduli space,

$$\mathcal{M}(X, \mathfrak{s})^I = \{ \text{Seiberg–Witten solutions on } \mathfrak{s} \} / \mathcal{G}^I.$$

By Proposition 2.13, we have the identifications,

$$\hat{\mathcal{M}}(\hat{X}, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}) \cong \mathcal{M}(X, \mathfrak{s})^I \cong \mathcal{M}(X, \bar{\mathfrak{s}})^I \cong \hat{\mathcal{M}}(\hat{X}, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}^c).$$

The second identification is the isomorphism of complex conjugation in the ordinary Seiberg–Witten theory.

Corollary 2.14. $\text{SW}^{\text{Pin}}(\hat{X}, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}^c) = \pm \text{SW}^{\text{Pin}}(\hat{X}, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}).$

3. Real symplectic 4-manifolds

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.4. Suppose a closed real symplectic 4-manifold (X, ω, ι) satisfies the assumption of Theorem 1.1.

First we consider the $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole equations on the canonical Spin^{c-} structure. Let \mathfrak{s}_0 be the canonical Spin^c structure on (X, ω) and $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0$ the canonical Spin^{c-} structure on $X \rightarrow \hat{X}$. Recall $\hat{\omega}$ is a $\ell_{\mathbb{R}}$ -valued self-dual

2-form such that $\omega = \pi^* \hat{\omega}$. Normalize the metric on X so that $|\hat{\omega}| = \sqrt{2}$ and pull it back to \hat{X} so that $|\omega| = \sqrt{2}$. Recall the splitting

$$\Lambda^+(X) \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{C} = \mathbb{C} \cdot \omega \oplus K \oplus K^{-1}.$$

The Clifford multiplication by ω induces the splitting $W_0^+ = \underline{\mathbb{C}} \oplus K^{-1}$. In fact, the components $\underline{\mathbb{C}}$ and K^{-1} are respectively $(+2)$ and (-2) -eigenspaces of the action of (ω/i) on W_0^+ .

On the Spin^c structure $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0$, we have a twisted Clifford multiplication $\rho: \Lambda^1(\hat{X}) \otimes i\ell_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\hat{W}_0^+, \hat{W}_0^-)$ [17], and this extends to

$$\rho: \Lambda^+(\hat{X}) \otimes i\ell_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow \text{End}(\hat{W}_0^+).$$

Then $(\hat{\omega}/i)$ induces the splitting $\hat{W}_0^+ = \hat{\underline{\mathbb{C}}} \oplus \hat{K}^{-1}$. Since the real part of $\hat{\underline{\mathbb{C}}}$ is trivial, there is a constant section \hat{u}_0 such that $|\hat{u}_0| = 1$. Mimicking the argument of Taubes [23], we obtain the following.

Proposition 3.1. *There is a unique $\text{O}(2)$ -connection \hat{A}_0 (up to gauge) on \hat{P}_K whose induced covariant derivative $\nabla_{\hat{A}_0}$ on \hat{W}^+ has the property that*

$$\left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\rho(\hat{\omega}/i)\right) \nabla_{\hat{A}_0} \hat{u}_0 = 0.$$

Furthermore, $D_{\hat{A}_0} \hat{u}_0 = 0$ if and only if $d\hat{\omega} = 0$, where $D_{\hat{A}_0}$ is the Dirac operator associated with \hat{A}_0 .

Let us consider the $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole equations rescaled and perturbed as follows:

$$(3.2) \quad D_{\hat{A}} \hat{\phi} = 0, \quad F_{\hat{A}}^+ = r q(\hat{\phi}) - \frac{r}{4} i \hat{\omega} + F_{\hat{A}_0}^+,$$

where \hat{A} is an $\text{O}(2)$ -connection on \hat{P}_K , $\hat{\phi} \in \Gamma(\hat{W}_0^+)$, q is the quadratic form defined in [17] and r is a positive real constant. (This is an analogue of Taubes' perturbation [25].) Then we can see that (\hat{A}_0, \hat{u}_0) is a solution to (3.2) for every r .

To proceed further, it is convenient to move to the upstairs and consider the I -invariant part. Let (A_0, u_0) be the lift of (\hat{A}_0, \hat{u}_0) . Then a spinor $\phi \in \Gamma(W_0^+)$ can be written as $\phi = \alpha u_0 + \beta$, where α is a complex-valued function on X and $\beta \in \Gamma(K^{-1})$. Then a solution to the equation (3.2) corresponds to an I -invariant solution to the perturbed equation due to Taubes [25]:

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} D_A \phi &= 0, \\ F_A^+ - F_{A_0}^+ &= -\frac{ir}{8}(1 - |\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2)\omega + \frac{ir}{4}(\alpha\bar{\beta} + \bar{\alpha}\beta). \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By construction, (A_0, u_0) is an I -invariant solution to (3.3) for every r . Taubes [23–25] (see also Kotschick [14]) proved that there is no solution to (3.3) except (A_0, u_0) for large r . It follows from this that (\hat{A}_0, \hat{u}_0) is a unique solution to (3.2) for large r . These imply Theorem 1.1. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Suppose the $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole invariant on a Spin^c -structure $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}$ is nonzero. Then the equations (3.2) on $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}$ has a solution $(\hat{A}, \hat{\phi})$ for every r . Then the lift (A, ϕ) of $(\hat{A}, \hat{\phi})$ is an I -invariant solution to (3.3)

for r . By Kotschick [14] (Cf. Taubes [24]), the existence of solutions for large r implies that

$$(3.4) \quad |c_1(L) \cdot [\omega]| \leq c_1(K) \cdot [\omega],$$

where L is the determinant line bundle of (X, \mathfrak{s}) . Let \hat{L} be the characteristic bundle for $(\hat{X}, \hat{\mathfrak{s}})$. Then $L = \pi^* \hat{L}$. The inequality (1.5) follows from (3.4)

By [25], we can find an embedded symplectic curve C in X such that $e = P.D.[C]$ satisfies $e^2 = c_1(K \otimes L)$. If X contains embedded 2-spheres with self-intersection number -1 , then blow them down. The resulting manifold is a minimal symplectic manifold X' with another embedded symplectic curve C' (see, e.g., [20]). Then the proof of Theorem 0.2(6) of [25] implies that the virtual dimension $d(\mathfrak{s})$ of the moduli space for (X, \mathfrak{s}) is 0. Therefore $d(\hat{\mathfrak{s}}) = \frac{1}{2}d(\mathfrak{s}) = 0$. \square

4. Real Kähler surfaces

The purpose of this section is to prove that the $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole moduli space on a real Kähler surface can be identified with the I -invariant moduli space of holomorphic simple pairs, and the space of I -invariant effective divisors. The moduli space of vortices is also introduced as an intermediate object. The goal of this section is Corollary 4.22 and Corollary 4.26.

Let (X, ω, ι) be a compact Kähler surface with anti-holomorphic free involution ι such that $\iota^* \omega = -\omega$. Note that the pull-back of a (p, q) -form by the anti-linear map ι is a (q, p) -form, and the complex conjugation of a (q, p) -form is a (p, q) -form. We define the involution I on the space of (p, q) -forms $\Omega^{p,q}(X)$ by

$$I(\alpha) = \overline{\iota^* \alpha}, \quad \alpha \in \Omega^{p,q}(X).$$

Note that $K = \Lambda^{2,0}(X)$, $K^{-1} = \Lambda^{0,2}(X)$, $\iota^* K = K^{-1}$.

Suppose that there is a canonical Spin^{c-} structure $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0$ on $X \rightarrow \hat{X} = X/\iota$. As explained in §2.2, every Spin^{c-} structure on $X \rightarrow \hat{X}$ is obtained from $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0$ and an \mathbb{R}^2 -bundle \hat{E} twisted along $\ell_{\mathbb{R}}$ as $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0 \hat{\otimes} \hat{E}$.

For a Spin^{c-} structure $\hat{\mathfrak{s}} = \hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0 \hat{\otimes} \hat{E}$, there exists a Spin^c structure $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{s}_0 \otimes E$ on X which is the canonical reduction of $\pi^* \hat{\mathfrak{s}}$, whose positive spinor bundle is $W^+ = E \oplus (E \otimes K^{-1})$ such that $E \cong \pi^* \hat{E}$ as \mathbb{R}^2 -bundles. Note that $\iota^* \mathfrak{s} = \bar{\mathfrak{s}}$. Then $\iota^* E = \bar{E}$ and E naturally admits a Hermitian metric h such that $\iota^* h = \bar{h}$.

Let C be a Hermitian connection on K^{-1} induced by the Chern connection on TX associated with the Kähler structure.

Recall that the Dirac operator D on the canonical Spin^c structure \mathfrak{s}_0 is identified with

$$D = \sqrt{2}(\bar{\partial} + \bar{\partial}^*): \Omega^{0,0}(X) \oplus \Omega^{0,2}(X) \rightarrow \Omega^{0,1}(X).$$

Since ι is anti-holomorphic, the pull-back of D by ι is

$$\iota^* D = \sqrt{2}(\partial + \partial^*): \Omega^{0,0}(X) \oplus \Omega^{2,0}(X) \rightarrow \Omega^{1,0}(X).$$

Then we see that the Dirac operator D is I -equivariant.

Next we consider Dirac operators on a Spin^c structure $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{s}_0 \otimes E$. For a Hermitian connection A on $\det(W^+) = E^2 \otimes K^{-1}$, there is a unique

Hermitian connection B on E such that $A = C \otimes B^{\otimes 2}$. Then the Dirac operator D_A associated with A is identified with

$$D_A = \sqrt{2}(\bar{\partial}_B + \bar{\partial}_B^*) : \Omega^{0,0}(E) \oplus \Omega^{0,2}(E) \rightarrow \Omega^{0,1}(E).$$

The pull-back $B' = \iota^* B$ is a Hermitian connection on $\bar{E} = \iota^* E$, and the pull-back $\iota^* D_A$ can be written as

$$\iota^* D_A = \sqrt{2}(\partial_{B'} + \partial_{B'}^*) : \Omega^{0,0}(\bar{E}) \oplus \Omega^{2,0}(\bar{E}) \rightarrow \Omega^{1,0}(\bar{E}).$$

For an $\text{O}(2)$ -connection \hat{B} on \hat{E} , we have a Hermitian connection B on E which is the $\text{U}(1)$ -reduction of $\pi^* \hat{B}$. Then B is I -invariant, i.e., $B = \overline{\iota^* B}$. For such a connection B , the Dirac operator $D_A = \sqrt{2}(\bar{\partial}_B + \bar{\partial}_B^*)$ is also I -equivariant.

Recall the identifications:

$$H^2(X; \mathbb{C}) = H^{1,1} \oplus H^{2,0} \oplus H^{0,2}, \quad H_+(X; i\mathbb{R}) = i\mathbb{R}\omega \oplus H^{0,2}.$$

Note that the $I = \overline{\iota^* (\cdot)}$ -action preserves $H_+(X; i\mathbb{R})$ and

$$H_+(\hat{X}; \ell_{\mathbb{R}}) \cong H_+(X; i\mathbb{R})^I = i\mathbb{R}\omega \oplus (H^{0,2})^I.$$

In particular, we have the following.

Proposition 4.1. *If $b_+^\ell = \text{rank } H_+(\hat{X}; \ell_{\mathbb{R}}) \geq 2$, then $(H^{2,0})^I \cong (H^{0,2})^I \neq \emptyset$.*

4.1. Seiberg–Witten equations. The Seiberg–Witten equations on Kähler surfaces can be written as follows ([16, 27]):

$$\begin{aligned} (4.2) \quad & \bar{\partial}_B \alpha + \bar{\partial}_B \beta = 0 \\ & 2F_B^{0,2} + 2\pi i \eta^{0,2} - \frac{1}{2} \beta \bar{\alpha} = 0 \\ & 2F_B^{2,0} + 2\pi i \eta^{2,0} + \frac{1}{2} \alpha \bar{\beta} = 0 \\ & \{\Lambda_g(F_B + \pi i \eta) - \frac{i}{2} s_g + \frac{i}{8} (|\beta|^2 - |\alpha|^2)\} \omega = 0 \end{aligned}$$

These are the equations for Hermitian connections B on E and sections $(\alpha, \beta) \in (\Omega^{0,0} \oplus \Omega^{0,2})(E)$. The perturbation term is given by $\eta \in \Omega^2(X)$, Λ_g denotes the adjoint of the multiplication operator $\omega \wedge \cdot : i\Omega^{0,0} \rightarrow i\Omega^{1,1}$, and s_g is the scalar curvature. (Here we use the fact that $i\Lambda_g F_C = s_g$ for the Chern connection C .) If we take an I -invariant η , then (4.2) is I -equivariant.

