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Abstract. Given a smooth projective variety, a Chow–Künneth decomposition is called multiplicative if it is compatible with the intersection product. Following works of Beauville and Voisin, Shen and Vial conjectured that hyper-Kähler varieties admit a multiplicative Chow–Künneth decomposition. In this paper, based on the mysterious link between Fano varieties with cohomology of K3 type and hyper-Kähler varieties, we ask whether Fano varieties with cohomology of K3 type also admit a multiplicative Chow–Künneth decomposition, and provide evidence by establishing their existence for cubic fourfolds and Küchle fourfolds of type $c7$. On the other end of the spectrum, we also give evidence that varieties with ample canonical class and with cohomology of K3 type might admit a multiplicative Chow–Künneth decomposition, by establishing this for two families of Todorov surfaces.

Introduction

Multiplicative Chow–Künneth decompositions. Let $X$ be a smooth projective variety over a field $k$. A multiplicative Chow–Künneth decomposition – abbreviated MCK decomposition – for $X$ is a decomposition of the Chow motive of $X$, considered as an algebra object, that lifts the Künneth decomposition of its homological motive (when it exists). This notion was first introduced in [57] as a way to make explicitly verifiable the splitting principle for hyper-Kähler varieties due to Beauville [3]. Having a multiplicative Chow–Künneth decomposition is a restrictive condition on the variety $X$ and determining the class of varieties that could admit an MCK decomposition is still elusive. A precise definition of MCK decomposition is given in §1 and examples of varieties admitting or not admitting MCK decompositions are reviewed. Nonetheless, Beauville’s splitting principle suggests that the situation for hyper-Kähler varieties is special.

Conjecture 1 (Shen–Vial [57]). Any hyper-Kähler variety admits a multiplicative Chow–Künneth decomposition.

In fact, it could be moreover expected that, if it exists, such an MCK decomposition is unique for hyper-Kähler varieties. So far, Conjecture 1 has been established in the hyper-Kähler world for K3 surfaces [5] (reinterpreted by [57, Prop. 8.14]), Hilbert schemes of points on K3 surfaces [64], generalized Kummer varieties [17] and all hyper-Kähler varieties birationally equivalent to these examples by [53].

Fano varieties of cohomological K3 type. A smooth projective complex variety is said to be of cohomological K3 type, or more succinctly of K3 type, if it is even-dimensional, say $\dim X = 2m$, and the Hodge numbers $h^{p,q}(X)$ are 0 for all $p \neq q$ except for $h^{m−1,m+1}(X) = h^{m+1,m−1}(X) = 1$. Since the foundational work of Beauville–Donagi [4], it has become clear that hyper-Kähler varieties are intimately related to Fano varieties of cohomological K3 type.
The folklore expectation seems to be that to any Fano variety of K3 type can be associated geometrically (via a moduli construction) a hyper-Kähler variety, and that the transcendental part of the middle cohomology of the Fano variety corresponds to the transcendental part of the second cohomology of the hyper-Kähler variety (via an Abel–Jacobi isomorphism). Apart from the example of Beauville–Donagi [4], this “folklore expectation” is based on the examples [50], [11], [23], [42], [43], [24], [25], [13]. It is further motivated by the construction of a closed holomorphic 2-form on the non-singular locus of moduli spaces associated to any Fano variety of cohomological K3 type [30].

In this paper, we give further evidence that the conjectural existence of an MCK decomposition for hyper-Kähler varieties could transfer to Fano varieties of K3 type, and thereby strengthen the apparent connection between those two types of varieties. This question was already tackled for certain Fano varieties of K3 type in [37], [38], [39], [40]; here, we obtain a positive answer to Question 1 for the Fano fourfolds that occur in the foundational work of Beauville–Donagi [4]:

**Theorem 1.** All smooth cubic fourfolds have a multiplicative Chow–Künneth decomposition.

Theorem 1 will be proven in a more precise version, namely Theorem 4.1. In Theorem 5.2, we give further evidence for the existence of an MCK decomposition for Fano varieties of K3 type by establishing the existence of an MCK decomposition for Küchle fourfolds of type $c7$.

**Varieties with ample canonical class and of cohomological K3 type.** On the other end of the spectrum, we also provide examples of varieties of K3 type with ample canonical class that admit an MCK decomposition:

**Theorem 2.** Let $S$ be a smooth Todorov surface with fundamental invariants $(0, 9)$ or $(1, 10)$. Then $S$ has a multiplicative Chow–Künneth decomposition.

This gives the first example of a regular surface of general type with $p_g \neq 0$ that admits an MCK decomposition. For details on Todorov surfaces, we refer to §6.2 and to the references therein.

We are led to ask:

**Question 1.** Let $X$ be a smooth projective variety whose canonical divisor is ample or anti-ample. Assume that $X$ is of cohomological K3 type. Does $X$ have a multiplicative Chow–Künneth decomposition? If it exists, is it unique?

We note that without the assumption that $X$ be of cohomological K3 type, the question has a negative answer. In the case where the canonical divisor is ample, a very general curve of genus larger than 2 already provides an example that does not admit an MCK decomposition; see Example 2.3. Other examples are provided by very general surfaces in $\mathbb{P}^3$ of degree $\geq 7$; see Proposition 3.4. In the case where the canonical divisor is anti-ample, examples are provided by Beauville’s examples of Fano threefolds that do not satisfy the so-called weak splitting property; see Example 1.11.

**Strategy of proof.** In both the case of smooth cubic fourfolds and the case of Todorov surfaces of type $(0, 9)$ and $(1, 10)$, the proof goes through relating those varieties to some hyper-Kähler varieties, namely Fano varieties of lines on smooth cubic fourfolds and K3 surfaces respectively. Then, in all cases, we use the existence of a sufficiently big deformation space and proceed through establishing a Franchetta-type property. In particular, we use recent results [15] concerning the generalized Franchetta conjecture for the square of Fano varieties of lines of cubic fourfolds. In the case of Todorov surfaces, we establish in Proposition 6.1 a general criterion that makes it possible to lift an MCK decomposition along a dominant morphism of mildly singular projective surfaces.
**Organization of the paper.** We start in §1 by reviewing the notion of MCK decomposition and examples of varieties for which such an MCK decomposition exists. The case of curves and regular surfaces is then extensively reviewed in §§2 and 3 respectively. In those cases, as already observed in [57, Prop. 8.4] the existence of an MCK decomposition is related to the vanishing of a modified small diagonal. In the case of curves, we show that the existence of an MCK decomposition modulo algebraic equivalence is equivalent to the vanishing of the Ceresa cycle. We also provide consequences to the existence of an MCK decomposition for regular surfaces in Proposition 3.5. The results of Sections 1, 2 and 3 are mostly expository and serve as motivation for the special place that hyper-Kähler varieties and varieties of K3 type with ample or anti-ample canonical class play with respect to multiplicative Chow–Künneth decompositions. Our new results are contained in the subsequent Sections 4, 5 and 6 where we establish the existence of an MCK decomposition for smooth cubic fourfolds, Kuechle fourfolds of type \(c7\), and certain Todorov surfaces, respectively.

**Future work.** In concomitant work, we use Theorem 1 on the existence of an MCK decomposition for smooth cubic fourfolds to establish in [16] the generalized Franchetta conjecture for Lehn–Lehn–Sorger–van Straten hyper-Kähler eightfolds and to study in [19] the Chow motives, as algebra objects, of smooth cubic fourfolds with Fourier–Mukai equivalent Kuznetsov categories.

**Notation and conventions.** In this note, the word variety will refer to a reduced irreducible separated scheme of finite type over \(\mathbb{C}\). We will write \(H_j(X)\) to indicate its rational singular cohomology group \(H_j(X(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{Q})\). For a scheme of finite type over a field, \(CH_i(X)\) denotes the Chow group of codimension-\(i\) cycle classes on \(X\) with rational coefficients. The category of rational Chow motives (pure motives with respect to rational equivalence as in [1, 55]) is denoted by \(M_{rat}\), which is a pseudo-abelian rigid tensor category, whose tensor unit is denoted by \(1\). The contravariant functor from the category of smooth projective varieties to \(M_{rat}\) that sends a variety to its Chow motive is denoted by \(h\).

1. Generalities on multiplicative Chow–Künneth decompositions


**Definition 1.1** (Chow–Künneth decomposition). Let \(X\) be a smooth projective variety of dimension \(d\). A Chow–Künneth decomposition for \(X\) is a direct-sum decomposition

\[
h(X) = h^0(X) \oplus \cdots \oplus h^{2d}(X)
\]

of its rational Chow motive in \(M_{rat}\), such that for any \(0 \leq i \leq 2d\), the Betti realization \(H^*(h^i(X)) = H^i(X)\).

In other words, a Chow–Künneth decomposition is a system of self-correspondences \(\{\pi^0, \ldots, \pi^{2d}\}\) in \(CH^d(X \times X)\) satisfying the following properties:

- (Projectors) \(\pi^i \circ \pi^i = \pi^i\) for any \(i\);
- (Orthogonality) \(\pi^i \circ \pi^j = 0\) for any \(i \neq j\);
- (Completeness) \(\pi^0 + \cdots + \pi^{2d} = \Delta_X\);
- (Künneth property) \(\pi^i_*H^*(X) = H^i(X)\) for any \(i\).

The existence of a Chow–Künneth decomposition for any smooth projective variety is part of Murre’s conjectures [47].

**Remark 1.2** (\(\pi^0\) and \(\pi^{2d}\)). In a Chow–Künneth decomposition of a \(d\)-dimensional irreducible smooth projective variety \(X\), the first and the last projectors are usually taken to be of the form \(\pi^0 = z \times 1_X\) and \(\pi^{2d} = 1_X \times z'\) respectively, where \(z, z'\) are 0-cycles of degree 1 and \(1_X\) is the
fundamental class. We point out that if \( X \) is Kimura finite-dimensional \([28]\), we have \( h^0(X) \simeq 1 \) and \( h^{2d}(X) \simeq 1(-d) \), therefore \( \pi^0 \) and \( \pi^{2d} \) must be of the above form.

**Remark 1.3** (Duality). Thanks to the motivic Poincaré duality \( h(X) = h(X)^\vee (-d) \), we see that a Chow–Künneth decomposition

\[
h(X) = h^0(X) \oplus \cdots \oplus h^{2d}(X),
\]

naturally admits a **dual decomposition**:

\[
h(X) = h^{2d}(X)^\vee (-d) \oplus \cdots \oplus h^0(X)^\vee (-d).
\]

In terms of projectors, the dual of a system \( \{ \pi^0, \ldots, \pi^{2d} \} \) is \( \{ t_\pi^{2d}, \ldots, t_\pi^0 \} \). A Chow–Künneth decomposition is called **self-dual** if for any \( 0 \leq i \leq 2d \), we have \( h^i(X)^\vee = h^{2d-i}(X)(d) \), or equivalently, \( \pi^i = t_\pi^{2d-i} \).

**1.2. Murre’s conjectures and the Bloch–Beilinson filtration.**

**Conjecture 1.4** (Murre \([47]\)). Let \( X \) be a smooth projective variety of dimension \( d \). Then

(A) there exists a Chow–Künneth decomposition \( \{ \pi^0, \ldots, \pi^{2d} \} \). Any such decomposition induces a descending filtration

\[
F^jCH^i(X) := \bigcap_{k \geq 2i-j} \ker(\pi^k : CH^i(X) \to CH^i(X)) = \sum_{k \leq 2i-j} \im(\pi^k : CH^i(X) \to CH^i(X))
\]

with the following properties:

(B) \( F^0CH^i(X) = CH^i(X) \) and \( (B') F^{i+1}CH^i(X) = 0 \).

(C) The filtration \( F^\bullet \) on \( CH^i(X) \) is independent of the choice of the Chow–Künneth decomposition.

(D) \( F^1CH^i(X) = CH^i(X)_{\text{hom}} \).

