STABILITY AND SEMI-STABILITY OF (2,2)-TYPE SURFACES

A.J. PARAMESWARAN AND NABANITA RAY

ABSTRACT. We describe the GIT compactification of the moduli of (2,2)-type effective divisors of \( \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \) (i.e. surfaces of the linear system \( |\pi_1^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(2) \otimes \pi_2^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(2)| \) ). In order to get the compactification, we characterize stable and semi-stable (2,2)-type surfaces, and also determine the equivalence classes of strictly semi-stable (2,2)-type surfaces under the equivalence relation of their orbit closure meeting.

1. Introduction

Mumford’s geometric invariant theory provides a construction of moduli spaces of family of varieties. In this paper, we apply his method to obtain a description of moduli space of (2,2)-type surfaces of \( \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \) and its GIT compactification. To this extent, we calculate stable surfaces, semi-stable surfaces, and strictly semi-stable surfaces. Many authors calculate moduli spaces of hypersurfaces of given degree, and classify stable and semi-stable hypersurfaces in terms of their singularities. Hilbert studies plane curve of degree \( \leq 6 \) and cubic surfaces in [5]. Shah provides much more detailed information about sextic plane curves [15], and analyzes quartic surfaces [16]. Recently many results are developed for quintic surfaces, for instance one can check [14], [4] etc. There are few development in higher dimensional hypersurfaces. In particular, the stability and the moduli of cubic threefolds (resp. fourfolds) are studied in [17] and [18] (resp. [15] and [7]). For further references see [10]. It can be noticed (from [5], [16], [4], [14]) that smooth surfaces are always stable and stable surfaces have at most Du Val A-D-E type isolated singularities depending on their degrees. There are not enough evidences of study about the stability of effective divisors which are not hypersurfaces.

In this note, we study (2,2)-type effective divisors of \( \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \) which are parametrized by \( \mathbb{P}(H^0(\pi_1^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(2) \otimes \pi_2^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(2))) \cong \mathbb{P}^{17} \). Note that these surfaces are not hypersurfaces. It is known from [13], that smooth (2,2)-type surfaces are rational and isomorphic to \( \mathbb{P}^2 \) blown-up at seven points. There is a natural linear action on the linear system \( |\pi_1^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(2) \otimes \pi_2^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(2)| \) by the reductive group \( G = \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}) \times \text{SL}(3, \mathbb{C}) \). We define the stability and the semi-stability with respect to this action. Unlike the cases of hypersurfaces, in our situation smooth surfaces and surfaces having at most \( A_1 \)-type singularities are semi-stable (see Lemma 3.1) and stable (2,2)-type surfaces can have non-isolated singularities (Proposition 3.10).

In this paper we prove our results step by step using combinatorial arguments. In the third section we prove our main results. In the first subsection of the third section we prove results for irreducible surfaces. In the following theorem we describe irreducible semi-stable surfaces.

Theorem 1.1. (3.5) Let \( S = Z(f) \) be an irreducible (2,2)-type surface. Then \( S \) is semi-stable if and only if for all \( P = P_1 \times P_2 \in S_{\text{sing}} \) satisfies each of the following conditions:
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(i) The tangent cone of $S$ at $P$ is not a pull back of a tangent cone of $P_2$ by the map $p_2$,

(ii) If the fibre over $P_1$ is non-reduced, then the fibre $p_1^{-1}(P_1)$ is not in the ramification locus of $p_2$, and

(iii) The fibre over $P_1$ is reduced but non-irreducible and let $L_1$ and $L_2$ be two components of the fibre over $P_1$. If there is a section $\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}^1 \times P \subset S$ of $p_1$ and $L_2$ is in the ramification locus of $p_2$, then the corresponding map $\phi_\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}(T_{\mathbb{P}^2,P_2})$ is $\phi_\sigma(\mathbb{P}^1) \neq p_2(L_2)$ (see [17]).

The following theorem is about irreducible stable surfaces.