The discussion below is largely indebted to Teleman's excellent exposition [27]. The general principle is to “consider in the upstairs and take the I -invariant part”. The next two theorems are obtained by restricting everything to the I -invariant part in the corresponding theorems of [27].

Theorem 4.3 ([27], Théorème 8.1.7). *Suppose η is an I -invariant closed $(1,1)$ -form, and*

$$\Theta := \frac{1}{2} \langle ([\eta] - 2c_1(E) + c_1(K)) \cup [\omega], [X] \rangle \neq 0$$

Then an I -invariant triple (B, α, β) is a solution to (4.2) if and only if:

$$(4.4) \quad \beta = 0, \quad \bar{\partial}_B \alpha = 0, \quad F_B^{0,2} = 0, \quad i\Lambda_g F_B + \frac{1}{8} |\alpha|^2 = \pi \Lambda_g \eta - \frac{s_g}{2}$$

II. $\Theta < 0$ and

$$(4.5) \quad \alpha = 0, \quad \bar{\partial}_B^* \beta = 0, \quad F_B^{0,2} = 0, \quad i\Lambda_g F_B - \frac{1}{8}|\beta|^2 = \pi\Lambda_g \eta - \frac{s_g}{2}$$

Let C^\vee be the Hermitian connection on K induced from the Chern connection C . For a Hermitian connection on E , let B' be the Hermitian connection on $K \otimes \bar{E}$ such that $B \otimes B' = C^\vee$. For $\beta \in \Omega^{0,2}(E) = \Gamma(E \otimes K^{-1})$, let $\varphi = \bar{\beta} \in \Gamma(\bar{E} \otimes K)$. Then the condition $\bar{\partial}_B^* \beta = 0$ is equivalent to $\bar{\partial}_{B'} \varphi = 0$ by the Serre duality, and (4.5) can be rewritten as

$$\alpha = 0, \quad \bar{\partial}_{B'} \varphi = 0, \quad F_{B'}^{0,2} = 0, \quad i\Lambda_g F_{B'} + \frac{1}{8}|\varphi|^2 = -\pi\Lambda_g \eta + \frac{s_g}{2}.$$

If η is not a $(1,1)$ -form, then we have the following.

Theorem 4.6 ([27], Théorème 9.3.1). *Suppose an I -invariant 2-form η has a form of $\eta = \eta^{2,0} \oplus \eta^{1,1} \oplus \overline{\eta^{2,0}}$ where $\eta^{2,0}$ is an I -invariant non-zero holomorphic 2-form. Then an I -invariant triple (B, α, β) is a solution to (4.2) if and only if:*

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \alpha\bar{\beta} &= -8\pi i \eta^{2,0}, \quad \bar{\partial}_B \alpha = \bar{\partial}_B^* \beta = 0, \quad F_B^{0,2} = 0, \\ i\Lambda_g F_B + \frac{1}{8}(|\beta|^2 - |\alpha|^2) &= \pi\Lambda_g \eta^{1,1} - \frac{s_g}{2} \end{aligned}$$

Let C^\vee , B' and φ be as above. Then (4.7) can be rewritten as

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \alpha\varphi &= -8\pi i \eta^{2,0}, \quad B \otimes B' = C^\vee, \\ \bar{\partial}_B \alpha &= \bar{\partial}_{B'} \varphi = 0, \quad F_B^{0,2} = F_{B'}^{0,2} = 0, \\ \frac{i}{2}\Lambda_g(F_B - F_{B'}) + \frac{1}{8}(|\varphi|^2 - |\alpha|^2) &= \pi\Lambda_g \eta \end{aligned}$$

4.2. Vortex equations. Let (X, ω, ι) be a compact Kähler surface with anti-holomorphic free involution ι . Suppose we have a C^∞ Hermitian line bundle (E, h) over X with an isomorphism $\iota^*(E, h) \cong (\bar{E}, \bar{h})$. This isomorphism defines the bundle map $I = \overline{\iota^*(\cdot)}$ covering ι which is the composite map of

$$E \xrightarrow{\iota^*} \iota^* E \cong \bar{E} \xrightarrow{(\cdot)} E.$$

We suppose I generates an order-2 action (involution) on E . We define the I -action on $\Omega^0(E)$ also by $I = \overline{\iota^*(\cdot)}$. Let $\mathcal{A}(E, h)$ be the space of Hermitian connections on E . Then the involution I naturally induces an involution on $\mathcal{A}(E, h)$, also denoted by I . The gauge transformation group $\mathcal{G} = C^\infty(X; S^1)$ acts on $\mathcal{A}(E, h) \times \Omega^0(E)$ by

$$(B, \phi) \cdot f = (B + f^{-1}df, f^{-1}\phi) \text{ for } (B, \phi) \in \mathcal{A}(E, h) \times \Omega^0(E), f \in \mathcal{G}.$$

A configuration (B, ϕ) with $\phi \neq 0$ is called an *irreducible*. The group \mathcal{G} acts on the space of irreducibles freely. We define the involution I on \mathcal{G} by $I(f) = \overline{\iota^* f}$. Then the \mathcal{G} -action on $\mathcal{A}(E, h) \times \Omega^0(E)$ is I -equivariant.

Definition 4.9. Let $t: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a C^∞ -function. A t -vortex is a solution $(B, \phi) \in \mathcal{A}(E, h) \times \Omega^0(E)$ to the system of the equations

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \bar{\partial}_B \phi &= 0 \\ F_B^{0,2} &= 0 \\ i\Lambda_g F_B + \frac{1}{2}|\phi|^2 - t &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

If (B, ϕ) is a solution to (4.10), then

$$(4.11) \quad \Xi := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_X t d\text{vol}_g - \langle c_1(E) \cup [\omega], [X] \rangle = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_X (t - i\Lambda_g F_B) d\text{vol}_g = \frac{1}{4\pi} \|\phi\|_{L^2}^2 \geq 0.$$

If t is ι -invariant, that is, $\iota^* t = t$, then the system (4.10) is I -equivariant. Define I -invariant moduli spaces as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_t(E)^I &= \{ I\text{-invariant } t\text{-vortices} \} / \mathcal{G}^I, \\ \mathcal{V}_t^*(E)^I &= \{ I\text{-invariant irreducible } t\text{-vortices} \} / \mathcal{G}^I. \end{aligned}$$

If $\Xi > 0$, then $\mathcal{V}_t^*(E)^I = \mathcal{V}_t(E)^I$.

As usual, we take L_k^2 -completion of $\mathcal{C}^*(E) := \mathcal{A}(E, h) \times (\Omega^0(E) \setminus \{0\})$ and L_{k+1}^2 -completion of \mathcal{G} for sufficiently large k . We use the notation $(\cdot)_k$ for the completed spaces. For a generic choice of I -invariant t with positive Ξ , the space $\mathcal{V}_t^*(E)^I$ is a submanifold of the Hilbert manifold

$$(\mathcal{B}_k^*)^I := (\mathcal{C}^*(E)_k)^I / \mathcal{G}_{k+1}^I.$$

For an orbit $[v] = [(B, \phi)] \in (\mathcal{B}_k^*)^I$, the tangent space of $(\mathcal{B}_k^*)^I$ at $[v]$ is given by

$$T_{[v]}(\mathcal{B}_k^*)^I = \{ (\dot{B}, \dot{\phi}) \mid d^* \dot{B} - i \text{Im}(\dot{\phi} \bar{\phi}) = 0 \}^I.$$

The following is a direct consequence of Theorem 4.3.

Corollary 4.12. Suppose η is an I -invariant closed $(1,1)$ -form. Let $t = \pi \Lambda_g \eta - s_g/2$. Then we have the following identifications:

- (1) $\mathcal{M}(X, \mathfrak{s}_0 \otimes E)^I \cong \mathcal{V}_t^*(E)^I$, if $\Theta > 0$.
- (2) $\mathcal{M}(X, \mathfrak{s}_0 \otimes E)^I \cong \mathcal{V}_{-t}^*(K \otimes E^{-1})^I$, if $\Theta < 0$.

4.3. Holomorphic simple pairs. Let (X, ω, ι) be a compact Kähler surface with anti-holomorphic involution ι , and E a C^∞ complex line bundle such that $\iota^* E \cong \bar{E}$. As before, we suppose $I = \overline{\iota^* (\cdot)}$ generates an involution on E . We define the I -action on $\Omega^0(E)$ also by $I = \iota^* (\cdot)$. Let $\mathcal{A}^{0,1}(E)$ be the space of semiconnections on E . Note that a semiconnection $\delta \in \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(E)$ can be written as $\delta = \bar{\partial}_B$ for some complex linear connection B on E . The involution I naturally induces an involution on $\mathcal{A}^{0,1}(E)$, also denoted by I . The complex gauge transformation group $\mathcal{G}^{\mathbb{C}} = C^\infty(X, \mathbb{C}^*)$ acts on $\mathcal{P}(E) = \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(E) \times \Omega^0(E)$ by

$$(\delta, \phi) \cdot f = (\delta \cdot f, f^{-1} \phi) \text{ for } (\delta, \phi) \in \mathcal{P}(E), \quad f \in \mathcal{G}^{\mathbb{C}},$$

where $\delta \cdot f = f^{-1} \circ \delta \circ f = \delta + f^{-1} \bar{\partial} f$. A pair (δ, ϕ) with nonzero ϕ is called *simple*. Let $\mathcal{P}^s(E)$ be the space of simple pairs. Then $\mathcal{G}^{\mathbb{C}}$ acts on $\mathcal{P}^s(E)$ freely. We define the involution I on $\mathcal{G}^{\mathbb{C}}$ by $I(f) = \overline{\iota^* f}$. Then the $\mathcal{G}^{\mathbb{C}}$ -action on $\mathcal{P}(E)$ is I -equivariant.

Let $\mathcal{H}(E)$ be the space of holomorphic pairs:

$$\mathcal{H}(E) = \{(\delta, \phi) \in \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(E) \times \Omega^0(E) \mid \delta \circ \delta = 0, \delta\phi = 0\}.$$

A pair $(\delta, \phi) \in \mathcal{H}(E)$ with non-zero ϕ is called a *holomorphic simple pair*. Let $\mathcal{H}^s(E)$ be the space of holomorphic simple pairs.

We consider the I -invariant moduli space of holomorphic simple pairs:

$$\mathcal{M}^s(E)^I = \mathcal{H}^s(E)^I / (\mathcal{G}^\mathbb{C})^I.$$

The deformation complex for an I -invariant holomorphic simple pair $\mathfrak{p} = (\delta, \phi)$ is given by

$$(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{p}})^I = (\mathcal{C}^0)^I \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{p}}^0} (\mathcal{C}^1)^I \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{p}}^1} (\mathcal{C}^2)^I \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{p}}^2} (\mathcal{C}^3)^I,$$

where

(4.13)

$$\mathcal{C}^0 = \Omega^{0,0}(X), \quad \mathcal{C}^i = \Omega^{0,i}(X) \oplus \Omega^{0,i-1}(E) \quad (i = 1, 2), \quad \mathcal{C}^3 = \Omega^{0,2}(E),$$

(4.14)

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{p}}^i(\alpha, \sigma) = (\bar{\partial}\alpha, -\delta\sigma - \alpha\phi).$$

The moduli space $\mathcal{M}^s(E)^I$ has a Kuranishi model as follows.

Proposition 4.15 (Cf. [27], Proposition 8.2.10). *Let $H^i((\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{p}})^I)$, $\mathbb{H}^i((\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{p}})^I)$ be the cohomology group and harmonic space of the elliptic complex $(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{p}})^I$. There exists a neighborhood $U_{\mathfrak{p}}$ of $0 \in \mathbb{H}^1((\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{p}})^I)$ and a smooth map*

$$\mathfrak{t}_{\mathfrak{p}}: U_{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^2((\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{p}})^I)$$

such that a neighborhood of $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{M}^s(E)^I$ is homeomorphic to $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(0)$. Furthermore, if $H^2((\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{p}})^I) = 0$, then $\mathcal{M}^s(E)^I$ is a smooth manifold of dimension $\dim H^1((\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{p}})^I)$ near $[\mathfrak{p}]$, and the tangent space of $\mathcal{M}^s(E)^I$ at $[\mathfrak{p}]$ is identified with $H^1((\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{p}})^I)$.

The proof is standard.

4.4. I -invariant divisors. (A reference of this subsection is [21], I.4.) A Weil divisor is a formal linear combination $\sum_i n_i D_i$ of irreducible analytic hypersurfaces. Define the I -action on divisors by $I \cdot D = \sum_i n_i \iota(D_i)$. We call a divisor D *I -invariant* if $D = I \cdot D$. We will mainly consider effective divisors, i.e., $D = \sum_i n_i D_i$ with $n_i \geq 0$.