We note that Murre’s conjecture for all smooth projective varieties is equivalent to the existence of the Bloch–Beilinson filtration; see \([26]\) for a precise statement. In particular, any Chow–Künneth decomposition induces a splitting of the conjectural Bloch–Beilinson filtration. As will be explained below in Remark 1.8, the following notion of multiplicative Chow–Künneth decomposition gives a sufficient condition for the above splitting to be compatible with intersection product.

**1.3. Multiplicative Chow–Künneth decomposition.** Recall that if \( X \) is a \( d \)-dimensional irreducible smooth scheme of finite type over a field, intersection product defines a (graded) ring structure on \( CH^*(X) = \bigoplus_i CH^i(X) \); moreover, if \( X \) is in addition proper, the intersection product is controlled by the class of the small diagonal \( \delta_X := \{(x,x,x) \in X^3\} \) in \( CH^{2d}(X \times X \times X) \) in the sense that \( (\delta_X)_*(\alpha \times \beta) = \alpha \cdot \beta \) for all \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \in CH^*(X) \). The small diagonal \( \delta_X \) seen as a correspondence from \( X \times X \) to \( X \) endows the Chow motive \( h(X) \) with the structure of a unital commutative algebra object. (The unit is the fundamental class of \( X \), seen as a morphism \( 1 \to h(X) \).) We write

\[
\mu : h(X) \otimes h(X) \to h(X)
\]

for the multiplication thus defined.

**Definition 1.5** (Multiplicative Chow–Künneth (MCK) decomposition, Shen–Vial \([57]\)). Let \( X \) be a smooth projective variety of dimension \( d \). A Chow–Künneth decomposition

\[
h(X) = h^0(X) \oplus \cdots \oplus h^{2d}(X)
\]

is called **multiplicative**, if for any \( 0 \leq i, j \leq 2d \), the restriction of the multiplication \( \mu : h(X) \otimes h(X) \to h(X) \) to the direct summand \( h^i(X) \otimes h^j(X) \) factors through the direct summand \( h^{i+j}(X) \).
In other words, id = ∈ 之间的关系。现在注意到 ∈ 。

**Lemma 1.6.** Let X be a smooth projective variety of dimension d. Let \{π^0, \ldots, π^{2d}\} be the system of projectors corresponding to a Chow–Künneth decomposition of X (see Definition 1.1). Then the following conditions are equivalent:

1. The Chow–Künneth decomposition is multiplicative;
2. For any i, j, k such that i + j ≠ k, we have π^k ∘ δ_X ∘ (π^i ⊗ π^j) = 0.
3. For any i, j, we have π^{i+j} ∘ δ_X ∘ (π^i ⊗ π^j) = δ_X ∘ (π^i ⊗ π^j).
4. \δ_X = \sum_{i,j} π^{i+j} ∘ δ_X ∘ (π^i ⊗ π^j).

Here δ_X denotes the small diagonal of X^3, viewed as a correspondence from X × X to X.

**Proof.** Noting that µ is induced by δ_X by definition, the equivalence between (i) and (ii) becomes tautological.

(ii) \implies (iv): by the completeness of the system \sum_i π^i = Δ_X, we see that

\[ \delta_X = \sum_{i,j,k} π^k ∘ δ_X ∘ (π^i ⊗ π^j) = \sum_{k=i+j} π^k ∘ δ_X ∘ (π^i ⊗ π^j) + \sum_{k≠i+j} π^k ∘ δ_X ∘ (π^i ⊗ π^j) = \sum_{i,j} π^{i+j} ∘ δ_X ∘ (π^i ⊗ π^j). \]

(iv) \implies (iii): it is enough to post-compose both sides of (iv) with π^i ⊗ π^j and use the orthogonality between the projectors.

(iii) \implies (ii): it suffices to pre-compose both sides of (iii) with π^k and use the orthogonality between the projectors.

It turns out that an MCK decomposition is automatically self-dual (Remark 1.3):

**Proposition 1.7** (Multiplicativity implies self-duality [18, §6 Footnote 24]). Let \{π^0, \ldots, π^{2d}\} be a multiplicative Chow–Künneth decomposition for a smooth projective variety X of dimension d. Then it is self-dual, that is, π^i = t^{2d-i} for all i.

**Proof.** Projecting both sides of (iv) in Lemma 1.6 to the first two factors (or equivalently, pre-composing with the canonical morphism \(\epsilon : h(X) \to \mathbb{1}(-d)\) given by the fundamental class), one finds

\[ \epsilon ∘ δ_X = \sum_{i,j} \epsilon ∘ π^{i+j} ∘ δ_X ∘ (π^i ⊗ π^j). \]

As π^{2d} ∈ End(h(X)) is the composition h(X) ↪ \mathbb{1}(-d) ↪ h(X), we get from the orthogonality between π^{2d} and the other projectors that for any i + j ≠ 2d, \(\epsilon ∘ π^{i+j} = 0\) and \(\epsilon ∘ π^{2d} = \epsilon\). Therefore the equality simplifies to

\[ \epsilon ∘ δ_X = \sum_i \epsilon ∘ δ_X ∘ (π^{2d-i} ⊗ π^i). \]

Now noting that \(\epsilon ∘ δ_X\) is the diagonal class \(Δ_X ∈ CH^d(X × X)\), we obtain

\[ Δ_X = \sum_i (t^{2d-i} ⊗ π^i)_*(Δ_X), \]

In other words, id = \(\sum_i t^{2d-i} ⊗ π^i\). This allows us to conclude by composing with π^i and tπ^{2d-i}:

\[ π^i = \left( \sum_j t_{\pi}^{2d-j} ⊗ π^j \right) ∘ π^i = t_{\pi}^{2d-i} ⊗ π^i = t_{\pi}^{2d-i} ∘ \left( \sum_j t_{\pi}^{2d-j} ⊗ π^j \right) = t^{2d-i}. \]

□
Remark 1.8 (Multiplicative bigrading). A multiplicative Chow–Künneth decomposition \( \mathfrak{h}(X) = \mathfrak{h}^0(X) \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathfrak{h}^{2d}(X) \) naturally gives rise to a multiplicative bigrading on the Chow ring \( \text{CH}^i(X) = \bigoplus_{s} \text{CH}^i(X)_{(s)} \) with

\[
\text{CH}^i(X)_{(s)} := \text{CH}^i \left( \mathfrak{h}^{2i-s}(X) \right) := \text{Hom} \left( 1(-i), \mathfrak{h}^{2i-s}(X) \right).
\]

Here the multiplicativity means that

\[
\text{CH}^i(X)_{(s)} \cdot \text{CH}^j(X)_{(s')} \subseteq \text{CH}^{i+j}(X)_{(s+s')},
\]

which clearly follows from the multiplicativity of the Chow–Künneth decomposition. However, we note that actually any Chow–Künneth decomposition induces a splitting of the Chow groups of \( X \) and the property that it is a ring grading, \( i.e. \), that \( \text{CH}^i(X)_{(s)} \cdot \text{CH}^j(X)_{(s')} \subseteq \text{CH}^{i+j}(X)_{(s+s')} \) is strictly weaker than having a MCK decomposition; a very general curve of genus \( \geq 2 \) does not admit an MCK decomposition (Example 2.3 below) but any splitting of its Chow groups induced by a Chow–Künneth decomposition is compatible with the intersection product. The new grading is chosen so that, via Murre’s conjecture 1.4 (C),

\[
\text{CH}^i(X)_{(s)} = \text{Gr}^s F \text{CH}^i(X).
\]

In other words, a multiplicative Chow–Künneth decomposition should induce a multiplicative splitting of the (conjectural) Bloch–Beilinson filtration on Chow groups.

We call the indexation by \( s \) the grade of a cycle. For example, by Murre’s conjecture 1.4 (B) and (D), all cycles of negative grade are expected to be zero and the subspace consisting of cycles of grade zero, \( \text{CH}^*(X)_{(0)} \), is expected to inject into the cohomology of \( X \) via the cycle class map. In particular, the subalgebra of \( \text{CH}^*(X) \) generated by \( \text{CH}^i(X)_{(0)} \) is expected to inject into cohomology; this is Beauville’s so-called weak splitting property [3].

1.4. Which varieties admit a multiplicative Chow–Künneth decomposition? Although a Chow–Künneth decomposition is conjectured to exist for all smooth projective varieties, there exist examples of varieties (in fact, examples of curves; see e.g. Example 2.3 below) that do not admit any MCK decomposition. Nonetheless, as shown by Shen–Vial [58], the notion of multiplicative Chow–Künneth decomposition is robust enough to allow many standard procedures to produce new examples out of old ones.

Proposition 1.9 ([58]). Let \( X \) and \( Y \) be smooth projective varieties admitting MCK decompositions \( \{ \pi^X_i \} \) and \( \{ \pi^Y_i \} \), respectively.

- (Product) The product \( X \times Y \) has a naturally induced MCK decomposition: for all \( k \),
  \[
  \pi^X_{k,XY} := \sum_{i=0}^{k} \pi^X_i \otimes \pi^Y_{k-i}.
  \]
- (Projective bundle) If \( E \) is a vector bundle on \( X \) whose Chern classes are all of grade 0, then \( \text{P}(E) \) has a natural MCK decomposition.
- (Blow-up) Suppose that \( Y \) is a subvariety of \( X \) and that, as an element in \( \text{CH}(X \times Y) \), the graph of the embedding is of grade 0 for the natural product MCK decomposition. Assume further that the Chern classes of the normal bundle are of grade 0 and the Chern classes of the tangent bundle of \( X \) are of grade 0. Then the blow-up of \( X \) along \( Y \) admits a natural MCK decomposition.
- (Quotient) If a finite group \( G \) acts on \( X \) such that the graphs of the automorphisms (as elements in \( \text{CH}(X \times X) \)) are of grade 0, then the quotient \( X/G \) admits a natural MCK decomposition.
- (Hilbert scheme) Assume that the Chern classes of \( X \) are of grade 0. Then the Hilbert schemes of length-2 and length-3 subschemes of \( X \) admit an MCK.

Consequently, we may ask the following general, but vague, question:
Question 1.10. Which smooth projective varieties constitute the “building blocks” of varieties admitting a multiplicative Chow–K"unneth decomposition? For which of those can we expect an MCK decomposition to be unique?

Note that, since homological equivalence and rational equivalence agree on powers of a variety whose motive is of Lefschetz type (for example, toric varieties, homogeneous varieties), it admits a unique Chow–K"unneth decomposition and this decomposition is multiplicative.

The original and main motivation for studying MCK decompositions comes from the study of Chow rings of varieties with trivial canonical bundle. A canonical multiplicative Chow–K"unneth decomposition exists in the following cases: abelian varieties \[2, 12, 33\], K3 surfaces \[5\] (interpreted by \[57, Proposition 8.4\]) and some (conjecturally, all) hyper-K"ahler varieties \[57, 64, 17, 15\]. The case of Calabi–Yau varieties is not so clear: there are examples of Calabi–Yau varieties due to Beauville \[3, Example 2.1.5(b)\] that do not admit a Chow–K"unneth decomposition inducing a grading satisfying \(1\), while examples of Calabi–Yau varieties with a MCK decomposition exist in all dimensions \[41\]. Concerning the uniqueness of an MCK decomposition, we will show that this is the case for curves and for regular surfaces with finite-dimensional motive in the sense of Kimura. It is expected \[57, 18\] that for hyper-K"ahler varieties, if an MCK decomposition exists, then it is unique. Note however that an MCK decomposition is not unique for abelian varieties; translating the canonical Chow–K"unneth decomposition (which is multiplicative) of an abelian variety along a point that is not rationally equivalent to the origin provides a new MCK decomposition.

Concerning the existence of an MCK decomposition in general, the answer is for the time being not clear in general. The main purpose of the paper is, beyond reviewing known examples of varieties admitting or not admitting an MCK decomposition, to explore whether varieties with ample or anti-ample canonical class can be added to the list of varieties admitting such a decomposition.