**Theorem 1.2.** (3.7) Let $S = Z(f)$ be an irreducible semi-stable $(2,2)$-type surface of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$. Then $S$ is stable if and only if $S$ satisfies following properties:

(i) Either $p_2 : S \to \mathbb{P}^2$ is a finite map or there exist some sections $\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to S$ of $p_1$ which are contracted by $p_2$. Moreover, $\operatorname{Im}(\sigma)$ contains at most $A_1$-type singular points and $\phi_\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}(T_{\mathbb{P}^2,P_2})$ (see [17]) is non-constant for all such sections.

(ii) If $P = P_1 \times P_2 \in S_{\text{sing}}$ which is not $A_1$-type then the fibre over $P_1$ is reduced.

We also describe the degeneration of irreducible strictly semi-stable surfaces in the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.3.** (3.9) Let $S = Z(f)$ be an irreducible semi-stable surface. Then $S$ is a strictly semi-stable if and only if $S$ satisfies one of the following conditions:

(i) There are some sections $\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to S$ of $p_1$ such that $\phi_\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}(T_{\mathbb{P}^2,P_2})$ (see [1.7]) is a constant map, where $(p_2(\sigma(\mathbb{P}^1))) \neq p_2 \in \mathbb{P}^2$.

(ii) $p_2$ is not finite at $P \in S_{\text{sing}}$, where $P$ is not $A_1$-type singularity.

(iii) $P = P_1 \times P_2 \in S_{\text{sing}}$ which is not $A_1$-type and the fibre over $P_1$ is non-reduced.

In particular, $f$ degenerates to one of the following equations:

\[
\begin{align*}
f_1 &= x_0^2(a_{11}y_1^2 + a_{02}y_0y_2) + x_0x_1(b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{02}y_0y_2) + x_1^2(c_{11}y_1^2 + c_{02}y_0y_2) \quad \text{where } a_{11} \neq 0 \text{ and } b_{02} \neq 0; \text{ and } c_{11} \neq 0 \text{ or } c_{02} \neq 0. \\
f_2 &= a_{22}x_0^2y_1^2 + x_0x_1(b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{02}y_0y_2) + c_{00}x_1^2y_0^2 \quad \text{where } a_{22} \neq 0, b_{11} \neq 0 \text{ and } c_{00} \neq 0. \\
f_3 &= a_{12}x_0^2y_1y_2 + x_0x_1(b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{02}y_0y_2) + c_{01}x_1^2y_0y_1 \quad \text{where } a_{12} \neq 0, b_{02} \neq 0 \text{ and } c_{01} \neq 0.
\end{align*}
\]

In the second subsection of the third section, we separately describe stability and semi-stability of non-irreducible surfaces.

**Theorem 1.4.** (3.10) Let $S = Z(f)$ be a non-irreducible $(2,2)$-type surface of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$. Then $S$ never be a stable surface.

$S$ is strictly semi-stable if and only if one of the following holds:

1. $f = f_1f_2$, where $Z(f_1) \in \{(1,0)\}$, $Z(f_2) \in \{(1,2)\}$ and generic fibres of $Z(f_2)$ over $\mathbb{P}^1$ are smooth. Then $S$ is semi-stable if and only if $C = Z(f_1) \cap Z(f_2)$ is smooth. Also $f$ degenerates to $x_0x_1(\alpha y_0y_2 + \beta y_1^2)$, $\alpha \neq 0$ and $\beta \neq 0$; or
In the last theorem we describe the GIT compactification of the moduli of (2,2)-type surfaces.

**Theorem 1.5.** (3.19) The closed subset \(|(2, 2)|^s / G \setminus |(2, 2)|^s / G|\) consists of the images of following points of \(|(2, 2)|\) in \(|(2, 2)|^s / G|:\n
\[
Z(f_1) = Z(x_0^2(a_{11}y_1^2 + a_{02}y_0y_2) + x_0y_1(b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{02}y_0y_2) + x_1^2(c_{11}y_1^2 + c_{02}y_0y_2)) \text{ where } a_{11} \neq 0, b_{02} \neq 0 \text{ and either } c_{02} \neq 0 \text{ or } c_{11} \neq 0.
\]
\[
Z(f_2) = Z(a_{22}x_0^2y_2^2 + x_0x_1(b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{02}y_0y_2) + c_{00}x_1^2y_0^2) \text{ where } a_{22} \neq 0, b_{11} \neq 0 \text{ and } c_{00} \neq 0.
\]
\[
Z(f_3) = Z(a_{12}x_0^2y_1y_2 + x_0x_1(b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{02}y_0y_2) + c_{01}x_1^2y_0y_1) \text{ where } a_{12} \neq 0, b_{02} \neq 0 \text{ and } c_{01} \neq 0.
\]
\[
Z(f_4) = Z(x_1x_0(b_{02}y_0y_2 + b_{11}y_1^2)) \text{ where } b_{02} \neq 0 \text{ and } b_{11} \neq 0.
\]