When D is considered as a Cartier divisor, the I -action can be written as follows. For an open subset $U \subset X$ and a holomorphic function $f \in \mathcal{O}_X(U)$, define $I \cdot f \in \mathcal{O}_X(\iota(U))$ by $(I \cdot f)(x) = \overline{f(\iota x)}$. Let \mathcal{S} be the set of pairs (U_λ, λ) where U_λ is an open set and $\lambda \in \mathcal{O}_X(U_\lambda)$. Then define the I -action on \mathcal{S} by

$$I \cdot (U_\lambda, \lambda) = (\iota(U_\lambda), I \cdot \lambda)$$

An effective Cartier divisor is given as a subset $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{S}$ whose elements (U_λ, λ) satisfy the following:

- (1) λ is not identically zero.
- (2) $\bigcup_{\lambda \in \mathcal{F}} U_\lambda = X$.
- (3) For every $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{F}$, there exists $g_{\lambda, \mu} \in \mathcal{O}_X^*(U_\lambda \cap U_\mu)$ such that $\lambda = g_{\lambda, \mu} \mu$.

We will take a maximal one of such systems for \mathcal{F} . The effective Weil divisor corresponding to an effective Cartier divisor is obtained by considering λ as local defining equations. Let

$$I \cdot \mathcal{F} = \{I \cdot (U_\lambda, \lambda) \mid (U_\lambda, \lambda) \in \mathcal{F}\}.$$

Then $I \cdot D$ corresponds to $I \cdot \mathcal{F}$. Note that $g_{I\lambda, I\mu} = Ig_{\lambda, \mu}$. If D is I -invariant, then we can take \mathcal{F} corresponding to D such that $\mathcal{F} = I \cdot \mathcal{F}$.

The system of cocycles $\{g_{\lambda, \mu}\}$ and local functions $\{\lambda\}$ defines a holomorphic line bundle \mathcal{L} with a holomorphic section ϕ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} &= \left(\bigcup_{\lambda \in \mathcal{F}} \{\lambda\} \times U_\lambda \times \mathbb{C} \right) / \sim, \\ \{\mu\} \times (U_\lambda \cap U_\mu) \times \mathbb{C} &\ni (\mu, u, \zeta) \sim (\lambda, u, g_{\lambda, \mu} \zeta) \in \{\lambda\} \times (U_\lambda \cap U_\mu) \times \mathbb{C}, \\ \phi(u) &= [(\lambda, u, \lambda(u))] \mod \sim \quad (u \in U_\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Then the corresponding divisor D is $D = Z(\phi)$. When (\mathcal{L}_D, ϕ_D) is associated with D (or \mathcal{F}), note that the line bundle with section associated with $I \cdot D$ (or $I \cdot \mathcal{F}$) is

$$(\mathcal{L}_{I \cdot D}, \phi_{I \cdot D}) = (\overline{\iota^* \mathcal{L}_D}, \overline{\iota^* \phi_D}).$$

If D is I -invariant, then an anti-linear involution I on \mathcal{L}_D covering ι is naturally defined by

$$I \cdot [(\lambda, u, \zeta)] = [(I\lambda, \iota(u), \zeta)].$$

4.5. I -equivariant sheaves. Under the I -action, the structure sheaf \mathcal{O}_X is an I -equivariant sheaf in the sense of [10, 22], i.e., the sheaf projection $\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow X$ is I -equivariant. If D is I -invariant, then $\mathcal{O}_X(D)$ and $\mathcal{O}_D(D) = \mathcal{O}_X(D)/\mathcal{O}_X$ are also I -equivariant. For an I -equivariant sheaf \mathcal{E} , the equivariant sheaf cohomology $H^p(X; I, \mathcal{E})$ is defined: For an I -invariant open set $U \subset X$, let $\Gamma^I(U; \mathcal{E})$ be the module of I -invariant sections. Take an injective resolution $\mathcal{J}^*(\mathcal{E})$ of \mathcal{E} in the category of I -equivariant sheaves. Then $H^p(X; I, \mathcal{E})$ is defined by

$$H^p(X; I, \mathcal{E}) = H^p(\Gamma^I(X; \mathcal{J}^*(\mathcal{E}))).$$

The equivariant direct image $\pi^I \mathcal{E}$ of \mathcal{E} is the sheaf on $\hat{X} = X/\iota$ which is generated by the presheaf,

$$\hat{U} \mapsto \Gamma^I(\pi^{-1}(\hat{U}); \mathcal{E}), \quad \hat{U} \subset \hat{X} = X/\iota \text{ open.}$$

In general, π^G is a left exact functor for G -sheaves. However our case is much simple. Since I covers the free involution ι on X , π^I is an exact functor. That is, for an exact sequence of I -sheaves on X ,

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 0,$$

we have an exact sequence of sheaves on \hat{X} ,

$$0 \rightarrow \pi^I \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \pi^I \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \pi^I \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 0.$$

In particular,

$$\pi^I \mathcal{F} / \pi^I \mathcal{E} = \pi^I (\mathcal{F} / \mathcal{E}).$$

The fact that I covers the free involution ι on X also implies that

$$H^i(X; I, \mathcal{E}) = H^i(X/\iota; \pi^I(\mathcal{E})).$$

([10], p.204, Corollaire; [22], Corollary 5.6.)

There is an I -equivariant exact sequence.

$$0 \longrightarrow \tilde{\mathbb{Z}} \xrightarrow{i} \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{\exp 2\pi} \mathcal{O}_X^* \longrightarrow 0,$$

where $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}$ is the constant sheaf on which I acts via multiplication of -1 . This induces the sequence

$$0 \rightarrow H^1(X; I, \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}) \rightarrow H^1(X; I, \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow H^1(X; I, \mathcal{O}_X^*) \xrightarrow{\tilde{c}_1} H^2(X; I, \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}) \rightarrow \dots$$

Note that $H^i(X; I, \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}) \cong H^i(\hat{X}; \ell)$. Let $\text{NS}^I(X) = \text{Im } \tilde{c}_1$. For $e \in \text{NS}^I(X)$, let $\mathcal{D}(e)$ be the set of effective divisors representing e .

Proposition 4.16 ([27], Proposition 8.2.13). *Let $e = \tilde{c}_1(E)$.*

- (1) *The map $(\delta, \phi) \mapsto Z(\phi)$ induces a bijection $\mathcal{M}^s(E)^I \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{D}(e)^I$.*
- (2)

$$H^0((\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{p}})^I) = 0, \quad H^i((\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{p}})^I) \cong H^{i-1}(X; I, \mathcal{O}_D(D)) = H^{i-1}(\hat{X}; \pi^I \mathcal{O}_D(D)),$$

for each positive integer i .

Proof. With §4.4 understood, (1) is easy. The proof of (2) is parallel to that of [27, Proposition 8.2.13]. Let $\mathcal{A}^{p,q}(X)$ and $\mathcal{A}^{p,q}(E)$ be the sheaves of C^∞ -sections of $\Lambda^{p,q}$ and $\Lambda^{p,q}(E)$. Let

$$\mathcal{C}^0 := \mathcal{A}^0(X), \quad \mathcal{C}^i := \mathcal{A}^{0,i}(X) \oplus \mathcal{A}^{0,i-1}(E), \quad (i = 1, 2), \quad \mathcal{C}^3 := \mathcal{A}^{0,2}(E).$$

Then the I -action makes \mathcal{C}^i I -equivariant sheaves. The operators $\mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{p}}^i$ in (4.14) define a sequence of I -equivariant sheaves:

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^0 \xrightarrow{\delta_{\mathfrak{p}}^0} \mathcal{C}^1 \xrightarrow{\delta_{\mathfrak{p}}^1} \mathcal{C}^2 \xrightarrow{\delta_{\mathfrak{p}}^2} \mathcal{C}^3 \rightarrow 0.$$

This induces the sequence of sheaves over $\hat{X} = X/\iota$:

$$(4.17) \quad 0 \rightarrow \pi^I \mathcal{C}^0 \xrightarrow{\hat{\delta}_{\mathfrak{p}}^0} \pi^I \mathcal{C}^1 \xrightarrow{\hat{\delta}_{\mathfrak{p}}^1} \pi^I \mathcal{C}^2 \xrightarrow{\hat{\delta}_{\mathfrak{p}}^2} \pi^I \mathcal{C}^3 \rightarrow 0.$$

Since ι is free, it can be seen from the $\bar{\partial}$ -Poincaré lemma that the sequence (4.17) is exact unless $i \neq 1$. Furthermore, the following map is an isomorphism:

$$\pi^I \mathcal{O}_X(\mathcal{E}_\delta) / \phi \pi^I \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \ker \hat{\delta}_{\mathfrak{p}}^1 / \text{im } \hat{\delta}_{\mathfrak{p}}^0, \quad [\lambda] \mapsto (0, \lambda).$$

For $i > 0$,

$$H^i(\pi^I \mathcal{C}^1 / \text{im } \hat{\delta}_{\mathfrak{p}}^0) = 0.$$

Then we obtain a resolution of $\pi^I \mathcal{O}_X(\mathcal{E}_\delta) / \phi \pi^I \mathcal{O}_X = \pi^I \mathcal{O}_D(D)$ as follows:

$$0 \rightarrow \pi^I \mathcal{O}_X(\mathcal{E}_\delta) / \phi \pi^I \mathcal{O}_X = \ker \hat{\delta}_{\mathfrak{p}}^1 / \text{im } \hat{\delta}_{\mathfrak{p}}^0 \rightarrow \pi^I \mathcal{C}^1 / \text{im } \hat{\delta}_{\mathfrak{p}}^0 \xrightarrow{\hat{\delta}_{\mathfrak{p}}^1} \pi^I \mathcal{C}^2 \xrightarrow{\hat{\delta}_{\mathfrak{p}}^2} \pi^I \mathcal{C}^3 \rightarrow 0.$$

Since $H^1(\text{im } \hat{\delta}_{\mathfrak{p}}^0) \cong H^1(\pi^I \mathcal{C}^0)$, we have

$$H^0(\pi^I \mathcal{C}^1) / \mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{p}}^0(H^0(\pi^I \mathcal{C}^0)) \cong H^0(\pi^I \mathcal{C}^1 / \text{im } \hat{\delta}_{\mathfrak{p}}^0).$$

Then we obtain

$$H^0(\pi^I \mathcal{O}_D(D)) \cong \ker \left(H^0(\pi^I \mathcal{C}^1 / \text{im } \hat{\delta}_{\mathfrak{p}}^0) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{p}}^1} H^0(\pi^I \mathcal{C}^2) = (\mathcal{C}^2)^I \right) = H^1((\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{p}})^I),$$

$$H^i(\pi^I \mathcal{O}_D(D)) \cong \ker \mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{i+1} / \text{im } \mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{p}}^i = H^{i+1}((\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{p}})^I).$$

□

Corollary 4.18. *For $D \in \mathcal{D}(e)^I$, if $H^1(X; I, \mathcal{O}_D(D)) = H^1(\hat{X}; \pi^I \mathcal{O}_D(D)) = 0$, then $\mathcal{D}(e)^I$ is smooth at D , and the tangent space of $\mathcal{D}(e)^I$ at D is identified with $H^0(X; I, \mathcal{O}_D(D)) = H^0(\hat{X}; \pi^I \mathcal{O}_D(D))$.*

We call the following the Zariski tangent space of $\mathcal{D}(e)^I$ at D :

$$T_D(\mathcal{D}(e)^I) := H^0(X; I, \mathcal{O}_D(D)) = H^0(\hat{X}; \pi^I \mathcal{O}_D(D)).$$

4.6. Correspondence. Define the map $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}: \mathcal{C}^*(E)_k \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^s(E)_k$ by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{J}}(B, \phi) = (\bar{\partial}_B, \phi).$$

Then the restriction of $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ to the I -invariant part $\mathcal{C}^*(E)_k^I$ induces a submersion

$$\mathcal{J}': (\mathcal{B}_k^*)^I = \mathcal{C}^*(E)_k^I / \mathcal{G}_{k+1}^I \rightarrow (\mathcal{B}_k^s)^I := \mathcal{P}^s(E)_k^I / (\mathcal{G}_{k+1}^{\mathbb{C}})^I.$$

The goal of this subsection is the next proposition.