In the case of Fano varieties, there are examples of varieties (with motive not of Lefschetz type) that admit an MCK decomposition. By \[18, Proposition 5.7\], all Fermat cubic hypersurfaces admit a multiplicative Chow–K"unneth decomposition. It is in fact conjectured in \[18, Conjecture 5.8\] that all Fano or Calabi–Yau Fermat hypersurfaces admit multiplicative Chow–K"unneth decompositions. Other examples have been exhibited in \[37, 38, 39, 40\] and Theorem 1 shows that cubic fourfolds can be added to the list. On the other hand there are also examples of Fano varieties that do not admit an MCK decomposition:

Example 1.11 (Fano varieties may fail to have an MCK decomposition). In \[3, Example 2.1.5(a)\], Beauville constructed, by blowing up \(P^3\) along certain smooth curves, examples of Fano 3-folds such that the subalgebra generated by divisors does not inject in cohomology. Such Fano 3-folds cannot have an MCK decomposition. Indeed, by \[62, §4.2.2\], any Chow–K"unneth decomposition of the blow-up \(X\) of a curve inside \(P^3\) will be such that \(CH^1(X) = CH^1(X)_0\) and such that \(CH^*(X) \hookrightarrow H^*(X)\) is injective. In particular, for any choice of Chow–K"unneth decomposition, \(X\) fails to satisfy Beauville’s weak splitting property, and hence by Remark 1.8 any choice of Chow–K"unneth decomposition for \(X\) fails to be multiplicative.

In the case of varieties with ample canonical bundle, we will review below that a very general curve of genus \(> 2\) (Example 2.3) does not admit an MCK decomposition. Moreover, Proposition 3.4 below suggests that a general surface in \(P^3\) of degree \(\geq 7\) also does not admit an MCK decomposition. There are however examples of varieties with ample canonical bundle (and with motive not of Lefschetz type) that admit an MCK decomposition: this is the case for example
for any product of hyperelliptic curves of genus > 1 by combining Example 2.2 with Proposition 1.9. Our Theorem 2 provides further examples, namely Todorov surfaces of type (0,9) or (1,10), that are not (birational to) products of curves.

It turns out that the Todorov surfaces we study are intimately linked to K3 surfaces. Likewise the Fano examples of [37, 38, 39, 40], as well as the cubic fourfolds of Theorem 1, have cohomology of K3 type: these are Fano fourfolds with Hodge numbers $h^{p,q} = 0$ for all $p \neq q$ except for $h^{3,1}(X) = h^{1,3}(X) = 1$. In the light of these examples, but also based (in the Fano case) on the folklore expectation that to any Fano variety of K3 type can be associated geometrically (via a moduli construction) a hyper-Kähler variety, we ask whether every smooth projective variety with ample or anti-ample canonical bundle, and with cohomology of K3 type, admits a (unique) multiplicative Chow–Küneth decomposition; cf. Question 1.

\section{Curves}

\subsection{Multiplicative Chow–Küneth decomposition for curves}

As mentioned before, the projective line (a special case of homogeneous varieties) and elliptic curves (special cases of abelian varieties) admit canonical multiplicative Chow–Küneth decompositions. Let $C$ be a smooth projective curve of genus $g \geq 2$. As it is Kimura finite-dimensional, by Remark 1.2 and Proposition 1.7, a multiplicative Chow–Küneth decomposition for $C$ must take the following form:

$$\pi^0 = z \times 1_C, \pi^1 = \Delta_C - z \times 1_C - 1_C \times z, \pi^2 = 1_C \times z,$$

where $z$ is a 0-cycle of degree 1 and $1_C$ is the fundamental class. Given such a 0-cycle $z$, there is the natural embedding $\iota : C \to J(C)$, which sends a point $p \in C$ to $\mathcal{O}_C(p - z)$. Denote $[C] := \iota_*(1_C) \in \text{CH}_1(J(C))$.

\begin{proposition}[MCK for curves] Notation is as above ($g \geq 2$). Let $z$ be a 0-cycle of degree 1 on $C$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

\begin{enumerate}[(i)]
  \item the Chow–Küneth decomposition (2) determined by $z$ is multiplicative;
  \item the modified small diagonal $\Gamma_3(C,z) = 0$ in $\text{CH}^2(C^3)$, where
  \begin{align*}
  \Gamma_3(C,z) := \delta_C - p_{12}^*\Delta_C p_{3}^*(z) - p_{23}^*(\Delta_C) p_3^*(z) - p_{13}^*(\Delta_C) p_2^*(z) + p_1^*(z) p_2^*(z) + p_1^*(z) p_3^*(z) + p_2^*(z) p_3^*(z);
  \end{align*}
  \item the class $[C]$ belongs to $\text{CH}_1(J(C))(0)$.
\end{enumerate}

In particular, if it exists, an MCK decomposition for $C$ is unique, given by $z = \frac{1}{2g-2}K_C$.
\end{proposition}

\begin{proof}
The equivalence between (i) and (ii) follows from a direct computation using Lemma 1.6 (see [57, Proposition 8.14]).

(ii) $\implies$ (iii) is proved in [18, Proposition 7.1] using an idea from [5, Proposition 3.2]. Let $f : C^3 \to J(C)$ be the composition of the embedding $\iota^3 : C^3 \to J(C)^3$ followed by the summation on $J(C)$. We have

$$f_*(\Gamma_3(C,z)) = [3]_*|C| - 3[2]_*|C| + 3|C| = 0 \text{ in } \text{CH}_1(J(C)) .$$

Use the Beauville decomposition [2] of $\text{CH}_1(J(C))$, we see that $[C]$ belongs to $\text{CH}_1(J(C))(0)$.

(iii) $\implies$ (i) is implied by [18, Propositions 5.3 and 6.1].

Finally, for the uniqueness, let (ii) act on $\Delta_C$, we get $c_1(T_C) = (2 - 2g)z$. Hence $z$ is determined by the curve.
\end{proof}

The next two examples illustrates that Proposition 2.1 leads to both existence and non-existence results on MCK decompositions for curves:
Example 2.2 (Curves with MCK decompositions [57, Example 8.16]). If C is hyperelliptic, take z to be a Weierstrass point, then Gross–Schoen [22] proved that the modified small diagonal \(\Gamma_3(C,z)\) vanishes. Alternately, by [59, Proposition 2.1], the class \([C]\) belongs to \(\text{CH}_1(J(C))(0)\). By Proposition 2.1, this implies that the Chow–Künneth decomposition (2) is multiplicative.

Example 2.3 (Curves without MCK decompositions [18, §7]). As is pointed out before, any MCK decomposition for a curve C is determined by a 0-cycle of degree 1. If C admits an MCK decomposition, then Proposition 2.1 (iii) implies in particular that the Ceresa cycle \([C] - \mathbb{R}[C] \in \text{CH}_1(J(C))\) vanishes.

Ceresa [10] proves that the Ceresa cycle of a very general complex curve of genus > 2 is not algebraically trivial. As more explicit examples, Otsubo [51] proves that the Ceresa cycle of Fermat curves of degree \(4 \leq d \leq 1000\) is not algebraically trivial. Therefore, those curves do not admit any multiplicative Chow–Künneth decomposition.

Remark 2.4 (MCK modulo algebraic equivalence). If instead of rational equivalence, we work with algebraic equivalence, the analogue of Proposition 2.1 still holds and the choice of the 0-cycle \(z\) becomes irrelevant. More precisely, given a smooth projective curve C, the following conditions are equivalent:

(i) C admits a multiplicative Chow–Künneth decomposition modulo algebraic equivalence (which, again, must be of the form (2))

(ii) The modified small diagonal \(\Gamma_3(C,\text{pt})\) is algebraically trivial.

(iii) The class \([C]\) belongs to \(\text{CH}_1(J(C))(0)/\text{alg.}\).

Of course, (iii) implies as before

(iv) the Ceresa cycle \([C] - \mathbb{R}[C] \in \text{CH}_1(J(C))\) is algebraically trivial.

Now the point of this remark is that (iv) is actually equivalent to (iii), hence also to (i), or (ii).

Indeed, in the Beauville decomposition

\[
\text{CH}_1(J(C)) = \bigoplus_{s=0}^{g-1} \text{CH}_1(J(C))(s),
\]

denote by \(C(s)\) the grade-s component of the class \([C]\). It is well-defined modulo the algebraic equivalence. Then (iv) implies that \(C(1) = 0\). By Marini’s result [44, Corollary 26], we have \(C(s) = 0\) for all \(s > 0\), that is, \([C] \in \text{CH}_1(J(C))(0)/\text{alg.}\).

In conclusion, the vanishing of the Ceresa cycle characterizes the multiplicativity of the Chow–Künneth decomposition modulo algebraic equivalence.

2.2. On the tautological ring of powers of curves. The following proposition, essentially due to Tavakol [59], relates for a given curve the existence of an MCK decomposition to the existence of enough relations in the tautological ring.

Proposition 2.5. Let C be a smooth projective complex curve. Let \(R^*(C^m) \subseteq \text{CH}^*(C^m)\) denote the subring generated by pullbacks of the canonical divisor and of the diagonal \(\Delta_C\). Then C admits an MCK decomposition if and only if the cycle class map induces injections

\[
R^i(C^m) \hookrightarrow H^{2i}(C^m)
\]

for all positive integers m and all i.

Proof. Tavakol [59] shows that the cohomological relations among \(p^*_i K_C\) and \(p^*_i \Delta_C\) are generated by 3 relations, namely the Faber–Pandharipande relation, the Gross–Schoen relation and the finite-dimensionality relation; see also [70, Remark 3.8(i)]. By Kimura [28], the finite-dimensionality relation holds modulo rational equivalence. The Gross–Schoen relation is nothing but the vanishing of the modified small diagonal. By Proposition 2.1, this relation is equivalent to the existence of an MCK decomposition. Finally, the Faber–Pandharipande relation,
\[ p_1^*K_C \cdot p_2^*K_C = \text{deg}(K_C) p_1^*K_C \cdot \Delta_C, \]
can be obtained by making both sides of the Gross–Schoen relation, viewed as correspondences from \( C \) to \( C \times C \), act on \( K_C \). \( \square \)

3. Regular surfaces

3.1. Multiplicative Chow–Künneth decomposition for regular surfaces. Let \( S \) be a regular surface, that is, a smooth projective complex surface with \( H^4(S, \mathcal{O}_S) = 0 \). Then for any 0-cycle of degree 1 on \( S \), we have a self-dual Chow–Künneth decomposition

\[ \pi^0 = z \times 1_S, \pi^4 = 1_S \times z, \pi^2 = \Delta_S - \pi^0 - \pi^1, \pi^3 = 0. \]  

(3)

Assuming the Kimura finite-dimensionality conjecture [28], any self-dual Chow–Künneth decomposition should be of this form (Remark 1.2). Similarly to Proposition 2.1, we have the following result.

**Proposition 3.1** (MCK decomposition for regular surfaces). Let \( S \) be a regular smooth projective surface. Let \( z \) be a 0-cycle of degree 1 on \( S \). Then the following conditions are equivalent:

(i) the Chow–Künneth decomposition (3) is multiplicative;

(ii) the modified small diagonal \( \Gamma_3(S, z) \in \text{CH}^4(S^3) \) vanishes, where

\[ \Gamma_3(S, z) := \delta_S - p_{12}^*(\Delta_S)p_3^*(z) - p_{23}^*(\Delta_S)p_1^*(z) - p_{31}^*(\Delta_S)p_2^*(z) + p_1^*(z)p_2^*(z) + p_2^*(z)p_3^*(z) + p_3^*(z)p_1^*(z) + p_2^*(z)p_3^*(z). \]

Moreover, they imply the following two properties:

(iii) \( \text{Im} \left( \text{CH}^1(S) \otimes \text{CH}^1(S) \to \text{CH}^2(S) \right) = Q \cdot z. \)

(iv) \( c_2(T_S) = \chi_{\text{top}}(S)z, \) where \( \chi_{\text{top}} \) is the topological Euler characteristic.

In particular, if it exists, an MCK decomposition of the form (3) for \( S \) is unique.