Moreover, if \(Z(f)\) is a strictly semi-stable surface, then there is a \(h \in f.G\) such that \(h\) is a span of either \(M^\oplus((0, 0)(-1, 0, 1))\), or \(M^\oplus((-1, 1)(-1, 0, 1))\), or \(M^\oplus((-1, 1)(-2, 0, 2))\), or \(M^\oplus((-2, 2)(-1, 0, 1))\).

1.1. Notations and conventions. We fix the following notations:

- We denote \(\pi_1 : \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \to \mathbb{P}^1\) and \(\pi_2 : \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \to \mathbb{P}^2\) as the first and second projection maps respectively. Let \(S\) be a surface inside \(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2\). Then \(p_1 : S \to \mathbb{P}^1\) and \(p_2 : S \to \mathbb{P}^2\) are restrictions of projection maps respectively.

- Let \(S = Z(f)\) be a (2,2)-type surface of \(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2\), passing through the point \(P = P_1 \times P_2\). Also let that \(x_i\)'s and \(y_i\)'s are homogeneous coordinates of \(\mathbb{P}^1\) and \(\mathbb{P}^2\) respectively. Then \(f \in V = \mathbb{C}[x_0, x_1]_2 \otimes \mathbb{C}[y_0, y_1, y_2]_2\) the space of homogeneous (2,2)-type bi-degree polynomial. In some affine neighbourhood of \(P\), \(f\) can be written as

\[
f(x, y) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^2} a_\alpha (x - P_1)^{\alpha_1} (y - P_2)^{\alpha_2}; \text{ with } |\alpha_1| \leq 2 \text{ and } |\alpha_2| \leq 2.
\]

This is an expansion of \(f\) around \(P\), where we use the usual multi-index notation.

- We denote the degree \(d\) homogeneous part of a polynomial \(g(z_1, \ldots z_n)\) by \(g(z_1, \ldots z_n)_d\).

- The GIT terminology is that of Mumford et al. [9]. For us, unstable means not semi-stable, non-stable is for not properly stable, and strictly semi-stable means semi-stable, but not properly stable.

- We say that one semi-stable surface degenerates to another if the second lies in the orbit closure of the first.

- In this note we write categorical (resp. geometric) quotients in place of good categorical (resp. geometric) quotients.

- Let \(S\) be a (2,2)-type surface and \(P = P_1 \times P_2 \in S\). Also \(p_2\) is not a finite map at \(P_2\). Then there is a section \(\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to S\) such that \(\sigma(\mathbb{P}^1) \simeq \mathbb{P}^1 \times P_2\) and the section is contracted by the map \(p_2\). As \(p_1 : S \to \mathbb{P}^1\) is a conic bundle map (see [10]), fibres are conic. If such section \(\sigma\) exists, then for all \(P_1 \in \mathbb{P}^1\), \(p_2(p_1^{-1}(P_1))\) is a conic in \(\mathbb{P}^2\), passes through \(P_2\). If \(\sigma(\mathbb{P}^1) \not\subseteq S_{\text{sing}}\), then generic conics are smooth at \(P_2\). Hence we can define a morphism from an open subset \(U \subseteq \mathbb{P}^1\) to the tangent space of \(P_2 \in \mathbb{P}^2\) corresponding to the section \(\sigma\), i.e \(\phi_{\sigma} : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}(T_{P_2, \mathbb{P}^2}) \simeq \mathbb{P}^1\) such that \(\phi_{\sigma}(P_1)\) is the tangent line of
the conic \( p_2(p_1^{-1}(P_1)) \) at \( P_2 \). From the valuation criterion the map \( \phi \sigma \) can be extended to \( \mathbb{P}^1 \).

