

GLOBALLY GENERATED VECTOR BUNDLES WITH $c_1 = 5$ ON \mathbb{P}^n , $n \geq 4$

CRISTIAN ANGHEL, IUSTIN COANDĂ, AND NICOLAE MANOLACHE

ABSTRACT. We complete the classification of globally generated vector bundles with small c_1 on projective spaces by treating the case $c_1 = 5$ on \mathbb{P}^n , $n \geq 4$ (the case $c_1 \leq 3$ has been considered by Sierra and Ugaglia, while the cases $c_1 = 4$ on any projective space and $c_1 = 5$ on \mathbb{P}^2 and \mathbb{P}^3 have been studied in two of our previous papers). It turns out that there are very few indecomposable bundles of this kind: besides some obvious examples there are, roughly speaking, only the (first twist of the) rank 5 vector bundle which is the middle term of the monad defining the Horrocks bundle of rank 3 on \mathbb{P}^5 , and its restriction to \mathbb{P}^4 . We recall, in an appendix, from our preprint [arXiv:1805.11336], the main results allowing the classification of globally generated vector bundles with $c_1 = 5$ on \mathbb{P}^3 . Since there are many such bundles, a large part of the main body of the paper is occupied with the proof of the fact that, except for the simplest ones, they do not extend to \mathbb{P}^4 as globally generated vector bundles.

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
1. Preliminaries	4
2. The case $c_1 = 5$ on \mathbb{P}^4	10
3. The case $c_1 = 5$ on \mathbb{P}^n , $n \geq 5$	22
Appendix A. Overview of the case $c_1 = 5$ on \mathbb{P}^3	25
References	39

INTRODUCTION

We classify, in this paper, the globally generated vector bundles with first Chern class $c_1 = 5$ on the n -dimensional projective space \mathbb{P}^n (over an algebraically closed field k of characteristic 0) for $n \geq 4$. This completes the classification of globally generated vector bundles with $c_1 \leq 5$ on projective spaces. Indeed, Sierra and Ugaglia [25], [26] solved the case $c_1 \leq 3$, while we treated the cases $c_1 = 4$ on any projective space and $c_1 = 5$ on \mathbb{P}^2 in [2] and the case $c_1 = 5$ on \mathbb{P}^3 in [5]. Moreover, Chiodera and Ellia [11] noticed that there is no indecomposable globally generated rank 2 vector bundle with $c_1 = 5$ on \mathbb{P}^4 . Besides their own interest, these classification results are useful in attacking other geometric problems: see, for example, the paper of Fania and Mezzetti [15].

Our main result is the following:

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 14J60; Secondary: 14H50, 14N25.
Key words and phrases. projective space, vector bundle, globally generated sheaf.

Theorem 0.1. *Let E be an indecomposable globally generated vector bundle with $c_1 = 5$ on \mathbb{P}^n , $n \geq 4$, such that $H^i(E^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$. Then one of the following holds:*

- (i) $E \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(5)$;
- (ii) $E \simeq P(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(5))$;
- (iii) $n = 4$ and one has an exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^3(3) \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^2(2) \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^1(1) \longrightarrow E(-1) \longrightarrow 0;$$

- (iv) $n = 4$ and one has an exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow E(-1) \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^2(2) \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^1(1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4} \longrightarrow 0;$$

- (v) $n = 5$ and one has an exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^5}^4(4) \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^5}^2(2) \longrightarrow E(-1) \longrightarrow 0;$$

- (vi) $n = 5$ and one has an exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow E(-1) \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^5}^2(2) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^5} \longrightarrow 0;$$

- (vii) $n = 6$ and $E \simeq \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^6}^1(2)$;

- (viii) $n = 6$ and $E \simeq \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^6}^4(5)$.

As a matter of notation: if E is a globally generated vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^n , $P(E)$ denotes the dual of the kernel of the evaluation morphism $H^0(E) \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n} \rightarrow E$. It is globally generated and has Chern classes $c_1(P(E)) = c_1(E)$, $c_2(P(E)) = c_1(E)^2 - c_2(E)$ etc. This construction allows one, when classifying globally generated vector bundles, to assume that $c_2(E) \leq c_1(E)^2/2$. Notice that $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^6}^4(5) \simeq P(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^6}^1(2))$ and if E is the bundle from item (iii) (resp., (v)) of the theorem then $P(E)$ is the bundle from item (iv) (resp., (vi)).

As for the condition $H^i(E^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, if E is a globally generated vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^n then $H^0(E^\vee) = 0$ if and only if E has no direct summand isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}$ and, in this case, considering the universal extension:

$$0 \longrightarrow H^1(E^\vee)^\vee \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n} \longrightarrow \tilde{E} \longrightarrow E \longrightarrow 0,$$

\tilde{E} is globally generated, it has the same Chern classes as E , and $H^i(\tilde{E}^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$.

It is striking, again, how rare are the globally generated vector bundles, this time with $c_1 = 5$, on higher dimensional projective spaces. Notice that if E is the vector bundle from item (v) of the theorem then $E(-1)$ is the middle term of the monad defining the Horrocks bundle of rank 3 on \mathbb{P}^5 (see [20]).

The proof of Theorem 0.1 uses the classification of globally generated vector bundles with $c_1 = 5$ on \mathbb{P}^3 from our lengthy preprint [5]. Fortunately, we use here only the basic principles of this classification and we recall everything we need, with complete proofs (except for one fact), in Appendix A. More precisely, if F is a globally generated vector bundle of rank ≥ 3 with $c_1 = 5$ on \mathbb{P}^3 such that $H^i(F^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, and if $H^0(F(-2)) \neq 0$ then F admits a direct summand of the form $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(a)$, for some a with $2 \leq a \leq 5$. A nine pages long proof of this fact can be found in [5, Appendix A] and we decided to not reproduce it in the present paper. On the other

hand, if $H^0(F(-2)) = 0$ then, with some exceptions that can be described explicitly, F can be realized as an extension :

$$0 \longrightarrow (\operatorname{rk} F - 3)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow G(2) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where G is a *stable* rank 3 vector bundle with $c_1(G) = -1$. If $c_2(F) \leq 12$, which we can assume using the functor $P(*)$ defined above, then $c_2(G) \leq 4$. Taking advantage of the fact that the intermediate cohomology of G (and its twists) can be described by a numerical invariant called the *spectrum* of G , one can get a description of the Horrocks (or, sometimes, Beilinson) monad of F . The hard part of the classification on \mathbb{P}^3 is to show that the cohomology bundles of these monads are really globally generated but, fortunately, we do not need this here. For a significant application of our constructions of globally generated vector bundles with $c_1 = 5$ on \mathbb{P}^3 , see, however, [4].

As for the classification problem we are concerned with in this paper, if E is a globally generated vector bundle with $c_1 = 5$ on \mathbb{P}^n , $n \geq 4$, such that $H^i(E^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, and if $H^0(E_\Pi(-2)) \neq 0$ for some fixed 3-plane $\Pi \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ then we show, in Section 1, that E has a direct summand of the form $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(a)$, for some a with $2 \leq a \leq 5$. The proof of this fact uses two lifting results from [2, Chap. 1] that we recall, too. It follows that we can concentrate only on the case where $H^0(E_\Pi(-2)) = 0$, for every 3-plane $\Pi \subset \mathbb{P}^n$. This turns out to be a quite strong restriction.

We classify, in Section 2, the globally generated vector bundles E with $c_1 = 5$ and $c_2 \leq 12$ on \mathbb{P}^4 such that $H^i(E^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, and that $H^0(E_H(-2)) = 0$, for every hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$. We spend most of the time showing that, except for the simplest ones, the globally generated vector bundles with $c_1 = 5$ on \mathbb{P}^3 do not extend to \mathbb{P}^4 as globally generated vector bundles.

Finally, we describe, in Section 3, the globally generated vector bundles with $c_1 = 5$ on \mathbb{P}^n , $n \geq 5$. This is easier because on \mathbb{P}^4 there are very few such bundles.

Unfortunately, the method used in this paper (and in the previous ones), which consists in classifying globally generated vector bundles on \mathbb{P}^3 (the case of \mathbb{P}^2 is special: see Ellia [14]) and then trying to decide which of them extend to higher dimensional projective spaces, does not seem to work, anymore, for $c_1 > 5$. The reason is that on \mathbb{P}^3 there are too many globally generated vector bundles. Moreover, in order to achieve the classification in the case $c_1 \leq 5$, we almost exhausted the results about vector bundles on projective spaces, obtained by several authors in the period when this was a quite active domain, namely the 1970s and 1980s. There might be possible to classify globally generated vector bundles with $c_1 \leq n$ on \mathbb{P}^n but a different approach is needed. Note, in this context, that Theorem 0.1 settles the case $n = 6$ of [2, Conjecture 0.3] about globally generated vector bundles with $c_1 < n$ on \mathbb{P}^n (the case $n \leq 5$ was settled in [2]).

Notation. (i) We work over an algebraically closed field k of characteristic 0.

(ii) If X is a k -scheme of finite type, with structure sheaf \mathcal{O}_X , and \mathcal{F} an \mathcal{O}_X -module we denote its dual $\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{O}_X)$ by \mathcal{F}^\vee . We use, most of the time, the additive notation $m\mathcal{F}$ for the direct sum of m copies of \mathcal{F} . Similarly for modules over a ring. We shall write, however, k^m instead of mk .

(iii) For X and \mathcal{F} as above, if Y is a closed subscheme of X we put $\mathcal{F}_Y := \mathcal{F} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{O}_Y$ and identify it, if necessary, with the restriction $\mathcal{F}|_Y := i^* \mathcal{F}$, where $i: Y \rightarrow X$ is the inclusion morphism.

(iv) We denote by \mathbb{P}^n the projective space $\mathbb{P}(V)$ parametrizing the 1-dimensional k -vector spaces of $V := k^{n+1}$. Its homogeneous coordinate ring is $S := \text{Sym}(V^\vee)$. If e_0, \dots, e_n is the canonical basis of V and X_0, \dots, X_n the dual basis of V^\vee then S is isomorphic to the polynomial k -algebra $k[X_0, \dots, X_n]$. We denote by S_+ the ideal (X_0, \dots, X_n) of S and by \underline{k} the graded S -module S/S_+ .

(v) If \mathcal{F} is a coherent $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}$ -module and $i \geq 0$ an integer we denote by $H_*^i(\mathcal{F})$ the graded S -module $\bigoplus_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} H^i(\mathcal{F}(l))$ and by $h^i(\mathcal{F})$ the dimension of $H^i(\mathcal{F})$ as a k -vector space.

1. PRELIMINARIES

Our main purpose, in this section, is to show how one can reduce the classification of globally generated vector bundles E with $c_1 = 5$ on \mathbb{P}^n , $n \geq 4$, to the case where $H^0(E_\Pi(-2)) = 0$, for every 3-plane $\Pi \subset \mathbb{P}^n$. We also record some auxiliary results that are needed in the sequel.

We begin by recalling, from Sierra and Ugaglia [26, Lemma 1 and Lemma 2], two observations allowing one to reduce the classification of globally generated vector bundles E on \mathbb{P}^n to the case where $H^i(E^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, and $c_2 \leq c_1^2/2$ (c_1, c_2 being the first two Chern classes of E).

Remark 1.1. (a) If E is a globally generated vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^n we denote, following Bruguères [8, Appendix A], by $P(E)$ the dual of the kernel of the evaluation morphism $H^0(E) \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n} \rightarrow E$. $P(E)$ is a globally generated vector bundle with the property that $H^i(P(E)^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, and if $H^i(E^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, then $P(P(E)) \simeq E$.

(b) If $\phi: E \rightarrow E'$ is a morphism of globally generated vector bundles with the property that its kernel and cokernel are direct sums of copies of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}$ then $P(\phi): P(E') \rightarrow P(E)$ is an isomorphism. *Indeed*, one checks easily that the kernel and cokernel of $P(\phi)$ are direct sums of copies of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}$. Since $H^0(P(E)^\vee) = 0$ it follows that $\text{Coker } P(\phi) = 0$, that is, $P(\phi)$ is an epimorphism. Since $H^1(P(E)^\vee) = 0$ it follows that $\text{Ker } P(\phi)$ is a direct summand of $P(E')$. But this implies that $\text{Ker } P(\phi) = 0$ because $H^0(P(E')^\vee) = 0$.

(c) The Chern classes of $P(E)$ can be related to the Chern classes c_1, c_2, \dots of E by the formulae:

$$\begin{aligned} c_1(P(E)) &= c_1, \quad c_2(P(E)) = c_1^2 - c_2, \quad c_3(P(E)) = c_3 + c_1(c_1^2 - 2c_2), \\ c_4(P(E)) &= -c_4 + c_2^2 + 2c_1c_3 - 3c_1^2c_2 + c_1^4, \text{ etc.} \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if $c_2 > c_1^2/2$ then $c_2(P(E)) < c_1^2/2$.

Remark 1.2. Let E be a globally generated vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^n . Consider the globally generated vector bundle $F := P(P(E))$. Recall, from Remark 1.1(a), that one has, by definition, an exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow P(E)^\vee \xrightarrow{u} H^0(E) \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n} \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_E} E \longrightarrow 0.$$

Applying the Snake Lemma to the dual of the commutative diagram :

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & E^\vee & \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_E^\vee} & H^0(E)^\vee \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n} & \xrightarrow{u^\vee} & P(E) \longrightarrow 0 \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow H^0(u^\vee) & & \parallel \\
0 & \longrightarrow & F^\vee & \longrightarrow & H^0(P(E)) \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n} & \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_{P(E)}} & P(E) \longrightarrow 0
\end{array}$$

one gets an exact sequence :

$$0 \longrightarrow H^1(E^\vee)^\vee \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n} \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow E \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_{E^\vee}^\vee} H^0(E^\vee)^\vee \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Since E is globally generated, $\text{ev}_{E^\vee}^\vee$ has a right inverse hence $E \simeq (H^0(E^\vee)^\vee \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}) \oplus Q$, where Q is the cokernel of $H^1(E^\vee)^\vee \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n} \rightarrow F$.

(b) With the notation from (a), one has : F is globally generated, $H^i(F^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, E and F have the same Chern classes, $H^0(F(l)) \xrightarrow{\sim} H^0(E(l))$ for $l \leq -1$, $H_*^i(F) \xrightarrow{\sim} H_*^i(E)$ if $1 \leq i \leq n-2$, and, if $i = n-1$ or n , $H^i(F(l)) \xrightarrow{\sim} H^i(E(l))$ for $l \geq -n$.

(c) If one has an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow E' \rightarrow m\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n} \rightarrow E \rightarrow 0$ then $P(E^\vee) \simeq F$. Indeed, the kernel and cokernel of the obvious morphism $E' \rightarrow P(E)^\vee$ are direct sums of copies of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}$ hence the same is true for its dual $P(E) \rightarrow E'^\vee$. One applies, now, Remark 1.1(b).

The next two results are [2, Lemma 1.18] and a (more practical) variant of [2, Lemma 1.19] (combined with [2, Remark 1.20(c)]).

Lemma 1.3. *Let E be a globally generated vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^n , $n \geq 4$, such that $H^i(E^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, and $H \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ a fixed hyperplane. Let F be the vector bundle $P(P(E_H))$ on $H \simeq \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ (see Remark 1.2). If $F \simeq A \oplus P(B)$, with A and B direct sums of line bundles on H such that $H^0(A^\vee) = 0$ and $H^0(B^\vee) = 0$, then $E \simeq \hat{A} \oplus P(\hat{B})$, where \hat{A} and \hat{B} are direct sums of line bundles on \mathbb{P}^n lifting A and B , respectively. \square*

Lemma 1.4. *Let E be a globally generated vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^n , $n \geq 4$, such that $H^i(E^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, and $\Pi \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ a fixed 3-plane. Let F be the vector bundle $P(P(E_\Pi))$ on $\Pi \simeq \mathbb{P}^3$ (see Remark 1.2). If $F \simeq A \oplus P(B) \oplus \Omega_\Pi(2)$, with A and B direct sums of line bundles on Π such that $H^0(A^\vee) = 0$, $H^0(B^\vee) = 0$, $\text{rk } A < n$ and $\text{rk } B < n$, then one of the following holds :*

- (i) $A \simeq A_1 \oplus (n-3)\mathcal{O}_\Pi(1)$ and $E \simeq \hat{A}_1 \oplus P(\hat{B}) \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}(2)$, where \hat{A}_1 and \hat{B} are direct sums of line bundles on \mathbb{P}^n lifting A_1 and B , respectively;
- (ii) $B \simeq B_1 \oplus (n-3)\mathcal{O}_\Pi(1)$ and $E \simeq \hat{A} \oplus P(\hat{B}_1) \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{n-2}(n-1)$, where \hat{A} and \hat{B}_1 are direct sums of line bundles on \mathbb{P}^n lifting A and B_1 , respectively.

We include, for the reader's convenience, an argument that uses the first half of the proof of [2, Lemma 1.19] and some arguments that appear in [2, Remark 1.20(c),(d)].

Proof of Lemma 1.4. Consider a saturated flag $\Pi = \Pi_3 \subset \Pi_4 \subset \dots \subset \Pi_n = \mathbb{P}^n$ of linear subspaces of \mathbb{P}^n and put $E_i := E|_{\Pi_i}$, $i = 3, \dots, n$. In particular, $E_3 = E_\Pi$ and $E_n = E$. One has $H_*^1(E_3) \simeq \underline{k}(2)$. One deduces, by induction, that $H^1(E_i(l)) = 0$ for $l \leq -3$, $i = 3, \dots, n$. It follows, in particular, that $H^1(E_4(-2))$ injects into $H^1(E_3(-2)) \simeq k$.

Case 1. $H^1(E_4(-2)) \neq 0$.

In this case, $H^1(E_4(-2)) \xrightarrow{\sim} H^1(E_3(-2))$. One deduces that $H_*^2(E_4) = 0$. This implies, by induction, that $H_*^2(E_i) = 0$, $i = 4, \dots, n$ hence the restriction map $H^1(E_i(-2)) \rightarrow H^1(E_{i-1}(-2))$ is bijective, $i = 4, \dots, n$ (recall that $H^1(E_i(-3)) = 0$, $i = 4, \dots, n$). In particular, $H^1(E(-2)) \xrightarrow{\sim} H^1(E_\Pi(-2))$.

On the other hand, by Serre duality, $H_*^2(E_4^\vee) = 0$. This implies, by induction, that $H_*^2(E_i^\vee) = 0$, $i = 4, \dots, n$. Recalling that $H^1(E^\vee) = 0$, one gets, using the exact sequence :

$$H^1(E_n^\vee) \longrightarrow H^1(E_{n-1}^\vee) \longrightarrow H^2(E_n^\vee(-1))$$

that $H^1(E_{n-1}^\vee) = 0$. It follows, by decreasing induction, that $H^1(E_i^\vee) = 0$, $i = n, n-1, \dots, 3$. In particular, $H^1(E_\Pi^\vee) = 0$. One deduces, from Remark 1.2, that :

$$E_\Pi \simeq A \oplus \Omega_\Pi(2) \oplus P(B) \oplus t\mathcal{O}_\Pi,$$

for some integer $t \geq 0$.

A non-zero element of $H^1(E(-2))$ defines an extension :

$$0 \longrightarrow E \longrightarrow E' \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(2) \longrightarrow 0,$$

whose restriction to Π is equivalent to the extension :

$$0 \longrightarrow E_\Pi \longrightarrow A \oplus 4\mathcal{O}_\Pi(1) \oplus P(B) \oplus t\mathcal{O}_\Pi \xrightarrow{(0, \varepsilon, 0, 0)} \mathcal{O}_\Pi(2) \longrightarrow 0,$$

with ε an epimorphism. Since $H^i(E^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, Lemma 1.3 implies that $E' \simeq \widehat{A} \oplus 4\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(1) \oplus P(\widehat{B})$ hence the above extension is equivalent to an extension of the form :

$$0 \longrightarrow E \longrightarrow \widehat{A} \oplus 4\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(1) \oplus P(\widehat{B}) \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(2) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Now, $A = A_2 \oplus m\mathcal{O}_\Pi(1)$, where A_2 is a direct sum of sheaves of the form $\mathcal{O}_\Pi(a)$, with $a \geq 2$. Since $H^1(E(-2)) \neq 0$ it follows that $\phi|_{\widehat{A}_2} = 0$ hence $E \simeq \widehat{A}_2 \oplus K$, where K is the kernel of the epimorphism $\psi : (m+4)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(1) \oplus P(\widehat{B}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(2)$ induced by ϕ . Let $\psi_1 : (m+4)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(1) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(2)$ and $\psi_2 : P(\widehat{B}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(2)$ be the components of ψ .

Claim. ψ_1 is an epimorphism.