**Proof.** The equivalence between (i) and (ii) is a direct computation using Lemma 1.6, which was first observed in [57, Proposition 8.4]. The implication from them to (iii) and (iv) are proved as in [5]: let both sides of (ii) act on the exterior product of two divisors to obtain (iii) and on \( \Delta_S \) to get (iv). \( \square \)

**Example 3.2** (Regular surfaces with an MCK decomposition). First we note that any Chow–Künneth decomposition of a surface whose Chow motive is of Lefschetz type is multiplicative. Hence any complex surface with trivial Chow group of 0-cycles admits an MCK decomposition. Beyond the above obvious examples, the following regular surfaces are known to admit an MCK decomposition: K3 surfaces, certain elliptic surfaces constructed by Schreieder [56] and Todorov surfaces of type \( (0,9) \) or \( (1,10) \). The case of K3 surfaces is seminal and is due to Beauville–Voisin [5] who establish the existence of a canonical 0-cycle \( o \) of degree 1 such that the modified small diagonal \( \Gamma_3(S, o) \) vanishes. This was reinterpreted, via a direct computation, as saying that a K3 surface admits an MCK decomposition in [57, §8]. The case of the Schreieder surfaces is [41, Theorem 2], while the case of Todorov surfaces is the content of Theorem 2 to be proven below.

**Remark 3.3** (MCK on the image). Let \( S \) be a smooth projective regular surface admitting a multiplicative Chow–Künneth decomposition (3). Let \( f : S \to S' \) be a surjective morphism to another smooth projective surface. Then \( S' \) must be regular and it admits a multiplicative Chow–Künneth decomposition. Indeed, by Proposition 3.1, we have a degree-one 0-cycle \( z \) on \( S \) such that \( \Gamma_3(S, z) = 0 \) in \( \text{CH}^4(S^3) \). It is easy to check that \( (f, f, f)_*(\Gamma_3(S, z)) = \text{deg}(f)\Gamma_3(S', f_*(z)) \). Again by Proposition 3.1, \( S' \) has an MCK decomposition. Note that if \( f : C \to C' \) is a dominant morphism of curves, the same argument shows that a MCK decomposition for \( C \) yields an MCK decomposition for \( C' \).

Proposition 3.1 (iii) and (iv) give obstructions to the existence of multiplicative Chow–Künneth decompositions for regular surfaces. Moreover, we can use this to see the difference between (iii) and MCK decompositions:
Proposition 3.4 (MCK decomposition v.s. degeneration of intersection product). For any \(d \geq 7\), a very general smooth surface of degree \(d\) in \(\mathbb{P}^3\) does not admit any multiplicative Chow–Künneth decomposition of the form (3). However as a very general surface has Picard number 1, the condition (iii) and (iv) in Proposition 3.1 are obviously satisfied with \(z = \frac{1}{d}c_1(\mathcal{O}(1))^2\).

Proof. Generalizing the octic surface example in [14, §1.4], O’Grady [49] constructed, for each integer \(d\), a smooth surface \(S\) of degree \(d\) in \(\mathbb{P}^3\) with

\[
\dim \operatorname{Im} \left( \operatorname{CH}^1(S) \otimes \operatorname{CH}^1(S) \to \operatorname{CH}^2(S) \right) \geq \left\lceil \frac{d-1}{3} \right\rceil.
\]

So by Proposition 3.1 such a surface \(S\) does not have an MCK decomposition of the form (3) when \(d\) is at least 7. By Proposition 3.1, the modified small diagonal \(\Gamma_3(S, \frac{1}{d}c_1(\mathcal{O}(1))^2)\) does not vanish. However, since the cycle \(\Gamma_3(S, \frac{1}{d}c_1(\mathcal{O}(1))^2)\) is defined universally for all smooth degree-\(d\) surfaces, its non-vanishing on one member, namely \(S\), implies that it is non-trivial for a very general member by an argument using Hilbert schemes (cf. [68, Lemma 3.2]). \(\square\)

3.2. On the tautological ring of powers of regular surfaces. The following proposition due to Q. Yin [70], gives yet another characterization of regular surfaces admitting an MCK decomposition.

Proposition 3.5. Let \(S\) be a smooth projective complex surface. Let \(R^*(S^m) \subset \operatorname{CH}^*(S^m)\) denote the subring generated by pullbacks of divisors, Chern classes, and diagonals \(\Delta_S\). Assume that \(S\) is regular and that \(p_g := H^0(S, \Omega^2_S) > 0\). Then \(S\) admits an MCK decomposition of the form (3) if and only if the cycle class map induces injections

\[
R^i(S^m) \hookrightarrow H^{2i}(S^m)
\]

for all \(m \leq 2b^2_T(S) + 1\) and all \(i\). Here \(b^2_T(S)\) is the dimension of the transcendental cohomology of \(S\), i.e., the smallest Hodge substructure of \(H^2(S)\) whose complexification contains \(H^0(S, \Omega^2_S)\). Moreover, \(S\) admits an MCK decomposition and is Kimura–O’Sullivan finite-dimensional if and only if \(R^i(S^m) \to H^{2i}(S^m)\) is injective for all \(m\) and all \(i\).

Proof. This is simply an application of Yin’s theorem [70] (which works for any regular surface with \(p_g > 0\), see also [70, Remark 3.8(iii)]), via reinterpreting the vanishing of the modified small diagonal as providing an MCK decomposition. \(\square\)

4. Cubic fourfolds

Cubic fourfolds are the most well-known examples of Fano varieties of K3 type. They have the following Hodge diamond:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
1 & & & & & \\
& 0 & 0 & & & \\
& 0 & 1 & 0 & & \\
& 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
0 & 1 & 21 & 1 & 0 & \\
& 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
& 0 & 1 & 0 & & \\
& 0 & 0 & & & \\
1 & & & & & \\
\end{array}
\]
4.1. Statement of the main result. Let $B \subset \text{PH}^0(\mathbb{P}^5, \mathcal{O}(3))$ be the open subset parameterizing smooth cubic fourfolds, and let $\mathcal{X} \to B$ be the universal family of smooth cubic fourfolds. There is a natural evaluation map $e : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{P}^5$. Set $H := e^*(\mathcal{O}(1)) \in \text{CH}^1(\mathcal{X})$, the relative hyperplane section class. Then

$$
\pi^0_{\mathcal{X}} = \frac{1}{3} H^4 \times_B \mathcal{X}, \quad \pi^2_{\mathcal{X}} = \frac{1}{3} H^3 \times_B H, \quad \pi^6_{\mathcal{X}} = \frac{1}{3} H \times_B H^3, \quad \pi^8_{\mathcal{X}} = \frac{1}{3} \mathcal{X} \times_B H^4
$$

(4)

defines a relative Chow–Künneth decomposition, in the sense that its specialization to any fiber $\mathcal{X}_b$ over $b \in B$ gives a Chow–Künneth decomposition of $\mathcal{X}_b$.

The aim of this section is to establish the following result.

**Theorem 4.1.** The relative Chow–Künneth decomposition (4) is fiberwise multiplicative. In particular, a smooth cubic fourfold admits a multiplicative Chow–Künneth decomposition.

The strategy will be to reduce to the so-called Franchetta property, which is discussed in §4.2 below, established in [15] for the universal family $\mathcal{F} \to B$ of Fano varieties of lines in smooth cubic fourfolds and its relative square. In that reduction step, we will have to establish the Franchetta property for $\mathcal{X} \to B$ and for $\mathcal{X} \times_B \mathcal{X} \to B$.

4.2. The Franchetta property.

**Definition 4.2.** Let $\mathcal{X} \to B$ be a smooth projective morphism to a smooth quasi-projective complex variety $B$. We say that $\mathcal{X} \to B$ has the Franchetta property if for any cycle class $a \in \text{CH}^i(\mathcal{X})$ and for any $b \in B(\mathbb{C})$, there is equivalence

$$
a|_{\mathcal{X}_b} = 0 \quad \text{in } H^{2i}(X_b) \iff a|_{\mathcal{X}_b} = 0 \quad \text{in } \text{CH}^i(X_b).
$$

This property is studied in [48], [52] for the universal family of K3 surfaces of low genus. This is extended to certain families of hyper-Kähler varieties in [15] (cf. also [6]).

**Theorem 4.3** ([15]). Let $B$ be the open subset of $\text{PH}^0(\mathbb{P}^5, \mathcal{O}(3))$ parameterizing smooth cubic fourfolds, and let $\mathcal{F} \to B$ be the universal family of Fano varieties of lines in smooth cubic fourfolds. Then the families $\mathcal{F} \to B$ and $\mathcal{F} \times_B \mathcal{F} \to B$ have the Franchetta property.

**Sketch of proof.** Such a statement is proved along the following lines. If $F$ is the Fano variety of lines on a smooth complex cubic fourfold, denote $\text{GDCH}^*(F)$ and $\text{GDCH}^*(F \times F)$ the subrings of $\text{CH}^*(F)$ and $\text{CH}^*(F \times F)$ respectively generated by cycles that are restrictions of cycles on the universal families $\mathcal{F} \to B$ and $\mathcal{F} \times_B \mathcal{F} \to B$. The notation $\text{GDCH}^*$ stands for “generically defined” cycles.

First, one finds generators for $\text{GDCH}^*(F)$ and $\text{GDCH}^*(F \times F)$. We have by [15, Lemma 3.1 and Proposition 6.3] that

$$
\text{GDCH}^*(F) = \langle g, c \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \text{GDCH}^*(F \times F) = \langle p_i^*g, p_j^*c, \Delta_F, I \rangle,
$$

where $\langle \cdot \rangle$ means the generated subalgebra, $p_i : F \times F \to F$ is the projection on the $i$-th factor, $g = -c_1(\mathcal{E})|_F$ is the Plücker polarization, $c = c_2(\mathcal{E})|_F$, $\mathcal{E}$ is the tautological rank-2 bundle on $\text{Gr}(2, 6)$, and $I = \{(\ell_1, \ell_2) \in F \times F : \ell_1 \cap \ell_2 \neq \emptyset\}$ is the incidence correspondence.

Second, one establishes sufficiently many relations modulo rational equivalence among the generators for $\text{GDCH}^*(F)$ and $\text{GDCH}^*(F \times F)$ to inject in $H^*(F)$ and $H^*(F \times F)$ via the cycle class map. In the case of $\text{GDCH}^*(F)$, the required relations were established by Voisin [65], and in the case of $\text{GDCH}^*(F \times F)$, these were established by Voisin [65], Shen–Vial [57] and Fu–Laterveer–Shen–Vial in [15, Appendix].
**Proposition 4.4.** Let $B$ be the open subset of $\text{Pic}^0(\mathbb{P}^5, \mathcal{O}(3))$ parameterizing smooth cubic fourfolds, and let $\mathcal{X} \to B$ be the universal family of smooth cubic fourfolds. Then the families $\mathcal{X} \to B$ and $\mathcal{X} \times_B \mathcal{X} \to B$ have the Franchetta property.

**Proof.** Let $X$ be a smooth complex cubic fourfold. Again, denote $\text{GDCH}^*(X)$ and $\text{GDCH}^*(X \times X)$ the subrings of $\text{CH}^*(X)$ and $\text{CH}^*(X \times X)$ respectively generated by cycles that are restrictions of cycles on the universal families $\mathcal{X} \to B$ and $\mathcal{X} \times_B \mathcal{X} \to B$.

First, we determine generators for the rings $\text{GDCH}^*(X)$ and $\text{GDCH}^*(X \times X)$. It follows from [15, Proposition 5.2], since $\mathcal{X} \to B$ and $\mathcal{X} \times_B \mathcal{X} \to B$ are “stratified projective bundles” in the sense of loc. cit., that

$$\text{GDCH}^*(X) = \langle h \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \text{GDCH}^*(X \times X) = \langle p_1^* h, \Delta_X \rangle,$$

where $h \in \text{CH}^1(X)$ denotes the hyperplane section class and $p_i : X \times X \to X$ is the projection on the $i$-th factor.