Theorem 4.19. *If $\Xi > 0$, then the map \mathcal{J}' induces a homeomorphism*

$$\mathcal{J}: \mathcal{V}_t^*(E)^I \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{M}^s(E)^I.$$

For the proof, we need some preparation. Define $\tilde{\mu}_t: \mathcal{C}_k^* \rightarrow \Omega^0(E)_{k-1}$ by the left hand side of the third equation of (4.10) as

$$\tilde{\mu}_t(B, \phi) = i\Lambda_g F_B + \frac{1}{2}|\phi|^2 - t.$$

The restriction of $\tilde{\mu}_t$ to the I -invariant part $(\mathcal{C}_k^*)^I$ induces the map $\mu_t^I: (\mathcal{B}_k^*)^I \rightarrow \Omega^0(E)_{k-1}^I$. Let $Z(\mu_t^I) = (\mu_t^I)^{-1}(0)$. For $v = (B, \phi) \in (\mathcal{C}_k^*)^I$, by using the Kähler identities $\partial^* = i[\Lambda, \bar{\partial}]$, $\bar{\partial}^* = -i[\Lambda, \partial]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_{[v]}Z(\mu_t^I) &= T_{[v]}(\mathcal{B}_k^*)^I \cap \ker d\tilde{\mu}_t \\ &= \{(\dot{B}, \dot{\phi}) \mid d^*\dot{B} - i\text{Im}(\dot{\phi}\bar{\phi}) = 0, -i\Lambda_g d\dot{B} - \text{Re}(\dot{\phi}\bar{\phi}) = 0\}^I \\ &= \{(\dot{B}, \dot{\phi}) \mid 2\bar{\partial}^*\dot{B}^{0,1} - \dot{\phi}\bar{\phi} = 0\}^I \end{aligned}$$

Note that the last space can be identified with the L^2 -orthogonal complement of the tangent space of the orbit $\mathfrak{p} \cdot (\mathcal{G}_{k+1}^{\mathbb{C}})^I$ in $T_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathcal{P}_k^s)^I$ where $\mathfrak{p} = \tilde{\mathcal{J}}(v) \in (\mathcal{P}^s)^I$. From this, we obtain the following:

Proposition 4.20. *The map $\mathcal{J}'|_{Z(\mu_t^I)}: Z(\mu_t^I) \rightarrow (\mathcal{B}_k^s)^I$ is a local homeomorphism.*

Proof of Theorem 4.19. (Cf. [27], Proposition 8.2.20.) By Proposition 4.20, it suffices to see that \mathcal{J} is bijective. First, we prove \mathcal{J} is surjective. Suppose $(\delta, \phi) \in \mathcal{M}^s(E)^I$. We have an Hermitian connection $B = A_{h,\delta}$ associated with the holomorphic structure δ . We want to find an I -invariant function $\psi \in C^\infty(X; \mathbb{R})^I$ such that $(A_{h,\delta}, f, \phi)$ is a solution to (4.10) for $f = e^{-\psi}$. Note that

$$A_{h,\delta}, f = A_{h,\delta} - \bar{\partial}\psi + \partial\psi,$$

and $(A_{h,\delta}, f, \phi)$ is a t -vortex if and only if

$$(4.21) \quad i\Lambda_g \bar{\partial}\partial\psi + \frac{1}{2}e^{2\psi}|\phi|^2 = t - i\Lambda_g F_B.$$

Since ϕ and $\theta := t - i\Lambda_g F_B$ are I -invariant section and function, they descend on \hat{X} , i.e., we find $\hat{\phi}$ and $\hat{\theta}$ such that $\phi = \pi^*\hat{\phi}$ and $\theta = \pi^*\hat{\theta}$. Consider the following equation for $\hat{\psi} \in C^\infty(\hat{X}; \mathbb{R})$:

$$\Delta_{\hat{g}}\hat{\psi} + \frac{1}{2}e^{2\hat{\psi}}|\hat{\phi}|^2 = \hat{\theta}.$$

This is a Kazdan-Warner type equation [13], and has a unique solution $\hat{\psi}$ since $\int_{\hat{X}} \hat{\theta} d\text{vol}_{\hat{g}} = \frac{1}{2} \int_X \theta d\text{vol}_g = \frac{1}{2} \Theta > 0$. Then $\psi = \pi^*\hat{\psi}$ is an I -invariant solution to (4.21).

We prove \mathcal{J} is injective. Suppose $(B_1, \phi_1), (B_2, \phi_2)$ are I -invariant solutions to (4.10) such that $(\partial_{B_1}, \phi_1) = (\partial_{B_2}, \phi_2) \cdot f$ for some $f \in (\mathcal{G}^\mathbb{C})^I$. By replacing (B_2, ϕ_2) with \mathcal{G}^I -equivalent one, if necessary, we may assume $f = e^{-\psi}$ for some I -invariant function ψ . Since (B_2, ϕ_2) is an I -invariant solution, ψ satisfies (4.21). Since (B_1, ϕ_1) is an I -invariant solution, $\psi = 0$ is a solution to (4.21). Moving to the downstairs, we see that the uniqueness of the solution to Kazdan-Warner's equation implies that $\psi = 0$. \square

Recall that $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0 \hat{\otimes} \hat{E}$ is a Spin^c -structure on $X \rightarrow \hat{X}$ and $\mathfrak{s}_0 \otimes E$ is the canonical reduction of $\pi^*(\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0 \hat{\otimes} \hat{E})$. We choose an I -invariant closed $(1, 1)$ -form η for the perturbation term of the I -invariant Seiberg-Witten equation (4.2).

Corollary 4.22. *Let $t = \pi\Lambda_g\eta - s_g/2$, $e = \tilde{c}_1(\hat{E})$ and $k = \tilde{c}_1(\hat{K})$.*

(1) *If $\Theta > 0$, then*

$$\mathcal{M}(\hat{X}, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0 \hat{\otimes} \hat{E}) \cong \mathcal{M}(X, \mathfrak{s}_0 \otimes E)^I \cong \mathcal{V}_t^*(E)^I \cong \mathcal{M}^s(E)^I \cong \mathcal{D}(e)^I.$$

(2) *If $\Theta < 0$, then*

$$\mathcal{M}(\hat{X}, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0 \hat{\otimes} \hat{E}) \cong \mathcal{M}(X, \mathfrak{s}_0 \otimes E)^I \cong \mathcal{V}_{-t}^*(E^{-1} \otimes K)^I \cong \mathcal{M}^s(E^{-1} \otimes K)^I \cong \mathcal{D}(k - e)^I.$$

4.7. Witten's perturbation. In the previous subsection, we consider the perturbation by an I -invariant $(1, 1)$ -form η , and the $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole moduli space is identified with the I -invariant moduli space of vortices and holomorphic simple pairs. In this subsection, we consider the perturbation as in Theorem 4.6.

Let (X, ω, ι) be a compact Kähler surface with anti-holomorphic involution ι , and E and E' two C^∞ complex line bundles such that $\iota^*E \cong \bar{E}$ and $\iota^*E' \cong \bar{E}'$. We suppose $I = \overline{\iota^*}(\cdot)$ defines involutions on E and E' . Consider $\mathcal{P}^s(E) \times \mathcal{P}^s(E')$. Let $\mathcal{G}^\mathbb{C} = C^\infty(X, \mathbb{C}^*)$ act on $\mathcal{P}^s(E) \times \mathcal{P}^s(E')$ by

$$(\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p}') \cdot f := (\mathfrak{p} \cdot f, \mathfrak{p}' \cdot f^{-1}) \text{ for } (\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p}') \in \mathcal{P}^s(E) \times \mathcal{P}^s(E'), f \in \mathcal{G}^\mathbb{C}.$$

Fix a holomorphic structure \mathcal{N} on $N = E \otimes E'$, and let $\delta_{\mathcal{N}}$ be the corresponding integrable semiconnection. (Later we assume \mathcal{N} , and therefore $\delta_{\mathcal{N}}$, are I -invariant.) Let

$$\mathcal{H}^s(E) \times_{\mathcal{N}} \mathcal{H}^s(E') := \{((\delta, \phi), (\delta', \phi')) \in \mathcal{H}^s(E) \times_{\mathcal{N}} \mathcal{H}^s(E') \mid \delta \otimes \delta' = \delta_{\mathcal{N}}\}.$$

A natural map $\mathcal{T}: \mathcal{P}^s(E) \times \mathcal{P}^s(E') \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^s(N)$ given by $((\delta, \phi), (\delta', \phi')) \mapsto (\delta \otimes \delta', \phi \otimes \phi')$ is $\mathcal{G}^\mathbb{C}$ -invariant. We have a $\mathcal{G}^\mathbb{C}$ -equivariant commutative

diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{H}^s(E) \times \mathcal{H}^s(E') & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{T}} & \mathcal{H}^s(N) \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ \mathcal{H}^s(E) \times_{\mathcal{N}} \mathcal{H}^s(E') & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{N}}} & \{\delta_{\mathcal{N}}\} \times (H^0(\mathcal{N}) \setminus \{0\}) \end{array}$$

Now suppose \mathcal{N} is I -invariant and $(H^0(\mathcal{N}) \setminus \{0\})^I \neq \emptyset$. Choose an I -invariant holomorphic section $\xi \in (H^0(\mathcal{N}) \setminus \{0\})^I$. Let

$$\mathcal{M}^s(E, E', \mathcal{N}, \xi)^I = (\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{N}}^{-1}(\xi))^I / \mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{C}}^I.$$

For $e = c_1(E)$ and $e' = c_1(E')$, consider the map defined by sum of divisors

$$\theta: \mathcal{D}(e) \times \mathcal{D}(e') \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(e + e').$$

For $\Delta \in \mathcal{D}(e + e')$, let

$$\mathcal{D}_b(\Delta) := \theta^{-1}(\Delta).$$

Then, for $\Delta = Z(\xi)$, we have a natural identification

$$\mathcal{M}^s(E, E', \mathcal{N}, \xi)^I \cong \mathcal{D}_b(\Delta)^I.$$

The Zariski tangent space $T_{(D, D')}(\mathcal{D}_b(\Delta)^I)$ of $\mathcal{D}_b(\Delta)^I$ at (D, D') is given by

$$T_{(D, D')}(\mathcal{D}_b(\Delta)^I) = \ker(\theta_*: T_D(\mathcal{D}(e)^I) \oplus T_{D'}(\mathcal{D}(e')^I) \rightarrow T_{\Delta}(\mathcal{D}(e + e')^I)).$$

For I -invariant $D, D', \Delta = D + D'$, the inclusions $\emptyset \subset D \subset \Delta, \emptyset \subset D' \subset \Delta$ induce the inclusions

$$\pi^I \mathcal{O}_X \subset \pi^I \mathcal{O}_X(D) \subset \pi^I \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta), \quad \pi^I \mathcal{O}_X \subset \pi^I \mathcal{O}_X(D') \subset \pi^I \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta),$$

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^I \mathcal{O}_D(D) &= \pi^I (\mathcal{O}_X(D) / \mathcal{O}_X) \hookrightarrow \pi^I (\mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) / \mathcal{O}_X) = \pi^I \mathcal{O}_{\Delta}(\Delta), \\ \pi^I \mathcal{O}_{D'}(D') &= \pi^I (\mathcal{O}_X(D') / \mathcal{O}_X) \hookrightarrow \pi^I (\mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) / \mathcal{O}_X) = \pi^I \mathcal{O}_{\Delta}(\Delta), \end{aligned}$$

and therefore the injective maps

$$\begin{aligned} T_D(\mathcal{D}(e)^I) &= H^0(\pi^I \mathcal{O}_D(D)) \xrightarrow{i} H^0(\pi^I \mathcal{O}_{\Delta}(\Delta)) = T_{\Delta}(\mathcal{D}(e + e')^I), \\ T_{D'}(\mathcal{D}(e')^I) &= H^0(\pi^I \mathcal{O}_{D'}(D')) \xrightarrow{i'} H^0(\pi^I \mathcal{O}_{\Delta}(\Delta)) = T_{\Delta}(\mathcal{D}(e + e')^I). \end{aligned}$$

Then it can be seen that

$$\theta_*(a, a') = i(a) + i'(a').$$

Proposition 4.23. *Let D_0 be the maximal effective divisor such that $D_0 \leq D$ and $D_0 \leq D'$. (Note that D_0 is also I -invariant.) Then there exists an isomorphism $T_{(D, D')}(\mathcal{D}_b(\Delta)^I) \cong H^0(\pi^I \mathcal{O}_{D_0}(D_0))$.*