Indeed, assume, by contradiction, that it is not. Then $\text{Coker } \psi_1 \simeq \mathcal{O}_\Lambda(2)$, for some non-empty linear subspace Λ of \mathbb{P}^n such that $\Lambda \cap \Pi = \emptyset$ (because $H^1(E_\Pi(-1)) = 0$ hence $H^0((\psi_1)_\Pi(-1))$ is surjective). One has an exact sequence :

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Ker } \psi_1 \longrightarrow K \longrightarrow P(\widehat{B}) \xrightarrow{\overline{\psi}_2} \mathcal{O}_\Lambda(2) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where $\overline{\psi}_2$ is the composite morphism $P(\widehat{B}) \xrightarrow{\psi_2} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(2) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_\Lambda(2)$. Let $W \subseteq H^0(\mathcal{O}_\Lambda(2))$ be the image of $H^0(\overline{\psi}_2)$. Since the kernel \mathcal{K} of $\overline{\psi}_2$ is globally generated, applying the Snake Lemma to the diagram :

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{K}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}} & \longrightarrow & H^0(\widehat{B})^\vee \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}} & \longrightarrow & W \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{K} & \longrightarrow & P(\widehat{B}) & \xrightarrow{\overline{\psi}_2} & \mathcal{O}_\Lambda(2) \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

one gets an exact sequence $\widehat{B}^\vee \rightarrow W \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_\Lambda(2) \rightarrow 0$. Any component of the degeneracy locus of the morphism $\widehat{B}^\vee \rightarrow W \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}$ must have codimension $\leq \text{rk } \widehat{B}^\vee - \dim_k W + 1$ hence $\text{codim}(\Lambda, \mathbb{P}^n) \leq \text{rk } \widehat{B}^\vee - \dim_k W + 1$. Since W generates $\mathcal{O}_\Lambda(2)$ on Λ one must have $\dim_k W \geq \dim \Lambda + 1$. One deduces that $\text{rk } \widehat{B}^\vee \geq n$ which *contradicts* our hypothesis that $\text{rk } B < n$.

It follows, from the claim, that $K \simeq (m - n + 3)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(1) \oplus K'$, where K' sits into an exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}(2) \longrightarrow K' \longrightarrow P(\widehat{B}) \longrightarrow 0.$$

But $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}}^1(P(\widehat{B}), \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}(2)) = 0$ hence $K' \simeq P(\widehat{B}) \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}(2)$.

Case 2. $H^1(E_4(-2)) = 0$.

In this case, $H^1(E_3(-2))$ injects into $H^2(E_4(-3))$ hence $H^2(E_4(-3)) \neq 0$. Consider the (globally generated) vector bundle $E' := P(E)$ on \mathbb{P}^n and the vector bundle $F' := P(P(E'_\Pi))$ associated to E'_Π on Π . Using the exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow E'_\Pi \longrightarrow H^0(E) \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_\Pi \longrightarrow E_\Pi \longrightarrow 0,$$

and Remark 1.2(c), one gets that $P(E'_\Pi) \simeq F$ (as vector bundles on Π) hence $F' \simeq P(F) \simeq B \oplus P(A) \oplus \Omega_\Pi(2)$. Moreover, $h^1(E'_4(-2)) = h^3(E'_4(-3)) = h^2(E_4(-3)) \neq 0$. Consequently, E' satisfies the hypotheses of the lemma, with A and B interchanged, and of Case 1. One deduces that there is a decomposition $B \simeq B_1 \oplus (n - 3)\mathcal{O}_\Pi(1)$ such that $E' \simeq \widehat{B}_1 \oplus P(\widehat{A}) \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}(2)$ hence $E \simeq P(E') \simeq \widehat{A} \oplus P(\widehat{B}_1) \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{n-2}(n - 1)$. \square

The next result achieves the goal stated at the beginning of the section.

Theorem 1.5. *Let E be a globally generated vector bundle with $c_1 = 5$ on \mathbb{P}^n , $n \geq 4$, such that $H^i(E^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$. Let $\Pi \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a fixed 3-plane. If $H^0(E_\Pi(-2)) \neq 0$ then $E \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(a) \oplus E'$, where a is an integer with $2 \leq a \leq 5$ and E' is a globally generated vector bundle with $c_1(E') = 5 - a$.*

The globally generated vector bundles E' on \mathbb{P}^n with $c_1(E') \leq 3$ and such that $H^i(E'^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, have been classified by Sierra and Ugaglia [25], [26]. Their results are recalled in [2, Thm. 0.1]. On \mathbb{P}^4 , these bundles are direct sums of bundles of the form $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(b)$, $P(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(b))$ (both with $c_1 = b$, $1 \leq b \leq 3$), $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}(2)$ and $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^2(3)$ (both with $c_1 = 3$) while on \mathbb{P}^n , $n \geq 5$, they are direct sums of bundles of the form $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(b)$ and $P(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(b))$.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. The result is known if $H^0(E_\Pi(-3)) \neq 0$ (see [2, Prop. 2.4] and [2, Prop. 2.11]). Assume, now, that $H^0(E_\Pi(-2)) \neq 0$ and $H^0(E_\Pi(-3)) = 0$. Let F be the vector bundle $P(P(E_\Pi))$ on $\Pi \simeq \mathbb{P}^3$ (see Remark 1.2). According to Prop. A.1 in Appendix A, either F is a stable rank 2 vector bundle with $c_1(F) = 5$, $c_2(F) = 8$ or $F \simeq \mathcal{O}_\Pi(2) \oplus F'$ with $c_1(F') = 3$. In the former case, [2, Cor. 1.5] would imply that there exists a rank 2 vector bundle E' on \mathbb{P}^4 with Chern classes $c_1(E') = 5$, $c_2(E') = 8$ which would *contradict* Schwarzenberger's congruence (recalled in Remark 2.1(b) below).

In the latter case, F' is a direct sum of bundles of the form $\mathcal{O}_\Pi(b)$, $P(\mathcal{O}_\Pi(b))$, or $\Omega_\Pi(2)$ (by the results of Sierra and Ugaglia).

If $\Omega_{\Pi}(2)$ is not a direct summand of F' then Lemma 1.3 implies that $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(2)$ is a direct summand of E .

If $F' \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\Pi}(1) \oplus \Omega_{\Pi}(2)$ then Lemma 1.4 implies that $n = 4$ and $E \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(2) \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}(2)$ while if $F' \simeq \mathcal{T}_{\Pi}(-1) \oplus \Omega_{\Pi}(2)$ then the same result implies that $n = 4$ and $E \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(2) \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^2(3)$. \square

The second part of the section contains miscellaneous auxiliary results that are needed somewhere in the sequel.

Lemma 1.6. *Let E be a globally generated vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^n such that $H^i(E^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$. If ξ is a non-zero element of $H^1(E^\vee(-1))$ then there exists a locally split monomorphism $\phi: \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}(1) \rightarrow E^\vee$ such that the image of $H^1(\phi(-1)): H^1(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}) \rightarrow H^1(E^\vee(-1))$ is $k\xi$.*

Proof. Dualizing the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow P(E)^\vee \rightarrow H^0(E) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n} \rightarrow E \rightarrow 0$ one gets that $H^0(E)^\vee \xrightarrow{\sim} H^0(P(E))$ and $H^0(P(E)(-1)) \xrightarrow{\sim} H^1(E^\vee(-1))$. It follows that ξ corresponds to a global section σ of $P(E)(-1)$. One uses, now, the commutative diagram :

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}(1) & \longrightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(1)) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(1) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \sigma \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & E^\vee & \longrightarrow & H^0(P(E)) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n} & \longrightarrow & P(E) \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

taking into account the injectivity of the map $H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(1)) \rightarrow H^0(P(E))$, $h \mapsto h\sigma$. \square

The following elementary, well known result will be used several times in the sequel. Note that its particular case $r = b$ is the Bilinear Map Lemma [17, Lemma 5.1] asserting that if $\mu: A \times B \rightarrow C$ is a bilinear map such that $\mu(u, v) \neq 0$, $\forall u \in A \setminus \{0\}$, $\forall v \in B \setminus \{0\}$, then $\dim C \geq \dim A + \dim B - 1$.

Lemma 1.7. *Let A , B and C be k -vector spaces, of finite dimension a , b and c , respectively, r an integer with $1 \leq r \leq \min(b, c)$ and $\phi: A \rightarrow \text{Hom}_k(B, C)$ a k -linear map. If $\phi(u): B \rightarrow C$ has rank $\geq r$, $\forall u \in A \setminus \{0\}$, then $a \leq (b-r+1)(c-r+1)$. \square*

Definition 1.1. (a) Let V denote the k -vector space k^{n+1} . Consider, for $i \geq 0$, the canonical pairing $\langle *, * \rangle: \bigwedge^i V^\vee \times \bigwedge^i V \rightarrow k$. One defines, for $\omega \in \bigwedge^p V$, the contraction mapping $*_{\perp} \omega: \bigwedge^{p+q} V^\vee \rightarrow \bigwedge^q V^\vee$ by :

$$\langle \alpha \perp \omega, \eta \rangle := \langle \alpha, \omega \wedge \eta \rangle, \quad \forall \alpha \in \bigwedge^{p+q} V^\vee, \quad \forall \eta \in \bigwedge^q V.$$

By definition, $*_{\perp} \omega$ is the dual of $\omega \wedge * : \bigwedge^q V \rightarrow \bigwedge^{p+q} V$ and

$$(\alpha \perp \omega) \perp \eta = \alpha \perp (\omega \wedge \eta), \quad \forall \alpha \in \bigwedge^{p+q+r} V^\vee, \quad \forall \eta \in \bigwedge^q V.$$

Moreover, if one considers the isomorphisms $\bigwedge^{n+1-i} V \xrightarrow{\sim} \bigwedge^i V^\vee$ identifying the exterior multiplication pairings $\bigwedge^{n+1-i} V \times \bigwedge^i V \rightarrow \bigwedge^{n+1} V \simeq k$ with the above canonical pairings then $*_{\perp} \omega$ can be identified with $* \wedge \omega: \bigwedge^{n+1-p-q} V \rightarrow \bigwedge^{n+1-q} V$.

(b) Recall that we view \mathbb{P}^n as the projective space $\mathbb{P}(V)$ of 1-dimensional vector subspaces of V . Consider the tautological geometric Koszul complex on \mathbb{P}^n :

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(-n-1) \otimes \bigwedge^{n+1} V^\vee \xrightarrow{d_{n+1}} \mathcal{O}(-n) \otimes \bigwedge^n V^\vee \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(-1) \otimes V^\vee \xrightarrow{d_1} \mathcal{O} \rightarrow 0.$$

$\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^i(i)$ is isomorphic to the image of $d_{i+1}(i): \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-1) \otimes \bigwedge^{i+1} V^\vee \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n} \otimes \bigwedge^i V^\vee$ and the reduced fibre of $d_{i+1}(i)$ at a point $[v] \in \mathbb{P}(V)$ can be identified with $*_{\mathbb{L}} v: \bigwedge^{i+1} V^\vee \rightarrow \bigwedge^i V^\vee$. One gets, for $\omega \in \bigwedge^p V$, commutative diagrams:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-1) \otimes \bigwedge^{p+q+1} V^\vee & \xrightarrow{d_{p+q+1}(p+q)} & \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n} \otimes \bigwedge^{p+q} V^\vee \\ \downarrow *_{\mathbb{L}} \omega & & \downarrow *_{\mathbb{L}} \omega \\ \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-1) \otimes \bigwedge^{q+1} V^\vee & \xrightarrow{(-1)^p d_{q+1}(q)} & \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n} \otimes \bigwedge^q V^\vee \end{array}$$

hence $*_{\mathbb{L}} \omega: \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n} \otimes \bigwedge^{p+q} V^\vee \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n} \otimes \bigwedge^q V^\vee$ induces a map $\phi: \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{p+q}(p+q) \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^q(q)$ such that $H^0(\phi(1))$ can be identified with $(-1)^p(*_{\mathbb{L}} \omega): \bigwedge^{p+q+1} V^\vee \rightarrow \bigwedge^{q+1} V^\vee$. One thus gets an injective map:

$$\bigwedge^p V \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}}(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{p+q}(p+q), \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^q(q))$$

which turns out to be bijective, by dimensional reasons. Moreover, the mapping $H^0(\phi^\vee): H^0(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^q(q)^\vee) \rightarrow H^0(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{p+q}(p+q)^\vee)$ can be identified with $\omega \wedge *: \bigwedge^q V \rightarrow \bigwedge^{p+q} V$.

The next lemma is the basic fact in the construction of the Trautmann-Vetter-Tango bundle of rank $n-1$ on \mathbb{P}^n .

Lemma 1.8. *Using the notation from the above definition, let W be a vector subspace of $\bigwedge^2 V^\vee$ (resp., $\bigwedge^{n-1} V$). Consider the vector subspace W^\perp of $\bigwedge^2 V$ consisting of the elements η such that $\langle \alpha, \eta \rangle = 0, \forall \alpha \in W$ (resp., $\eta \wedge \omega = 0, \forall \omega \in W$). Then W generates globally $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^1(2)$ (resp., $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{n-1}(n-1)^\vee$) if and only if W^\perp contains no decomposable element of $\bigwedge^2 V$, i.e., no element of the form $v \wedge w$, with $v, w \in V$ linearly independent.*

Proof. W generates $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^1(2)$ globally if and only if $W_{\mathbb{L}} v = \bigwedge^2 V^\vee_{\mathbb{L}} v$ (inside V^\vee), $\forall v \in V \setminus \{0\}$. But $\bigwedge^2 V^\vee_{\mathbb{L}} v$ is the kernel of the linear function $*_{\mathbb{L}} v: V^\vee \rightarrow k$ (which is, actually, evaluation at v). If, for some $v \in V \setminus \{0\}$, $W_{\mathbb{L}} v$ is contained strictly in $\bigwedge^2 V^\vee_{\mathbb{L}} v$ then there exists another linear function on V^\vee vanishing on $W_{\mathbb{L}} v$. This linear function is of the form $*_{\mathbb{L}} w$, for some $w \in V \setminus kv$. It follows that $W_{\mathbb{L}}(v \wedge w) = (W_{\mathbb{L}} v)_{\mathbb{L}} w = (0)$.

The assertion about $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{n-1}(n-1)^\vee$ can be proven similarly (actually, $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{n-1}(n-1)^\vee \simeq \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^1(2)$). \square

Lemma 1.9. *Consider a morphism $\phi: \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^3(3) \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^2(2) \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^1(1)$ defined by contraction with an $\omega \in \bigwedge^2 V$ and a $v \in V$, where $V := k^5$ (see Definition 1.1). Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (i) ϕ is an epimorphism;
- (ii) There exists a k -basis v_0, \dots, v_4 of V such that $\omega = v_0 \wedge v_1 + v_2 \wedge v_3$ and $v = v_4$;
- (iii) $H^0(\phi(1)): H^0(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^3(4) \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^2(3)) \rightarrow H^0(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^1(2))$ is surjective.

Proof. According to Definition 1.1, $H^0(\phi(1))$ can be identified with the map $\bigwedge^4 V^\vee \oplus \bigwedge^3 V^\vee \rightarrow \bigwedge^2 V^\vee$ defined by contraction with ω and with $-v$ and this map can be identified with the map $V \oplus \bigwedge^2 V \rightarrow \bigwedge^3 V$ defined by exterior multiplication to the right by ω and by $-v$. Consider the subspace $W := V \wedge \omega - \bigwedge^2 V \wedge v$ of $\bigwedge^3 V$.

Since the isomorphism $\bigwedge^3 V \xrightarrow{\sim} \bigwedge^2 V^\vee$ identifies the exterior multiplication pairing $\bigwedge^3 V \times \bigwedge^2 V \rightarrow \bigwedge^5 V$ with the canonical pairing $\bigwedge^2 V^\vee \times \bigwedge^2 V \rightarrow k$, Lemma 1.8 implies that $\phi(1)$ is an epimorphism if and only if the subspace W^\perp of $\bigwedge^2 V$ contains no decomposable element. Now, one has :

$$(V \wedge \omega)^\perp = \text{Ker}(\bigwedge^2 V \xrightarrow{\omega \wedge *} \bigwedge^4 V), \quad (\bigwedge^2 V \wedge v)^\perp = \text{Ker}(\bigwedge^2 V \xrightarrow{v \wedge *} \bigwedge^3 V) \supseteq v \wedge V.$$

If $\omega = v_0 \wedge v_1$, with v_0, v_1 linearly independent then $(V \wedge \omega)^\perp \supseteq v_0 \wedge V + v_1 \wedge V$ hence W^\perp contains decomposable elements.

It remains that $\omega = v_0 \wedge v_1 + v_2 \wedge v_3$, with v_0, \dots, v_3 linearly independent. Put $V' := kv_0 + \dots + kv_3$. Then :

$$(V \wedge \omega)^\perp \supseteq \text{Ker}(\bigwedge^2 V' \xrightarrow{\omega \wedge *} \bigwedge^4 V' \simeq k)$$

hence if $v \in V'$ then W^\perp contains a (non-zero) decomposable element of $\bigwedge^2 V$.

Consequently, v_0, \dots, v_3, v must be linearly independent. In this case, $V' \wedge \omega = \bigwedge^3 V'$ and $\bigwedge^2 V \wedge v \supseteq \bigwedge^2 V' \wedge v$ hence $W = \bigwedge^3 V$. \square

Corollary 1.10. *Consider an epimorphism $\varepsilon: \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^2(2) \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^1(1) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}$ defined by contraction with an $\omega \in \bigwedge^2 V$ and a $v \in V$, where $V := k^5$. Then $\text{Ker } \varepsilon(1)$ is globally generated if and only if there exists a k -basis v_0, \dots, v_4 of V such that $\omega = v_0 \wedge v_1 + v_2 \wedge v_3$ and $v = v_4$.*

Proof. Let K be the kernel of ε . Applying the Snake Lemma to the diagram whose vertical morphisms are the evaluation morphisms of the terms of the short exact sequence :

$$0 \longrightarrow K(1) \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^2(3) \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^1(2) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon(1)} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(1) \longrightarrow 0,$$

one gets that $K(1)$ is globally generated if and only if the morphism $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^3(3) \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^2(2) \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^1(1)$ defined by contraction with ω and with $-v$ is an epimorphism. One can apply, now, Lemma 1.9. \square

2. THE CASE $c_1 = 5$ ON \mathbb{P}^4

We classify, in this section, the globally generated vector bundles E with $c_1 = 5$ on \mathbb{P}^4 with the property that $H^i(E^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, and such that $H^0(E_H(-2)) = 0$, for every hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$. We actually use the results about the classification of the analogous bundles on \mathbb{P}^3 , recalled in Appendix A, and try to decide which of these bundles extend to \mathbb{P}^4 (as globally generated vector bundles). We spend most of the time showing that many of them do not extend.

We begin by collecting, in the next result, some general information about globally generated vector bundles with $c_1 = 5$ on \mathbb{P}^4 .

Remark 2.1. Let E be a globally generated vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^4 , of rank r , with Chern classes $c_1 = 5$, $c_2 \leq 12$, c_3, c_4 , and such that $H^i(E^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$.

(a) $r - 1$ general global sections of E define an exact sequence :

$$0 \longrightarrow (r - 1)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4} \longrightarrow E \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_Y(5) \longrightarrow 0,$$

with Y a *nonsingular* surface in \mathbb{P}^4 of degree c_2 . Severi's theorem (asserting that the only surface in \mathbb{P}^4 which is not linearly normal is the Veronese surface) implies that

$H^1(E(l)) = 0$, for $l \leq -4$ (recalling [2, Prop. 2.2]). Moreover, Kodaira's vanishing theorem implies that $H^2(E(l)) \simeq H^2(\mathcal{I}_Y(5+l)) \simeq H^1(\mathcal{O}_Y(5+l)) = 0$, for $l \leq -6$.

(b) Applying the Riemann-Roch theorem (recalled in [2, Thm. 7.3]) to E^\vee and taking into account that $h^3(E^\vee) = h^1(E(-5)) = 0$ and $h^4(E^\vee) = h^0(E(-5)) = 0$ (because, otherwise, $E \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(5)$), one gets that :

$$r = \frac{5c_3 + 2c_4 - c_2(c_2 - 10)}{12} + h^2(E^\vee).$$

Moreover, Schwarzenberger's congruence $(2c_1 + 3)(c_3 - c_1c_2) + c_2^2 + c_2 \equiv 2c_4 \pmod{12}$ (see [2, Cor. 7.4]) becomes, in our case :

$$c_2(c_2 - 4) + c_3 \equiv 2c_4 \pmod{12}$$

(recall, also, that $c_3 \equiv c_1c_2 \pmod{2}$ hence, in our case, $c_3 \equiv c_2 \pmod{2}$).