It is then clear that the cycle class map $\text{GDCH}^*(X) \hookrightarrow H^*(X)$ is injective. The injectivity of the cycle class map $\text{GDCH}^*(X \times X) \to H^*(X \times X)$ is deduced easily from the following relation in $\text{CH}^5(X \times X)$:

$$\Delta_X \cdot p_1^* h = \Delta_X \cdot p_2^* h = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i+j=5, i,j>0} p_1^* h^i \cdot p_2^* h^j. \quad (5)$$

To show (5), we consider the following cartesian diagram whose excess normal bundle is $\mathcal{O}_X(3)$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
X & \to & X \times X \\
\Delta_X \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\mathbb{P}^5 & \to & \mathbb{P}^5 \times \mathbb{P}^5.
\end{array}$$

The excess intersection formula [20, Theorem 6.3] yields that

$$\Delta_{X,*}(c_1(\mathcal{O}_X(3))) = \Delta_{\mathbb{P}^5}|_{X \times X}.$$

As $\Delta_{\mathbb{P}^5} = \sum_{i=0}^{5} h^i \times h^{5-i}$ in $\text{CH}^5(\mathbb{P}^5 \times \mathbb{P}^5)$, where with an abuse of notation $h$ denotes also the hyperplane section class in $\mathbb{P}^5$, we obtain that in $\text{CH}(X \times X)$,

$$\Delta_{X,*}(3h) = \sum_{i=0}^{5} h^i \times h^{5-i},$$

which is nothing else but (5).

\[ \square \]

### 4.3. Cubic fourfolds and their Fano varieties of lines.

In [35], Laterveer related the Chow motives of a cubic hypersurface, its Hilbert square, and its Fano variety of lines. For our purpose, we need to establish the following slightly different result, which roughly says that the motive of a cubic fourfold as well as that of its symmetric square can be controlled by the motive of its Fano variety of lines. The proof relies as in [35] on a construction of Voisin [69] but also on the Franchetta property established in Proposition 4.4 for the square of a smooth cubic fourfold.

**Proposition 4.5.** Let $\mathcal{X} \to B$ denote the universal smooth cubic fourfold, $\mathcal{X}^{(2)} \to B$ its relative symmetric square, and let $\mathcal{F} \to B$ denote the universal Fano variety of lines in a cubic fourfold. There exist relative morphisms of Chow motives over $B$

$$\Phi : \mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{X}) \to \mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{F})(1) \oplus \bigoplus B(*)$$

and

$$\Psi : \mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{X}^{(2)}) \to \bigoplus \mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{F})(*) \oplus \bigoplus B(*)$$
which are fiberwise split injective. Here, $\bigoplus \mathbb{I}_B(*)$ means a direct sum of relative Lefschetz motives and $\bigoplus \mathfrak{h}(F)(*)$ means a direct sum of Tate twists of $\mathfrak{h}(F)$.

Proof. Let $\pi_X^j$ be the relative Chow–Künneth decomposition (4). Let $P \subset F \times_B X$ be the relative universal line, also seen as a relative morphism of motives

$$P : h(X) \rightarrow h(F)(1).$$

Let $h^4,\text{prim}(X)$ denote the motive defined by the projector

$$\pi_X^{4,\text{prim}} = \pi_X - \frac{1}{3}H^2 \times_B H^2,$$

where $H \in CH^1(X)$ denotes the relative hyperplane section. The Abel–Jacobi isomorphism of [4] implies that the composition

$$h^4,\text{prim}(X) \hookrightarrow h(X) \xrightarrow{P} h(F)(1) \xrightarrow{g^2} h(F)(-1) \xrightarrow{i_P} h(X) \rightarrow h^4,\text{prim}(X),$$

where $g$ denotes the relative Plücker polarization, induces fiberwise on $H^4(X)_{\text{prim}}$ a non-zero multiple of the identity. The Franchetta property for $X \times_B X \rightarrow B$ proved in Proposition 4.4 shows that $\pi_X^{4,\text{prim}} \circ P \circ (g^2) \circ P \circ \pi_X^{4,\text{prim}}$ is equal to a non-zero multiple of $\pi_X^{4,\text{prim}}$. It follows that $P \circ \pi_X^{4,\text{prim}} : h^4,\text{prim}(X) \rightarrow h(F)(1)$ is fiberwise split injective, from which we deduce the existence of a morphism $\Phi$ as in the statement of the proposition.

Let us now turn to the existence of a morphism $\Psi$ as in the statement. This is based on the following construction (which is more generally performed for smooth cubic hypersurfaces of any dimension) due to Galkin–Shinder [21] and Voisin [69]. Let $X$ be a smooth cubic fourfold and let $F$ be its Fano variety of lines; then Galkin–Shinder [21, Proof of Theorem 5.1] constructed a birational map $\phi : X^{[2]} \rightarrow W$ from the Hilbert scheme of length-2 subschemes $X^{[2]}$ of $X$, where $W$ is some $P^1$-bundle over $X$, and Voisin [69, Proposition 2.9] constructed an explicit resolution of indeterminacies

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
V & \xrightarrow{\phi} & X^{[2]} \xrightarrow{\phi} W,
\end{array}$$

with the property of interest to us that the morphism $\phi^2 : V \rightarrow W$ is a smooth blow-up with center $Z' \subset W$ of codimension 3, where $Z'$ has the structure of a $P^1$-bundle over $F$. (The morphism $\phi^1 : V \rightarrow X^{[2]}$ is also explicit; it is a blow-up with center $Z \subset X^{[2]}$ of codimension 2, where $Z$ has the structure of a $P^2$-bundle over $F$.) Pulling back along the Hilbert–Chow morphism $X^{[2]} \rightarrow X^{(2)}$ composed with $\phi^1$ gives a split injective morphism $h(X^{(2)}) \hookrightarrow h(V)$. The projective bundle formula and the blow-up formula for Chow motives provides an isomorphism

$$h(V) \simeq \bigoplus h(X)(*) \oplus \bigoplus h(F)(*).$$

Now we observe that the above construction of Galkin–Shinder and Voisin can be performed family-wise, and so we obtain a split injective morphism of relative motives over $B$

$$h(X^{(2)}) \hookrightarrow \bigoplus h(X)(*) \oplus \bigoplus h(F)(*).$$

(6)

Utilizing the morphism of relative motives $\Phi$ constructed above, we obtain the desired, fiberwise split injective, morphism $\Psi$. $\square$
4.4. **Proof of Theorem 4.1.** Let \( \pi^i_X \in \text{CH}^i(\mathcal{X} \times_B \mathcal{X}) \) be the relative Chow–Künneth projectors of (4). We have to show that the cycle
\[
\pi^i_X \circ \delta_{\mathcal{X}/B} \circ \left( \pi^i_X \otimes \pi^j_X \right) \in \text{CH}^i(\mathcal{X} \times_B \mathcal{X} \times_B \mathcal{X})
\] (7)
vanishes fiberwise for all \( k \neq i + j \). Let \( \sigma \) be the relative morphism \( \mathcal{X} \times_B \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \times_B \mathcal{X} \) that permutes the factors. Then, by commutativity of the algebra structure on the motive of a variety, we have
\[
\pi^k_X \circ \delta_{\mathcal{X}/B} \circ \left( \pi^i_X \otimes \pi^j_X \right) \circ \sigma = \pi^k_X \circ \delta_{\mathcal{X}/B} \circ \sigma \circ \left( \pi^i_X \otimes \pi^j_X \right) = \pi^k_X \circ \delta_{\mathcal{X}/B} \circ \left( \pi^i_X \otimes \pi^j_X \right)
\]
as cycles in \( \text{CH}^i(\mathcal{X} \times_B \mathcal{X} \times_B \mathcal{X}) \). It follows that the pull-push of (7) along \( \mathcal{X} \times_B \mathcal{X} \times_B \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^{(2)} \times_B \mathcal{X} \) is the cycle
\[
\pi^k_X \circ \delta_{\mathcal{X}/B} \circ \left( \pi^i_X \otimes \pi^j_X + \pi^j_X \otimes \pi^i_X \right) \in \text{CH}^i(\mathcal{X} \times_B \mathcal{X} \times_B \mathcal{X}).
\] (8)
Since the cycles (7) vanish cohomologically fiberwise for all \( k \neq i + j \), the same holds for the cycles (8) for all \( k \neq i + j \). Combining Proposition 4.5 with Theorem 4.3, we find that the cycles (8) vanish in the Chow group fiberwise for all \( k \neq i + j \). Composing on the right with \( \pi^k_X \otimes \pi^j_X \) proves the theorem. \( \square \)

**Remark 4.6** (Chern classes). By definition of \( \pi^2_X \), we have for a smooth cubic fourfold \( X \) that \( \text{CH}^4(X)_{(0)} = \text{CH}^1(X) = \mathbb{Q}h \). Since the Chern classes of \( X \) are powers of \( h \), we get by multiplicativity that
\[
c_i(X) \in \text{CH}^i(X)_{(0)}
\]
for all \( i \). This is especially useful in view of Proposition 1.9.

**Remark 4.7** (Uniqueness of the MCK decomposition). Let \( X \) be a smooth cubic fourfold whose Chow motive is finite-dimensional, in the sense of Kimura [28]. Then \( X \) admits a unique MCK decomposition, obtained by specializing the decomposition (4) to \( X \). Indeed, let \( \{ \pi^i_X, 0 \leq i \leq 8 \} \) be a Chow–Künneth decomposition for \( X \). By Kimura finite-dimensionality, since \( X \) has vanishing odd cohomology, we must have \( \pi^i_X = 0 \) for all \( i \) odd. Since \( \text{CH}_0(X) = \mathbb{Q}h^4 \), we have by Remark 1.2 that \( \pi^0_X = \frac{1}{7}h^4 \times 1_X \). Since \( H^2(X) = \mathbb{Q}(-1) = \mathbb{Q}h \), we have \( h^2(X) \simeq 1 \). In other words, \( \pi^2_X \) factors as \( h(X) \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow h(X) \). Since \( \text{CH}^1(X) = \mathbb{Q}h \), we see that necessarily \( \pi^2_X = \frac{1}{7}(h^3 + \varepsilon) \times h \), where \( \varepsilon \) is a homologically trivial 1-cycle on \( X \). Suppose now that \( \{ \pi^i_X, 0 \leq i \leq 8 \} \) is an MCK decomposition. Then by Proposition 1.7 we know it must be self-dual. In particular, we get \( \pi^5_X = \frac{1}{7}h^4 \times h \) and \( \pi^6_X = \frac{1}{7}h \times (h^3 + \varepsilon) \). By multiplicativity, we must have \( \text{CH}^3(X)_{(0)} = (\text{CH}^1(X)_{(0)})^3 = \mathbb{Q}h^3 \); this implies that \( \varepsilon = 0 \), and thereby establishes the uniqueness claim.

5. **Küchle fourfolds of type \( c7 \)**

As a first step towards the construction of Fano fourfolds, Küchle classified in [29] all Fano fourfolds of index 1 that can be obtained as zero loci of generic sections of homogenous vector bundles on Grassmannian varieties. Among those Küchle fourfolds, those with type \( c5, c7, d3 \) are of cohomological K3 type. The aim of this section is to establish the existence of an MCK decomposition for Küchle fourfolds of type \( c7 \). Those of type \( d3 \) were dealt with in [37], while the case of those of type \( c5 \) is still open and certainly worth further study; see [32]. Let us first recall the definition.

**Definition 5.1** ([29, Theorem 3.1]). A Küchle fourfold of type \( c7 \) is the zero locus of a generic section of the vector bundle
\[
\wedge^2 \mathcal{O}(1) \oplus \mathcal{O}(1)
\]
Küchle fourfolds of type $c7$ are of cohomological K3 type; their Hodge diamonds are as follows:

$$
\begin{array}{cccccc}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 22 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\end{array}
$$

The main result of this section is the following.

**Theorem 5.2.** A Küchle fourfold $X$ of type $c7$ has an MCK decomposition. Moreover, the Chern classes $c_j(X)$ are in $\text{CH}^j(X)_{(0)}$.