Proof. This is proved by considering the I -invariant part or applying π^I to everything in the proof of [27, Lemma 9.3.3]. The commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & \pi^I \mathcal{O}(D) & & \\
 & \nearrow & & \searrow & \\
 \pi^I \mathcal{O} & \longrightarrow & \pi^I \mathcal{O}(D_0) & & \pi^I \mathcal{O}(\Delta) \\
 & \searrow & & \nearrow & \\
 & & \pi^I \mathcal{O}(D') & &
 \end{array}$$

induces a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & H^0(\pi^I \mathcal{O}_D(D)) & & \\
 & \nearrow u & & \searrow i & \\
 H^0(\pi^I \mathcal{O}_{D_0}(D_0)) & \xrightarrow{v} & & & H^0(\pi^I \mathcal{O}_\Delta(\Delta)) \\
 & \searrow u' & & \nearrow i' & \\
 & & H^0(\pi^I \mathcal{O}_{D'}(D')) & &
 \end{array}$$

where all of maps are linear monomorphisms. The image of the monomorphism

$$(-u) \oplus u': H^0(\pi^I \mathcal{O}_{D_0}(D_0)) \rightarrow H^0(\pi^I \mathcal{O}_D(D)) \oplus H^0(\pi^I \mathcal{O}_{D'}(D'))$$

is contained in $\ker(\theta_*)$. Therefore

$$H^0(\pi^I \mathcal{O}_{D_0}(D_0)) \subset \ker(\theta_*) = T_{(D,D')}(\mathcal{D}_b(\Delta)^I).$$

Conversely, let (a, a') be an element of $\ker(\theta_*)$. Then $i(a) + i'(a') = 0$. We have the exact sequences

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 &\rightarrow \pi^I \mathcal{O}_{D'}(-D) \rightarrow \pi^I \mathcal{O}_\Delta \xrightarrow{\rho} \pi^I \mathcal{O}_D \rightarrow 0, \\
 0 &\rightarrow \pi^I \mathcal{O}_D(-D') \rightarrow \pi^I \mathcal{O}_\Delta \xrightarrow{\rho'} \pi^I \mathcal{O}_{D'} \rightarrow 0, \\
 0 &\rightarrow \pi^I \mathcal{O}_{D'}(D') \xrightarrow{i'} \pi^I \mathcal{O}_\Delta(\Delta) \xrightarrow{r} \pi^I \mathcal{O}_D(\Delta) \rightarrow 0, \\
 0 &\rightarrow \pi^I \mathcal{O}_D(D) \xrightarrow{i} \pi^I \mathcal{O}_\Delta(\Delta) \xrightarrow{r'} \pi^I \mathcal{O}_{D'}(\Delta) \rightarrow 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Then ρ, ρ', r, r' are restriction maps, since the corresponding maps in the exact sequences without π^I called the *decomposition sequences* [1, p.62] are restriction maps. Since $r' \circ i = r \circ i' = 0$ and $i(a) = -i'(a')$, we have

$$r'(i(a)) = 0, \quad r(i(a)) = -r(i'(a')) = 0.$$

Hence the restrictions of $i(a) \in H^0(\pi^I \mathcal{O}_\Delta(\Delta))$ to D and D' are 0. Let $\tilde{D} \leq \Delta$ be the smallest effective divisor such that $D \leq \tilde{D}$, $D' \leq \tilde{D}$. Then the restriction of $i(a)$ to \tilde{D} is also 0. By using the decomposition $\Delta = D_0 + \tilde{D}$, we obtain the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \pi^I \mathcal{O}_{D_0}(D_0) \xrightarrow{v} \pi^I \mathcal{O}_\Delta(\Delta) \xrightarrow{\tilde{r}} \pi^I \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{D}}(\Delta) \rightarrow 0.$$

Since $\tilde{r}(i(a)) = 0$, we have an element $b \in H^0(\pi^I \mathcal{O}_{D_0}(D_0))$ such that $v(b) = i(a)$. Since $v = i \circ u$ and i is injective, $a = u(b)$. Then $i'(a' + u'(b)) = -i(a) + (i' \circ u')(b) = -i(a) + v(b) = 0$, and hence $a' = -u'(b)$. \square

Fix Hermitian metrics h, h' on E and E' , a function $t \in C^\infty(X, \mathbb{R})$, an integrable connection Σ on N and a nonzero $\bar{\partial}_\Sigma$ -holomorphic section $\xi \in \Omega^0(N) \setminus \{0\}$. (Later we assume that all of them are I -invariant.) Let \mathcal{N} be the holomorphic structure on N induced from Σ . Let $\mathcal{G} = C^\infty(X, S^1)$ act on $(\mathcal{A}(E, h) \times \Omega^0(E)) \times (\mathcal{A}(E', h') \times \Omega^0(E'))$ by

$$((B, \phi), (B', \phi')) \cdot f = ((B, \phi) \cdot f, (B', \phi') \cdot f^{-1}).$$

Consider the following system of equations:

$$(4.24) \quad \begin{cases} \bar{\partial}_B \phi = \bar{\partial}_{B'} \phi' = 0 \\ F_B^{0,2} = F_{B'}^{0,2} = 0 \\ i\Lambda_g(F_B - F_{B'}) + \frac{1}{2}(|\phi|^2 - |\phi'|^2) = t \\ B \otimes B' = \Sigma \\ \phi \otimes \phi' = \xi \end{cases}$$

Suppose that all of h, h', t, Σ and η are I -invariant. Let

$$\mathcal{V}_t(E, E', \Sigma, \xi)^I = \{ I\text{-invariant solutions to (4.24)} \} / \mathcal{G}^I.$$

Theorem 4.25. *The correspondence*

$$((B, \phi), (B', \phi')) \mapsto ((\bar{\partial}_B, \phi), (\bar{\partial}_{B'}, \phi'))$$

induces a homeomorphism

$$\mathcal{V}_t(E, E', \Sigma, \xi)^I \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{M}^s(E, E', \mathcal{N}, \xi)^I$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 4.19. In this case, we need to find an I -invariant function $\psi: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ so that

$$i\Lambda_g \bar{\partial} \partial \psi + \frac{1}{2} e^{2\psi} |\phi|^2 - \frac{1}{2} e^{-2\psi} |\phi'|^2 = t - i\Lambda_g(F_B - F_{B'}).$$

As before, this equation descends to \hat{X} , and it has a unique smooth solution. (See [2] or [19, §3.2].) The rest of the proof is similar. \square

Corollary 4.26. *For η as in Theorem 4.6, let $t = \pi\Lambda_g \eta^{1,1} - s_g/2$.*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}(\hat{X}, \hat{s}_0 \hat{\otimes} \hat{E}) &\cong \mathcal{M}(X; \mathfrak{s}_0 \otimes E)^I \\ &\cong \mathcal{V}_t(E, E^{-1} \otimes K, C^\vee, \eta^{2,0})^I \cong \mathcal{M}^s(E, E^{-1} \otimes K, \mathcal{K}, \eta^{2,0})^I \cong \mathcal{D}_b(\Delta)^I \end{aligned}$$

5. Computation and Examples

The purpose of this section is to compute $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole invariants of several concrete examples.

5.1. Surfaces of general type. In this subsection, we prove Theorem 1.6 on the surfaces of general type and give a series of examples of this type.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. (Cf. [16], Theorem 7.4.1.) The results on the canonical and anti-canonical Spin^{c-} structures follow from Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.3.

Since X is minimal and of general type, $K_X^2 > 0$ and K_X is numerically effective. The latter condition implies $K_X \cdot \omega \geq 0$. But if $K_X \cdot \omega = 0$, then the Hodge index theorem implies $K_X^2 \leq 0$. Therefore $K_X \cdot \omega > 0$.

Suppose that $\text{SW}_X^{\text{Pin}}(\hat{\mathfrak{s}})$ is nonzero for a Spin^{c-} structure $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}$. Let \mathfrak{s} be the canonical reduction of $\pi^*\hat{\mathfrak{s}}$. Let L be the determinant line bundle of \mathfrak{s} . Then there exists a complex line bundle E such that $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{s}_0 \otimes E$. Note that $L = 2E - K_X$.

Since $\text{SW}_X^{\text{Pin}}(\hat{\mathfrak{s}}) \neq 0$, $d(\mathfrak{s}) = 2d(\hat{\mathfrak{s}}) \geq 0$, and therefore $L^2 \geq K_X^2 > 0$. Then $c_1(L)^+$ is not a torsion class, and this implies that there is no reducible solution and $L \cdot \omega \neq 0$.

Suppose $L \cdot \omega > 0$. Since $\text{SW}_X^{\text{Pin}}(\hat{\mathfrak{s}}) \neq 0$, there is an I -invariant holomorphic structure on E and an I -invariant non-zero holomorphic section. Hence $K_X \cdot E \geq 0$ because K_X is numerically effective. Since E can be written as $E = (K_X + L)/2$, $K_X \cdot E \geq 0$ implies $K_X^2 \geq -K_X \cdot L$. Since $K_X \cdot \omega > 0$ and $L \cdot \omega > 0$, there is $t \geq 0$ such that

$$\omega \cdot (K_X + tL) = 0.$$

By the Hodge index theorem, we have

$$0 \geq (K_X + tL)^2 = K_X^2 + 2tK_X \cdot L + t^2L^2 =: f(t).$$

The quadratic function $f(t)$ attains its minimum at $t = -(K_X \cdot L)/L^2$ and the minimum is

$$K_X^2 - \frac{(K_X \cdot L)^2}{L^2}.$$

Since $L^2 \geq K_X^2 \geq -K_X \cdot L$, this quantity is non-negative, and therefore equal to 0. Then we have $L^2 = K_X^2 = -K_X \cdot L$, and we see that $f(t) \leq 0$ only when $t = 1$. Hence $(K_X + L)^2 = 0$ and $(K_X + L) \cdot \omega = 0$. By the Hodge index theorem, we have $K_X + L$ is a torsion class, and therefore E is also a torsion class. Since E has an I -invariant non-zero holomorphic section, E is an I -equivariant trivial bundle. This means $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}$ is the canonical Spin^{c-} structure.

On the other hand, in the case when $L \cdot \omega > 0$, $\text{SW}_X^{\text{Pin}}(\hat{\mathfrak{s}}) \neq 0$ implies the existence of an I -invariant holomorphic structure on $E - K_X$, and an I -invariant holomorphic section on it. Arguing similarly, we can prove that $K_X - L$ is a torsion class, and $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}$ is the anti-canonical Spin^{c-} structure. \square

For a positive integer k , let M_{4k} be the hypersurface in \mathbb{CP}^3 defined by real polynomials of degree $4k$, e.g., $\sum_{j=0}^3 x_j^{4k}$. If $k > 1$, then M_{4k} is a minimal Kähler surfaces of general type. Define the antiholomorphic free involution ι by

$$[x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3] \mapsto [\bar{x}_1, -\bar{x}_0, \bar{x}_3, -\bar{x}_2].$$

Let $\hat{M}_{4k} = M_{4k}/\iota$. We check the assumptions.

Lemma 5.1. *There is a lift of $w_2(\hat{M}_{4k})$ in the torsion part of $H^2(\hat{M}_{4k}; \mathbb{Z})$.*

Proof. See [11]. The proof in [11] is on \hat{M}_4 , but it works well for \hat{M}_{4k} . \square

Proposition 5.2. $w_2(\hat{K}) = 0$ and $w_2(\hat{M}_{4k}) = w_1(\ell_{\mathbb{R}})^2$. $\pi^*: H^1(\hat{M}_{4k}; \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow H^1(M_{4k}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is surjective.

Proof. The fact that $w_2(\hat{K}) = 0$ follows from that the canonical bundle K of M_{4k} is given by

$$K = (4k - 4)H,$$

where H is the hyperplane section. By Lemma 5.1 and [17, §1, Remark 3(2)], there exists a class $\alpha \in H^1(\hat{M}_{4k}; \ell)$ such that $w_2(\hat{M}_{4k}) = \alpha \cup \alpha$. Since $\pi_1(M_{4k}) = 1$, $\pi_1(\hat{M}_{4k}) = \mathbb{Z}/2$, α must be $w_1(\ell_{\mathbb{R}})$ and π^* is surjective. \square

Corollary 5.3. There exists a canonical Spin^{c-} structure \mathfrak{s}_0 on $M_{4k} \rightarrow \hat{M}_{4k}$.

Proposition 5.4. The moduli space for $(\hat{M}_{4k}, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0)$ is orientable and its virtual dimension is 0. Therefore the $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole invariant of $(\hat{M}_{4k}, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0)$ can be defined as a \mathbb{Z} -valued invariant.

Proof. Note $b_1^\ell(\hat{M}_{4k}) = 0$. In order to prove the orientability of the moduli space, it suffices to prove the Dirac index, $\text{ind } D$, of $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0$ is even by [18, Proposition 2.15]. Let $d(\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0)$ be the virtual dimension of the moduli space. Since ι is free, we have $d(\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0) = \frac{1}{2}d(\mathfrak{s}_0) = 0$. Then

$$0 = d(\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0) = \text{ind } D - (b_0^\ell - b_1^\ell + b_+^\ell).$$

Since ℓ is nontrivial, $b_0^\ell = 0$. Therefore

$$\text{ind } D = b_+^\ell = \frac{1}{2}(1 + b_+(M_{4k})) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{4k}{3} \{16k^2 - 24k + 11\} \right).$$

(For the calculation of $b_+(M_{4k})$, see e.g. [15, Example 4.27].) Therefore $\text{ind } D$ is even. \square

Remark 5.5. Note that \hat{M}_4 is diffeomorphic to an Enriques surface. If $k > 1$, then all of the ordinary Seiberg–Witten invariants of \hat{M}_{4k} are zero by a theorem due to S. Wang [30].