(c) Assume, now, that there is a hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ such that $H^0(E_H(-2)) = 0$. In this case, E must have rank $r \geq 3$ because Chiodera and Ellia [11] showed that every globally generated rank 2 vector bundle with $c_1 = 5$ on \mathbb{P}^4 splits, i.e., is of the form $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(a) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(b)$, with $a \geq 0$, $b \geq 0$ and $a + b = 5$.

According to Remark 1.2, the (globally generated) vector bundle $F := P(P(E_H))$ on $H \simeq \mathbb{P}^3$ satisfies $H^i(F^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, and there is an exact sequence :

$$0 \longrightarrow s\mathcal{O}_H \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow Q \longrightarrow 0,$$

with $s := h^1(E_H^\vee)$, such that $E_H \simeq t\mathcal{O}_H \oplus Q$, where $t := h^0(E_H^\vee)$. Since $H^i(E^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, it follows that $h^0(E_H^\vee) = h^1(E^\vee(-1))$. One has $H_*^1(E_H) \simeq H_*^1(F)$ and $H^2(E_H(l)) \simeq H^2(F(l))$ for $l \geq -3$.

We assert that, under the above assumption, one has $\text{rk } Q \geq 3$ (hence $\text{rk } F \geq 3$). *Indeed*, if $\text{rk } Q \leq 2$ then, by [2, Cor. 1.5(b)], there exists a globally generated vector bundle E' on \mathbb{P}^4 such that $E'_H \simeq Q$. By the above mentioned result of Chiodera and Ellia, $E' \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(a) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(b)$ hence $Q \simeq \mathcal{O}_H(a) \oplus \mathcal{O}_H(b)$. But this *contradicts* our assumption that $H^0(E_H(-2)) = 0$.

One deduces, now, from Lemma A.2(b), that $H^2(E_H(l)) = 0$ for $l \geq -2$ hence $H^3(E(l)) = 0$ for $l \geq -3$. Moreover, $H^3(E(-5)) \simeq H^1(E^\vee)^\vee = 0$ and $h^2(E_H(-3)) \geq h^3(E(-4)) = h^1(E^\vee(-1)) = t$. One also gets, from the Riemann-Roch formula, that :

$$h^2(E(-3)) - h^1(E(-3)) = \chi(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(c_1 - 3)) + \frac{(2c_1 - 3)(c_3 - c_1c_2) + c_2^2 + c_2 - 2c_4}{12},$$

where, of course, $c_1 = 5$.

We would like to point out the following *basic fact* : either F is one of the bundles from the conclusion of Prop. A.6 or it can be realized as an extension :

$$0 \longrightarrow (\text{rk } F - 3)\mathcal{O}_H \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow G(2) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where G is a *stable* rank 3 vector bundle on $H \simeq \mathbb{P}^3$ with $c_1(G) = -1$, $c_2(G) = c_2 - 8$, $c_3(G) = c_3 - 2c_2 + 12$. In the latter case one deduces easily, from the above exact sequence, that $\text{rk } F = 3 + h^2(G(-2))$. For further information (including the definition and the properties of the *spectrum* of G) the reader is referred to Remark A.10.

(d) Assume, finally, that $H^0(E_H(-2)) = 0$, for *every* hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$. Then, as we noticed in (c), one has $H^2(E_H(l)) = 0$ for $l \geq -2$ and for any hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$. Consider the exact sequences:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = H^0(E_H(-2)) &\rightarrow H^1(E(-3)) \xrightarrow{h} H^1(E(-2)) \rightarrow H^1(E_H(-2)) \rightarrow \\ &\rightarrow H^2(E(-3)) \xrightarrow{h} H^2(E(-2)) \rightarrow H^2(E_H(-2)) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the Bilinear Map Lemma [17, Lemma 5.1] one gets that if $h^1(E_H(-2)) \leq 3$ then $H^1(E(-3)) = 0$ and $H^2(E(-2)) = 0$. The latter vanishing implies that $H^2(E(l)) = 0$, $\forall l \geq -2$. Notice, also, that $h^1(E_H(-2)) = \frac{1}{2}(5(c_2 - 8) - c_3)$, by Lemma A.2(b).

Lemma 2.2. *Let $d_0 \leq d_1 \leq \dots \leq d_n$ be positive integers and let K be the kernel of an epimorphism $\bigoplus_{i=0}^n \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-d_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}$. Then $K(l)$ is globally generated if and only if $l \geq d_{n-1} + d_n$.*

Proof. The epimorphism from the statement is defined by homogeneous polynomials f_0, \dots, f_n of degree d_0, \dots, d_n , respectively. Let $C \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be the complete intersection defined by f_0, \dots, f_{n-2} . Then $K_C \simeq \bigoplus_{i=0}^{n-2} \mathcal{O}_C(-d_i) \oplus \mathcal{O}_C(-d_{n-1} - d_n)$. It follows that if $K(l)$ is globally generated then $l \geq d_{n-1} + d_n$. The converse can be proven using the Koszul complex. \square

Lemma 2.3. *Let E be a globally generated vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^4 with $c_1 = 5$, $c_2 \leq 12$, and such that $H^i(E^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, and let $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ be a hyperplane. If $H^0(E_H(-2)) = 0$ then $H^2(E_H^\vee) = 0$.*

Proof. Assume, by contradiction, that $H^2(E_H^\vee) \neq 0$. By Serre duality, $H^2(E_H^\vee) \simeq H^1(E_H(-4))^\vee$. If F is the (globally generated) vector bundle $P(P(E_H))$ on H (see Remark 1.2), then $H^1(E_H(-4)) \simeq H^1(F(-4))$. It follows (see Remark A.10) that either

- (1) F is as in item (ii) of the conclusion of Prop. A.6, i.e., $F \simeq \mathcal{O}_H(1) \oplus F_0$, where F_0 is the kernel of an epimorphism $4\mathcal{O}_H(2) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_H(4)$

or F can be realized as an extension:

$$0 \longrightarrow (\text{rk } F - 3)\mathcal{O}_H \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow G(2) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where G is a stable rank 3 vector bundle on $H \simeq \mathbb{P}^3$ with $c_1(G) = -1$, $c_2(G) = c_2 - 8$, $c_3(G) = c_3 - 2c_2 + 12$ such that $H^1(G(-2)) \neq 0$. Using the properties of the spectrum of G (recalled in Remark A.10), Lemma A.11 and Lemma A.12, one deduces that one of the following holds:

- (2) $c_2(G) = 2$ and G has spectrum $(1, 0)$;
- (3) $c_2(G) = 3$ and G has one of the spectra $(1, 0, 0)$, $(1, 1, 0)$;
- (4) $c_2(G) = 4$ and G has one of the spectra $(1, 0, 0, -1)$, $(1, 0, 0, 0)$, $(1, 1, 0, -1)$, $(1, 1, 0, 0)$, $(1, 1, 1, 0)$.

We shall eliminate all of these possibilities one by one.

Case 1. F as in item (ii) of the conclusion of Prop. A.6.

In this case $c_2 = 12$, $c_3 = 8$ hence, according to Schwarzenberger's congruence, one must have $c_4 > 0$. In particular, $r \geq 4$. Since $H^2(F(l)) = 0$ for $l \geq -3$ it follows that $t = 0$ (using the notation from Remark 2.1(c)) hence $E_H \simeq F$. In particular,

$H_*^1(E_H^\vee) = 0$ which implies that $H_*^1(E^\vee) = 0$. Applying [2, Lemma 1.14(b)] to E^\vee one deduces that E is the kernel of an epimorphism $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(1) \oplus 4\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(2) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(4)$. But this *contradicts*, according to Lemma 2.2, the fact that E is globally generated. Consequently, *this case cannot occur*.

The case where G has spectrum $(1, 0, 0, -1)$ can be eliminated similarly, using Lemma A.15.

Case 2. G has spectrum $(1, 0)$.

In this case, $\text{rk } F = 3$, $c_2(G) = 2$, and $c_3(G) = -4$ hence $c_2 = c_2(F) = 10$ and $c_3 = c_3(F) = 4$ (see Remark A.10). Since $H^2(F(l)) = 0$ for $l \geq -3$ it follows that, using the notation from Remark 2.1(c), one has $t = 0$ hence E has rank $r \leq 3$. Using Schwarzenberger's congruence one gets a *contradiction* hence *this case cannot occur*, either.

The cases where G has one of the spectra $(1, 0, 0)$, $(1, 1, 0)$, $(1, 0, 0, 0)$, $(1, 1, 0, 0)$, $(1, 1, 1, 0)$ can be eliminated similarly.

Case 3. G has spectrum $(1, 1, 0, -1)$.

In this case, $\text{rk } F = 4$, $c_2(G) = 4$ and $c_3(G) = -6$ hence $c_2 = 12$ and $c_3 = 6$. Since $H^2(F(l)) = 0$ for $l \geq -3$ it follows that $t = 0$ (using the notation from Remark 2.1(c)). On the other hand, Schwarzenberger's congruence implies that $c_4 > 0$ hence E has rank $r \geq 4$. One deduces that $E_H \simeq F$.

Now, $H^2(E_H^\vee) \neq 0$ implies that $H^2(E^\vee) \neq 0$ because $H^3(E^\vee(-1)) \simeq H^1(E(-4))^\vee = 0$ (see Remark 2.1(a)). On the other hand, by Lemma A.17, $H^1(E_H^\vee(1)) = 0$ hence $H^2(E^\vee) \neq 0$ implies that $H^2(E^\vee(1)) \neq 0$. But $H^2(E^\vee(1)) \simeq H^2(E(-6))^\vee$ and $H^2(E(-6)) = 0$ by Kodaira vanishing (see Remark 2.1(a)). This *contradiction* shows that Case 3 *cannot occur*. \square

Corollary 2.4. *Under the hypothesis of Lemma 2.3, $h^1(E_H^\vee) = h^2(E^\vee(-1)) - h^2(E^\vee)$. Moreover, if $H^0(E_H(-2)) = 0$, for every hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$, then either $H^2(E^\vee) = 0$ or $h^1(E_H^\vee) \geq 4$, $\forall H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ hyperplane, and $h^2(E^\vee(-1)) \geq 5$.*

Proof. One uses the exact sequence:

$$0 = H^1(E^\vee) \longrightarrow H^1(E_H^\vee) \longrightarrow H^2(E^\vee(-1)) \xrightarrow{h} H^2(E^\vee) \longrightarrow H^2(E_H^\vee) = 0$$

($h = 0$ being an equation of H in \mathbb{P}^4) and, for the second part, the Bilinear Map Lemma [17, Lemma 5.1]. \square

Remark 2.5. Under the hypothesis of Lemma 2.3, let F be the vector bundle $P(P(E_H))$ on H (see Remark 1.2). Assume that F can be realized as an extension:

$$0 \longrightarrow (\text{rk } F - 3)\mathcal{O}_H \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow G(2) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where G is a *stable* rank 3 vector bundle on H (see the last part of Remark 2.1(c)). Lemma 2.3 implies that $H^1(E_H(-4)) = 0$ hence $H^1(G(-2)) = 0$. Taking into account Lemma A.11, one deduces that the spectrum (k_1, \dots, k_m) of G must satisfy the inequalities $0 \geq k_1 \geq \dots \geq k_m \geq -2$.

Lemma 2.6. *Let E be a globally generated vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^4 , with $c_1 = 5$, $c_2 \leq 12$, and such that $H^i(E^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$. Assume, also, that $H^0(E_H(-2)) = 0$, for every hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$. Then $c_2 \geq 10$ and $c_3 \geq c_2$.*

Proof. Assume, by contradiction, that $c_2 = 9$ (see Prop. A.9) or that $10 \leq c_2 \leq 12$ and $c_3 < c_2$. Let $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ be an arbitrary hyperplane and let F be the vector bundle $P(P(E_H))$ on H (see Remark 1.2). Then either :

(1) F is as in item (i) of Prop. A.6

(F cannot be as in item (ii) of Prop. A.6 by Lemma 2.3) or it can be realized as an extension $0 \rightarrow (\text{rk } F - 3)\mathcal{O}_H \rightarrow F \rightarrow G(2) \rightarrow 0$, where G is a stable rank 3 vector bundle on $H \simeq \mathbb{P}^3$. Let (k_1, \dots, k_m) be the spectrum of G ($m = c_2 - 8$). Since $-2 \sum k_i = c_3 - c_2 + 4$ it follows that $\sum k_i \geq -1$. On the other hand, by Remark 2.5, $k_1 \leq 0$. One deduces that one of the following holds :

- (2) G has one of the spectra (0) , $(0, 0)$, $(0, 0, 0)$, $(0, 0, 0, 0)$ in which case $9 \leq c_2 \leq 12$, $c_3 = c_2 - 4$ and $\text{rk } F = 3$;
- (3) G has one of the spectra $(0, -1)$, $(0, 0, -1)$, $(0, 0, 0, -1)$ in which case $10 \leq c_2 \leq 12$, $c_3 = c_2 - 2$ and $\text{rk } F = 4$.

Notice, also, that if F is as in item (i) of Prop. A.6 then $9 \leq c_2 \leq 12$, $c_3 = c_2 - 4$ and $\text{rk } F = 3$.

In all of the cases, $H^2(E_H(l)) = 0$ for $l \geq -3$ hence, using the notation from Remark 2.1(c), $t = 0$. Consequently, $3 \leq r \leq \text{rk } F$. Moreover, among the above mentioned Chern classes, the only ones that satisfy the congruence $c_2(c_2 - 4) + c_3 \equiv 0 \pmod{12}$ are $c_2 = 11$, $c_3 = 7$. One deduces that either $r = 3$, $c_2 = 11$, $c_3 = 7$ or $c_4 > 0$. In the latter case $r \geq 4$ hence $\text{rk } F = 4$ and $E_H = F$. In both cases, $h^1(E_H^\vee) = h^1(F^\vee) = 0$. One can get rid of the former case using the relation :

$$r = \frac{5c_3 + 2c_4 - c_2(c_2 - 10)}{12} + h^2(E^\vee).$$

from Remark 2.1(b). *Indeed*, this relation gives $h^2(E^\vee) = 1$ while Cor. 2.4 implies that $H^2(E^\vee) = 0$.

Assume, now, that $r = 4$. Then F is as in item (3) above. Since, as we already saw, $h^1(E_H^\vee) = 0$, Cor. 2.4 implies that $H^2(E^\vee) = 0$ and $H^2(E^\vee(-1)) = 0$. By Serre duality, $H^2(E(-4)) = 0$.

Moreover, if F is as in item (3) above and $c_2 \in \{10, 11\}$ then Remark 2.1(d) implies that $H^1(E(-3)) = 0$. Using the exact sequence :

$$0 = H^1(E(-3)) \longrightarrow H^1(E_H(-3)) \longrightarrow H^2(E(-4)) = 0$$

one gets that $H^1(E_H(-3)) = 0$. But, according to the spectrum, one must have $h^1(E_H(-3)) \in \{1, 2\}$ and this is a *contradiction*.

Assume, finally, that F is as in item (3) above with $c_2 = 12$. As we noticed above, $H^2(E(-4)) = 0$. Since $H^2(E_H(l)) = 0$ for $l \geq -3$, one deduces that $H^2(E(l)) = 0$ for $l \geq -4$. Since $H^1(E(-4)) = 0$ (see Remark 2.1(a)) it follows that $h^1(E(-3)) = h^1(E_H(-3)) = 3$. Since $H^0(E_H(-2)) = 0$ one gets that $h^1(E(-2)) - h^1(E(-3)) = h^1(E_H(-2)) = 5$ hence $h^1(E(-2)) = 8$. Consider, now, the exact sequence :

$$0 \rightarrow H^0(E(-1)) \rightarrow H^0(E_H(-1)) \rightarrow H^1(E(-2)) \xrightarrow{h} H^1(E(-1)) \rightarrow H^1(E_H(-1)) \rightarrow 0.$$

Lemma A.4 implies that $h^0(E_H(-1)) \leq 1$ hence, by Lemma A.2(b),

$$h^1(E_H(-1)) = \frac{1}{2}(7(c_2 - 10) - c_3) + h^0(E_H(-1)) \leq 3.$$

Using the exact sequence above (for any linear form h on \mathbb{P}^4) and the Bilinear Map Lemma [17, Lemma 5.1], one gets that $H^0(E(-1)) = 0$. This implies that $h^1(E(-1)) - h^1(E(-2)) = h^1(E_H(-1)) - h^0(E_H(-1)) = 2$ hence $h^1(E(-1)) = 10$.

Since $h^1(E_H(-1)) \leq 3$, one deduces, from Lemma A.2(b), that $h^1(E_H) = 0$. Since this happens for every hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$, the Bilinear Map Lemma implies that $h^1(E(-1)) \geq h^1(E) + 4$.

We want, finally, to estimate $h^0(E)$ using the exact sequence :

$$0 \longrightarrow H^0(E) \longrightarrow H^0(E_H) \longrightarrow H^1(E(-1)) \xrightarrow{h} H^1(E) \longrightarrow 0.$$

By Riemann-Roch, $h^0(E_H) = \chi(E_H) = 10$ hence $h^0(E) \leq h^0(E_H) - 4 = 6$. Since there is no epimorphism $6\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4} \rightarrow E$ (its kernel would have rank 2 and strictly positive c_3) one gets a *contradiction* and this eliminates the case where F is as in item (3) above with $c_2 = 12$. \square

Proposition 2.7. *Let E be a globally generated vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^4 , with $c_1 = 5$, $10 \leq c_2 \leq 12$, $c_3 = c_2$, and such that $H^i(E^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$. Assume, also, that $H^0(E_H(-2)) = 0$, for every hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$. Then $c_2 = 10$ and $E \simeq 5\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(1)$.*

Note that this proposition completes the classification of globally generated vector bundles with $c_1 = 5$ and $c_2 = 10$ on \mathbb{P}^4 . Indeed, by Prop. A.6 and Remark A.10, if F is a globally generated vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^3 with $c_1 = 5$, $c_2 = 10$, and such that $H^0(F(-2)) = 0$ then $c_3 \leq 10$.

Proof of Prop. 2.7. Let $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ be an arbitrary hyperplane, of equation $h = 0$, and let $F_{[h]}$ be the vector bundle $P(P(E_H))$ on H (see Remark 1.2). Then, according to Remark A.10, one of the following holds :

- (i) $F_{[h]}$ is as in item (iii) of Prop. A.6 ;
- (ii) One has an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow (\text{rk } F_{[h]} - 3)\mathcal{O}_H \rightarrow F_{[h]} \rightarrow G_{[h]}(2) \rightarrow 0$, where $G_{[h]}$ is a stable rank 3 vector bundle on H with $c_1(G_{[h]}) = -1$, $2 \leq c_2(G_{[h]}) \leq 4$ and spectrum $(-1, -1)$, $(0, -1, -1)$, $(0, 0, -1, -1)$, respectively.

Since $\text{rk } F_{[h]} = 5$ in both cases (in case (ii) one uses the formula $\text{rk } F_{[h]} = 3 + h^2(G_{[h]}(-2))$) and $c_3(F_{[h]}) \neq 0$ it follows that, using the notation from Remark 2.1, $s \leq 2$, i.e., $h^1(E_H^\vee) \leq 2$ for every hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$. Cor. 2.4 implies, now, that $H^2(E^\vee) = 0$ and that $s = h^2(E^\vee(-1)) = h^2(E(-4))$. Recall, also, that $t = h^1(E^\vee(-1)) = h^3(E(-4))$ (s and t are defined in Remark 2.1(c)).

Claim 1. $H^2(E(-3)) = 0$.

Indeed, by Lemma A.2(b), $h^1(E_H(-2)) = 0$ for $c_2 = 10$, $h^1(E_H(-2)) = 2$ for $c_2 = 11$ and $h^1(E_H(-2)) = 4$ for $c_2 = 12$. Remark 2.1(d) implies that if $c_2 \in \{10, 11\}$ then $H^1(E(-3)) = 0$ and $H^2(E(-2)) = 0$. Moreover, if $c_2 = 10$ one also has $H^1(E(-2)) = 0$ and $H^2(E(-3)) = 0$, because $H^1(E_H(-2)) = 0$.

Now, by the Riemann-Roch formula (see Remark 2.1(c)), $h^2(E(-3)) - h^1(E(-3))$ is equal to $(5 - c_4)/6$ if $c_2 = 10$, to $(2 - c_4)/6$ if $c_2 = 11$ and to $-c_4/6$ if $c_2 = 12$. Since $c_4 \geq 0$, one deduces that $c_4 = 5$ if $c_2 = 10$, that $h^2(E(-3)) = 0$ and $c_4 = 2$ if $c_2 = 11$, and that $h^2(E(-3)) = 0$ if $h^1(E(-3)) = 0$ in the case $c_2 = 12$.