We need an alternative description, due to Kuznetsov [31, Section 4], of Küchle fourfolds of type $c7$ as blow-ups of (special) cubic fourfolds along the Veronese surface. Let $M$ be the blow-up of $\mathbb{P}^5$ along the Veronese surface $S := v_2(\mathbb{P}^2)$, where $v_2 : \mathbb{P}^2 \to \mathbb{P}^5$ is the embedding induced by the linear system $|O_{\mathbb{P}^2}(2)|$. Let $\pi : M \to \mathbb{P}^5$ be the blow-up morphism. It was shown in [31, Corollary 4.11] that a generic Küchle fourfold $X$ of type $c7$ arises as a member of the linear system $|3H - E|$ on $M$, where $H$ is the pull-back of the hyperplane section class on $\mathbb{P}^5$ and $E$ is the exceptional divisor. Therefore, its image $Y := \pi(X)$ is a cubic fourfold containing $S$. Set $\bar{B} := \text{Pic}^0(M, O_M(3H - E))$, and set $B$ to be the Zariski open subset of $\bar{B}$ parameterizing smooth fourfolds $X_b \subset M$ such that the cubic fourfold $Y_b = \pi(X_b)$ is also smooth. Let $\mathcal{X} \subset M \times B$ and $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{P}^5 \times B$ denote the universal families of Küchle fourfolds of type $c7$ and cubic fourfolds, respectively.

As a first step of the proof, we establish the Franchetta property for these two families, which is of independent interest. Note that $\mathcal{Y} \to B$ is the universal family of Hassett’s special cubic fourfolds $\mathcal{C}_{20}$.

**Lemma 5.3.** The families $\mathcal{X} \to B$ and $\mathcal{Y} \to B$ have the Franchetta property.

**Proof.** Let $\bar{\mathcal{X}} \to \bar{B}$ denote the family of possibly singular hypersurfaces. Since the linear system $|3H - E|$ is base-point free, $p : \bar{\mathcal{X}} \to M$ has the structure of a projective bundle. We first show the following equality:

$$\text{Im}
\left(
\text{CH}^i(\bar{\mathcal{X}}) \to \text{CH}^i(X_b)
\right) = \text{Im}
\left(
\text{CH}^i(M) \to \text{CH}^i(X_b)
\right), \quad \forall b \in B. \tag{9}
$$

Indeed, for any $\alpha \in \text{CH}^i(\bar{\mathcal{X}})$, the projective bundle formula yields

$$\alpha = \sum_{j=0}^{i} p^*(a_{i-j}) \cdot \xi^j \quad \text{in} \, \text{CH}^i(\bar{\mathcal{X}}),$$

where $\xi \in \text{CH}^1(\bar{\mathcal{X}})$ is relatively ample with respect to $p$ and $a_j \in \text{CH}^j(M)$. Let $h \in \text{CH}^1(\bar{B})$ be a hyperplane section and let $q : \bar{\mathcal{X}} \to \bar{B}$ denote the projection. We have $q^*(h) = \nu \xi + p^*(z)$, for some $\nu \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $z \in \text{CH}^1(M)$. It is readily checked that $\nu$ is non-zero. (Indeed, assume for

---

1In [31, Section 4], $M$ was defined to be the zero locus of a generic section of the vector bundle $\wedge^3 Q$ on Gr(3, 8). But according to [31, Theorem 4.10], this is equivalent to the definition by blow-up.
a moment \( \nu \) were zero. Then we would have \( q^*(\alpha|_E) = p^*(\beta) \) in \( \text{CH}^{\dim B}(\bar{\mathcal{X}}) \). But the right-hand side is non-zero, since \( \dim \bar{B} > \dim M = 5 \), while the left-hand side is non-zero.)

The constant \( \nu \) being non-zero, we can write

\[ \xi = p^*(z) + q^*(c) \quad \text{in} \quad \text{CH}^1(\bar{\mathcal{X}}), \]

where \( z \in \text{CH}^1(M) \) and \( c \in \text{CH}^1(\bar{B}) \) are non-zero elements. The restriction of \( q^*(c) \) to a fiber \( X_b \) is zero, and so we find that

\[ \alpha|_{X_b} = a'_b|_{X_b} \quad \text{in} \quad \text{CH}^i(X_b), \]

for some \( a'_b \in \text{CH}^i(M) \). This proves the equality (9).

Second, we claim that for any \( b \in B \), we have the following equality:

\[ \text{Im}(\text{CH}^*(\mathcal{Y} \to Y_b)) = \text{Im}(\text{CH}^*(\mathbb{P}^5) \to \text{CH}^*(Y_b)) + \text{Im}(\tau_{b,*} : \text{CH}^*(S) \to \text{CH}^*(Y_b)), \tag{10} \]

where \( \tau_b : S \to Y_b \) is the natural inclusion and the other morphisms are natural restriction maps. The right-hand side of (10) is clearly contained in its left-hand side. Let us show the reverse inclusion. Denote by \( \pi_b : X_b \to Y_b \) the restriction of \( \pi \) to \( X_b \), which fits into the following cartesian commutative diagram:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
E \cup X_b & \overset{i_E \cup i_X}{\longrightarrow} & M \\
{(\tau_b \circ \pi|_E) \cup \pi_b} \downarrow & & \pi \\
Y_b & \overset{i_Y}{\longrightarrow} & \mathbb{P}^5.
\end{array}
\]

For any \( z \in \text{Im}(\text{CH}^*(\mathcal{Y} \to Y_b)) \), \( z = \pi_b^*(\xi^*_E(z)) = \pi_b^*(i^*_Y(\alpha)) \) for some \( \alpha \in \text{CH}^*(M) \). Here we used (9) and the fact that \( \pi_b^*(z) \in \text{CH}^*(X_b) \) is the restriction of a cycle of \( \mathcal{X} \). By the base-change formula, we obtain

\[ i^*_Y \pi_b^*(\alpha) = \pi_{b,*}(i^*_Y(\alpha)) + \tau_{b,*}(\pi|_E)_*(i^*_E(\alpha)), \]

where the first term on the right-hand side is \( z \). The equality (10) is proven.

Denote as before \( \text{GDCH}^*(Y_b) := \text{Im}(\text{CH}^*(\mathcal{Y} \to Y_b)) \), the “generically defined cycles”. Thanks to (10), \( \text{GDCH}^*(Y_b) \) is generated, as a \( \mathbb{Q} \)-subalgebra of \( \text{CH}^*(Y_b) \), by the hyperplane class \( h \), the fundamental class of the Veronese surface \( S \), and the class of a line \( l \) in the surface \( S \). We need to show that the cycle class map restricted to this subalgebra \( \text{GDCH}^*(Y_b) = \langle h, S, l \rangle \) is injective.

To this end, we first observe that the generator \( l \) is redundant:

\[ l := \tau_*(c_1(\mathcal{O}_S(1))) = \tau_*(\frac{1}{2} \tau^*(h)) = \frac{1}{2} h \cdot S. \]

Hence \( \text{GDCH}^*(Y_b) = \langle h, S \rangle \). The cohomology classes \([S]\) and \([h]^2\) being independent, we only need to establish the following two relations in \( \text{CH}^*(Y_b) \):

- \( S^2 \) is proportional to \( h^4 \);
- \( S \cdot h \) is proportional to \( h^3 \).

The first one follows immediately from the fact that \( \text{CH}_0(Y_b) \simeq \mathbb{Q} \). For the second one, using the fact that the class of the Veronese surface in \( \mathbb{P}^5 \) is \( 4 c_1(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^5}(1))^3 \), we have

\[ S \cdot h = \frac{1}{3} i_*(i_Y^*(S)) = \frac{4}{3} h^3, \]

where \( i_Y : Y_b \to \mathbb{P}^5 \) is the natural inclusion.
The Franchetta property for \( X \to B \) now follows from the commutative diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{CH}^*(X) & \xrightarrow{\pi_*} & \text{CH}^*(X_b) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\text{CH}^*(Y) & \xrightarrow{(\pi_b)_*} & \text{CH}^*(Y_b)
\end{array}
\]

plus the fact that the Veronese surface \( S \cong \mathbb{P}^2 \subset Y_b \) has trivial Chow groups. \( \square \)

**Proof of Theorem 5.2.** To prove that Küchle fourfolds of type \( c7 \) have an MCK decomposition, it suffices, by specialization, to show that the generic Küchle fourfold of type \( c7 \) has an MCK decomposition with universally defined projectors. The generic fourfold of type \( c7 \) is a blow-up of a cubic fourfold as above, and so to establish an MCK, it suffices to check that the hypotheses of the “blow-up” part of Proposition 1.9 are met with. The second, third and fourth hypotheses follow from Theorem 4.1, Remark 4.6, and the fact that \( S \cong \mathbb{P}^2 \). The only thing that needs checking is the first hypothesis, i.e. that the graph of the inclusion morphism \( \tau: S \to Y \) lies in \( \text{CH}^*(S \times Y)_0 \).

Clearly, the inclusion morphism is universally defined (i.e., it exists as a relative morphism \( \tau \) over the base \( B \)). Since

\[ \Gamma_{\tau_b} \in \text{CH}^4(S \times Y_b) \cong \bigoplus_{j=2}^{4} \text{CH}^j(Y_b) \]

and since the MCK decomposition for \( S \times Y_b \) is universally defined over the base \( B \), it follows from Lemma 5.3 that

\[ (\pi_{S \times Y_b})_* (\Gamma_{\tau_b}) = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \text{CH}^4(S \times Y_b) \quad \forall j \neq 8, \]

i.e., \( \Gamma_{\tau_b} \in \text{CH}^4(S \times Y_b)_0 \), as desired.

Finally, the statement about the Chern classes \( c_j(X) \) follows from Lemma 5.3, in view of the fact that the Chern classes of \( X \) and the MCK decomposition of \( X \) are universally defined. \( \square \)

**Remark 5.4.** The link between Küchle \( c7 \) and cubic fourfolds is interesting also on the cubic fourfolds side. Indeed, thanks to the relation with Küchle \( c7 \) we were able to show (Lemma 5.3) the Franchetta property for the Hassett divisor \( C_{20} \) (parametrizing cubic fourfolds containing a Veronese surface). More generally, one can ask whether all Hassett divisors \( C_d \) have the Franchetta property. For those values of \( d \) where there is an associated K3 surface, this is equivalent to O’Grady’s generalized Franchetta conjecture for K3 surfaces. For other values of \( d \) (such as \( d = 20 \)), the expected answer is not so clear.

6. Todorov surfaces

We exhibit examples of regular surfaces with ample canonical class and with cohomology of K3 type that admit a multiplicative Chow–Kühneth decomposition, namely Todorov surfaces of type \((0,9)\) and \((1,10)\). For that purpose we first state a general criterion for lifting MCK decompositions along dominant morphisms of regular surfaces. (Criteria for descending an MCK decomposition along a generically finite morphism were given and used in [57, 58] to show that MCK decompositions were stable under the operation of taking the Hilbert scheme of length-2 or 3 subschemes.) We then define Todorov surfaces and check that for those of type \((0,9)\) and \((1,10)\) all the hypotheses of the general criterion are met with. As a by-product we obtain a Franchetta-type result for those Todorov surfaces.
6.1. A general criterion for lifting MCK decompositions on regular surfaces. Let \( p : S \to T \) be a dominant morphism between regular surfaces. In Remark 3.3, we saw that an MCK decomposition on \( S \) descends to give an MCK decomposition on \( T \). In general, one cannot infer an MCK decomposition on \( S \) from an MCK decomposition on \( T \). (Consider indeed the blow-up of a K3 surface at a very general point). The following proposition provides sufficient conditions for an MCK decomposition on \( T \) to lift to an MCK decomposition on \( S \) and will be used to construct such a decomposition on certain Todorov surfaces.