5.2. Elliptic surfaces. In this subsection, we compute the $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole invariants of the quotient manifolds of some elliptic surfaces. First, we construct anti-holomorphic involutions on certain elliptic surfaces over \mathbb{CP}^1 .

A method to construct elliptic fibrations by using hyperelliptic involutions is given in Gompf–Stipsicz’s book [9], §3.2. Let Σ_k be a Riemannian surface of genus k , and $h_k: \Sigma_k \rightarrow \Sigma_k$ be a hyperelliptic involution. Take the diagonal \mathbb{Z}_2 -action $h_k \times h_1$ on $\Sigma_k \times \Sigma_1$. Dividing by the \mathbb{Z}_2 -action $h_k \times h_1$, we obtain the quotient $(\Sigma_k \times \Sigma_1)/\mathbb{Z}_2$ with $4(2k + 2)$ singular points. Resolving the singular points produces a complex manifold $X(k + 1)$. Dividing the projection $\text{pr}_1: \Sigma_k \times \Sigma_1 \rightarrow \Sigma_k$ and extending it to the resolution, we obtain the elliptic fibration $\varpi: X(k + 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{CP}^1$. It is well-known that $X(n)$ is diffeomorphic to $E(n)$, the fiber sum of $E(1) = \mathbb{CP}^2 \# 9\overline{\mathbb{CP}}^2$.

We construct an anti-holomorphic free involution on $X(2n)$. Take the antipodal map ι_0 on $\mathbb{CP}^1 = \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ defined by $z \mapsto z^* := -1/\bar{z}$. Choose k distinct points a_1, \dots, a_k on \mathbb{CP}^1 satisfying $0 < |a_i| < 1$. Let Σ_k be the hyperelliptic curve defined by the equation

$$w^2 = z(z - a_1)(z - a_1^*) \cdots (z - a_k)(z - a_k^*),$$

and $\Sigma_k \rightarrow \mathbb{CP}^1$ the associated double covering branched at $a_1, a_1^*, \dots, a_k, a_k^*, 0, \infty$. Then the antipodal map ι_0 on the base \mathbb{CP}^1 can be lifted to an anti-holomorphic map σ_k on Σ_k with order 2 if k is odd, and with order 4 if k is even.

Suppose $k = 2n - 1$ for a positive integer n . Take the diagonal action $\sigma_{2n-1} \times \sigma_1: \Sigma_{2n-1} \times \Sigma_1 \rightarrow \Sigma_{2n-1} \times \Sigma_1$. Then $\sigma_{2n-1} \times \sigma_1$ descends to a free involution on the quotient $(\Sigma_{2n-1} \times \Sigma_1)/\mathbb{Z}_2$. Furthermore we can easily extend it to an anti-holomorphic free involution ι on $X(2n)$ which covers the antipodal map ι_0 on the base \mathbb{CP}^1 .

Proposition 5.6. *The surface $X(2n)$ admits a Kähler form ω such that $\iota^*\omega = -\omega$.*

Proof. We can easily construct a Kähler form ω_0 on $\Sigma_k \times \Sigma_1$ such that $(h_k \times h_1)^*\omega_0 = \omega_0$ and $(\sigma_k \times \sigma_1)^*\omega_0 = -\omega_0$. Then ω_0 induces a singular Kähler form $\hat{\omega}_0$ on $(\Sigma_k \times \Sigma_1)/\mathbb{Z}_2$. By the results due to Fujiki [8], we can obtain a Kähler form ω on $X(2n)$. Moreover we can choose ω such that $\iota^*\omega = -\omega$. \square

Let $\hat{X}(2n) = X(2n)/\iota$. By construction, $\varpi: X(2n) \rightarrow \mathbb{CP}^1$ descends to $\hat{\varpi}: \hat{X}(2n) \rightarrow \mathbb{RP}^2$. The general fiber of $\hat{\varpi}$ is a torus. Note that $X(2) = E(2)$ is a $K3$ surface.

Proposition 5.7. *The quotient manifold $\hat{X}(2) = X(2)/\iota$ is diffeomorphic to an Enriques surface.*

Proof. ([5] and [4], §15.1.) Take an I -invariant holomorphic form ϕ on $X(2)$. By the Calabi-Yau theorem, there exists a unique Kähler-Einstein metric. Then ϕ and ω induce a hyper-Kähler structure on $X(2)$. There exists a complex structure for which ι is a holomorphic free involution. Thus $\hat{X}(2)$ is an Enriques surface. \square

Since $X(2n)$ is diffeomorphic to the fiber sum of $E(2) = K3$ with $E(2n - 2)$, $\hat{X}(2n)$ is diffeomorphic to the fiber sum of the fibration $\hat{\varpi}: \hat{X}(2) \rightarrow \mathbb{RP}^2$ with $E(n - 1)$.

Proposition 5.8. *If $k \equiv 2$ modulo 4, then there exists a canonical Spin^c -structure $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0$ on $X(k) \rightarrow \hat{X}(k)$.*

Proof. Since $\hat{X}(4m + 2)$ is the fiber sum of $\hat{\varpi}: \hat{X}(2) \rightarrow \mathbb{RP}^2$ and $E(2m)$, it is easy to see that $\hat{X}(4m + 2)$ is a non-spin manifold with $\pi_1(\hat{X}(4m + 2)) = \mathbb{Z}/2$ whose intersection form is isomorphic to

$$(2m + 1)(-E_8) \oplus (4m + 1)H,$$

where H is a hyperbolic form. Then it follows from a result of Hambleton-Kreck [12] (Cf. [29]) that $\hat{X}(4m + 2)$ is homeomorphic to the connected sum

$$\Sigma \# (2m + 1)|E_8| \# (4m + 1)(S^2 \times S^2),$$

where Σ is a rational homology 4-sphere such that $\pi_1(\Sigma) = \mathbb{Z}/2$ and $w_2(\Sigma) \neq 0$, and $|E_8|$ is the E_8 -manifold, i.e., the simply-connected topological manifold whose intersection form is isomorphic to $-E_8$. Since $|E_8|$ and $S^2 \times S^2$ are spin and $w_2(\Sigma)$ is a torsion class, $w_2(\hat{X}(4m + 2))$ is a torsion class.

Since the canonical divisor K of $X(n)$ is $K = (n - 2)F$, where F is a general fiber, we can see that $\tilde{c}_1(\hat{K})$ is divided by 2 if $n = 4m + 2$. The rest of the proof is similar to that of Proposition 5.2. \square

Take an I -invariant divisor D_k of $X(n)$ of the form

$$D_k = \sum_{i=1}^k (F_i + IF_i),$$

where F_i are general fibers. Let E_k be the line bundle associated to D_k . Then E_k can be written as the pull-back $E_k = \varpi^*L$ where $\varpi: X(n) \rightarrow \mathbb{CP}^1$ is the elliptic fibration and L is a line bundle over \mathbb{CP}^1 of degree $2k$. Let $\hat{E}_k = E_k/I$.

The next is an analogue of [7, Proposition 4.2] or [3, Proposition 42].

Theorem 5.9. *Let $\hat{X} = \hat{X}(4m + 2)$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_k = \hat{\mathfrak{s}}_0 \hat{\otimes} \hat{E}_k$. The moduli space $\hat{\mathcal{M}}(\hat{X}, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}_k)$ is orientable and the corresponding invariant is*

$$\text{SW}^{\text{Pin}}(\hat{X}, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}_k) = \pm \binom{2m}{k}.$$

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 5.9. For $q \in \mathbb{CP}^1$, let $q^* = \iota_0(q)$ where ι_0 is the antipodal map. Choose $2m$ distinct points q_1, \dots, q_{2m} on \mathbb{CP}^1 such that all of q_1, \dots, q_{2m} and q_1^*, \dots, q_{2m}^* are distinct. Let $F_i = \varpi^{-1}(q_i)$. Then $IF_i = \varpi^{-1}(q_i^*)$, and we obtain an I -invariant canonical divisor $D_m = \sum_{i=1}^{2m} (F_i + IF_i)$ of $X = X(4m + 2)$. Let η be the corresponding I -invariant holomorphic section on the canonical bundle \mathcal{K} . By Corollary 4.26, the $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole moduli space $\mathcal{M}(\hat{X}, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}_k)$ is identified with

$$\mathcal{V}_t(E, E', \Sigma, \eta)^I \cong \mathcal{M}^s(E, E', \mathcal{K}, \eta)^I \cong \mathcal{D}_b(\Delta)^I,$$

where $E' = K \otimes E^{-1}$ and $\Delta = Z(\eta)$.

Lemma 5.10. *The moduli space $\mathcal{M}(\hat{X}, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}_k)$ is 0-dimensional and orientable.*

Proof. Let \mathfrak{s}_k be the Spin^c structure on X of the canonical reduction of $\pi^*\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_k$. Note that $c_1(L)^2 = 0$, $\tau(X) = -16(2m + 1)$ and $2e(X) + 3\tau(X) = 0$, where $L = K^{-1} \otimes E_k^2$ is the determinant line bundle, and $e(X)$ and $\tau(X)$ are the Euler characteristic and signature of X . Then the virtual dimension $d(\mathfrak{s}_k)$ of the Seiberg–Witten moduli space of (X, \mathfrak{s}_k) is

$$d(\mathfrak{s}_k) = \frac{1}{4}(c_1(L)^2 - 2e(X) - 3\tau(X)) = 0.$$

Then we have $d(\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_k) = d(\mathfrak{s}_k)/2 = 0$.

Since the index of the Dirac operator $D_{\hat{A}}$ on $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_k$ is a half of that on \mathfrak{s} , we have

$$\text{ind } D_{\hat{A}} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{4}(c_1(L)^2 - \tau(X)) \right) = 4m + 2.$$

Especially, $\text{ind } D_{\hat{A}}$ is even. Then the moduli space is orientable by [18, Proposition 2.15]. \square

Proposition 5.11. *Every $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole solution corresponding to a divisor $D \in \mathcal{D}_b(\Delta)^I$ is non-degenerate.*

Proof. Since $D_m - D$ and D have no intersection for $D \in \mathcal{D}_b(\Delta)^I$, Proposition 4.23 implies that the first cohomology H^1 of the deformation complex of the solution corresponding to D is 0. Therefore the second cohomology H^2 is also 0 since $d(\mathfrak{E}_k) = 0$ and $H^1 = 0$. \square

For a subset $\{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \subset \{1, \dots, 2m\}$, we have an I -invariant divisor $\sum_{j=1}^k (F_{i_j} + IF_{i_j}) \in \mathcal{D}_b(\Delta)^I$. Since this correspondence is bijective, the number of elements in $\mathcal{D}_b(\Delta)^I$ is $\binom{2m}{k}$. In order to complete the proof of Theorem 5.9, we show that all of the divisors in $\mathcal{D}_b(\Delta)^I$ have same orientation.