Assume, finally, that $c_2 = 12$ and $H^1(E(-3)) \neq 0$. Since $h^1(E_H(-2)) = 4$, for every hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$, using the exact sequence from Remark 2.1(d) and the Bilinear Map Lemma one deduces that the map $H^1(E(-2)) \rightarrow H^1(E_H(-2))$

is surjective, $\forall H$. It follows that the multiplication by any non-zero linear form $h: H^2(E(-3)) \rightarrow H^2(E(-2))$ is bijective, which implies that $H^2(E(-3)) = 0$ and Claim 1 is proven.

Claim 2. $F_{[h]}$ is as in item (ii) above, for every hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$.

Indeed, assume, by contradiction, that there exists a hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ such that $F_{[h]}$ can be realized as an extension $0 \rightarrow M(2) \rightarrow F_{[h]} \rightarrow T_H(-1) \rightarrow 0$, where M is a stable rank 2 vector bundle on H with $c_1(M) = 0$, $c_2(M) = c_2 - 9$ and such that $H^1(M(-2)) = 0$ (which implies that $H^2(M(-2)) = 0$). Since $H^i(E(-3)) = 0$, $i = 2, 3$ (by Claim 1 and Remark 2.1(c)), one gets that $H^2(E_H(-3)) \xrightarrow{\sim} H^3(E(-4))$ hence $h^3(E(-4)) = 1$. Using the notation from Remark 2.1(c), it follows that $t = 1$ hence $r \leq 6$.

Now, since $H^3(E(-4)) \neq 0$, Lemma 1.6 implies that there exists an epimorphism $\varepsilon: E \rightarrow T_{\mathbb{P}^4}(-1)$. The kernel K of ε is a vector bundle of rank ≤ 2 and, since $T_{\mathbb{P}^4}(-1)_H \simeq \mathcal{O}_H \oplus T_H(-1)$, one has $c_i(K) = c_i(M(2))$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. One deduces that $K = \widetilde{M}(2)$, where \widetilde{M} is a rank 2 vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^4 with $c_1(\widetilde{M}) = 0$, $c_2(\widetilde{M}) = c_2 - 9$. Moreover, since $H^0(E(-2)) = 0$ one has $H^0(\widetilde{M}) = 0$, i.e., \widetilde{M} is stable. But, if $c_2 \in \{10, 11\}$, such a bundle *cannot exist* because its Chern classes do not satisfy Schwarzenberger's congruence while, for $c_2 = 12$, it cannot exist according to a result of Barth and Elencwajg [7] (which says that there is no stable rank 2 vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^4 with $c_1 = 0$, $c_2 = 3$). Consequently, Claim 2 is proven.

Claim 3. If $c_2 = 10$ then $E \simeq 5\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(1)$.

Indeed, as we saw in the proof of Claim 1, $H^1(E(-2)) = 0$, $H^2(E(-3)) = 0$ and $c_4 = 5$. Using a formula from Remark 2.1(b), one deduces that $r = 5$. Moreover, since $H^3(E(-4)) = 0$ (because $H^2(E_H(-3)) = 0$, for every hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$, by Claim 2) and $H^4(E(-5)) \simeq H^0(E^\vee)^\vee = 0$, E is (-1) -regular. In particular, $E(-1)$ is globally generated and $c_1(E(-1)) = 0$ hence $E(-1) \simeq 5\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}$.

Claim 4. The case $c_2 = 11$ cannot occur.

Indeed, assume, by contradiction, that it does. We saw in the proof of Claim 1 that $h^1(E_H(-2)) = 2$, for every hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$, that $H^1(E(-3)) = 0$ and that $H^2(E(-3)) = 0$. One deduces that $H^1(E(-2)) \xrightarrow{\sim} H^1(E_H(-2))$, $H^1(E_H(-3)) \xrightarrow{\sim} H^2(E(-4))$ and $H^2(E_H(-3)) \xrightarrow{\sim} H^3(E(-4))$ hence, taking into account Claim 2, $h^1(E(-2)) = 2$, $h^2(E(-4)) = 1$ and $h^3(E(-4)) = 0$. Since $h^4(E(-5)) = h^0(E^\vee) = 0$, the Castelnuovo-Mumford lemma implies that $H^2(E(l)) = 0$ for $l \geq -3$. One also has $h^2(E(-5)) = h^2(E^\vee) = 0$ (by Cor. 2.4).

Consider, now, the exact sequences :

$$0 \rightarrow H^0(E(-1)) \rightarrow H^0(E_H(-1)) \rightarrow H^1(E(-2)) \xrightarrow{h} H^1(E(-1)) \rightarrow H^1(E_H(-1)) \rightarrow 0.$$

The inequality $h^1(E_H(-1)) \leq \max(h^1(E_H(-2)) - 3, 0)$ from the proof of Lemma A.3 implies that $H^1(E_H(-1)) = 0$. Since this happens for every hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ and since $h^1(E(-2)) = 2$, the Bilinear Map Lemma [17, Lemma 5.1] implies that $H^1(E(-1)) = 0$. Moreover, by Riemann-Roch on H , $h^0(E_H(-1)) = 2$. Taking into account that $h^1(E(-2)) = 2$, it follows that $H^0(E(-1)) = 0$. Applying Beilinson's theorem (recalled in [2, Thm. 1.23] and [2, Remark 1.25]) to $E(-1)$ one deduces

an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^3(3) \rightarrow 2\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}(1) \rightarrow E(-1) \rightarrow 0$. In order to get a *contradiction* it suffices to prove the following:

Subclaim 4.1. *There is no locally split monomorphism $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^3(3) \rightarrow 2\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}(1)$.*

Indeed, according to Definition 1.1, any morphism $\phi: \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^3(3) \rightarrow 2\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}(1)$ is defined by contraction with two elements ω, ω' of $\bigwedge^2 V$ (where $V = k^5$). We want to show that the dual morphism $\phi^\vee: 2\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}(1)^\vee \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^3(3)^\vee$ cannot be an epimorphism. Let W be the subspace $\omega \wedge V + \omega' \wedge V$ of $\bigwedge^3 V$ (recall the description of $H^0(\phi^\vee)$ from the above mentioned definition). According to Lemma 1.8, we have to show that W^\perp contains a decomposable element of $\bigwedge^2 V$. We consider, for that, only the generic case. More precisely, we assume that there exist two bases u_0, \dots, u_4 and u'_0, \dots, u'_4 of V such that $\omega = u_0 \wedge u_1 + u_2 \wedge u_3$ and $\omega' = u'_0 \wedge u'_1 + u'_2 \wedge u'_3$. Moreover, putting $U := ku_0 + \dots + ku_3$ and $U' := ku'_0 + \dots + ku'_3$, we assume that $U + U' = V$. One has $\omega \wedge V = \bigwedge^3 U + k(\omega \wedge u_4)$ and $\omega' \wedge V = \bigwedge^3 U' + k(\omega' \wedge u'_4)$. Moreover, $(\bigwedge^3 U)^\perp = \bigwedge^2 U$, $(\bigwedge^3 U')^\perp = \bigwedge^2 U'$ and $\bigwedge^2 U \cap \bigwedge^2 U' = \bigwedge^2(U \cap U')$ which is a 3-dimensional vector subspace of $\bigwedge^2 V$ consisting of decomposable elements. Exterior multiplications by $\omega \wedge u_4$ and $\omega' \wedge u'_4$ define linear functions on $\bigwedge^2(U \cap U')$ hence there exists a non-zero element η of $\bigwedge^2(U \cap U')$ such that $\eta \wedge \omega \wedge u_4 = 0$ and $\eta \wedge \omega' \wedge u'_4 = 0$. η belongs to W^\perp and it is decomposable. This proves the subclaim and, with it, Claim 4.

Claim 5. *The case $c_2 = 12$ cannot occur.*

Indeed, assume, by contradiction, that it does. Let $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ be an arbitrary hyperplane. Since $H^2(E_H(l)) = 0, \forall l \geq -2$, one gets, from Claim 1, that $H^2(E(l)) = 0$ for $l \geq -3$. Lemma A.4 implies that $h^0(E_H(-1)) \leq 1$ hence, by Lemma A.2(b), $h^1(E_H(-1)) = 1 + h^0(E_H(-1)) \leq 2$. The last inequality in Lemma A.2(b) implies, now, that $h^1(E_H) = 0$.

As we saw in the proof of Claim 1, $h^1(E(-3)) = c_4/6$. Since $H^0(E_H(-2)) = 0$ and $H^2(E(-3)) = 0$ one gets that $h^1(E(-2)) = h^1(E(-3)) + h^1(E_H(-2)) = h^1(E(-3)) + 4$. Consider the exact sequence:

$$0 \rightarrow H^0(E(-1)) \rightarrow H^0(E_H(-1)) \rightarrow H^1(E(-2)) \xrightarrow{h} H^1(E(-1)) \rightarrow H^1(E_H(-1)) \rightarrow 0.$$

Since $h^0(E_H(-1)) \leq 1$ and $h^1(E_H(-1)) \leq 2$ the Bilinear Map Lemma implies that $H^0(E(-1)) = 0$ (recall that H is an *arbitrary* hyperplane). The above exact sequence shows, now, that:

$$h^1(E(-1)) - h^1(E(-2)) = h^1(E_H(-1)) - h^0(E_H(-1)) = 1$$

hence $h^1(E(-1)) = h^1(E(-3)) + 5$. We want to evaluate, next, $h^0(E)$ using the exact sequence:

$$0 = H^0(E(-1)) \rightarrow H^0(E) \rightarrow H^0(E_H) \rightarrow H^1(E(-1)) \xrightarrow{h} H^1(E) \rightarrow H^1(E_H) = 0.$$

Firstly, the Bilinear Map Lemma implies that $h^1(E(-1)) - h^1(E) \geq 4$ (recall, again, that H is an arbitrary hyperplane). Secondly, by Riemann-Roch on H , $h^0(E_H) = (r-1) + 8 = r+7$ hence $h^0(E) \leq h^0(E_H) - 4 = r+3$. Since E is globally generated, there exists an epimorphism $(r+3)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4} \rightarrow E$. The kernel K of this epimorphism is a rank 3 vector bundle. But an easy computation shows that $c_4(K) = -c_4 + c_2^2 + 2c_1c_3 - 3c_1^2c_2 + c_1^4$ which implies that $c_4(K) \neq 0$ because the first four terms

are divisible by 6 (recall that $c_4 = 6h^1(E(-3))$) while c_1^4 is not. This *contradiction* concludes the proof of Claim 5. \square

Proposition 2.8. *Let E be a globally generated vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^4 , with Chern classes $c_1 = 5$, $c_2 = 11$, c_3, c_4 , and such that $H^i(E^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$. Assume, also, that $H^0(E_H(-2)) = 0$, for every hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$. Then one of the following holds:*

- (i) $c_3 = 15$, $c_4 = 16$ and $E \simeq 4\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(1) \oplus T_{\mathbb{P}^4}(-1)$;
- (ii) $c_3 = 13$, $c_4 = 9$ and $E \simeq 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(1) \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}(2)$.

Proof. According to Lemma 2.6 and to Prop. 2.7, one must have $c_3 \geq 13$ (recall that $c_3 \equiv c_1 c_2 \pmod{2}$). Let $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ be an arbitrary hyperplane, of equation $h = 0$, and let $F_{[h]}$ be the vector bundle $P(P(E_H))$ on H (see Remark 1.2). Then, according to Remark A.10, $F_{[h]}$ can be realized as an extension :

$$0 \longrightarrow (\mathrm{rk} F_{[h]} - 3)\mathcal{O}_H \longrightarrow F_{[h]} \longrightarrow G_{[h]}(2) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where $G_{[h]}$ is a *stable* rank 3 vector bundle with $c_1(G_{[h]}) = -1$, $c_2(G_{[h]}) = 3$, $c_3(G_{[h]}) \geq 3$. One deduces that $G_{[h]}$ has one of the following spectra: $(0, -1, -2)$, $(-1, -1, -1)$ and $(-1, -1, -2)$.

If the spectrum of $G_{[h]}$ is $(-1, -1, -2)$, for at least one hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$, then $c_3(G_{[h]}) = 5$ hence $c_3 = 15$. It is easy to show (see [5, Prop. 3.4]) that, in this case, $F_{[h]} \simeq 4\mathcal{O}_H(1) \oplus T_H(-1)$. One deduces, from Lemma 1.3, that $E \simeq 4\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(1) \oplus T_{\mathbb{P}^4}(-1)$.

Similarly, if the spectrum of $G_{[h]}$ is $(-1, -1, -1)$, for at least one hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$, then $c_3(G_{[h]}) = 3$ hence $c_3 = 13$ and $F_{[h]} \simeq 3\mathcal{O}_H(1) \oplus \Omega_H(2)$ (by [5, Prop. 3.4]). Lemma 1.4 implies that, in this case, $E \simeq 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(1) \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}(2)$.

It remains to investigate the case where $G_{[h]}$ has spectrum $(0, -1, -2)$, for every hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$. *We want, actually, to eliminate this case.* Assume, by contradiction, that it occurs. Then $c_3(G_{[h]}) = 3$ hence $c_3 = 13$. Moreover, $\mathrm{rk} F_{[h]} = 3 + h^2(G_{[h]}(-2)) = 6$ (see the last part of Remark 2.1(c)). Since $h^2(F_{[h]}(-3)) = h^2(G_{[h]}(-1)) = 1$, one has $t \leq 1$ (see Remark 2.1(c) for the notation) hence E has rank $r \leq 7$.

Now, one has $h^1(E_H(-3)) = 1$ (use the spectrum). Moreover, by Lemma A.2(b), $h^1(E_H(-2)) = 1$ and $h^1(E_H(-1)) = h^0(E_H(-1)) - 3$. But Lemma A.3 implies that $h^0(E_H(-1)) \leq 3$ hence $h^0(E_H(-1)) = 3$ and $h^1(E_H(-1)) = 0$. Remark 2.1(d) implies that $H^1(E(-3)) = 0$ and that $H^2(E(l)) = 0$ for $l \geq -2$. The formula from Remark 2.1(c) shows, now, that $h^2(E(-3)) = (9 - c_4)/6$.

Claim 1. $H^3(E(-4)) = 0$.

Indeed, assume, by contradiction, that $H^3(E(-4)) \neq 0$. Then, by Lemma 1.6, E can be realized as an extension :

$$0 \longrightarrow E_1 \longrightarrow E \longrightarrow T_{\mathbb{P}^4}(-1) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where E_1 is a vector bundle of rank $r - 4 \leq 3$. One must have $1 + c_1(E_1) + \dots + c_i(E_1) = c_i$, $i = 1, \dots, 4$, hence $c_1(E_1) = 4$, $c_2(E_1) = 6$, $c_3(E_1) = 2$ and, since $c_4(E_1) = 0$, $c_4 = 13$. But this *contradicts* the formula $h^2(E(-3)) = (9 - c_4)/6$ and Claim 1 is proven.

It follows, from Claim 1 and from the fact that $H^1(E(-3)) = 0$, that one has, for every hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$, an exact sequence :

$$0 \longrightarrow H^1(E_H(-3)) \longrightarrow H^2(E(-4)) \xrightarrow{h} H^2(E(-3)) \longrightarrow H^2(E_H(-3)) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Since $h^1(E_H(-3)) = 1$, $h^2(E_H(-3)) = 1$ and $h^2(E(-3)) = (9 - c_4)/6 \leq 1$, one gets that $h^2(E(-3)) = 1$ and $h^2(E(-4)) = 1$. Using the exact sequence :

$$0 \longrightarrow H^1(E(-2)) \longrightarrow H^1(E_H(-2)) \longrightarrow H^2(E(-3)) \longrightarrow H^2(E(-2)) = 0$$

and the fact, noticed above, that $h^1(E_H(-2)) = 1$, one gets that $H^1(E(-2)) = 0$. Since $H^1(E_H(-1)) = 0$ it follows that $H^1(E(-1)) = 0$ and, moreover, $H^0(E(-1)) \xrightarrow{\sim} H^0(E_H(-1))$ hence $h^0(E(-1)) = 3$.

Putting together the cohomological information obtained so far one deduces, applying Beilinson's theorem (recalled in [2, Thm. 1.23] and [2, Remark 1.25]) to $E(-1)$, that one has an exact sequence :

$$0 \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^3(3) \longrightarrow 3\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4} \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^2(2) \longrightarrow E(-1) \longrightarrow 0.$$

In order to get the desired *contradiction* it suffices to prove the following :

Claim 2. *There is no locally split monomorphism $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^3(3) \rightarrow 3\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4} \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^2(2)$.*

Indeed, according to Definition 1.1, any morphism $\phi: \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^3(3) \rightarrow 3\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4} \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^2(2)$ is defined by contraction with three elements $\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3$ of $\bigwedge^3 V$ and with a vector $v_0 \in V$ (where $V = k^5$). We want to show that the dual morphism $\phi^\vee: 3\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4} \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^2(2)^\vee \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^3(3)^\vee$ cannot be an epimorphism. Let W be the subspace $v_0 \wedge \bigwedge^2 V + \sum k\omega_i$ of $\bigwedge^3 V$ (recall the description of $H^0(\phi^\vee)$ from the above mentioned definition). According to Lemma 1.8, we have to show that W^\perp contains a decomposable element of $\bigwedge^2 V$. One has $(v_0 \wedge \bigwedge^2 V)^\perp = V \wedge v_0$. Exterior multiplication to the right by ω_i defines a linear function on $V \wedge v_0$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. Since $V \wedge v_0$ has dimension 4, there exists $v_1 \in V \setminus kv_0$ such that $v_1 \wedge v_0 \wedge \omega_i = 0$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. It follows that W^\perp contains the decomposable element $v_1 \wedge v_0$. This concludes the proof of Claim 2 and, with it, of the proposition. \square

Lemma 2.9. *There exists no globally generated vector bundle E on \mathbb{P}^4 , with Chern classes $c_1 = 5$, $c_2 = 12$, $c_3 = 14$, c_4 , such that $H^i(E^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, and $H^0(E_H(-2)) = 0$, for every hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$.*

Proof. Assume, by contradiction, that such a bundle exists. Since $h^1(E_H(-2)) = 3$ (by Lemma A.2(b)), Remark 2.1(d) implies that $H^2(E(l)) = 0$ for $l \geq -2$, and that $H^1(E(-3)) = 0$. It follows, from the formula in Remark 2.1(c), that $h^2(E(-3)) = (7 - c_4)/6$. One deduces that, for every hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ of equation $h = 0$, one has an exact sequence :

$$0 \longrightarrow H^1(E(-2)) \longrightarrow H^1(E_H(-2)) \longrightarrow H^2(E(-3)) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Since $h^2(E(-3)) \leq 1$ it follows that $2 \leq h^1(E(-2)) \leq 3$ (recall that $h^1(E_H(-2)) = 3$). Consider, now, the exact sequence :

$$0 \rightarrow H^0(E(-1)) \rightarrow H^0(E_H(-1)) \rightarrow H^1(E(-2)) \xrightarrow{h} H^1(E(-1)) \rightarrow H^1(E_H(-1)) \rightarrow 0.$$

Since $h^1(E_H(-1)) = h^0(E_H(-1)) \leq 1$, by Lemma A.2(b) and Lemma A.4, the Bilinear Map Lemma [17, Lemma 5.1] implies that $H^0(E(-1)) = 0$. One deduces

that $h^1(E(-1)) = h^1(E(-2))$ and that the multiplication by any non-zero linear form $h: H^1(E(-2)) \rightarrow H^1(E(-1))$ has corank ≤ 1 . Applying, now, Lemma 1.7 to the map $H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(1)) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_k(H^1(E(-2)), H^1(E(-1)))$ one gets a *contradiction* (recall that $h^1(E(-2)) \in \{2, 3\}$). \square

Proposition 2.10. *Let E be a globally generated vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^4 with Chern classes $c_1 = 5$, $c_2 = 12$, c_3, c_4 , such that $H^i(E^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, and $H^0(E_H(-2)) = 0$, for every hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$. Then one of the following holds:*

- (i) $c_3 = 20$, $c_4 = 28$ and $E \simeq 3\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(1) \oplus 2T_{\mathbb{P}^4}(-1)$;
- (ii) $c_3 = 18$, $c_4 = 21$ and $E \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(1) \oplus T_{\mathbb{P}^4}(-1) \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}(2)$;
- (iii) $c_3 = 18$, $c_4 = 15$ and $E \simeq 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(1) \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^2(3)$;
- (iv) $c_3 = 16$, $c_4 = 8$ and $E \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(1) \oplus E_0$, where $E_0(-1)$ is the cohomology sheaf of a monad of the form:

$$0 \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^3(3) \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^2(2) \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^1(1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4} \longrightarrow 0,$$

i.e., $E_0(-1)$ is the bundle \mathcal{G} from the statement of the main result of the paper of Abo, Decker and Sasakura [1];

- (v) $c_3 = 16$, $c_4 = 8$ and one has an exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^3(3) \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^2(2) \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^1(1) \longrightarrow E(-1) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Proof. According to Lemma 2.6, Prop. 2.7 and Lemma 2.9 one must have $c_3 \geq 16$ (recall that $c_3 \equiv c_1 c_2 \pmod{2}$). If $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ is an arbitrary hyperplane, of equation $h = 0$, let $F_{[h]}$ denote the vector bundle $P(P(E_H))$ on H (see Remark 1.2). By Lemma A.2(b),

$$h^0(F_{[h]}(-1)) - h^1(F_{[h]}(-1)) = \frac{1}{2}(c_3 - 14)$$

hence $h^0(F_{[h]}(-1)) \geq 2$ if $c_3 \geq 18$. In this case, by Remark A.5, either $c_3 = 20$ and $F_{[h]} \simeq 3\mathcal{O}_H(1) \oplus 2T_H(-1)$ or $c_3 = 18$ and $F_{[h]} \simeq 2\mathcal{O}_H(1) \oplus T_H(-1) \oplus \Omega_H(2)$. In the former case one deduces, from Lemma 1.3, that E is as in item (i) of the statement while, in the latter case, E is as in item (ii) or in item (iii) of the statement, by Lemma 1.4. It thus remains to consider the case $c_3 = 16$. In this case, by Remark A.10, $F_{[h]}$ can be realized as an extension:

$$0 \longrightarrow (\text{rk } F_{[h]} - 3) \longrightarrow F_{[h]} \longrightarrow G_{[h]}(2) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where $G_{[h]}$ is a stable rank 3 vector bundle on H with $c_1(G_{[h]}) = -1$, $c_2(G_{[h]}) = 4$, $c_3(G_{[h]}) = 4$. Taking into account Remark 2.5, the possible spectra of $G_{[h]}$ are $(0, -1, -1, -2)$ and $(-1, -1, -1, -1)$. In both cases $h^2(G_{[h]}(-2)) = 4$ hence $F_{[h]}$ has rank 7 (see the last part of Remark 2.1(c)). One also has, by Lemma A.2(b), $h^1(E_H(-2)) = 2$ (and $h^1(E_H(-1)) = h^0(E_H(-1)) - 1$) hence, by Remark 2.1(d), $H^1(E(-3)) = 0$ and $H^2(E(l)) = 0$ for $l \geq -2$. One deduces, from the formula in Remark 2.1(c), that $h^2(E(-3)) = (14 - c_4)/6$. One gets an exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow H^1(E(-2)) \longrightarrow H^1(E_H(-2)) \longrightarrow H^2(E(-3)) \longrightarrow 0$$

hence $h^1(E(-2)) + h^2(E(-3)) = 2$.