**Proposition 6.1 (Lifting MCK decompositions).** Let \( T \to B \) and \( S \to B \) be relatively flat and projective surfaces over a smooth quasi-projective complex variety \( B \). For any \( b \in B \), denote by \( T_b \) and \( S_b \) the respective fibers. Assume that for all \( b \in B \), \( S_b \) and \( T_b \) are regular surfaces which are smooth or finite-group quotients of smooth surfaces. Let \( p : S \to T \) be a dominant morphism over \( B \). Assume the following conditions:

(i) (Franchetta property for \( T/B \)) There exists a cycle \( c \in \text{CH}^2(T) \) which is fiberwise of degree 1 such that for any \( \alpha \in \text{CH}^2(T) \) and for any \( b \in B \), we have \( \alpha_b \in \text{Qc}_b \).

(ii) The relative CK decomposition \( \pi^0_T = c \times_B T, \pi^4_T = T \times_B c, \pi^2_T = \Delta_T/B - \pi^0_T - \pi^4_T \) is fiberwise an MCK decomposition; in other words, the modified small diagonal vanishes \( \Gamma_3(T_b, c_b) = 0 \) for any \( b \in B \) (see Proposition 3.1).

(iii) For any \( b \in B \), the pushforward \( p_* : \text{CH}^2(S_b) \to \text{CH}^2(T_b) \) is an isomorphism.

Then, denoting \( c' = \frac{1}{\deg(p)} p^* c \), the set \( \{ \pi^0_S = c' \times_B S, \pi^4_S = S \times_B c', \pi^2_S = \Delta_S/B - \pi^0_S - \pi^4_S \} \) defines a relative CK decomposition for \( S \) which is fiberwise an MCK decomposition. Moreover, the Franchetta property holds for the family \( S \to B \).

**Proof.** Intersection theory with rational coefficients extends naturally to quotients of smooth varieties by finite groups. Denote by \( d := \deg(p) \). First of all, note that the inverse of the isomorphism in (iii) is obviously \( \frac{1}{d} p^* \) by the projection formula. Then we can establish the Franchetta property for the family \( S/B : \) for any \( \alpha \in \text{CH}^2(S) \) and any \( b \in B \), by (i), \( p_*(\alpha_b) = mc_b \) in \( \text{CH}_0(T_b) \) for some \( m \in \mathbb{Q} \). Therefore,

\[
\alpha_b = \frac{1}{d} p^* (p_*(\alpha_b)) = \frac{1}{d} p^* (mc_b) = mc'_b \in \text{Qc}'_b.
\]

To show the multiplicativity of the Chow–K"unneth decomposition for the fibers of \( S \), we need to reinterpret it as follows. The relative Chow motive of \( S/B \) splits as

\[
\mathfrak{h}(S) = \mathfrak{h}(S)^{\text{inv}} \oplus \mathfrak{h}(S)^{\text{coinv}},
\]

where \( \mathfrak{h}(S)^{\text{inv}} = \frac{1}{d} p^* p_* \mathfrak{h}(S) \) and \( \mathfrak{h}(S)^{\text{coinv}} = (\Delta_S/B - \frac{1}{d} p^* p_*) \mathfrak{h}(S) \). For any \( b \in B \), \( \mathfrak{h}(S_b)^{\text{inv}} \) forms a subalgebra object of \( \mathfrak{h}(S_b) \), because \( \frac{1}{d} p^* p_* \circ \delta_{S_b} \circ (\frac{1}{d} p^* p_* \otimes \frac{1}{d} p^* p_*) = \delta_{S_b} \circ (\frac{1}{d} p^* p_* \otimes \frac{1}{d} p^* p_*) \).

Moreover \( p^* \) induces an isomorphism of algebra objects:

\[
\mathfrak{h}(T_b) \simeq \mathfrak{h}(S_b)^{\text{inv}}.
\]

In particular, \( p_* : \text{CH}^2(\mathfrak{h}(S_b)^{\text{inv}}) \to \text{CH}^2(\mathfrak{h}(T_b)) \) is an isomorphism. The assumption (iii) implies that for any \( b \in B \), \( \text{CH}^2(\mathfrak{h}(S_b)^{\text{coinv}}) = 0 \). It is also clear that \( \text{CH}^0(\mathfrak{h}(S_b)^{\text{coinv}}) = 0 \). By Lemma 6.2 below, \( \mathfrak{h}(S_b)^{\text{coinv}} \) is isomorphic to \( 1(-1)^r \) for some \( r \in \mathbb{N} \). Note that the number \( r \) may vary with \( b \), but the minimal value is attained by a very general point \( b \).

Now it is easy to see that fiberwise the relative Chow–K"unneth decomposition for \( S/B \) is given as \( \mathfrak{h}^i(S_b) = \mathfrak{h}^i(T_b) \) for \( i = 0 \) and 4, via the isomorphism (12), while \( \mathfrak{h}^2(S_b) = \mathfrak{h}^2(T_b) \oplus \mathfrak{h}(S_b)^{\text{coinv}} \). Let us show that it is multiplicative. Let \( b \) be a very general point of \( B \).

- By the isomorphism (12) and the assumption (ii), this decomposition is multiplicative on the subalgebra summand \( \mathfrak{h}(S_b)^{\text{inv}} \).
• By construction, the intersection product sends $h(S)_{\text{coinv}} \otimes h(S)_{\text{coinv}}$ to $h(S)_{\text{inv}}$ and we need to show that this map lands in $h^4(S)$. As $h(S)_{\text{coinv}} \simeq 1(-1)^r$, the morphism $h(S)_{\text{coinv}} \otimes h(S)_{\text{coinv}} \to h(S)_{\text{inv}}$ is given by $r^2$ elements of $\text{CH}^2(h(S)_{\text{inv}})$. Clearly each of these 0-cycles is the restriction to the fiber of an element of $\text{CH}^2(S)$. By the Franchetta property established in the beginning of the proof, this element is fiberwise a multiple of $c'_b$. We conclude by the definition of $h^4(S_b)$.

• Similarly, the intersection product sends $h(S)_{\text{inv}} \otimes h(S)_{\text{coinv}}$ to $h(S)_{\text{coinv}}$. From the fact that $h(S)_\text{coinv}$ is a direct sum of Lefschetz motives, one sees immediately that the intersection product sends $h^0(S_b) \otimes h(S)_{\text{coinv}}$ to $h(S)_{\text{coinv}}$ (the fundamental class is a unit for the algebra structure on the motive of a variety) and sends $h^4(S_b) \otimes h(S)_{\text{coinv}}$ to zero. It remains to show that the intersection product sends $h^2(S_b)_{\text{inv}} \otimes h(S)_{\text{coinv}}$ to zero. To this end, we use again that $h(S)_{\text{coinv}} \simeq 1(-1)^r$ to see that the morphism $h^2(S_b)_{\text{inv}} \otimes h(S)_{\text{coinv}} \to h(S)_{\text{coinv}}$ is given by $r^2$ elements of $\text{Hom}(h^2(S_b)_{\text{inv}}, 1)$, which is a subspace of $\text{CH}^2(S_b)_{\text{deg}=0}$. Similarly as in the previous item, each of these 0-cycles is the restriction to the fiber of an element of $\text{CH}^2(S)$ and the Franchetta property for $S/B$ tells us that these elements are zero.

The following easy lemma, which is a special case of [63, Cor. 2.2] in the case $\pi = t\pi$, is used in the proof of the previous proposition. We provide a proof for the sake of completeness.

**Lemma 6.2.** Let $S$ be a smooth projective regular surface and $\pi \in \text{CH}^2(S \times S)$ be a projector. If the Chow motive $M := (S, \pi)$ has vanishing $\text{CH}^2$ and $\text{CH}^0$, then $M$ is isomorphic to a direct sum of copies of the Lefschetz motive $1(-1)$.

**Proof.** The condition $\text{CH}^2(M) = 0$ implies that for any $x \in S$, the restriction of $\pi$ to the fiber $\{x\} \times S$ is zero in $\text{CH}^2(S)$. By the Bloch–Srinivas decomposition of diagonal theorem [7], there exists a divisor $D$ of $S$, such that $\pi$ is supported in $D \times S$. As $S$ is assumed to be regular, $\pi$ must be of the form

$$\pi = \sum_i D_i \times D'_i + \gamma \times S,$$

for some divisors $D_i, D'_i$ in $S$ and some 0-cycle $\gamma$ on $S$. Using the fact that $\pi$ is a projector, it is of the form

$$\pi = \sum_i D_i \times D'_i + \text{deg}(\gamma)\gamma \times S.$$

Now the hypothesis that $\text{CH}^0(M) = 0$ implies that $\text{deg}(\gamma) = 0$, hence $\pi = \sum_i D_i \times D'_i$, that is, $M$ is a direct sum of copies of $1(-1)$. \qed

6.2. Todorov surfaces.

**Definition 6.3 ([45], [61]).** A Todorov surface is a canonical surface $S$ (i.e., a projective surface with only rational double points as singularities and with $K_S$ ample) with $p_g(S) = 1$, $q = 0$, and such that the bicanonical map $\phi_{2K_S} : S \to \mathbb{P}^r$ fits into a commutative diagram

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
S & \xrightarrow{\pi} & S \\
\phi_{2K_S} \downarrow & & \downarrow \phi_{2K_S} \\
S/\iota & \xrightarrow{\phi_{2K_S}} & \mathbb{P}^r \\
\end{array}
$$

where $\iota : S \to S$ is an involution for which $S/\iota$ is birational to a K3 surface. The K3 surface obtained by resolving the singularities of $S/\iota$ will be called the K3 surface associated to $S$. 

Definition 6.4 ([45]). The fundamental invariants of a Todorov surface $S$ are $(\alpha, k)$, where $\alpha$ is such that the 2-torsion subgroup of Pic($S$) has order $2^\alpha$, and $k = K^2_S + 8$. (The definition of $k$ is explained as the number of rational double points on a so-called “distinguished partial desingularization” of $S/\iota$; see [45, Theorem 5.2(ii)].)

Remark 6.5. By Morrison [45, p.335], there are exactly 11 irreducible families of Todorov surfaces, corresponding to the 11 possible values of the fundamental invariants:

$$(\alpha, k) \in \{(0, 9), (0, 10), (0, 11), (1, 10), (1, 11), (1, 12), (2, 12), (2, 13), (3, 14), (4, 15), (5, 16)\}.$$

For most of these families (in particular for types $(0, 9)$ and $(1, 10)$ which are of interest to us), examples of smooth members are given in [61].

6.3. The Franchetta property for Todorov surfaces of type $(0, 9)$ and $(1, 10)$.

6.3.1. Explicit descriptions. We now restrict attention to Todorov surfaces $S$ with fundamental invariants $(0, 9)$ and $(1, 10)$. This means that either $K^2_S = 1$, or $K^2_S = 2$ and the fundamental group of $S$ is $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ ([9, Theorem 2.11]). In these two cases, there happens to be a nice explicit description of $S$ in terms of complete intersections in weighted projective spaces.

Theorem 6.6 (Catanese [8, Theorem 3], Todorov [60, Theorem 6]). Let $S$ be a Todorov surface with fundamental invariants $(0, 9)$. Then $S$ is isomorphic to a complete intersection of two degree-6 hypersurfaces in the weighted projective space $\mathbb{P} := \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 2, 3, 3)$, invariant under the involution

$$\iota: \mathbb{P} \to \mathbb{P},$$

$$[x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_4] \mapsto [-x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_4].$$

Moreover, the involution $\iota$ of $\mathbb{P}$ restricts to the involution of Definition 6.3 on $S$.

Conversely, a weighted complete intersection as above with only rational double points as singularities is isomorphic to a Todorov surface with fundamental invariants $(0, 9)$.