Proposition 5.12. *For distinct points $b_1, \dots, b_k \in \mathbb{CP}^1$, consider the divisor $B = b_1 + \dots + b_k$. Let $F_j = \varpi^*(b_j)$ and $D = F_1 + \dots + F_j$. Then $\varpi^*: H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{CP}^1}(B)) \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(D))$ is an isomorphism, and*

$$H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(D)) = \mathbb{C}^{k+1}, \quad H^1(\mathcal{O}_X(D)) = 0, \quad H^2(\mathcal{O}_X(D)) = \mathbb{C}^{4m-k}$$

Proof. Consider the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(D) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_D(D) \rightarrow 0$$

and its associated long exact sequence. Note that $\mathcal{O}_{F_j}(D)$ is the holomorphic normal bundle of $F_j \subset X$. Since this is holomorphically trivial and the genus of F_j is 1, we have

$$H^0(\mathcal{O}_D(D)) = H^1(\mathcal{O}_D(D)) = \mathbb{C}^k.$$

Since X is simply-connected, $H^1(\mathcal{O}_X) = 0$ and therefore

$$H^1(\mathcal{O}_X(D)) = H^0(\mathcal{O}_X) \oplus H^1(\mathcal{O}_D(D)) = \mathbb{C}^{k+1}.$$

By the Serre duality,

$$H^2(\mathcal{O}_X(D)) = H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(K - D)) = \mathbb{C}^{4m-k}.$$

Also we have $H^1(\mathcal{O}_X(D)) = 0$. \square

Let $\mathfrak{t} = (B, \phi, \psi) \in \mathcal{A}(E, h) \times \Omega^{0,0}(E) \times \Omega^{2,0}(E^{-1})$ be an I -invariant solution to (4.24), i.e., $((B, \phi), (B', \phi'))$ where $B' = \Sigma \otimes B^{-1}$ and $\phi' = \psi$ is I -invariant and satisfies (4.24). The deformation complex at \mathfrak{t} is given by

$$(i\Omega_X^0)^I \xrightarrow{D_{\mathfrak{t}}^0} (i\Omega_X^1 \oplus \Omega^{0,0}(E) \oplus \Omega^{2,0}(E^{-1}))^I \xrightarrow{D_{\mathfrak{t}}^1} \left(\Omega^{0,1}(E) \oplus i \left(\Omega_X^{0,2} \oplus \Omega_X^{1,1} \right) \right)^I,$$

$$D_{\mathfrak{t}}^0(f) = \begin{pmatrix} df \\ f\phi \\ -f\psi \end{pmatrix}, \quad D_{\mathfrak{t}}^1(\dot{B}, \dot{\phi}, \dot{\psi}) = \begin{pmatrix} \dot{B}^{0,1}\phi + w(\dot{B}^{0,1})^*\bar{\psi} + \bar{\partial}_B\dot{\phi} + \bar{\partial}_B^*\bar{\psi} \\ \bar{\partial}\dot{B}^{0,1} - \frac{1}{2}\bar{\psi}\dot{\phi} - \frac{1}{2}\bar{\psi}\dot{\bar{\phi}} \\ \left\{ \Lambda_g d\dot{B} - i[\text{Re}(\dot{\phi}\bar{\phi}) - \text{Re}(\bar{\psi}\dot{\psi})] \right\} \omega \end{pmatrix},$$

where $w(\dot{B}^{0,1})^*$ is the adjoint of the multiplication operator $\dot{B}^{0,1} \wedge \cdot$. The adjoint of $D_{\mathfrak{t}}^0$ is

$$(D_{\mathfrak{t}}^0)^*(\dot{B}, \dot{\phi}, \dot{\psi}) = d^*\dot{B} - i\text{Im}(\dot{\phi}\bar{\phi}) + i\text{Im}(\bar{\psi}\dot{\psi}).$$

Set $\dot{b} = \sqrt{2}\dot{B}$, $U = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\phi$, $V = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\psi$. Replace \dot{b} by $\dot{b}^{0,1}$ via the identification $i\Omega_X \cong \Omega^{0,1}$. We introduce the operators $Q_{\mathfrak{t}}$ and $Q_{\mathfrak{t}}^0$ by

$$Q_{\mathfrak{t}} = \begin{pmatrix} -\text{id} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{2}\text{id} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}i\omega} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} D_{\mathfrak{t}}^1 \\ (D_{\mathfrak{t}}^0)^* \end{pmatrix},$$

$$Q_{\mathfrak{t}} \begin{pmatrix} \dot{b} \\ \dot{\phi} \\ \dot{\psi} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -b^{0,1}U - w(\dot{b}^{0,1})^*\bar{V} - \bar{\partial}_B\dot{\phi} - \bar{\partial}_B^*\bar{\psi} \\ \bar{\partial}\dot{b}^{0,1} - \bar{V}\bar{\phi} - \bar{\psi}\bar{U} \\ \bar{\partial}^*\dot{b}^{0,1} - \dot{\phi}\bar{U} + \bar{V}\dot{\psi} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$Q_{\mathfrak{t}}^0 \begin{pmatrix} \dot{b} \\ \dot{\phi} \\ \dot{\psi} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -\bar{\partial}_B\dot{\phi} - \bar{\partial}_B^*\bar{\psi} \\ \bar{\partial}\dot{b}^{0,1} \\ \bar{\partial}^*\dot{b}^{0,1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let K_0 and C_0 be the kernel and cokernel of $Q_{\mathfrak{t}}^0$, respectively,

$$K_0 := \ker Q_{\mathfrak{t}}^0 = \ker(\bar{\partial}_B + \bar{\partial}_B^*)^I \oplus \mathbb{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_X)^I,$$

$$C_0 := \text{coker } Q_{\mathfrak{t}}^0 = \ker(\bar{\partial}_B^* \oplus \bar{\partial}_B)^I \oplus \mathbb{H}^2(\mathcal{O}_X)^I \oplus \mathbb{H}^0(\mathcal{O})^I.$$

Note that $\mathbb{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_X) = 0$ since $b_1(X) = 0$. By Proposition 5.12, $\ker(\bar{\partial}_B^* \oplus \bar{\partial}_B) = H^1(\mathcal{O}_X(D)) = 0$.

To see the orientation of the solution \mathfrak{t} , we consider

$$\text{pr}_{C_0} \circ (Q_{\mathfrak{t}}|_{K_0}): K_0 = \ker(\bar{\partial}_B + \bar{\partial}_B^*)^I \rightarrow C_0 = H^2(\mathcal{O}_X)^I \oplus H^0(\mathcal{O}_X)^I.$$

This can be identified with

$$R_{\mathfrak{t}}: H^0(D)^I \oplus H^0(K - D)^I \rightarrow H^0(K)^I \oplus H^0(\mathcal{O}_X)^I,$$

$$R_{\mathfrak{t}} \begin{pmatrix} \dot{\phi} \\ \dot{\psi} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -V\dot{\phi} - U\dot{\psi} \\ \int(-\langle \dot{\phi}, U \rangle + \langle \dot{\psi}, V \rangle) d\text{vol}_g \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that $R_{\mathfrak{t}}$ is a linear isomorphism. If we fix orientations of the domain and target of $R_{\mathfrak{t}}$, the orientation of the solution \mathfrak{t} is determined by the sign of the determinant of $R_{\mathfrak{t}}$. (See e.g. [27], [19].) We want to represent $R_{\mathfrak{t}}$ by a matrix with some explicit bases of $H^0(D)^I \oplus H^0(K - D)^I$ and $H^0(K)^I \oplus H^0(\mathcal{O}_X)^I$.

Consider a complex manifold Z with a divisor D . Let \mathcal{L}_D be the holomorphic line bundle associated with D . Then $H^0(\mathcal{L}_D)$ can be identified with the space of meromorphic functions f such that λf are holomorphic for every local defining function λ of D . This space is denoted by $\mathfrak{M}(D)$. Note that $1 \in \mathfrak{M}(D)$ corresponds to the holomorphic section ϕ_D defined by the divisor D .

Suppose ι is an anti-holomorphic free involution on Z and the divisor D is I -invariant. The I -action on $H^0(\mathcal{L}_D) = \mathfrak{M}(D)$ is given by $f \mapsto \overline{\iota^* f}$.

Consider $(Z, \iota) = (\mathbb{CP}^1, \iota_0)$ where ι_0 is the antipodal map. Choose $p \in \mathbb{C} \subset \mathbb{CP}^1$ such that $|p| = 1$. Let $p^* = \iota_0(p) = -1/\bar{p} = -p$. Take the ι_0 -invariant divisor $B = p + p^*$. In terms of meromorphic functions, we can take the following for a complex basis of $\mathfrak{M}(B) = H^0(\mathcal{L}_B)$.

$$1, \quad \frac{z - p^*}{z - p}, \quad \frac{z - p}{z - p^*}.$$

We want to have a (real) basis for $\mathfrak{M}(B)^I = H^0(\mathcal{L}_B)^I$. Via the projection to the I -invariant part, $f \mapsto \frac{1}{2}(f + If)$, we see that the following is a real basis for $\mathfrak{M}(B)^I = H^0(\mathcal{L}_B)^I$:

$$1, \quad i \frac{z^2 + p^2}{z^2 - p^2}, \quad \frac{2pz}{z^2 - p^2}.$$

Let us consider the case of $\varpi: X = X(4m+2) \rightarrow \mathbb{CP}^1$ with the antiholomorphic involution ι . Choose $2m$ distinct points $p_1, \dots, p_k, q_1, \dots, q_{2m-k}$ on \mathbb{CP}^1 such that $|p_j| = 1$, $|q_l| = 1$, and all of p_j, p_j^*, q_l, q_l^* are distinct. Take the following divisors on \mathbb{CP}^1 :

$$B_D = \sum_{j=1}^k (p_j + p_j^*), \quad B_{K-D} = \sum_{l=1}^{2m-k} (q_l + q_l^*), \quad B_K = B_D + B_{K-D}.$$

Then $K = \varpi^* B_K$ is a canonical divisor of X . Let $D = \varpi^* B_D$. Then $K - D = \varpi^* B_{K-D}$. Let

$$P_j^1 = i \frac{z^2 + p_j^2}{z^2 - p_j^2}, \quad P_j^2 = \frac{2p_j z}{z^2 - p_j^2}, \quad Q_l^1 = i \frac{z^2 + q_l^2}{z^2 - q_l^2}, \quad Q_l^2 = \frac{2q_l z}{z^2 - q_l^2}.$$

Then $\{1, P_j^1, P_j^2\}$ ($j = 1, \dots, k$) is a basis of $\mathfrak{M}(B_D)^I = H^0(B_D)^I \cong H^0(D)^I$. Similarly, $\{1, Q_l^1, Q_l^2\}$ ($l = 1, \dots, 2m-k$) and $\{1, P_j^1, P_j^2, Q_l^1, Q_l^2\}$ ($j = 1, \dots, k, l = 1, \dots, 2m-k$) are bases of $\mathfrak{M}(B_{K-D})^I = H^0(B_{K-D})^I \cong H^0(K-D)^I$ and $\mathfrak{M}(B_K) = H^0(B_K)^I \cong H^0(K)^I$, respectively.

Now the divisor D corresponds to an I -invariant solution $\mathfrak{t} = (B, \phi, \psi)$ such that $\phi^{-1}(0) = D$ and $\psi^{-1}(0) = K - D$. We may assume the following correspondence,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 \in \mathfrak{M}(B_D)^I &\longleftrightarrow U = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \phi \in H^0(D)^I \\ 1 \in \mathfrak{M}(B_{K-D})^I &\longleftrightarrow V = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \psi \in H^0(K-D)^I \\ 1 \in \mathfrak{M}(B_K)^I &\longleftrightarrow W := U \otimes V \in H^0(K)^I \end{aligned}$$

and, for $f \in \mathfrak{M}(D)$, let fU denote the holomorphic section in $H^0(D)$ corresponding to f .

Let $\{e\}$ be a real basis of $H^0(\mathcal{O}_X)^I \cong \mathbb{R}$. We choose the basis for $H^0(D)^I \oplus H^0(K-D)^I$ as follows,

$$(5.13) \quad \{U, P_j^1 U, P_j^2 U\}_{j=1, \dots, k} \cup \{V, Q_l^1 V, Q_l^2 V\}_{l=1, \dots, 2m-k},$$

and for $H^0(K)^I \oplus H^0(\mathcal{O}_X)^I$,

$$(5.14) \quad \{W, P_j^1 W, P_j^2 W, Q_l^1 W, Q_l^2 W\}_{j=1, \dots, k}^{l=1, \dots, 2m-k} \cup \{e\},$$

With respect to the above bases, the isomorphism R_t is represented by the matrix

$$\begin{array}{c} U \quad P_1^1 U \quad P_1^2 U \quad \cdots \quad V \quad Q_1^1 V \quad Q_1^2 V \quad \cdots \\ \begin{array}{l} W \\ P_1^1 W \\ P_1^2 W \\ \vdots \\ Q_1^1 W \\ Q_1^2 W \\ \vdots \\ e \end{array} \end{array} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & -1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & -1 & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \\ -\|U\|^2 & -\langle U, P_1^1 U \rangle & -\langle U, P_1^2 U \rangle & \cdots & \|V\|^2 & \langle V, Q_1^1 V \rangle & \langle V, Q_1^2 V \rangle & \cdots \end{pmatrix}$$

It is easy to see that the determinant of the above matrix is $-\|U\|^2 - \|V\|^2$.

In order to prove any other solution t' has the same orientation with the solution t for D above, we need to prove that the determinant of the matrix $R_{t'}$ associated with t' has the same sign with $\det R_t$.