Claim 1. $H^3(E(-4)) = 0$.

Indeed, assume, by contradiction, that $H^3(E(-4)) \neq 0$. For every hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$, one has an exact sequence :

$$0 \rightarrow H^1(E_H(-3)) \rightarrow H^2(E(-4)) \xrightarrow{h} H^2(E(-3)) \rightarrow H^2(E_H(-3)) \rightarrow H^3(E(-4)) \rightarrow 0.$$

Since $h^2(E_H(-3)) = h^2(G_{[h]}(-1)) \leq 1$ (use the spectrum) one gets that $h^3(E(-4)) = h^2(E_H(-3)) = 1$ (hence, in particular, $G_{[h]}$ has spectrum $(0, -1, -1, -2)$). It follows that the multiplication by any non-zero linear form $h: H^2(E(-4)) \rightarrow H^2(E(-3))$ is surjective. Since $h^1(E_H(-3)) = 1$, the Bilinear Map Lemma [17, Lemma 5.1] implies that $H^2(E(-3)) = 0$ hence $c_4 = 14$. Moreover, one gets that $h^2(E(-4)) = h^1(E_H(-3)) = 1$ hence, by Cor. 2.4, $H^2(E^\vee) = 0$. Using a formula from Remark 2.1(b), one deduces that E has rank $r = 7$.

Now, the assumption $H^3(E(-4)) \neq 0$ implies, by Lemma 1.6, that E can be realized as an extension :

$$0 \longrightarrow E_1 \longrightarrow E \longrightarrow T_{\mathbb{P}^4}(-1) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where E_1 is a vector bundle of rank $r - 4 = 3$. One gets that $c_4(E_1) = c_4 - c_3 = -2$ and this *contradicts* the fact that E_1 has rank 3. This contradiction proves the claim.

One deduces, from Claim 1, that one has, for every hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$, an exact sequence :

$$0 \longrightarrow H^1(E_H(-3)) \longrightarrow H^2(E(-4)) \xrightarrow{h} H^2(E(-3)) \longrightarrow H^2(E_H(-3)) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Since $h^1(E_H(-3)) = h^2(E_H(-3)) \leq 1$ (use the spectrum), one gets that $h^2(E(-4)) = h^2(E(-3))$.

Claim 2. $H^2(E(-3)) \neq 0$.

Indeed, assume, by contradiction, that $H^2(E(-3)) = 0$. It follows that $h^1(E_H(-3)) = h^2(E_H(-3)) = 0$, for every hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$. Moreover, using the formula preceding Claim 1, $h^1(E(-2)) = 2$. Consider, for an arbitrary hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$, the exact sequence :

$$0 \rightarrow H^0(E(-1)) \rightarrow H^0(E_H(-1)) \rightarrow H^1(E(-2)) \xrightarrow{h} H^1(E(-1)) \rightarrow H^1(E_H(-1)) \rightarrow 0.$$

Since $h^1(E_H(-3)) = 0$, the last assertion in Lemma A.4 implies that $h^0(E_H(-1)) \leq 1$ hence, actually, $h^0(E_H(-1)) = 1$ and $h^1(E_H(-1)) = 0$ (recall that $h^1(E_H(-1)) = h^0(E_H(-1)) - 1$, by Lemma A.2(b)). Because this happens for every hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$, the Bilinear Map Lemma [17, Lemma 5.1] implies that $H^1(E(-1)) = 0$ and this clearly *contradicts* the fact that $h^1(E(-2)) = 2$ and $h^0(E_H(-1)) = 1$.

Consequently, one has $h^2(E(-4)) = h^2(E(-3)) \in \{1, 2\}$. Since the multiplication by any non-zero linear form $h: H^2(E(-4)) \rightarrow H^2(E(-3))$ has corank ≤ 1 one must have $h^2(E(-4)) = h^2(E(-3)) = 1$ (there is no injective linear map $k^5 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_k(k^2, k^2)$). One deduces that $c_4 = 8$ and that $h^1(E(-2)) = 1$ (by the formula preceding Claim 1). The last assertion in Lemma A.4 implies that $h^0(E_H(-1)) \leq 2$ hence $h^1(E_H(-1)) = h^0(E_H(-1)) - 1 \leq 1$, for every hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$. Using the exact sequence from the proof of Claim 2 and the Bilinear Map Lemma one deduces easily that one must have $h^1(E(-1)) \leq 1$. One also deduces

that $h^0(E(-1)) = h^1(E(-1))$ (because $h^1(E(-2)) = 1$). The cohomological information obtained so far suffices to conclude that the Beilinson monad of $E(-1)$ has one of the forms :

$$0 \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^3(3) \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^2(2) \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^1(1) \longrightarrow 0 \longrightarrow 0,$$

$$0 \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^3(3) \xrightarrow{\alpha} \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^2(2) \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^1(1) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4} \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4} \longrightarrow 0$$

(with the direct sums as the term of cohomological degree 0). If the Beilinson monad of $E(-1)$ has the first form then E is as in item (v) of the statement.

Assume, finally, that the Beilinson monad of $E(-1)$ has the second form. By the basic properties of Beilinson monads, the component $\beta_2: \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}$ of β is 0. It follows that the component $\beta_1: \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^2(2) \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^1(1) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}$ of β is an epimorphism. Since E is globally generated, $\text{Ker } \beta(1)$ must be globally generated hence $\text{Ker } \beta_1(1)$ is globally generated. Cor. 1.10 implies that there exists a k -basis v_0, \dots, v_4 of $V := k^5$ such that β_1 is defined by contraction with $\omega := v_0 \wedge v_1 + v_2 \wedge v_3$ and with $v := v_4$. The component $\alpha_1: \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^3(3) \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^2(2) \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^1(1)$ of α is defined by contraction with a $w \in V$ and an $\eta \in \wedge^2 V$. The condition $\beta_1 \circ \alpha_1 = 0$ is equivalent to $w \wedge \omega + \eta \wedge v = 0$ in $\wedge^3 V$. Put $V' := kv_0 + \dots + kv_3 \subset V$. Since $\wedge^3 V = \wedge^3 V' \oplus (\wedge^2 V' \wedge v_4)$ and since $* \wedge \omega$ maps V' isomorphically onto $\wedge^3 V'$, one deduces that one must have $w = -cv_4$, for some $c \in k$. This implies that $\eta = c\omega + u \wedge v_4$, for some $u \in V'$.

Now, since there is no locally split monomorphism $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^3(3) \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^1(1) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}$ (the cokernel of such a monomorphism would be isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(2)$) it follows that $c \neq 0$. $H^0(\alpha_1^\vee)$ can be identified to the map $\wedge^2 V \oplus V \rightarrow \wedge^3 V$ defined by $w \wedge *$ and $\eta \wedge *$. One deduces that $H^0(\alpha_1^\vee)$ is surjective (because its image contains $v_4 \wedge \wedge^2 V'$ and $\omega \wedge V' = \wedge^3 V'$) hence α_1^\vee is an epimorphism hence α_1 is a locally split monomorphism. One thus gets a monad :

$$0 \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^3(3) \xrightarrow{\alpha_1} \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^2(2) \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^4}^1(1) \xrightarrow{\beta_1} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Let E_1 be the cohomology sheaf of this monad (E_1 is, of course, locally free). One gets an exact sequence :

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4} \longrightarrow E(-1) \longrightarrow E_1 \longrightarrow 0.$$

Since $H^0(\alpha_1^\vee)$ is surjective it follows that $H^1(E_1^\vee) = 0$ hence $E(-1) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4} \oplus E_1$ hence E is as in item (iv) of the statement. \square

3. THE CASE $c_1 = 5$ ON \mathbb{P}^n , $n \geq 5$

We classify, in this section, the globally generated vector bundles E with $c_1 = 5$ on \mathbb{P}^n , $n \geq 5$, with the property that $H^i(E^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, and that $H^0(E_\Pi(-2)) = 0$ for every 3-plane $\Pi \subset \mathbb{P}^n$. We use the analogous classification for vector bundles on \mathbb{P}^4 from the preceding section and the following two auxiliary results.

Lemma 3.1. *Consider a morphism $\phi: \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^5}^3(3) \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^5}^1(1)$ defined by contraction with an element ω of $\wedge^2 V$, where $V := k^6$ (see Definition 1.1). Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (i) ϕ is an epimorphism;
- (ii) There exists a k -basis v_0, \dots, v_5 of V such that $\omega = v_0 \wedge v_1 + v_2 \wedge v_3 + v_4 \wedge v_5$;
- (iii) $H^0(\phi(1))$ is bijective.

Proof. $H^0(\phi(1)): H^0(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^5}^3(4)) \rightarrow H^0(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^5}^1(2))$ is the map $*_{\perp} \omega: \bigwedge^4 V^{\vee} \rightarrow \bigwedge^2 V^{\vee}$ which can be identified with the map $* \wedge \omega: \bigwedge^2 V \rightarrow \bigwedge^4 V$. Let W be the subspace $\bigwedge^2 V \wedge \omega$ of $\bigwedge^4 V$. By Lemma 1.8, $\phi(1)$ is an epimorphism if and only if the subspace W^{\perp} of $\bigwedge^2 V$ contains no decomposable element.

If $\omega = v_0 \wedge v_1$, with $v_0, v_1 \in V$ linearly independent then W^{\perp} contains the element $v_0 \wedge v_1$.

If $\omega = v_0 \wedge v_1 + v_2 \wedge v_3$, with $v_0, \dots, v_3 \in V$ linearly independent then W^{\perp} contains $v_0 \wedge v_2$.

One deduces that if ϕ is an epimorphism then there exists a k -basis v_0, \dots, v_5 of V such that $\omega = v_0 \wedge v_1 + v_2 \wedge v_3 + v_4 \wedge v_5$. We assert that, in this case, $W = \bigwedge^4 V$.

Indeed, any subset of $\{0, \dots, 5\}$ consisting of 4 elements contains one of the subsets $\{0, 1\}$, $\{2, 3\}$, $\{4, 5\}$. If it contains, for example, $\{0, 1\}$ and the other two elements i, j belong one to $\{2, 3\}$ and the other one to $\{4, 5\}$ then:

$$v_0 \wedge v_1 \wedge v_i \wedge v_j = v_i \wedge v_j \wedge \omega \in W.$$

On the other hand, one has:

$$\begin{aligned} W &\ni v_0 \wedge v_1 \wedge \omega = v_0 \wedge v_1 \wedge v_2 \wedge v_3 + v_0 \wedge v_1 \wedge v_4 \wedge v_5, \\ W &\ni v_2 \wedge v_3 \wedge \omega = v_0 \wedge v_1 \wedge v_2 \wedge v_3 + v_2 \wedge v_3 \wedge v_4 \wedge v_5, \\ W &\ni v_4 \wedge v_5 \wedge \omega = v_0 \wedge v_1 \wedge v_4 \wedge v_5 + v_2 \wedge v_3 \wedge v_4 \wedge v_5, \end{aligned}$$

hence $v_0 \wedge v_1 \wedge v_2 \wedge v_3$, $v_0 \wedge v_1 \wedge v_4 \wedge v_5$ and $v_2 \wedge v_3 \wedge v_4 \wedge v_5$ belong to W (one uses the fact that $\text{char } k \neq 2$). \square

Corollary 3.2. *Consider a morphism $\phi: \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^5}^2(2) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^5}$ defined by contraction with an $\omega \in \bigwedge^2 V$, where $V := k^6$.*

(a) *ϕ is an epimorphism if and only if there exists a k -basis v_0, \dots, v_5 of V such that either $\omega = v_0 \wedge v_1 + v_2 \wedge v_3$ or $\omega = v_0 \wedge v_1 + v_2 \wedge v_3 + v_4 \wedge v_5$.*

(b) *If ϕ is an epimorphism then $\text{Ker } \phi(1)$ is globally generated if and only if there exists a k -basis v_0, \dots, v_5 of V such that $\omega = v_0 \wedge v_1 + v_2 \wedge v_3 + v_4 \wedge v_5$.*

Proof. (a) ϕ is an epimorphism if and only if $H^0(\phi(1))$ is surjective, i.e., if and only if the contraction mapping $*_{\perp} \omega: \bigwedge^3 V^{\vee} \rightarrow V^{\vee}$ is surjective. On the other hand, this mapping can be identified with $* \wedge \omega: \bigwedge^3 V \rightarrow \bigwedge^5 V$. If there is a basis v_0, \dots, v_5 of V such that $\omega = v_0 \wedge v_1$ then $v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_5$ does not belong to $\bigwedge^3 V \wedge \omega$.

(b) One uses the same kind of argument as in the proof of Cor. 1.10. \square

Proposition 3.3. *Let E be a globally generated vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^n , $n \geq 5$, with $c_1 = 5$, $c_2 \leq 12$, such that $H^i(E^{\vee}) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, and $H^0(E_{\Pi}(-2)) = 0$, for every 3-plane $\Pi \subset \mathbb{P}^n$. Then one of the following holds:*

- (i) $c_2 = 10$ and $E \simeq 5\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(1)$;
- (ii) $c_2 = 11$ and $E \simeq 4\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(1) \oplus \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-1)$;
- (iii) $c_2 = 12$ and $E \simeq 3\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(1) \oplus 2\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-1)$;
- (iv) $n = 5$, $c_2 = 11$ and $E \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^5}(1) \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^5}(2)$;
- (v) $n = 6$, $c_2 = 11$ and $E \simeq \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^6}(2)$;
- (vi) $n = 5$, $c_2 = 12$ and $E \simeq \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{P}^5}(-1) \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^5}(2)$;
- (vii) $n = 5$, $c_2 = 12$ and one has an exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^5}^4(4) \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^5}^2(2) \longrightarrow E(-1) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Proof. According to Lemma 2.6, Prop. 2.7, Prop. 2.8 and Prop. 2.10 the pair of Chern classes (c_2, c_3) of E must take one of the values $(10, 10)$, $(11, 15)$, $(11, 13)$, $(12, 20)$, $(12, 18)$, $(12, 16)$. Let $\Pi \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a 3-plane and let F be the vector bundle $P(P(E_\Pi))$ on Π (see Remark 1.2). Taking into account the precise description of the globally generated vector bundles on \mathbb{P}^4 from the above mentioned results, one sees that, for the first five possible pairs of Chern classes, F is isomorphic to one of the bundles: $5\mathcal{O}_\Pi(1)$, $4\mathcal{O}_\Pi(1) \oplus T_\Pi(-1)$, $3\mathcal{O}_\Pi(1) \oplus \Omega_\Pi(2)$, $3\mathcal{O}_\Pi(1) \oplus 2T_\Pi(-1)$, $2\mathcal{O}_\Pi(1) \oplus T_\Pi(-1) \oplus \Omega_\Pi(2)$. It follows, from Lemma 1.3 and Lemma 1.4, that, in the first five cases, E is as in one of the items (i)–(vi) from the statement.

Assume, from now on, that $(c_2, c_3) = (12, 16)$. If $H \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ is an arbitrary hyperplane, of equation $h = 0$, then, as we noticed in Remark 1.2, the (globally generated) vector bundle $F_{[h]} := P(P(E_H))$ on H satisfies $H^i(F_{[h]}^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, and $E_H \simeq t\mathcal{O}_H \oplus Q_{[h]}$ where $t = h^0(E_H^\vee)$ and $Q_{[h]}$ is a quotient of $F_{[h]}$ by a trivial subbundle $s\mathcal{O}_H$, where $s = h^1(E_H^\vee)$.

Case 1. $n = 5$ (and, of course, $c_2 = 12$, $c_3 = 16$).

In this case, by Prop. 2.10, $F_{[h]}(-1)$ is the cohomology sheaf of a monad of the form :

$$0 \longrightarrow \Omega_H^3(3) \longrightarrow \Omega_H^2(2) \oplus \Omega_H^1(1) \oplus \mathcal{O}_H \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_H \longrightarrow 0,$$

in which the component $\mathcal{O}_H \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_H$ of the differential from the right can be non-zero. One deduces the following cohomological information about E_H :

- (1) $H^1(E_H(l)) = 0$ for $l \leq -3$ and $l \geq 0$, $h^1(E_H(-2)) = 1$, $h^1(E_H(-1)) = h^0(E_H(-1)) \leq 1$;
- (2) $H^2(E_H(l)) = 0$ for $l \leq -5$ and $l \geq -2$, $h^2(E_H(-4)) = h^2(E_H(-3)) = 1$;
- (3) $H^3(E_H(l)) = 0$ for $l \geq -4$, $h^3(E_H(-5)) = h^1(E_H^\vee) = s$.

Moreover, since $F_{[h]}$ has rank 6 and $c_4(F_{[h]}) = 8 \neq 0$, one must have $s \leq 2$.

Now, since $H^5(E(-6)) \simeq H^0(E^\vee)^\vee = 0$ it follows that $H^5(E(l)) = 0$ for $l \geq -6$.

One gets, from (3), that $H^4(E(l)) = 0$ for $l \geq -5$. Moreover, $H^4(E(-6)) \simeq H^1(E^\vee)^\vee = 0$.

Using the exact sequence :

$$H^2(E_H(-4)) \longrightarrow H^3(E(-5)) \xrightarrow{h} H^3(E(-4)) \longrightarrow H^3(E_H(-4)) = 0$$

and the Bilinear Map Lemma [17, Lemma 5.1] (recall that the hyperplane H is arbitrary) one deduces that $H^3(E(-4)) = 0$. Together with (3) this implies that $H^3(E(l)) = 0$ for $l \geq -4$. Moreover, using the exact sequence :

$$0 = H^2(E_H(-5)) \longrightarrow H^3(E(-6)) \xrightarrow{h} H^3(E(-5)) \longrightarrow H^3(E_H(-5))$$

and the Bilinear Map Lemma one gets that $H^3(E(-6)) = 0$.

It follows, from (2), that $H^2(E(l)) = 0$ for $l \leq -5$. Using the exact sequence :

$$H^1(E_H(-2)) \longrightarrow H^2(E(-3)) \xrightarrow{h} H^2(E(-2)) \longrightarrow H^2(E_H(-2)) = 0$$

and the Bilinear Map Lemma one deduces that $H^2(E(-2)) = 0$. Together with (2) this implies that $H^2(E(l)) = 0$ for $l \geq -2$.