Theorem 6.7 (Catanese–Debarre [9, Theorems 2.8, 2.9]). Let $S$ be a Todorov surface with fundamental invariants $(1, 10)$. Then $S$ is isomorphic to the quotient $V/\tau$, where $V$ is a complete intersection in the weighted projective space $\mathbb{P} := \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 2, 2)$ having only rational double points as singularities, given by the system of degree-4 equations

$$\begin{cases}
F = z_3^2 + cw^4 + w^2q(x_1, x_2) + Q(x_1, x_2) = 0, \\
G = z_4^2 + c'w^4 + w^2q'(x_1, x_2) + Q'(x_1, x_2) = 0.
\end{cases}$$

Here $[w : x_1 : x_2 : z_3 : z_4]$ are coordinates for $\mathbb{P}$, and $q, q'$ are quadratic forms, $Q, Q'$ are quartic forms without common factor, and $c, c'$ are constants not both 0. The involution $\tau: \mathbb{P} \to \mathbb{P}$ is defined as

$$[w : x_1 : x_2 : z_3 : z_4] \mapsto [-w : x_1 : x_2 : z_3 : z_4].$$

Moreover, the involution $\iota$ of $\mathbb{P}$ defined as

$$[w : x_1 : x_2 : z_3 : z_4] \mapsto [w : x_1 : x_2 : -z_3 : z_4]$$

induces the involution of Definition 6.3 on $S$.

Conversely, given a weighted complete intersection $V \subset \mathbb{P}$ as above, the quotient $S := V/\tau$ is isomorphic to a Todorov surface with fundamental invariants $(1, 10)$. 

Remark 6.8. As is shown in [8] (resp. [9]), the Todorov surfaces with fundamental invariants (0, 9) (resp. (1, 10)) form a 12-dimensional subfamily of a larger 18-dimensional (resp. 16-dimensional) family of surfaces of general type with $p_g = 1$, $q = 0$ and $K^2 = 1$ (resp. $K^2 = 2$ and $\pi_1 = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$), where the above explicit description using complete intersections in the weighted projective space is true. We do not know how to establish an MCK decomposition for these larger families of regular surfaces with $p_g = 1$. Note that for any surface $S$ in these larger families, there is still a Hodge isometry $H^2_{3\text{tr}}(S, \mathbb{Q}) \cong H^2_{4\text{tr}}(\bar{T}, \mathbb{Q})$ with $\bar{T}$ a K3 surface [46], but it is not clear whether this isometry is induced by an algebraic correspondence.

6.3.2. Universal families. In view of Theorems 6.6 and 6.7, let us construct universal families, which will play a crucial role in establishing the Franchetta property.

Notation 6.9. (i) (Case (0,9)): Let $\mathbb{P}$ be the weighted projective space $\mathbb{P}(1,2,2,3,3)$. Let $B \subset \mathbb{P}((\mathbb{H}^0(\mathbb{P},\mathcal{O}_\mathbb{P}(6))^{\oplus 2})$ be the linear subspace parameterizing pairs of (weighted) homogeneous polynomials of degree 6

$$F_b(x_0, \ldots, x_4), \quad G_b(x_0, \ldots, x_4),$$

where $x_0$ only occurs in even degree. Let $B$ be the Zariski open subset of $\bar{B}$ consisting of $b \in \bar{B}$ such that

$$S_b := \{ x \in \mathbb{P} \mid F_b(x) = G_b(x) = 0 \}$$

is a non-singular surface.

Let $S \to B$ denote the total space of the family over $B$ (i.e., by Theorem 6.6, the fiber $S_b$ over $b \in B$ is a smooth Todorov surface of type (0,9)), and let $\bar{S} \to \bar{B}$ denote the total space of the family over $\bar{B}$. We have a diagram of families

$$\begin{array}{ccl}
S & \subset & \bar{S} \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\bar{T} & \subset & \bar{T}
\end{array}$$

where $\bar{T}$ (resp. $T$) is the quotient of $\bar{S}$ (resp. $S$) under the involution $\iota$ induced by $[x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_4] \mapsto [-x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_4]$. That is, the fiber $T_b$ over $b \in B$ is a “singular K3 surface”, and its minimal resolution is the K3 surface associated to $S_b$.

(ii) (Case (1,10)): Let $\mathbb{P}$ be the weighted projective space $\mathbb{P}(1,1,1,2,2)$ with coordinates $[w, x_1, x_2, z_3, z_4]$. Let $\bar{B}$ be the linear subspace of $\mathbb{P}((\mathbb{H}^0(\mathbb{P},\mathcal{O}_\mathbb{P}(4))^{\oplus 2})$ parameterizing pairs of weighted homogeneous equations of the form

$$\begin{cases}
F_b = a z_3^2 + cw^4 + w^2 q(x_1, x_2) + Q(x_1, x_2), \\
G_b = a' z_3^2 + c' w^4 + w^2 q'(x_1, x_2) + Q'(x_1, x_2).
\end{cases}$$

Let $B$ be the Zariski open subset of $\bar{B}$ consisting of points $b \in \bar{B}$ such that

$$V_b := \{ x \in \mathbb{P} \mid F_b(x) = G_b(x) = 0 \}$$

is a smooth surface and $F_b, G_b$ are as in Theorem 6.7 (in particular $aa' \neq 0$ and $c, c'$ not both 0).

Let $V \to B$ denote the total space of the family over $B$, and let $\bar{S} := V/\langle \tau \rangle \to B$ denote the family obtained by applying the fixed point-free involution $\tau \times \text{id}_B$ to $V \subset \mathbb{P} \times B$ (i.e., by Theorem 6.7, the fiber $\bar{S}_b$ over $b \in B$ is a smooth Todorov surface of type (1,10)). Denote similarly $\bar{V}$ and $\bar{S} := \bar{V}/\langle \tau \rangle$ the total spaces of the corresponding families over $\bar{B}$. We have a diagram of families

$$\begin{array}{ccl}
V & \subset & \bar{V} \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
S & \subset & \bar{S} \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\bar{T} & \subset & \bar{T}
\end{array}$$
where $\bar{T}$ (resp. $T$) is the quotient of $S$ (resp. $S$) under the involution $\iota$ induced by $[w, x_1, x_2, z_3, z_4] \mapsto [w, x_1, x_2, -z_3, z_4]$. That is, the fiber $T_b$ over $b \in B$ is a “singular K3 surface”, and its minimal resolution is the K3 surface associated to $S_b$.

**Remark 6.10.** In both cases of Notation 6.9, it can be checked (cf. [8] and [9]) that the parameter space $B$ is non-empty, i.e., the general Todorov surface of type $(0,9)$ or $(1,10)$ is smooth. See also Remark 6.5.

6.3.3. The Franchetta property.

**Proposition 6.11** (Franchetta property for $T$). Let $T \to B$ be the universal family as above. Let $\gamma \in CH^2(T)$ be a cycle that has degree 0 on the general fiber. Then

$$\gamma|_{T_b} = 0 \quad \text{in} \ CH^2(T_b) \quad \forall b \in B.$$  

**Proof.** For the case $(0,9)$, the family $T \to B$ is constructed as the quotient

$$\pi: \ S \to \ S/(\iota) =: T,$$

where $S \to B$ is as in Notation 6.9(i), and $\iota$ is as in Theorem 6.6. The quotient $P/(\iota)$ can be identified with the weighted projective space $P' := P(2,2,2,3,3)$, and quotients of the form $T_b = S_b/(\iota|_{T_b})$ can be identified with weighted complete intersections of degree $(6,6)$ in $P'$. It follows that $T \to B$ is the same as the universal family of weighted complete intersections of degree $(6,6)$ in $P'$. As such, $T \to P'$ has the structure of a projective bundle.

Once we have a projective bundle structure, the argument proving (9) shows the following equality:

$$\text{Im}(CH^*(T) \to CH^*(T_b)) = \text{Im}(CH^*(P') \to CH^*(T_b)), \quad \forall b \in B.$$  

But $CH^2(P')$ is one-dimensional, generated by the square of a hyperplane $h \subset P'$. It follows that for any $\gamma \in CH^2(T)$,

$$\gamma|_{T_b} = m h^2|_{T_b} \quad \text{in} \ CH^2(T_b),$$

where $m \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $h_b := h|_{T_b} \in CH^1(T_b)$ is a hyperplane section. This implies the Franchetta property.

For the case $(1,10)$, the family $T \to B$ is constructed as the quotient

$$\pi: \ V \to \ V/(\tau, \iota) =: T,$$

where $V \to B$ and $\tau$ and $\iota$ are as in (ii) of Notation 6.9. We note that for any $b \in B$ the surface $V_b \subset P$ is contained in $P^- := P \setminus \{[0,0,0,1,0], [0,0,0,0,1]\}$. This means that $V$ is a Zariski open subset of $V^-$, which is defined by the fiber diagram

$$V^- \subset V \quad \text{and} \quad P^- \subset P.$$  

It is proven in [36, Lemma 2.12] that $V^- \to P^-$ is a $P^r$-bundle. The argument proving (9) then shows that there is equality

$$\text{Im}(CH^*(V^-) \to CH^*(V_b)) = \text{Im}(CH^*(P^-) \to CH^*(V_b)), \quad \forall b \in B.$$  

But $CH^2(P^-)$ is one-dimensional, generated by the square of a hyperplane $h$. It follows that

$$(\pi_b)^*(\gamma|_{T_b}) = (\pi^*\gamma)|_{V_b} = h^2|_{V_b} \quad \text{in} \ CH^2(V_b),$$

and we conclude as before. □
Remark 6.12. The link between Todorov surfaces and K3 surfaces is interesting also from the K3 side. Indeed, Proposition 6.11 says that the Franchetta property holds for the universal K3 surface obtained as a double cover of the projective plane branched along two cubics. (The fact that the quotient $T$ is of this type is proven in [54]. The fact that a general such K3 is quotient of a Todorov surface of type $(0,9)$ is because the period map for Todorov surfaces of type $(0,9)$ is known to have 2-dimensional fibers [60].) This corresponds to a 10-dimensional locus inside $\mathcal{F}_2$, the moduli stack of K3 surfaces of degree 2, and it is not a priori clear that the Franchetta property should be true over this locus. This is similar to Remark 5.4 about special cubic fourfolds related to K"uchle fourfolds of type $c7$.

6.4. Constructing an MCK decomposition. We prove Theorem 2. First, we recall the following result concerning the Chow group of 0-cycles of Todorov surfaces of type $(0,9)$ and $(1,10)$. It can be seen as a special case of the Bloch conjecture.

Theorem 6.13 (Laterveer [34], [36]). Let $S$ be a smooth Todorov surface with fundamental invariants $(0,9)$ or $(1,10)$. Let $\overline{T}$ be its associated K3 surface, and let $\Gamma \in \text{CH}^2(S \times \overline{T})$ be the correspondence induced by the quotient morphism $S \to T := S/\iota$ and the resolution of singularities $\overline{T} \to T$. Then $\Gamma$ induces an isomorphism

$$\Gamma_* : \text{CH}_0(S) \cong \text{CH}_0(\overline{T}).$$

Sketch of proof. The $(0,9)$ case is [34, Proposition 30], while the the $(1,10)$ case is [36, Theorem 5.2]. In both cases, the crux in proving an isomorphism of Chow groups is that there is an explicit description of the surfaces $S$ in terms of (quotients of) complete intersections. This ensures that Voisin’s method of “spread” [66], [67], [68] applies. This method exploits the fact that the total space of the universal family of complete intersections of a certain type has a very simple structure. Thanks to this simple structure, one can prove the Franchetta property for self-correspondences of degree zero that exist universally. This applies in particular to (a modification of) the graph of the involution $\iota$. □

Proof of Theorem 2. This is an application of Proposition 6.1, with $S \to B$ the family of smooth Todorov surfaces, and $T \to B$ the family of quotients under the involution $\iota$. Let us ascertain that the hypotheses of Proposition 6.1 are met with. The Franchetta property for $T \to B$ is Proposition 6.11. The MCK decomposition for the “singular K3 surface” $T$ follows from the MCK decomposition for its minimal resolution of singularities $\tilde{T}$ (which is a K3 surface and hence admits an MCK decomposition by Example 3.2) via Remark 3.3 (which still makes sense for surfaces with quotient singularities). Finally, hypothesis (iii) is Theorem 6.13. □

Remark 6.14. Theorem 6.13 has recently been proven in [71] for Todorov surfaces with fundamental invariants $(2,12)$. As such, it seems likely that the present approach also works to establish an MCK decomposition for this third family of Todorov surfaces.
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