For simplicity, we consider the case when $m = 2$, $k = 1$. The generalization to other cases will be obvious. Take the solution t corresponding to the divisors $D = \varpi^*(p_1 + p_1^* + p_2 + p_2^*)$ and $K - D = \varpi^*(q_1 + q_1^* + q_2 + q_2^*)$. Exchanging p_1 and q_1 , we obtain another I -invariant solution t' corresponding to $D' = \varpi^*(q_1 + q_1^* + p_2 + p_2^*)$ and $K - D' = \varpi^*(p_1 + p_1^* + q_2 + q_2^*)$. Let U, V be the holomorphic sections for t , and U', V' for t' . Without loss of generality, we may assume U', V' are related with U, V by

$$U' = \frac{p_1 z^2 - q_1^2}{q_1 z^2 - p_1^2} U, \quad V' = \frac{q_1 z^2 - p_1^2}{p_1 z^2 - q_1^2} V.$$

The meaning of this is as follows: When the holomorphic section U' associated with the solution t' is considered as an element of $H^0(D)^I = \mathfrak{M}(D)^I$ (not of $\mathfrak{M}(D')^I$), it is represented by the meromorphic function $\frac{p_1 z^2 - q_1^2}{q_1 z^2 - p_1^2}$.

We want to represent the map $R_{t'}$

$$R_{t'} \begin{pmatrix} \dot{\phi} \\ \dot{\psi} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -V' \dot{\phi} - U' \dot{\psi} \\ \int (-\langle \dot{\phi}, U' \rangle + \langle \dot{\psi}, V' \rangle) d\text{vol}_g \end{pmatrix}$$

by a matrix with respect to the bases (5.13), (5.14).

Before that we note several useful relations. For p_j and q_l with $|p_j| = |q_l| = 1$, let a, b be the real numbers such that $\frac{p_j}{q_l} = a + ib$. Then we have the following relations.

$$\begin{aligned} P_j^1 Q_l^1 &= -1 + \frac{a}{b} P_j^1 - \frac{a}{b} Q_l^1 \\ P_j^1 Q_l^2 &= \frac{1}{b} P_j^2 - \frac{a}{b} Q_l^2 \\ P_j^2 Q_l^1 &= -\frac{1}{b} Q_l^2 + \frac{a}{b} P_j^2 \\ P_j^2 Q_l^2 &= -\frac{1}{b} P_j^1 + \frac{1}{b} Q_l^1 \end{aligned}$$

Let a, b, c, d, e, f be the real numbers such that

$$\frac{p_1}{q_1} = a + ib, \quad \frac{p_2}{q_1} = c + id, \quad \frac{p_1}{q_2} = e + if.$$

Then we have $U' = (a + bP_1^1)U$, $V' = (a - bQ_1^1)V$, and the map $R_{U'}$ is represented by the matrix

$$\begin{array}{c} W \\ P_1^1 W \\ P_1^2 W \\ P_2^1 W \\ P_2^2 W \\ Q_1^1 W \\ Q_1^2 W \\ Q_2^1 W \\ Q_2^2 W \\ e \end{array} \begin{pmatrix} U & P_1^1 U & P_1^2 U & P_2^1 U & P_2^2 U & V & Q_1^1 V & Q_1^2 V & Q_2^1 V & Q_2^2 V \\ -a & -b & & -b & & -a & b & & b & \\ & & & & & -b & -a & & -\frac{be}{f} & \\ & & & & & & & -1 & & -\frac{b}{f} \\ & & & -\frac{ad-bc}{d} & & & & & & \\ & & & & -\frac{ad-bc}{d} & & & & & \\ b & -a & & \frac{bc}{d} & & & & & & \\ & & -1 & & -\frac{b}{d} & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & -\frac{af-be}{f} & & \\ -u_0 & -u_1^1 & -u_1^2 & -u_2^1 & -u_2^2 & v_0 & v_1^1 & v_1^2 & v_2^1 & v_2^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

where $u_0 = \langle U, U' \rangle$, $u_j^a = \langle P_j^a U, U' \rangle$, $v_0 = \langle V, V' \rangle$, $v_l^b = \langle Q_l^b V, V' \rangle$. Furthermore, we take one more *orientation-preserving* basis change given by

$$\begin{aligned} (U, P_1^1 U) \begin{pmatrix} a & -b \\ b & a \end{pmatrix} &= (U', (-b + aP_1^1)U), \\ (V, Q_1^1 V) \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ -b & a \end{pmatrix} &= (V', (b + aQ_1^1)V). \end{aligned}$$

Then the matrix above is transformed into

$$\begin{pmatrix} -1 & & -b & & -1 & & & b & & \\ & & & & & -1 & & -\frac{be}{f} & & \\ & & & & & & -1 & & -\frac{b}{f} & \\ & & -\frac{ad-bc}{d} & & & & & & & \\ & & & -\frac{ad-bc}{d} & & & & & & \\ -1 & & & \frac{bc}{d} & & & & & & \\ & -1 & & & -\frac{b}{d} & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & -\frac{af-be}{f} & & \\ & & & & & & & & -\frac{af-be}{f} & \\ -\|U'\|^2 & * & * & * & * & \|V'\|^2 & * & * & * & * \end{pmatrix}$$

where $*$ are some numbers of inner products of sections. It is easy to see that the determinant of the above matrix is

$$-\left(\frac{ad-bc}{d}\right)^2 \left(\frac{af-be}{f}\right)^2 (\|U'\|^2 + \|V'\|^2).$$

Since $\det R_t$ and $\det R_{t'}$ have the same sign, the orientation of the solution t' is same with that of t .

The above proof is easily generalized to the cases when $k \neq 1$ or $m \neq 2$, and we see that the orientation does not change by an exchange of some p_j and q_l . Thus Theorem 5.9 is proved.

6. Concluding remarks

6.1. More examples with nontrivial $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole invariants. By using the gluing formulae in [18], we obtain more examples with nontrivial $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole invariants. Let $Z \rightarrow \hat{Z}$ be a nontrivial double covering which satisfies the following:

- (1) $b_+^{\ell'}(\hat{Z}) = 0$ for $\ell' = Z \times_{\{\pm 1\}} \mathbb{Z}$.
- (2) There is a Spin^c -structure \mathfrak{s}' on $Z \rightarrow \hat{Z}$ whose characteristic bundle \hat{L}' satisfies $\tilde{c}_1(\hat{L}')^2 = \text{sign}(Z)$.

(For instance, a connected sum of several $S^2 \times \Sigma_g$ and $S^1 \times W$ has a double cover satisfying the above conditions [18, §1.2], where Σ_g is a Riemann surface with genus $g \geq 1$ and W is a closed 3-manifold.) Then [18, Theorem 3.11] implies that $\hat{M}_{4k} \# \hat{Z}$ and $\hat{X}(4m+2) \# \hat{Z}$ has nontrivial $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole invariants.

Furthermore, [18, Theorem 3.13] implies that any connected sum $\hat{Y}_1 \# \cdots \# \hat{Y}_N$ such that each \hat{Y}_i is \hat{M}_{4k} or $\hat{X}(4m+2)$ for any k or m has nontrivial $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole invariants.

As an application of the nontriviality of the $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole invariants, we have the adjunction inequality for local-coefficient classes [18, Theorem 1.15].

6.2. Problems. We suggest several problems for future researches.

- Generalize the results to the case of the real structures *with real parts*. If we can drop the condition that ι is *free* in our story, then we might expect some applications to, say, real algebraic geometry. For this purpose, we need to generalize the notion of the Spin^c -structure.
- Analogy of $\text{SW}=\text{Gr}$ [26]. Can SW^{Pin} be identified with some kind of *real* Gromov–Witten invariant? Cf. Tian–Wang [28].
- What is the counter part of $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole equations in Donaldson theory? Is there a version of Witten’s conjecture between $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole theory and Donaldson theory? More concretely, is SW^{Pin} equivalent to some kind of Donaldson invariants?

References

- [1] Wolf Barth, Klaus Hulek, Chris Peters, and Antonius Van de Ven, *Compact complex surfaces*, Ergebnisse der Math. ihrer Grenzgebiete, vol. 4, Springer, 2015.
- [2] Olivier Biquard, *Les équations de Seiberg–Witten sur une surface complexe non Kählérienne*, Communications in Analysis and Geometry **6** (1998), no. 1, 173–197.
- [3] Rogier Brussee, *The canonical class and the C^∞ properties of Kähler surfaces*, New York J. Math **2** (1996), 103–146.
- [4] Alexander Degtyarev, Ilia Itenberg, and Viatcheslav Kharlamov, *Real Enriques surfaces*, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1746, Springer, 2000.
- [5] S. K. Donaldson, *Yang–Mills invariants of four-manifolds*, Geometry of low-dimensional manifolds, 1 (Durham, 1989), 1990, pp. 5–40.
- [6] Robert Friedman and John W Morgan, *Algebraic surfaces and Seiberg–Witten invariants*, J. Algebraic geom. **6** (1997), 445–479.
- [7] ———, *Obstruction bundles, semiregularity, and Seiberg–Witten invariants*, Communications in Analysis and Geometry **7** (1999), no. 3, 451–495.
- [8] Akira Fujiki, *Kählerian normal complex surfaces*, Tohoku Mathematical Journal, Second Series **35** (1983), no. 1, 101–117.
- [9] Robert E Gompf and András I Stipsicz, *4-manifolds and Kirby calculus*, Graduate Studies in Math., vol. 20, American Mathematical Society Providence, RI, 1999.
- [10] Alexandre Grothendieck, *Sur quelques points d’algèbre homologique*, Tohoku Mathematical Journal, Second Series **9** (1957), no. 2, 119–183.
- [11] Nathan Habegger, *Une variété de dimension 4 avec forme d’intersection paire et signature -8* , Comm. Math. Helv. **57** (1982), 22–24.

- [12] Ian Hambleton and Matthias Kreck, *Smooth structures on algebraic surfaces with cyclic fundamental group*, *Inventiones mathematicae* **91** (1988), no. 1, 53–59.
- [13] Jerry L Kazdan and Frank W Warner, *Curvature functions for compact 2-manifolds*, *Annals of Mathematics* (1974), 14–47.
- [14] Dieter Kotschick, *The Seiberg–Witten invariants of symplectic four-manifolds*, *Séminaire Bourbaki* **38** (1995), 195–220.
- [15] Dusa McDuff and Dietmar Salamon, *Introduction to symplectic topology*, Oxford University Press, 1998.
- [16] John W Morgan, *The Seiberg–Witten Equations and Applications to the Topology of Smooth Four-Manifolds*, *Mathematical Notes Ser.*, vol. 44, Princeton University Press, 2014.
- [17] Nobuhiro Nakamura, *$\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole equations and intersection forms with local coefficients of four-manifolds*, *Math. Ann.* **357** (2013), no. 3, 915–939.
- [18] ———, *$\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole invariants*, *J. Differential Geom.* **101** (2015), no. 3, 507–549.
- [19] Liviu I Nicolaescu, *Notes on Seiberg–Witten theory*, *Graduate Studies in Math.*, vol. 28, American Mathematical Soc., 2000.
- [20] Hiroshi Ohta and Kaoru Ono, *Simple singularities and symplectic fillings*, *Journal of Differential Geometry* **69** (2005), no. 1, 001–042.
- [21] Robert Silhol, *Real algebraic surfaces*, *Lecture Notes in Math.*, vol. 1392, Springer, 2006.
- [22] Andreas Stieglitz, *Equivariant sheaf cohomology*, *manuscripta mathematica* **26** (1978), no. 1-2, 201–221.
- [23] Clifford Henry Taubes, *The Seiberg–Witten invariants and symplectic forms*, *Math. Res. Lett.* **1** (1994), no. 6, 809–822, DOI 10.4310/MRL.1994.v1.n6.a15. MR1306023 (95j:57039)
- [24] ———, *More constraints on symplectic forms from Seiberg–Witten invariants*, *Math. Res. Lett.* **2** (1995), no. 1, 9–13.
- [25] ———, *$SW \Rightarrow Gr$: From the Seiberg–Witten Equations to Pseudo-Holomorphic Curves*, *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* **9** (1996), no. 3, 845–918.
- [26] ———, *Seiberg–Witten and Gromov invariants for symplectic 4-manifolds*, *International Press Somerville, MA*, 2000.
- [27] Andrei Teleman, *Introduction à la théorie de jauge*, *Cours spécialisés, SMF*, 2012.
- [28] Gang Tian and Shuguang Wang, *Orientability and real Seiberg–Witten invariants*, *International Journal of Mathematics* **20** (2009), no. 05, 573–604.
- [29] Masaaki Ue, *Topology of elliptic surfaces*, *Sugaku* **44** (1992).
- [30] Shuguang Wang, *A vanishing theorem for Seiberg–Witten invariants*, *Math. Res. Letters* **2** (1995), 305–310.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, DIVISION OF LIBERAL ARTS, OSAKA MEDICAL COLLEGE, 2-7 DAIGAKU-MACHI, TAKATSUKI CITY, OSAKA, 569-8686, JAPAN

E-mail address: mat002@osaka-med.ac.jp