One gets, from (1), that $H^1(E(l)) = 0$, for $l \leq -3$. Using the exact sequence :

$$0 = H^1(E(-3)) \rightarrow H^2(E(-4)) \xrightarrow{h} H^2(E(-3)) \rightarrow H^2(E_H(-3)) \rightarrow H^3(E(-4)) = 0$$

and the Bilinear Map Lemma one deduces that $H^2(E(-4)) = 0$ and $H^2(E(-3)) \xrightarrow{\sim} H^2(E_H(-3))$ hence $h^2(E(-3)) = 1$. Since $H^i(E(-4)) = 0$, $i = 2, 3$, it follows that $H^2(E_H(-4)) \xrightarrow{\sim} H^3(E(-5))$ hence $h^3(E(-5)) = 1$.

Finally, using the exact sequence :

$$0 = H^1(E(-3)) \rightarrow H^1(E(-2)) \rightarrow H^1(E_H(-2)) \rightarrow H^2(E(-3)) \rightarrow H^2(E(-2)) = 0$$

and recalling that $h^1(E_H(-2)) = 1 = h^2(E(-3))$, one obtains that $H^1(E(-2)) = 0$. Since $H^i(E(-2)) = 0$, $i = 0, 1, 2$, it follows that $H^i(E(-1)) \xrightarrow{\sim} H^i(E_H(-1))$, $i = 0, 1$.

We have gathered enough cohomological information to conclude that the Beilinson monad of $E(-1)$ has one of the following two forms :

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^5}^4(4) \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^5}^2(2) \longrightarrow 0 \longrightarrow 0, \\ 0 &\longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^5}^4(4) \xrightarrow{\alpha} \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^5}^2(2) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^5} \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^5} \longrightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

If the monad of $E(-1)$ has the first form then E is as in item (vii) from the statement. We assert that $E(-1)$ *cannot have a monad of the second form*. *Indeed*, assume, by contradiction, that it does. Since, by the basic properties of the Beilinson monad, the component $\beta_2: \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^5} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^5}$ of β is 0, the component $\beta_1: \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^5}^2(2) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^5}$ must be an epimorphism. E globally generated implies that $\text{Ker } \beta(1)$ is globally generated hence $\text{Ker } \beta_1(1)$ is globally generated. Cor. 3.2(b) implies that there exists a k -basis v_0, \dots, v_5 of $V := k^6$ such that β_1 is defined by contraction with $\omega := v_0 \wedge v_1 + v_2 \wedge v_3 + v_4 \wedge v_5 \in \bigwedge^2 V$. The component $\alpha_1: \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^5}^4(4) \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^5}^2(2)$ is defined by contraction with an element η of $\bigwedge^2 V$. The condition $\beta_1 \circ \alpha_1 = 0$ is equivalent to $\eta \wedge \omega = 0$ (in $\bigwedge^4 V$). But, as we saw in the final part of the proof of Lemma 3.1, $* \wedge \omega: \bigwedge^2 V \rightarrow \bigwedge^4 V$ is bijective hence $\eta = 0$. Since there is no locally split monomorphism $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^5}^4(4) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^5}$ we have got the desired *contradiction*.

Case 2. $n \geq 6$ (and, of course, $c_2 = 12$, $c_3 = 16$).

We will show that this case *cannot occur*. Assume, by contradiction, that it does. We can suppose, of course, that $n = 6$. Using the notation from the beginning of the proof, Case 1 implies that one has an exact sequence :

$$0 \longrightarrow \Omega_H^4(4) \longrightarrow \Omega_H^2(2) \longrightarrow F_{[h]}(-1) \longrightarrow 0,$$

for every hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^6$. It follows that $H_*^1(E_H) = 0$ and this implies that $H_*^i(E) = 0$, $i = 1, 2$. Using the exact sequence :

$$H^2(E_H(-4)) \longrightarrow H^3(E(-5)) \xrightarrow{h} H^3(E(-4)) \longrightarrow H^3(E_H(-4))$$

and the fact that $H^i(E_H(-4)) = 0$, $i = 2, 3$, for every hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^6$, one gets that $H^3(E(-5)) = 0$ and $H^3(E(-4)) = 0$. But this *contradicts* the fact that $H^2(E_H(-3))$, which is 1-dimensional, injects into $H^3(E(-4))$ (because $H^2(E(-3)) = 0$). \square

APPENDIX A. OVERVIEW OF THE CASE $c_1 = 5$ ON \mathbb{P}^3

We explain in this appendix, for ease of reference, the method used in [5] to classify globally generated vector bundles with $c_1 = 5$ on \mathbb{P}^3 . Most of the results are of a technical nature but the way in which the method works effectively can be seen in the proof of Lemma A.15 below.

Firstly, let us recall the following result, which is a particular case of [3, Prop. 3.5], and for which a short self-contained proof can be found in [5, Appendix A].

Proposition A.1. *Let F be a globally generated vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^3 , with Chern classes $c_1 = 5$, c_2 , c_3 , and such that $H^i(F^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$. If $H^0(F(-3)) = 0$ and $H^0(F(-2)) \neq 0$ then either $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2)$ is a direct summand of F or $F \simeq M(3)$, for some stable rank 2 vector bundle M with $c_1(M) = -1$, $c_2(M) = 2$ (in which case $c_2(F) = 8$).*

Proof. This result is proven in [5, Prop. A.1] under the hypothesis $c_2 \leq 12$. The case $c_2 \geq 13$ is, however, easy. Indeed, the dependency locus of $r - 1$ general global sections of F is a nonsingular (but not, necessarily, connected) curve Y , whence one gets an exact sequence :

$$0 \longrightarrow (r - 1)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_Y(5) \longrightarrow 0.$$

The degree of Y is c_2 . Since $\mathcal{I}_Y(5)$ is globally generated and $H^0(\mathcal{I}_Y(3)) \neq 0$ it follows that Y is contained in a complete intersection of type $(3, 5)$. One deduces that either Y is a complete intersection of type $(3, 5)$ or $c_2 \leq 14$ and Y is directly linked by a complete intersection of type $(3, 5)$ to a (locally Cohen-Macaulay) curve Y' of degree $15 - c_2$.

In the former case, one gets an exact sequence :

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-3) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2) \oplus r\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow 0.$$

Since $H^i(F^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, it follows that, by dualizing the exact sequence, the map $H^0(r\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}) \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(3))$ is bijective. One deduces, easily, that $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2)$ is a direct summand of F .

In the latter case, one gets, from the exact sequence of liaison (recalled in [2, Remark 2.6]) :

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-8) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-3) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-5) \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_Y \longrightarrow \omega_{Y'}(-4) \longrightarrow 0,$$

that $\omega_{Y'}(1)$ is globally generated. If $c_2 \geq 13$ then $\deg Y' \in \{1, 2\}$. The condition $\omega_{Y'}(1)$ globally generated implies that Y' has degree 2 and it is a complete intersection of type $(1, 2)$ or a double structure on a line $L \subset \mathbb{P}^3$. Such a double structure is defined by an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_{Y'} \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_L \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_L(l) \rightarrow 0$, for some $l \geq -1$. It is well known that one has $\omega_{Y'} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{Y'}(-l - 2)$ hence $\omega_{Y'}(1)$ globally generated implies that $l = -1$, i.e., Y' is a complete intersection of type $(1, 2)$ in this case, too. Using a result of Ferrand about resolutions under liaison (also recalled in [2, Remark 2.6]) one gets a resolution :

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-2) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \longrightarrow 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2) \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_Y(5) \longrightarrow 0$$

and one concludes as in the case where Y is a complete intersection of type $(3, 5)$. \square

Now, using Prop. A.1, [2, Prop. 2.4] and [2, Prop. 2.10] one sees that, in order to classify globally generated vector bundles F on \mathbb{P}^3 with $c_1 = 5$, one can assume that $H^0(F(-2)) = 0$. The next result provides some preliminary cohomological information about such a bundle.

Lemma A.2. *Let F be a globally generated vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^3 of rank $r \geq 3$, with Chern classes $c_1 = 5$, $c_2 \leq 12$, c_3 , and such that $H^i(F^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$. Then :*

(a) $H^1(F(l)) = 0$ for $l \leq -5$.

(b) If, moreover, $H^0(F(-2)) = 0$ then $H^2(F(l)) = 0$, for $l \geq -2$, and one has:

$$h^1(F(-2)) = \frac{1}{2}(5(c_2 - 8) - c_3), \quad h^1(F(-1)) = \frac{1}{2}(7(c_2 - 10) - c_3) + h^0(F(-1)),$$

and $h^1(F) \leq \max(h^1(F(-1)) - 3, 0)$.

Proof. (a) The dependency locus of $r-1$ general global sections of F is a nonsingular curve Y of degree c_2 . One gets an exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow (r-1)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_Y(5) \longrightarrow 0.$$

According to [5, Lemma 1.1], Y is *connected* hence $H^1(F(l)) = 0$ for $l \leq -5$.

(b) $r-3$ general global sections of F define an exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow (r-3)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow F' \longrightarrow 0,$$

with F' a rank 3 vector bundle. Consider the *normalized* rank 3 vector bundle $G := F'(-2)$. It has Chern classes $c_1(G) = -1$, $c_2(G) = c_2 - 8$, $c_3(G) = c_3 - 2c_2 + 12$. Using the exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow (r-3)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow G(2) \longrightarrow 0$$

and its dual one deduces that $H^0(G) = 0$ and $H^0(G^\vee(-2)) = 0$. If $H^0(G^\vee(-1)) = 0$ then G is *stable*. In this case, according to the restriction theorem of Schneider [24] (see, also, Ein et al. [13, Thm. 3.4]) either $G \simeq \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)$ (in which case $c_2(G) = 1$) or the restriction G_H of G to a *general* plane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ is stable (in which case $c_2(G) \geq 2$). In the latter case $H^0(G_H) = 0$ hence $H^0(F_H(-2)) = 0$.

If $H^0(G^\vee(-1)) \neq 0$, a non-zero global section of $G^\vee(-1)$ defines a non-zero morphism $\phi : G \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1)$. The image of ϕ is of the form $\mathcal{I}_Z(-1)$, where Z is a closed subscheme of \mathbb{P}^3 , of codimension ≥ 2 (because $H^0(G^\vee(-2)) = 0$). Since $G(2)$ is globally generated, $\mathcal{I}_Z(1)$ globally generated, hence Z must be the empty set, a simple point or a line. But $c_3(G^\vee(-1)) = -c_3 + c_2 - 4 \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$ (because $c_3 \equiv c_1c_2 \equiv c_2 \pmod{2}$). One deduces that Z cannot be a simple point hence G can be realized as an extension of one of the following forms:

$$(A) \quad 0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow G \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \rightarrow 0,$$

$$(B) \quad 0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow G \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_L(-1) \rightarrow 0,$$

where M is a rank 2 vector bundle with $c_1(M) = 0$ and $H^0(M) = 0$ (hence it is stable) and L is a line in \mathbb{P}^3 . Moreover, $c_2(M) = c_2 - 8$ and $c_3 = c_2 - 4$ in case (A) while in case (B), $c_2(M) = c_2 - 9$ and $c_3 = c_2$. According to the restriction theorem of Barth [6] (see, also, Ein et al. [13, Thm. 3.3]) either M can be described by an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1) \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ (in which case $c_2(M) = 1$; these bundles are called *nullcorrelation* bundles) or the restriction M_H of M to a general plane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ is stable (in which case $c_2(M) \geq 2$). In the latter case $H^0(M_H) = 0$ hence $H^0(F_H(-2)) = 0$.

Now, with the above notation, if $G \simeq \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)$ (resp., if M is a nullcorrelation bundle) then $H^2(G) = 0$ (resp., $H^2(M) = 0$). It follows that, in order to prove that $H^2(F(-2)) = 0$, one can assume that $H^0(F_H(-2)) = 0$, for the *general* plane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^3$. Consider, for an *arbitrary* plane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^3$, the exact sequence:

$$H^1(F_H(-2)) \longrightarrow H^2(F(-3)) \xrightarrow{h} H^2(F(-2)) \longrightarrow H^2(F_H(-2)).$$

One has $H^2(F_H(-2)) \simeq H^0(F_H^\vee(-1))^\vee = 0$ (since F_H is globally generated, F_H^\vee embeds into a direct sum of copies of \mathcal{O}_H). Applying the Bilinear Map Lemma [17, Lemma 5.1] one deduces that if $H^2(F(-2)) \neq 0$ then $h^2(F(-3)) - h^2(F(-2)) \geq 3$. But, for a general plane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^3$, one has, by Riemann-Roch, $h^1(F_H(-2)) = c_2 - 10 \leq 2$ and this *contradiction* shows that, in fact, $H^2(F(-2)) = 0$. Since $H^3(F(-3)) \simeq H^0(F^\vee(-1))^\vee = 0$, the Castelnuovo-Mumford lemma (in the slightly more general form quoted in [2, Lemma 1.21]) implies that $H^2(F(l)) = 0, \forall l \geq -2$.

The next two relations from item (b) of the statement can be deduced from the Riemann-Roch formula (recalled in [2, Thm. 4.5]). Finally, since $H^1(F_H) = 0$, for every plane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ (by the proof of [2, Prop. 3.6]), it follows that the multiplication by any non-zero linear form $h: H^1(F(-1)) \rightarrow H^1(F)$ is surjective hence, using again the Bilinear Map Lemma, one gets the last inequality from the statement. \square

Prop. A.6 below shows that, except for a few cases in which the bundle F can be explicitly described, the rank 3 vector bundle G associated to F in the proof of Lemma A.2(b) is *stable*. This reduces the classification of globally generated vector bundles F on \mathbb{P}^3 with $c_1 = 5$ and $H^0(F(-2)) = 0$ to the classification of stable rank 3 vector bundles G on \mathbb{P}^3 , with $c_1(G) = -1$, $c_2(G) \leq 4$ and such that $G(2)$ is globally generated. In order to prove Prop. A.6 one needs two auxiliary results.

Lemma A.3. *Let F be a globally generated vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^3 with Chern classes $c_1 = 5, c_2 = 11, c_3$, and such that $H^0(F(-2)) = 0$. Then:*

$$h^0(F(-1)) \leq \max\left(\frac{1}{2}(c_3 - 7), 1\right).$$

Proof. It follows, from the description of globally generated vector bundles with $c_1 = 5, c_2 = 11$ on \mathbb{P}^2 from the proof of [2, Prop. 3.6], that $H^1(F_H(-1)) = 0$, for every plane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^3$. Using the exact sequences $H^1(F(-2)) \xrightarrow{h} H^1(F(-1)) \rightarrow H^1(F_H(-1)) = 0$ and applying the Bilinear Map Lemma, one gets that:

$$h^1(F(-1)) \leq \max(h^1(F(-2)) - 3, 0).$$

On the other hand, by Lemma A.2(b):

$$h^1(F(-2)) = \frac{1}{2}(15 - c_3) \text{ and } h^0(F(-1)) = \frac{1}{2}(c_3 - 7) + h^1(F(-1)).$$

The inequality from the statement is now clear. \square

Lemma A.4. *Let F be a globally generated vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^3 with Chern classes $c_1 = 5, c_2 = 12, c_3$, and such that $H^0(F(-2)) = 0$. If $h^0(F(-1)) \geq 2$ then $c_3 \in \{16, 18, 20\}$. Moreover, if $c_3 = 16$ then $h^1(F(-3)) = 1$ and $h^0(F(-1)) = 2$.*

Proof. Let r be the rank of F . As we saw in the proof of Lemma A.2(a), F can be realized as an extension:

$$0 \longrightarrow (r-1)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_Y(5) \longrightarrow 0,$$

with Y a nonsingular connected curve of degree $c_2 = 12$. Our hypotheses imply that $H^0(\mathcal{I}_Y(3)) = 0$ and $h^0(\mathcal{I}_Y(4)) \geq 2$. It follows that Y is directly linked, by a complete intersection of type $(4, 4)$, to a curve Y' of degree 4. Since $2 \deg Y > 4 \times 4$, Y' must be locally complete intersection except at finitely many points, where it is

locally Cohen-Macaulay. The fundamental exact sequence of liaison (recalled in [2, Remark 2.6]) :

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-8) \longrightarrow 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-4) \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_Y \longrightarrow \omega_{Y'}(-4) \longrightarrow 0$$

implies that $\omega_{Y'}(1)$ is globally generated. It follows that a general global section of $\omega_{Y'}(1)$ generates this sheaf except at finitely many points hence it defines an extension :

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-2) \longrightarrow \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_{Y'}(1) \longrightarrow 0$$

with \mathcal{G} a rank 2 reflexive sheaf with $c_1(\mathcal{G}) = -1$, $c_2(\mathcal{G}) = \deg Y' - 2 = 2$ (see [17, Thm. 4.1]). Since $\chi(\mathcal{G}) = \chi(\mathcal{I}_{Y'}(1)) = \chi(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)) - \chi(\mathcal{O}_{Y'}(1))$ and $\chi(\mathcal{O}_{Y'}(1)) = \deg Y' + \chi(\mathcal{O}_{Y'})$, the Riemann-Roch formula for $\chi(\mathcal{G})$ (see, for example, [2, Thm. 4.5]) implies that $c_3(\mathcal{G}) = 4 - 2\chi(\mathcal{O}_{Y'})$. One can show, similarly, that $c_3 = -12 - 2\chi(\mathcal{O}_Y)$. On the other hand, by a basic formula in liaison theory (recalled in the footnote on page 24 in [2]), one has :

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_{Y'}) - \chi(\mathcal{O}_Y) = \frac{1}{2}(4 + 4 - 4)(\deg Y - \deg Y') = 16.$$

It follows that $c_3 = c_3(\mathcal{G}) + 16$.

Now, if $H^0(\mathcal{I}_{Y'}(1)) \neq 0$ then Y' is a complete intersection of type $(1, 4)$, hence $\omega_{Y'} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{Y'}(1)$. It follows that $H^0(\omega_{Y'}(-1)) \neq 0$, hence $H^0(\mathcal{I}_Y(3)) \neq 0$, a *contradiction*.

It remains that $H^0(\mathcal{I}_{Y'}(1)) = 0$ hence \mathcal{G} is *stable*. [17, Thm. 8.2(b)] implies, now, that $c_3(\mathcal{G}) \in \{0, 2, 4\}$ hence $c_3 \in \{16, 18, 20\}$.

Assume, finally, that $c_3 = 16$. In this case $c_3(\mathcal{G}) = 0$ hence \mathcal{G} is a rank 2 vector bundle. These bundles have been studied, independently, by Hartshorne and Sols [19] and by Manolache [21]. One has $H^1(F(-3)) \simeq H^1(\mathcal{I}_Y(2))$ and, by the well known behaviour of the Hartshorne-Rao module $H_*^1(\mathcal{I}_C)$ (C space curve) under liaison, $H^1(\mathcal{I}_Y(2)) \simeq H^1(\mathcal{I}_{Y'}(2))^\vee$. But $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{Y'}(2)) = h^1(\mathcal{G}(1)) = 1$ (see, for example, [19, Prop. 2.2]) hence $h^1(F(-3)) = 1$. Moreover, dualizing the extension defining \mathcal{G} and using the fact that $H^1(\mathcal{G}(-2)) = 0$ one gets that $H^0(\omega_{Y'}) = 0$ hence $h^0(\mathcal{I}_Y(4)) = 2$ hence $h^0(F(-1)) = 2$. \square

Remark A.5. Since the rank 2 reflexive sheaves \mathcal{G} appearing in the proof of Lemma A.4 can be described concretely, one gets (see [5, Prop. 4.1]) that if F is a globally generated vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^3 with Chern classes $c_1 = 5$, $c_2 = 12$, c_3 , such that $H^i(F^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, $H^0(F(-2)) = 0$ and $h^0(F(-1)) \geq 2$ then one of the following holds :

- (i) $c_3 = 20$ and $F \simeq 3\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1) \oplus 2\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1)$;
- (ii) $c_3 = 18$ and $F \simeq 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1) \oplus \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \oplus \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2)$;
- (iii) $c_3 = 16$ and $F \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1) \oplus F_0$, where, up to a linear change of coordinates, F_0 is the cohomology of the monad :

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} s \\ u \end{pmatrix}} 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2) \oplus 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1) \oplus 4\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \xrightarrow{(p, 0)} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(3)$$

where $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \xrightarrow{s} 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2) \oplus 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1) \xrightarrow{p} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(3)$ is a subcomplex of the Koszul complex defined by x_0, x_1, x_2^2, x_3^2 and $u : \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \rightarrow 4\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}$ is defined by x_0, \dots, x_3 .