2. Preliminaries

In this preliminary section we recall all definitions and results with references which are used throughout this note. For basic algebraic geometry results we follow [6] and for geometric invariant theory, we follow [9], [10] and [3].

2.1. Stability and semi-stability. Let \( G \) be a reductive algebraic group acting on an irreducible algebraic variety \( X \) by the map \( \sigma : G \times X \to X \) and \( \pi : L \to X \) be a line bundle of \( X \). A \( G \)-linearization of \( L \) is an action \( \sigma : G \times L \to L \) such that the following diagram commutes:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
G \times L & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & L \\
\downarrow{\text{id} \times \pi} & & \downarrow{\pi} \\
G \times X & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & X
\end{array}
\]

and the zero section of \( L \) is \( G \)-invariant.

Now we recall definitions of stable and semi-stable points of \( X \) with respect to a \( G \)-linearized line bundle \( L \) due to Mumford.

**Definition 2.1.** Let \( L \) be a \( G \)-linearized line bundle on \( X \) and \( x \in X \),

(i) \( x \) is called semi-stable (with respect to \( L \)) if there exists \( m > 0 \) and \( s \in H^0(X, L^m)^G \) such that \( X_s = \{ y \in X : s(y) \neq 0 \} \) is affine and contains \( x \).

(ii) \( x \) is called stable (with respect to \( L \)) if there exists \( s \) as in (i) and additionally \( G_x \) is a finite subgroup and all orbit of \( G \) in \( X_s \) are closed.

(iii) \( x \) is called unstable (with respect to \( L \)) if \( x \) is not semi-stable.

We denote set of semi-stable, stable and unstable points by \( X^{ss}(L), X^s(L) \) and \( X^{uu}(L) \) respectively. Note that \( X^{ss}(L) \) and \( X^s(L) \) are open \( G \)-invariant subsets of \( X \). If we start with an ample line bundle \( L \) of a projective variety \( X \), then open sets \( X_s \) (of Definition 2.1(i)) are always affine. So the affineness condition of Definition 2.1 can be dropped.

2.2. Geometric quotients and categorical quotients.

**Definition 2.2.** Let \( G \) be an algebraic group acting on a variety \( X \). A \( G \)-invariant morphism \( p : X \to Y \) to another variety \( Y \) is called a categorical quotient if it satisfies following properties,

(i) For all open subset \( U \subseteq Y \), the corresponding ring homomorphism \( \mathcal{O}(U) \to \mathcal{O}(p^{-1}(U)) \) is isomorphic onto the subring \( (\mathcal{O}(p^{-1}(U)))^G \).

(ii) For all \( G \)-invariant closed subset \( W \subseteq X \), \( p(W) \) is a closed subset of \( Y \).

(iii) If \( W_1 \) and \( W_2 \) are two \( G \)-invariant closed subset of \( X \), with \( W_1 \cap W_2 = \emptyset \) then \( p(W_1) \cap p(W_2) = \emptyset \).

A categorical quotient is called geometric quotient if \( \psi : G \times X \to X \times X, (g,x) \to (g.x, x) \) fulfils the additional requirement:
(iv) \( \text{Img}(\psi) = X \times_Y X \).

The following lemma helps us to understand points in categorical quotients.

**Lemma 2.3.** Let \( p : X \to Y \) be the categorical quotient. Then

(i) two points \( x, x' \in X \) have same image in \( Y \) if and only if \( \overline{G.x} \cap \overline{G.x'} \neq \emptyset \);

(ii) for each \( y \in Y \), the fibre \( p^{-1}(y) \) contains a unique closed orbit.

**Proof.** Corollary 6.1 [3]. \( \square \)

The following theorem is about the existence of the categorical quotient of \( X^ss(L) \) and the geometric quotient of \( X^s(L) \).

**Theorem 2.4.** Let \( G \) be a reductive group acting on \( X \) and \( L \) be a \( G \)-linearized line bundle of \( X \). There exists categorical quotient

\[
\pi : X^ss(L) \to X^ss(L)/\!/G.
\]

There is an open subset \( U \) in \( X^ss(L)/\!/G \) such that \( X^s(L) = \pi^{-1}(U) \) and

\[
\pi : X^s(L) \to X^s(L)/\!/G
\]

is the geometric quotient. Moreover there exists an ample line bundle \( M \) on \( X^ss(L)/\!/G \) such that \( \pi^*(M) = L^\otimes n |_{X^s(L)} \), for some \( n > 0 \). In particular, \( X^ss(L)/\!/G \) is a quasi-projective variety.