Proposition A.6. *Let F be a globally generated vector bundle of rank $r \geq 3$ on \mathbb{P}^3 , with Chern classes $c_1 = 5$, $c_2 \leq 12$, c_3 , such that $H^i(F^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$. Assume, also, that $H^0(F(-2)) = 0$. As we saw in the proof of Lemma A.2(b), F can be realized as an extension:*

$$0 \longrightarrow (r-3)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow G(2) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where G is a rank 3 vector bundle with $c_1(G) = -1$, $c_2(G) = c_2 - 8$, $c_3(G) = c_3 - 2c_2 + 12$. If G is not stable then one of the following holds:

- (i) $r = 3$, $c_3 = c_2 - 4$, and F can be realized as an extension:

$$0 \longrightarrow M(2) \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where M is a rank 2 vector bundle with $c_1(M) = 0$, $c_2(M) = c_2 - 8$, $H^0(M) = 0$ and $H^1(M(-2)) = 0$ (i.e., M is a mathematical instanton bundle of charge $c_2 - 8$);

- (ii) $r = 4$, $c_2 = 12$, $c_3 = c_2 - 4 = 8$, and $F \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1) \oplus F_0$, where F_0 is the kernel of an epimorphism $4\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(4)$, and the image of the morphism $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \rightarrow F$ is contained in F_0 ;

- (iii) $r = 5$, $c_3 = c_2$ and there exists an exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow M(2) \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow T_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where M is a rank 2 vector bundle with $c_1(M) = 0$, $c_2(M) = c_2 - 9$, $H^0(M) = 0$ and $H^1(M(-2)) = 0$.

Proof. Firstly, since $H^i(F(-4)) \simeq H^{3-i}(F^\vee)^\vee = 0$, $i = 2, 3$, one has $H^2(G(-2)) \xrightarrow{\sim} H^3((r-3)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-4))$ hence $r = 3 + h^2(G(-2))$.

If G is not stable then one has the *alternatives* (A) and (B) from the proof of Lemma A.2(b). It is well known (see [17, Thm. 8.1(c)]) that if \mathcal{F} is a rank 2 reflexive sheaf on \mathbb{P}^3 with $c_1(\mathcal{F}) = 0$, $c_2(\mathcal{F}) \leq 2$ and $H^0(\mathcal{F}) = 0$ then $H^1(\mathcal{F}(-2)) = 0$.

Claim 1. *If $c_2 = 11$ then the bundle M from (A) satisfies $H^1(M(-2)) = 0$.*

Indeed, M has, *a priori* two possible spectra: $(1, 0, -1)$ and $(0, 0, 0)$ (see [17, Sect. 7] for the definition and the properties of the spectrum of a stable rank 2 reflexive sheaf on \mathbb{P}^3). But if M has spectrum $(1, 0, -1)$ then $h^0(M(1)) = 2$ (see [17, Lemma 9.15]) and this *contradicts* the fact that, by Lemma A.3, $h^0(G(1)) \leq 1$ (because $h^0(F(-1)) \leq 1$).

Claim 2. *If the vector bundle M from (A) satisfies $H^1(M(-2)) = 0$ then $r = 3$, i.e., $F = G(2)$.*

Indeed, $H^2(M(-2)) = 0$ by Serre duality and the fact that $M \simeq M^\vee$. It follows that $H^2(G(-2)) = 0$ hence $r = 3$ by the formula from the beginning of the proof.

Claim 3. *If $c_2 = 12$ and the bundle M from (A) satisfies $H^1(M(-2)) \neq 0$ then F is as in item (ii) from the statement.*

Indeed, in this case, M has spectrum $(1, 0, 0, -1)$. According to Chang [9, Prop. 1.5], either M has an unstable plane H of order 1 or it can be realized as the cohomology sheaf of a selfdual monad:

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-2) \longrightarrow 4\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2) \longrightarrow 0.$$

The former case cannot, however, occur because, in that case, there exists an epimorphism $M \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_{Z,H}(-1) \rightarrow 0$ where Z is a 0-dimensional subscheme of H , of length 5, and this would *contradict* the fact that $M(3)$ must be globally generated (since $G(2)$ is globally generated, the diagram of evaluation morphisms corresponding to the exact sequence (A) tensorized by $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2)$ induces an epimorphism from $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)$, which is the kernel of the evaluation morphism of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)$, to the cokernel of the evaluation morphism of $M(2)$).

It thus remains that M is the cohomology of a monad as above. Let K be the kernel of the epimorphism $4\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2)$ from the monad. K admits a (Koszul) resolution of the form :

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-6) \longrightarrow 4\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-4) \longrightarrow 6\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-2) \longrightarrow K \longrightarrow 0.$$

One deduces that $H^1(M(1)) \simeq H^3(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-5))$ and $H^1(M(2)) \simeq H^3(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-4)) \simeq k$. It follows that the multiplication map $H^1(M(1)) \otimes_k H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)) \rightarrow H^1(M(2))$ is a perfect pairing, that is, if $\xi \in H^1(M(1))$ is annihilated by every linear form $h \in H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1))$ then $\xi = 0$. Since $G(2)$ is globally generated, the map $H^0(G(2)) \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1))$ must be surjective hence the connecting map $H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)) \rightarrow H^1(M(2))$ associated to the exact sequence (A) tensorized by $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2)$ is zero. This implies that the element $\xi \in H^1(M(1))$ defining the extension $0 \rightarrow M(1) \rightarrow G(1) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \rightarrow 0$ is zero hence $G \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \oplus M$. Since $h^2(G(-2)) = h^2(M(-2)) = 1$ one has $r = 4$. Since $\text{Ext}^1(M(2), \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}) \simeq H^1(M^\vee(-2)) \simeq H^1(M(-2))$ is 1-dimensional and since the extension $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \rightarrow K(2) \rightarrow M(2) \rightarrow 0$ is non-trivial, one gets that $F \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1) \oplus K(2)$.

Claim 4. *If $c_2 = 12$ then the bundle M from (B) satisfies $H^1(M(-2)) = 0$.*

Indeed, one can use the same argument as in the proof of Claim 1 with Lemma A.4 instead of Lemma A.3.

Claim 5. *If G is as in (B) then F is as in item (iii) from the statement.*

Indeed, since $G(2)$ is globally generated the map $H^0(G(2)) \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{I}_L(1))$ must be surjective. Applying the Snake Lemma to the diagram :

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) & \longrightarrow & 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{I}_L(1) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & M(2) & \longrightarrow & G(2) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{I}_L(1) \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

one gets an exact sequence :

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \longrightarrow M(2) \oplus 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \longrightarrow G(2) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Since $H^2(M(-2)) = 0$ it follows that $h^2(G(-2)) = 2$ hence F has rank $r = 5$. Using the fact that $\text{Ext}^1(M(2), \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}) \simeq H^1(M^\vee(-2)) \simeq H^1(M(-2)) = 0$ one gets a commutative diagram :

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) & \longrightarrow & M(2) \oplus 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} & \longrightarrow & G(2) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} & \longrightarrow & F & \longrightarrow & G(2) \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

from which one deduces an exact sequence :

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix}} M(2) \oplus 4\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow 0,$$

Since $H^i(F^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, $H^0(v^\vee): H^0(4\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}) \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1))$ is an isomorphism hence v is defined by 4 linearly independent linear forms. One gets, now, easily, the exact sequence from item (iii) of the conclusion. \square

Lemma A.7. *Let F be a globally generated vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^3 , of rank r , with $c_1 = 5$, $c_2 \leq 12$, such that $H^i(F^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, and $H^0(F(-2)) = 0$. If $H^2(F(-3)) \neq 0$ then $r \geq 5$ and F can be realized as an extension :*

$$0 \longrightarrow F_1 \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow T_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \longrightarrow 0,$$

with F_1 a vector bundle of rank $r-3$ which, in turn, can be realized as an extension :

$$0 \longrightarrow (r-5)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \longrightarrow F_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_1(2) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where \mathcal{F}_1 is a stable rank 2 reflexive sheaf with $c_1(\mathcal{F}_1) = 0$, $c_2(\mathcal{F}_1) = c_2 - 9$ and $c_3(\mathcal{F}_1) = c_3 - c_2$.

We recall, in connection with the above lemma, that the stable rank 2 reflexive sheaves \mathcal{F} on \mathbb{P}^3 with $c_1(\mathcal{F}) = 0$ and $c_2(\mathcal{F}) \leq 3$ are studied by Chang in [10].

Proof of Lemma A.7. According to Lemma 1.6, there exists an epimorphism $\varepsilon: F \rightarrow T_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1)$. Let F_1 be its kernel. It has $c_1(F_1) = 4$ and $H^0(F_1(-2)) = 0$ hence it must have rank at least 2. One also has $H^0(F_1^\vee) = 0$.

Now, if W is a general vector subspace of dimension $r-1$ of $H^0(F)$ then one has an exact sequence :

$$0 \longrightarrow W \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_Y(5) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where Y is a nonsingular curve which is *connected* by [5, Lemma 1.1]. Since W is general, one can also assume that $H^0(\varepsilon)$ maps W surjectively onto $H^0(T_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1))$ (the map $H^0(\varepsilon): H^0(F) \rightarrow H^0(T_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1))$ is surjective because the only vector subspace of $H^0(T_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1))$ generating $T_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1)$ globally is $H^0(T_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1))$). One gets a commutative diagram :

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & (r-5)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} & \longrightarrow & W \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} & \longrightarrow & 4\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & F_1 & \longrightarrow & F & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} & T_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

If \mathcal{E}_1 is the cokernel of $(r-5)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \rightarrow F_1$ then it sits into an exact sequence :

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_Y(5) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Applying $\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}}(*, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1))$, one gets an exact sequence :

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-6) \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}_1^\vee(-1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \xrightarrow{\delta} \omega_Y(-2) \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}xt_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}}^1(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1)) \longrightarrow 0.$$

One cannot have $\delta = 0$ because, otherwise, $\mathcal{E}_1^\vee(-1) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-6)$ and this would contradict the fact that $H^0(F_1^\vee(-1)) = 0$. Since $\delta \neq 0$ and since Y is a connected nonsingular curve one gets that the support of $\mathcal{E}xt_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}}^1(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1))$ is 0-dimensional or empty which implies that \mathcal{E}_1 is reflexive (of rank 2). $\mathcal{F}_1 := \mathcal{E}_1(-2)$

has the Chern classes from the statement and $H^0(\mathcal{F}_1) = 0$ (i.e., \mathcal{F}_1 is stable) because $H^0(F_1(-2)) = 0$. \square

Remark A.8. As we saw in the above proof, the map $H^0(F) \rightarrow H^0(T_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1))$ is surjective. One deduces easily an exact sequence :

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix}} F_1 \oplus 4\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow 0,$$

with v defined by 4 linearly independent linear forms. It follows that if the multiplication map $H^0(F_1) \otimes H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)) \rightarrow H^0(F_1(1))$ is surjective then, up to an automorphism of $F_1 \oplus 4\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}$, one can assume that $u = 0$ hence $F \simeq T_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \oplus F_1$.

Proposition A.9. *Let F be a globally generated vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^3 with $c_1 = 5$ and such that $H^i(F^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, and $H^0(F(-2)) = 0$. Then $c_2 \geq 9$ and if $c_2 = 9$ then $c_3 = 5$ and one of the following holds:*

- (i) $F \simeq \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^3}(3)$;
- (ii) $F \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1) \oplus N(2)$, where N is a nullcorrelation bundle.

Proof. Assume, firstly, that F has rank 2. In this case, $F = M(3)$ where M is a rank 2 vector bundle with $c_1(M) = -1$ and $H^0(M(1)) = 0$. In particular, M is stable (i.e., $H^0(M) = 0$). It follows that $c_2(M) \geq 2$ (use [17, Cor. 3.3] and the fact that $c_2(M) \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$). But, as shown by Hartshorne and Sols [19] and by Manolache [21], if $c_2(M) = 2$ then $H^0(M(1)) \neq 0$. It remains that $c_2(M) \geq 4$ hence $c_2 = c_2(M) + 3c_1(M) + 3^2 \geq 10$.

If $\text{rk } F \geq 3$ then, according to Prop. A.6, one has to consider three cases :

Case 1. F as in Prop. A.6(i).

In this case, $c_2 = c_2(M) + 8$. Since M is stable it follows that $c_2(M) \geq 1$ hence $c_2 \geq 9$. Moreover, if $c_2 = 9$, i.e., if $c_2(M) = 1$, then M is isomorphic to a nullcorrelation bundle N . Since $H^1(N(1)) = 0$ it follows that $F \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1) \oplus N(2)$.

Case 2. F as in Prop. A.6(iii).

In this case, $c_2 = c_2(M) + 9 \geq 10$.

Case 3. *The rank 3 vector bundle G associated to F in the statement of Prop. A.6 is stable.*

The first two Chern classes of G are $c_1(G) = -1$, $c_2(G) = c_2 - 8$. According to the results of Schneider [24], $c_2(G) \geq 1$ and if $c_2(G) = 1$ then $G \simeq \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)$. One deduces that $c_2 \geq 9$ and if $c_2 = 9$ then $G \simeq \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)$. The formula $r = 3 + h^2(G(-2))$ (deduced at the beginning of the proof of Prop. A.6) implies that, in the case $c_2 = 9$, $r = 3$ hence $F = G(2) \simeq \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^3}(3)$. \square

Remark A.10. Let F be a globally generated vector bundle of rank $r \geq 3$ on \mathbb{P}^3 , with Chern classes $c_1 = 5$, $10 \leq c_2 \leq 12$, c_3 , such that $H^i(F^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, and $H^0(F(-2)) = 0$. According to Prop. A.6, except for the cases stated in the conclusion of that proposition, F can be realized as an extension :

$$0 \longrightarrow (r-3)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow G(2) \longrightarrow 0,$$

for some *stable* rank 3 vector bundle G with Chern classes $c_1(G) = -1$, $c_2(G) = c_2 - 8$, $c_3(G) = c_3 - 2c_2 + 12$. Moreover, $r = 3 + h^2(G(-2))$ (as we saw at the

beginning of the proof of Prop. A.6). The intermediate cohomology of G can be described, in part, by a sequence of integers (k_1, k_2, \dots, k_m) , $k_1 \geq \dots \geq k_m$, called the *spectrum* of G and denoted by k_G , according to the following formulae:

- (i) $h^1(G(l)) = h^0(\bigoplus_{i=1}^m \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(k_i + l + 1))$ for $l \leq -1$;
- (ii) $h^2(G(l)) = h^1(\bigoplus_{i=1}^m \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(k_i + l + 1))$ for $l \geq -2$.

Moreover, one has:

- (iii) $m = c_2(G) = c_2 - 8$ and $-2 \sum k_i = c_3(G) + c_2(G) = c_3 - c_2 + 4$;
- (iv) If $k \geq 0$ occurs in the spectrum then $0, 1, \dots, k$ occur too;
- (v) If $k \leq -1$ occurs in the spectrum then $-1, -2, \dots, k$ occur too;
- (vi) If 0 does not occur in the spectrum then -1 occurs at least twice;
- (vii) If $-1 \geq k_{i-1} > k_i > k_{i+1}$ for some i with $2 \leq i \leq m-1$ then $k_{i+1} > k_{i+2} > \dots > k_m$ and F has an *unstable plane* H of order $-k_m$, that is, $H^0(F_H^\vee(k_m)) \neq 0$ and $H^0(F_H^\vee(k_m - 1)) = 0$.

Proofs of the above facts can be found in the papers of Okonek and Spindler [22], [23] and of Coandă [12]. These proofs use the approach of Hartshorne [17], [18], who considered the case of stable rank 2 reflexive sheaves on \mathbb{P}^3 . Compact, self-contained arguments can be also found in [5, Appendix B].

Lemma A.11. *Let G be a stable rank 3 vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^3 with $c_1(G) = -1$, $c_2(G) = m$, and let $k_G = (k_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m}$ be its spectrum. Assume that $2 \leq m \leq 4$ and that $G(2)$ is globally generated. Then $1 \geq k_1 \geq \dots \geq k_m \geq -2$.*

Proof. Consider the universal extension:

$$0 \longrightarrow H^1(G^\vee(-2))^\vee \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow G(2) \longrightarrow 0.$$

F is a globally generated vector with $c_1 = 5$, $10 \leq c_2 \leq 12$, and such that $H^i(F^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, and $H^0(F(-2)) = 0$. It follows, from Lemma A.2, that $H^1(F(-5)) = 0$ and $H^2(F(-2)) = 0$ hence $H^1(G(-3)) = 0$ and $H^2(G) = 0$. Using the definition of the spectrum one gets the conclusion of the lemma. \square

Lemma A.12. *Let G be a stable rank 3 vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^3 with $c_1(G) = -1$, $2 \leq c_2(G) \leq 3$, and such that $G(2)$ is globally generated. Then G cannot have any of the following spectra: $(1, 0, -1)$, $(0, -1, -2, -2)$, $(1, 0, -1, -2)$, $(1, 0, -1, -1)$.*

Proof. We make, firstly, the following observation: let F be a globally generated vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^3 with $c_1(F) = 5$, $c_2(F) \in \{11, 12\}$. It follows, from the proof of [2, Prop. 3.6], that $H^0(F_H(-3)) = 0$, for every plane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^3$. Applying the Bilinear Map Lemma [17, Lemma 5.1] to the multiplication map $H^1(F(-4)) \otimes H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)) \rightarrow H^1(F(-3))$ one deduces that if $H^1(F(-4)) \neq 0$ then $h^1(F(-3)) \geq h^1(F(-4)) + 3$.

Now, if G has spectrum $(1, 0, -1)$ then $h^1(G(-2)) = 1$ and $h^1(G(-1)) = 3$ hence, according to the above observation (applied to $F := G(2)$), $G(2)$ cannot be globally generated.

The spectra $(1, 0, -1, -2)$ and $(1, 0, -1, -1)$ can be eliminated similarly.

Finally, assume, by contradiction, that G has spectrum $(0, -1, -2, -2)$ and that $G(2)$ is globally generated. The Chern classes of G are $c_1(G) = -1$, $c_2(G) = 4$, $c_3(G) = 6$ hence, by Riemann-Roch, $\chi(G(1)) = 2$. It follows that $h^0(G(1)) \geq 2$. As

in the proof of Lemma A.4, one has exact sequences :

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\longrightarrow 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \longrightarrow G(2) \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_Y(5) \longrightarrow 0, \\ 0 &\longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-2) \longrightarrow \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_{Y'}(1) \longrightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

where Y is a nonsingular connected curve of degree 12, Y' is a locally Cohen-Macaulay curve of degree 4, locally complete intersection except at finitely many points, directly linked to Y by a complete intersection of type $(4, 4)$, and \mathcal{G} is a stable reflexive sheaf with $c_1(\mathcal{G}) = -1$, $c_2(\mathcal{G}) = 2$, $c_3(\mathcal{G}) = c_3(G(2)) - 16 = 2$. According to [10, Lemma 2.4], \mathcal{G} can be realized as an extension :

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_Z \longrightarrow 0,$$

where Z is either the union of two disjoint lines or a divisor of the form $2L$ on a nonsingular quadric surface, L being a line. It follows that $H^1(\mathcal{G}(1)) = 0$ hence $H^1(\mathcal{I}_{Y'}(2)) = 0$. But, by the well known behaviour of the Hartshorne-Rao module $H_*^1(*)$ under liaison, $H^1(\mathcal{I}_{Y'}(2)) \simeq H^1(\mathcal{I}_Y(2))^\vee$ hence $H^1(\mathcal{I}_Y(2)) = 0$. This implies that $H^1(G(-1)) = 0$ which *contradicts* the fact that the spectrum of G is $(0, -1, -2, -2)$. \square

Lemma A.13. *Let F be a globally generated vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^3 of rank $r \geq 3$, with $c_1 = 5$, $10 \leq c_2 \leq 12$, such that $H^i(F^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, and $H^0(F(-2)) = 0$. If there exists a plane $H_0 \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ such that $H^0(F_{H_0}(-3)) \neq 0$ then $c_2 = 10$, $c_3 = 4$ and F is the kernel of an epimorphism $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(3) \oplus 3\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(4)$.*

Proof. If $c_2 \in \{11, 12\}$ then the proof of [2, Prop. 3.6] shows that $H^0(F_H(-3)) = 0$ for every plane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^3$. Assume, now, that $c_2 = 10$. If M is a rank 2 vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^3 with $H^0(M(-1)) = 0$ and $H^1(M(-2)) = 0$ then $H^0(M_H(-1)) = 0$ for every plane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^3$. It follows that F does not satisfy the hypothesis of Prop. A.6 hence it can be realized as an extension :

$$0 \longrightarrow (r-3)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow G(2) \longrightarrow 0,$$

for some *stable* rank 3 vector bundle G with $c_1(G) = -1$, $c_2(G) = 2$. Since $H^0(F(-3)) = 0$ and $H^0(F_{H_0}(-3)) \neq 0$ one deduces that $H^1(F(-4)) \neq 0$ hence $H^1(G(-2)) \neq 0$. The only possible spectrum for G is, therefore, $k_G = (1, 0)$. It follows that $c_3(G) = -4$ hence $c_3 = 4$ and, since $h^2(G(-2)) = 0$, $r = 3$, i.e., $F = G(2)$ (look at the beginning of the proof of Prop. A.6).

Now, one has $H^1(G(l)) = 0$ for $l \leq -3$, $h^1(G(-2)) = 1$ and $h^1(G(-1)) = 3$. Since $H^2(G(-2)) = 0$ and $H^3(G(-3)) \simeq H^0(G^\vee(-1))^\vee = 0$ it follows, from the Castelnuovo-Mumford lemma, that the graded S -module $H_*^1(G)$ is generated in degrees ≤ -1 .

Claim. *The multiplication map $H^1(G(-2)) \otimes H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)) \rightarrow H^1(G(-1))$ is surjective.*

Indeed, if it is not then there exist two linearly independent linear forms h_0 and h_1 annihilating $H^1(G(-2))$ inside $H_*^1(G)$. Let $L \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ be the line of equations $h_0 = h_1 = 0$. Tensorizing by G the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-2) \rightarrow 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_L \rightarrow 0$ one deduces that $H^0(\mathcal{I}_L \otimes G) \neq 0$ which *contradicts* the fact that $H^0(G) = 0$.

Consider, now, the universal extension :

$$0 \longrightarrow G \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2) \longrightarrow 0.$$

B is a rank 4 vector bundle with $H^1(B(-1)) = 0$, $H^2(B(-2)) \simeq H^2(G(-2)) = 0$ and $H^3(B(-3)) \simeq H^3(G(-3)) = 0$. It follows that B is 0-regular. One has $h^0(B(-1)) = h^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)) - h^1(G(-1)) = 1$ and $h^0(B) = \chi(B) = \chi(G) + \chi(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2)) = 7$. One deduces that the graded S -module $H_*^0(B)$ has one minimal generator of degree -1 and three minimal generators of degree 0. The epimorphism $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1) \oplus 3\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \rightarrow B$ defined by these generators must be an isomorphism because B has rank 4. \square

Lemma A.14. *Let F be a globally generated vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^3 of rank $r \geq 3$, with $c_1 = 5$, $10 \leq c_2 \leq 12$, such that $H^i(F^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$. Assume that F can be realized as an extension:*

$$0 \longrightarrow (r-3)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow G(2) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where G is a stable rank 3 vector bundle with $c_1(G) = -1$ (see Remark A.10). Assume, moreover, that $H^2(F(-3)) = 0$ and that F is not the bundle from the conclusion of Lemma A.13. Put $s := h^1(F(-3)) - h^1(F(-4))$. Then:

- (a) $H^0(F_H^\vee) = 0$ and $h^1(F_H^\vee) = s$, for any plane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^3$;
- (b) The graded S -module $H_*^1(F)$ is generated in degrees ≤ -2 ;
- (c) If $H^1(F(-4)) \neq 0$ then $s \geq 3$ and if, moreover, $s = 3$ then the multiplication map $H^1(F(-4)) \otimes H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)) \rightarrow H^1(F(-3))$ is surjective;
- (d) $H^1(F^\vee(l)) = 0$ for $l \leq 0$ and, if $h^1(F(-4)) \leq 1$, then the graded S -module $H_*^1(F^\vee)$ is generated by $H^1(F^\vee(1))$;
- (e) $h^1(F_H^\vee(1)) = h^1(F^\vee(1)) + h^2(F^\vee)$, for any plane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^3$;
- (f) $h^1(F_H^\vee(l)) \leq \max(h^1(F_H^\vee(l-1)) - 1, 0)$, $\forall l \geq 1$, for any plane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^3$.

Proof. (a) Since $H^i(F^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, one has $H^0(F_H^\vee) \xrightarrow{\sim} H^1(F^\vee(-1))$. But $H^1(F^\vee(-1)) \simeq H^2(F(-3))^\vee = 0$ hence $H^0(F_H^\vee) = 0$. For the second relation one uses the exact sequence:

$$0 = H^1(F^\vee) \rightarrow H^1(F_H^\vee) \rightarrow H^2(F^\vee(-1)) \rightarrow H^2(F^\vee) \rightarrow H^2(F_H^\vee)$$

and the fact that, by Lemma A.13, $H^2(F_H^\vee) \simeq H^0(F_H(-3))^\vee = 0$.

(b) This follows from the Castelnuovo-Mumford lemma (in the slightly more general form stated in [2, Lemma 1.21]) because $H^2(F(-3)) = 0$ and $H^3(F(-4)) \simeq H^0(F^\vee)^\vee = 0$.

(c) Since $H^0(F_H(-3)) = 0$, for any plane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^3$, by Lemma A.13, one deduces that the multiplication by any non-zero linear form $h: H^1(F(-4)) \rightarrow H^1(F(-3))$ is injective. One applies, now, the Bilinear Map Lemma [17, Lemma 5.1].

(d) One has, by hypothesis, $H^1(F^\vee) = 0$ and $H^1(F^\vee(-1)) \simeq H^2(F(-3))^\vee = 0$. On the other hand, for $l \leq -2$, $H^1(F^\vee(l)) \simeq H^2(F(-l-4))^\vee = 0$, by Lemma A.2(b).

Now, if $H^1(F(-4)) = 0$ then, by Serre duality, $H^2(F^\vee) = 0$ and $H^3(F^\vee(-1)) \simeq H^0(F(-3))^\vee = 0$. It follows, from the Castelnuovo-Mumford lemma, that $H_*^1(F^\vee)$ is generated in degrees ≤ 1 hence, actually, by $H^1(F^\vee(1))$.

Assume, finally, that $h^1(F(-4)) = 1$ and consider the extension:

$$0 \longrightarrow F(-4) \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \longrightarrow 0$$

defined by a non-zero element of $H^1(F(-4)) \simeq k$. One has $H^1(A) = 0$. Moreover, as we noticed in the proof of (c), the multiplication by any non-zero linear form $h: H^1(F(-4)) \rightarrow H^1(F(-3))$ is injective. This implies that $H^0(A(1)) = 0$. It follows,

by Serre duality, that $H^2(A^\vee(-4)) = 0$ and $H^3(A^\vee(-5)) = 0$. One deduces, from the Castelnuovo-Mumford lemma, that $H_*^1(A^\vee)$ is generated in degrees ≤ -3 . But $H_*^1(A^\vee) \xrightarrow{\sim} H_*^1(F^\vee(4))$.

(e) One uses the exact sequence :

$$0 = H^1(F^\vee) \rightarrow H^1(F^\vee(1)) \rightarrow H^1(F_H^\vee(1)) \rightarrow H^2(F^\vee) \rightarrow H^2(F^\vee(1))$$

and the fact that $H^2(F^\vee(1)) \simeq H^1(F(-5))^\vee = 0$, by Lemma A.2(a).

(f) We treat, firstly, the case $l = 1$. If $H \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ is an arbitrary plane then $h^1(F_H^\vee) = s$ (by (a)) and $h^1(F_H^\vee(1)) = h^1(F^\vee(1)) + h^2(F^\vee)$ (by (e)). It follows that, in order to prove the inequality from the statement for $l = 1$, one can assume that H is a *general* plane. We shall, actually, assume that G_H is stable (using the restriction theorem of Schneider [24]; see, also, Ein et al. [13, Thm. 3.4]). By Serre duality on H , one has $h^1(F_H^\vee) = h^1(F_H(-3))$ and $h^1(F_H^\vee(1)) \simeq h^1(F_H(-4))$. Using the exact sequence :

$$0 \longrightarrow (r-3)\mathcal{O}_H \longrightarrow F_H \longrightarrow G_H(2) \longrightarrow 0,$$

and applying [12, Prop. 1.6(b)] (with $E = G_H$ and $N_l = H^1(F(l-2))$), one gets that $h^1(F_H(-4)) = 0$ or $h^1(F_H(-4)) < h^1(F_H(-3))$.

Assume, now, that $l \geq 2$ and let $H \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ be an arbitrary plane. $r-2$ general global sections of F_H define an exact sequence :

$$0 \longrightarrow (r-2)\mathcal{O}_H \longrightarrow F_H \longrightarrow Q' \longrightarrow 0,$$

with Q' a rank 2 vector bundle on H with $c_1(Q') = 5$. Consider the normalized rank 2 vector bundle $Q := Q'(-3)$ which has $c_1(Q) = -1$. Since $H^0(F_H(-3)) = 0$, by Lemma A.13, it follows that $H^0(Q) = 0$, i.e., Q is stable. Applying [17, Thm. 5.3] (with $\mathcal{E} = Q$ and $N_{-l} = H^1(F_H(-l-3))$) one gets that $H^1(F_H(-l-3)) = 0$ or $h^1(F_H(-l-3)) < h^1(F_H(-l-2))$, i.e., $H^1(F_H^\vee(l)) = 0$ or $h^1(F_H^\vee(l)) < h^1(F_H^\vee(l-1))$. \square

Lemma A.15. *Let F be a globally generated vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^3 of rank $r \geq 3$, with $c_1 = 5$, $c_2 = 12$, and such that $H^i(F^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$. Assume that F can be realized as an extension :*

$$0 \longrightarrow (r-3)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow G(2) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where G is a stable rank 3 vector bundle with $c_1(G) = -1$, $c_2(G) = 4$ and spectrum $k_G = (1, 0, 0, -1)$ (see Remark A.10). Then F is the kernel of an epimorphism $4\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(4)$.

Proof. One has $c_3(G) = -4$ hence $c_3 = 8$. Moreover, $r = 4$ because $h^2(G(-2)) = 1$ (one uses the spectrum). By Lemma A.14(b), the graded S -module $H_*^1(F)$ is generated in degrees ≤ -2 . One has $h^1(F(-4)) = h^1(G(-2)) = 1$ and $h^1(F(-3)) = 4$ hence, by Lemma A.14(c), the multiplication map $H^1(F(-4)) \otimes H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)) \rightarrow H^1(F(-3))$ is bijective. If $H \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ is a general plane, of equation $h = 0$, then G_H is stable. In particular, $H^0(F_H(-2)) = H^0(G_H) = 0$ hence multiplication by $h: H^1(F(-3)) \rightarrow H^1(F(-2))$ is injective. Since $h^1(F(-2)) = 6$ (see Lemma A.2(b)), one deduces that the multiplication map $H^1(F(-3)) \otimes H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)) \rightarrow H^0(F(-2))$ has corank ≤ 2 . It follows that the graded S -module $H_*^1(F)$ has one minimal generator of degree -4 and at most two minimal generators of degree -2 .

On the other hand, by Lemma A.14(d), the graded S -module $H_*^1(F^\vee)$ is generated by $H^1(F^\vee(1))$. We want to estimate $h^1(F^\vee(1))$. Let $H \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ be a plane. $h^1(F_H^\vee) = 3$ (by Lemma A.14(a)) hence $h^1(F_H^\vee(1)) \leq 2$ (by Lemma A.14(f)). Since $h^2(F^\vee) = h^1(F(-4)) = 1$, it follows, from Lemma A.14(e), that $h^1(F^\vee(1)) \leq 1$.

By what has been proven so far, $F(-2)$ is the cohomology sheaf of a Horrocks monad of the form :

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \xrightarrow{\beta} B \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2) \oplus 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \longrightarrow 0,$$

where B is a direct sum of line bundles. B must have rank 8, $h^0(B) = h^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2) \oplus 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}) - h^1(F(-2)) = 6$, $h^0(B(-1)) = 0$ and $H^0(B^\vee(-2)) = 0$ (because $H^0(F^\vee) = 0$). It follows that $B \simeq 6\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \oplus 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1)$. Since there is no epimorphism $2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}$, the component $6\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \rightarrow 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}$ of α must be surjective hence $F(-2)$ is the cohomology sheaf of a monad of the form :

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \xrightarrow{\beta'} 4\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \oplus 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \xrightarrow{\alpha'} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2) \longrightarrow 0.$$

In order to complete the proof of the lemma, it suffices to verify the following :

Claim. *The component $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \rightarrow 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1)$ of β' is non-zero.*

Indeed, assume, by contradiction, that this component is zero. Then one has an exact sequence :

$$0 \longrightarrow F(-2) \longrightarrow T_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \oplus 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \xrightarrow{\alpha''} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Let $\alpha_1'': T_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2)$ and $\alpha_2'': 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2)$ be the components of α'' . $\text{Coker } \alpha_1'' \simeq \mathcal{O}_Z(2)$, for some closed subscheme Z of \mathbb{P}^3 . Let π denote the composite epimorphism :

$$2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \xrightarrow{\alpha_2''} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Z(2).$$

Restricting to Z the exact sequence :

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Ker } \alpha_1'' \longrightarrow F(-2) \longrightarrow 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathcal{O}_Z(2) \longrightarrow 0$$

one gets an epimorphism $F_Z(-2) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Z(-4)$. Since F is globally generated, it follows that $\dim Z \leq 0$. Since $c_3(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^3}(3)) = 5$, Z is a 0-dimensional subscheme of \mathbb{P}^3 of length 5. α_1'' can be extended to a Koszul resolution of $\mathcal{O}_Z(2)$:

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-3) \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^3} \longrightarrow T_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \xrightarrow{\alpha_1''} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Z(2) \longrightarrow 0$$

(we used the fact that $\bigwedge^2(T_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1)) \simeq \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2)$). One gets an exact sequence :

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-3) \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^3} \longrightarrow F(-2) \longrightarrow 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathcal{O}_Z(2) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Since $\mathcal{I}_Z(1)$ is not globally generated the map $H^0(\pi(1)): H^0(2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}) \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{O}_Z(3))$ is injective. One gets that $H^0(F(-1)) = 0$ hence $h^1(F(-1)) = 3$ (by Lemma A.2(b)). It follows, from the last assertion in Lemma A.2(b), that $H^1(F) = 0$. The above exact sequence implies, now, that $H^1(\text{Ker } \pi(2)) = 0$ and that $\text{Ker } \pi(2)$ is globally generated. Using the exact sequence :

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Ker } \pi(2) \longrightarrow 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Z(4) \longrightarrow 0$$

one deduces that $h^0(\text{Ker } \pi(2)) = h^0(2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)) - h^0(\mathcal{O}_Z(4)) = 3$. One obtains, now, an exact sequence :

$$3\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \longrightarrow 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Z(4) \longrightarrow 0.$$

But such an exact sequence cannot exist because Z has codimension 3 in \mathbb{P}^3 . This *contradiction* shows that the component $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \rightarrow 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1)$ of β' is non-zero and the claim is proven. \square

Remark A.16. One can actually show that, under the hypothesis of Lemma A.15, $F \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1) \oplus F_0$, where F_0 is the kernel of an epimorphism $4\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(4)$: see Claim 4.5 in the proof of [5, Prop. 4.13].

Lemma A.17. *Let F be a globally generated vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^3 of rank $r \geq 3$, with $c_1 = 5$, $c_2 = 12$, and such that $H^i(F^\vee) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$. Assume that F can be realized as an extension:*

$$0 \longrightarrow (r-3)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow G(2) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where G is a stable rank 3 vector bundle with $c_1(G) = -1$, $c_2(G) = 4$ and spectrum $k_G = (1, 1, 0, -1)$ (see Remark A.10). Then $r = 4$, $c_3 = 6$ and $H^1(F^\vee(1)) = 0$.

Proof. Using Remark A.10 one sees easily that $r = 4$ and $c_3(G) = -6$ hence $c_3 = 6$. Lemma A.14(a) implies that $h^1(F_H^\vee) = 3$, for every plane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^3$, while item (f) of the same lemma implies, now, that $h^1(F_H^\vee(1)) \leq 2$. Since $h^2(F^\vee) = h^1(F(-4)) = 2$ (use the spectrum), one deduces, from Lemma A.14(e), that $h^1(F^\vee(1)) = 0$. \square

Remark A.18. One can show that there is no bundle F satisfying the hypothesis of Lemma A.17: see Case 7 in the proof of [5, Prop. 4.13].

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Abo, W. Decker, N. Sasakura, *An elliptic conic bundle in \mathbb{P}^4 arising from a stable rank-3 vector bundle*, Math. Z. **229** (1998), No. 4, 725–741.
- [2] C. Anghel, I. Coandă, N. Manolache, *Globally generated vector bundles with small c_1 on projective spaces*, Memoirs Amer. Math. Soc. Vol. 253, No. 1209 (2018), also [arXiv:1305.3464 \[math.AG\]](#).
- [3] C. Anghel, I. Coandă, N. Manolache, *Locally Cohen-Macaulay space curves defined by cubic equations and globally generated vector bundles*, [arXiv:1502.05553 \[math.AG\]](#).
- [4] C. Anghel, I. Coandă, N. Manolache, *On the vector bundles from Chang and Ran’s proof of the unirationality of \mathcal{M}_g , $g \leq 13$* , [arXiv:1711.06060 \[math.AG\]](#).
- [5] C. Anghel, I. Coandă, N. Manolache, *Globally generated vector bundles with $c_1 = 5$ on \mathbb{P}^3* , [arXiv:1805.11336 \[math.AG\]](#).
- [6] W. Barth, *Some properties of stable rank-2 vector bundles on \mathbb{P}_n* , Math. Ann. **226** (1977), 125–150.
- [7] W. Barth, G. Elencwajg, *Concernant la cohomologie des fibrés algébriques stable sur $\mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{C})$* , in: Variétés analytiques compactes, Colloque Nice 1977, Lect. Notes Math. **683** (1978), Springer Verlag, pp. 1–24.
- [8] A. Bruguères, *The scheme of morphisms from an elliptic curve to a Grassmannian*, Compos. Math. **63** (1987), 15–40.
- [9] M.-C. Chang, *Stable rank 2 bundles on \mathbb{P}^3 with $c_1 = 0$, $c_2 = 4$, and $\alpha = 1$* , Math. Z. **184** (1983), 407–415.
- [10] M.-C. Chang, *Stable rank 2 reflexive sheaves on \mathbb{P}^3 with small c_2 and applications*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **284** (1984), 57–89.
- [11] L. Chiodera, Ph. Ellia, *Rank two globally generated vector bundles with $c_1 \leq 5$* , Rend. Istit. Mat. Univ. Trieste **44** (2012), 413–422, also [arXiv:1111.5725 \[math.AG\]](#).
- [12] I. Coandă, *On the spectrum of a stable rank 3 reflexive sheaf on \mathbb{P}^3* , J. reine angew. Math. **367** (1986), 155–171.
- [13] L. Ein, R. Hartshorne, H. Vogelaar, *Restriction theorems for stable rank 3 vector bundles on \mathbb{P}^n* , Math. Ann. **259** (1982), 541–569.

- [14] Ph. Ellia, *Chern classes of rank two globally generated vector bundles on \mathbb{P}^2* , Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Lincei Mat. Appl. **24** (2013), no. 2, 147–163.
- [15] M. L. Fania, E. Mezzetti, *Vector spaces of skew-symmetric matrices of constant rank*, Linear Algebra Appl. **434** (2011), no. 12, 2383–2403.
- [16] R. Hartshorne, *Algebraic Geometry*, Graduate Texts Math. **52**(1977), Springer-Verlag.
- [17] R. Hartshorne, *Stable reflexive sheaves*, Math. Ann. **254** (1980), 121–176.
- [18] R. Hartshorne, *Stable reflexive sheaves. II*, Invent. Math. **66** (1982), 165–190.
- [19] R. Hartshorne, I. Sols, *Stable rank 2 vector bundles on \mathbb{P}^3 with $c_1 = -1$, $c_2 = 2$* , J. reine angew. Math. **325** (1981), 145–152.
- [20] G. Horrocks, *Examples of rank three vector bundles on five-dimensional projective space*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) **18** (1978), 15–27.
- [21] N. Manolache, *Rank 2 stable vector bundles on \mathbb{P}^3 with Chern classes $c_1 = -1$, $c_2 = 2$* , Revue Roum. Math. Pures Appl. **26** (1981), 1203–1209.
- [22] C. Okonek, H. Spindler, *Reflexive Garben vom Rang $r > 2$ auf \mathbb{P}^n* , J. reine angew. Math. **344** (1983), 38–64.
- [23] C. Okonek, H. Spindler, *Das Spektrum torsionsfreier Garben I*, Manuscripta Math. **47** (1984), 187–228.
- [24] M. Schneider, *Einschränkung stabiler Vektorraumbündel vom Rang 3 auf Hyperebenen des projektiven Raumes*, J. reine angew. Math. **323** (1981), 177–192.
- [25] J.C. Sierra, L. Ugaglia, *On globally generated vector bundles on projective spaces*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **213** (2009), 2141–2146.
- [26] J.C. Sierra, L. Ugaglia, *On globally generated vector bundles on projective spaces II*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **218** (2014), 174–180.

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS “SIMION STOILOW” OF THE ROMANIAN ACADEMY, P.O. BOX 1-764, RO-014700, BUCHAREST, ROMANIA

Email address: Cristian.Anghel@imar.ro

Email address: Iustin.Coanda@imar.ro

Email address: Nicolae.Manolache@imar.ro