**Proof.** See [3], Theorem 8.1. \( \square \)

If \( L \) is an ample line bundle then the categorical quotient \( X^ss(L)/\!/G \) is a projective variety.

**Theorem 2.5.** Assume \( L \) is a \( G \)-linearized ample line bundle of a projective variety \( X \). Let \( R = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} H^0(X, L^\otimes n) \). Then

\[
X^ss(L)/\!/G \cong \text{Proj}(R^G).
\]

**Proof.** See [3], Proposition 8.1. \( \square \)

### 2.3. Stable and Semi-stable (2,2)-type surfaces of \( \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \).

Let \( \pi_1 : \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \to \mathbb{P}^1 \) and \( \pi_2 : \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \to \mathbb{P}^2 \) be two projection maps and \( V = \mathbb{C}[x_0, x_1]_2 \otimes \mathbb{C}[y_0, y_1, y_2]_2 \). Then clearly \( H^0(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \pi_1^*(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(2)) \otimes \pi_2^*(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(2))) \simeq V \) and \( |\pi_1^*(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(2)) \otimes \pi_2^*(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(2))| \simeq \mathbb{P}(V) \simeq \mathbb{P}^{17} \). Note that \( G = \text{SL}(2) \times \text{SL}(3) \) acts on \( V \) by the natural linear action.

Let us consider a \( G \)-linearized ample line bundle \( L = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{17}}(1) \) and a \( G \)-invariant section \( s \in H^0(\mathbb{P}(V), \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{17}}(m))^G \) for \( m > 0 \). This section \( s \) corresponds \( F_s \in \text{Pol}_m(V)^G \), the set of degree \( m \) homogeneous \( G \)-invariant polynomials defined on \( V \). So \( F_s(g.x) = F_s(x) \), for all \( x \in \mathbb{P}(V) \) and for all \( g \in G \). Then the set of unstable points in \( \mathbb{P}(V) \) is the image of the set

\[
\mathcal{N}(V, G) = \{ v \in V \mid F(v) = 0, \forall F \in \oplus_{m>0} \text{Pol}_m(V)^G \}
\]

This is called the *null cone* of the linear action \( G \) in \( V \). Let \( v \in V \) and \( G.v \) be its orbit in \( V \). If \( 0 \in \overline{G.v} \), then \( F(v) = F(G.v) = 0, \forall F \in \oplus_{m>0} \text{Pol}_m(V)^G \). Hence the corresponding point \( [v] = x \in \mathbb{P}(V) \) is unstable. Conversely, suppose \( 0 \notin \overline{G.v} \). Then there is a \( G \)-invariant polynomial \( P \) separates two closed subsets \( \{0\} \) and \( \overline{G.v} \) of \( V \) ([3], Lemma 6.1), i.e \( P(0) = 0 \).
but $P(v) \neq 0$. So there is a homogeneous part of $P_m$ of $P$ such that $P_m(v) \neq 0$. Then $v$ is a semi-stable point of $V$ and $[v] = x$ is the corresponding semi-stable point in $\mathbb{P}(V)$. In particular, we have the following definition of stable and semi-stable points of $V$ with respect to the action by $G$.

**Definition 2.6.** An element $f \in V$ is said to be semi-stable if $0 \not\in \mathcal{G}f$ and stable if $f$ is semi-stable, $G.f \subset V$ is closed and the stabilizer $G_f$ is finite.

The set of semi-stable (resp. stable) points is denoted by $V^{ss}$ (resp. $V^s$).

**Definition 2.7.** $S = Z(f)$ is called a stable (resp. semi-stable) $(2,2)$-type surface of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$ if and only if $cf \in V^s$ (resp. $V^{ss}$) for any $c \in \mathbb{C}^*$.

### 2.4. 1-Parameter Subgroup and Hilbert-Mumford Numerical Criterion.

**Definition 2.8.** A 1-parameter subgroup of $G$ is a non-trivial algebraic group homomorphism $\lambda : G_m \rightarrow G$.

**Diagonalizable group.** : Let $G$ be an affine algebraic group over $k$ and $A = k[G]$. Then the character group $X(G)$ is a subset of $A$. We call $G$ diagonalizable if $X(G)$ spans $A$ (as $k$-module).

**Lemma 2.9.** Let $\lambda : G_m \rightarrow G$ be a one-parameter subgroup of $G$. Then the matrices of $\lambda(G_m)$ are simultaneously diagonalizable i.e., $\lambda(t) = AD_1(t)A^{-1} \times BD_2(t)B^{-1}$ where $D_1(t)$ and $D_2(t)$ are $2 \times 2$ and $3 \times 3$ diagonal matrices respectively; and $A \in SL(2)$ and $B \in SL(3)$ are fixed matrices.

**Proof.** Let $f_1 : G \rightarrow SL(2)$ and $f_2 : G \rightarrow SL(3)$ be two projection maps. The ring of regular functions on $G_m$ is the ring of Laurent polynomials i.e., $R = \mathbb{C}[t, t^{-1}] = \oplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{C}X_n$, where $X_n(t) = t^n$ are characters of $G_m$, for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore the character group of $G_m$ spans $R$ as a $\mathbb{C}$-module. Hence $G_m$ is a diagonalizable group. Note that $\lambda_i = f_i \circ \lambda$ are rational representations of $G_m$. Then it follows from Proposition 8.4 [2] that each $\lambda_i$’s are simultaneously diagonalizable. Hence the result follows. \qed

A 1-parameter subgroup $\lambda : G_m \rightarrow G$ is called normalized ([3] Section 7.2(b)), if it’s image is in the torus

$$T = \{ \text{diag}(\zeta_0(t), \zeta_1(t)) \times \text{diag}(\eta_0(t), \eta_1(t), \eta_2(t)) \mid \zeta_0(t)\zeta_1(t) = 1, \eta_0(t)\eta_1(t)\eta_2(t) = 1 \} \subset SL(2) \times SL(3) \}.$$

Let

$$\lambda(t) = D_1(t) \times D_2(t) = \text{diag}(\zeta_0(t), \zeta_1(t)) \times \text{diag}(\eta_0(t), \eta_1(t), \eta_2(t))$$

be a normalized 1-parameter subgroup, for some $\zeta_i(t), \eta_i(t) \in \mathbb{C}[t, t^{-1}]$.

As $D_1(t) \times D_2(t) \in SL(2) \times SL(3)$, for all $t \in G_m$

$$\zeta_0(t)\zeta_1(t) = 1, \ \eta_0(t)\eta_1(t)\eta_2(t) = 1$$

Units of the Lautent polynomial ring $\mathbb{C}[t, t^{-1}]$ are of the form $at^n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Let $\lambda$ be a 1-parameter subgroup acts on $f$. After appropriate coordinate change $\lambda$ has the diagonal action

$$ \left( \text{diag} \ (t^{r_0}, t^{r_1}) \times \text{diag} \ (t^{s_0}, t^{s_1}, t^{s_2}) \right) \cdot f' $$
such that \( r_0 + r_1 = 0 \) and \( s_0 + s_1 + s_2 = 0 \); \( r_0 \leq r_1 \), and \( s_0 \leq s_1 \leq s_2 \); and \( f' \in V \) after a linear change of \( f \). As \( \lambda \) is a non-constant map, \( r_0 + s_0 < 0 \).

Let \( M = \{ v_{\alpha \beta} = x^\alpha y^\beta = x_0^{\alpha_0} x_1^{\alpha_1} y_0^{\beta_0} y_1^{\beta_1} y_2^{\beta_2} \mid \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 = 2 \) and \( \beta_0 + \beta_1 + \beta_2 = 2; \alpha_i \geq 0 \) and \( \beta_i \geq 0 \} \) be the collection of monomials forms a basis of the vector space \( V \). Hence,

\[
\left( \text{diag} \left( t^{r_0}, t^{r_1} \right) \times \text{diag} \left( t^{s_0}, t^{s_1}, t^{s_2} \right) \right)x^\alpha y^\beta = \left( \text{diag} \left( t^{r_0}, t^{r_1} \right) \times \text{diag} \left( t^{s_0}, t^{s_1}, t^{s_2} \right) \right)x_0^{\alpha_0} x_1^{\alpha_1} y_0^{\beta_0} y_1^{\beta_1} y_2^{\beta_2} = t^{r_0 + r_1 + s_0} x_0^{\alpha_0} x_1^{\alpha_1} y_0^{\beta_0} y_1^{\beta_1} y_2^{\beta_2} = t^{r_0 + s_0} x_0^{\alpha_0} x_1^{\alpha_1} y_0^{\beta_0} y_1^{\beta_1} y_2^{\beta_2},
\]

Let \( f \in V \), then

\[
f = \sum_{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{N}^2 \times \mathbb{N}^3, |\alpha| = 2, |\beta| = 2} a_{\alpha \beta} x^\alpha y^\beta.
\]

The Hilbert-Mumford function (see [9], Definition 2.2) is

\[
\mu(f, \lambda) = \min \{ r\alpha + s\beta \mid a_{\alpha \beta} \neq 0 \}
\]

In the following theorem and corollary, we see the numerical criterion of stability and semi-stability.

**Theorem 2.10.** (The Hilbert-Mumford Numerical Criterion) Let \( G \) be a reductive group acting on the vector space \( V \) and \( x \in X \). Then

\[
x \in X^s \iff \mu(x, \lambda) \leq 0 \text{ for all 1-parameter subgroup } \lambda \text{ of } G.
\]

\[
x \in X^s \iff \mu(x, \lambda) < 0 \text{ for all 1-parameter subgroup } \lambda \text{ of } G.
\]

**Proof.** See [3] Theorem 9.1, or [8] Theorem 7.3 and Theorem 7.4. \( \square \)

A one-parameter subgroup of \( G \) acts on \( V \) by the induced action i.e, \( G_m \to V \) given by \( t \to \lambda(t).f \), for all \( f \in V \). If this morphism extends to a morphism \( \mathbb{A}^1 \to V \), then the image of the origin is called the limit of \( \lambda \) at \( f \) as \( t \to 0 \), and denoted by \( \lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t).f \).

**Corollary 2.11.** An element \( f \in V \) is

(i) unstable if and only if there exists a 1-parameter subgroup \( \lambda : G_m \to G \) such that \( \lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t).f = 0 \) and

(ii) non-stable if and only if \( f = 0 \) or there exists a 1-parameter subgroup \( \lambda : G_m \to G \) such that \( \lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t).f \) exists.

**Proof.** (i) \( f \) is not semi-stable if and only if \( \mu(f, \lambda) > 0 \) if and only if \( \lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t).f = 0 \)

(ii) \( f \) is not stable if and only if \( \mu(f, \lambda) \geq 0 \) if and only if \( \lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t).f \) exists. \( \square \)

Given a normalized 1-parameter subgroup \( \lambda(t) = \text{diag}(t^{r_0}, t^{r_1}) \times \text{diag}(t^{s_0}, t^{s_1}, t^{s_2}) \), one can define two subsets of \( M \) (ref. [8]).

\[
M^+(\lambda) = M^+((r_0, r_1)(s_0, s_1, s_2)) = \{ x^\alpha y^\beta = x_0^{\alpha_0} x_1^{\alpha_1} y_0^{\beta_0} y_1^{\beta_1} y_2^{\beta_2} \in M | r_0 \alpha_0 + r_1 \alpha_1 + s_0 \beta_0 + s_1 \beta_1 + s_2 \beta_2 > 0 \} \text{ and}
\]

\[
M^\oplus(\lambda) = M^\oplus((r_0, r_1)(s_0, s_1, s_2)) = \{ x^\alpha y^\beta = x_0^{\alpha_0} x_1^{\alpha_1} y_0^{\beta_0} y_1^{\beta_1} y_2^{\beta_2} \in M | r_0 \alpha_0 + r_1 \alpha_1 + s_0 \beta_0 + s_1 \beta_1 + s_2 \beta_2 \geq 0 \}
\]
If a (2,2)-type surface is unstable (resp. non-stable) with respect to $\lambda$, then the corresponding equation is a linear span of monomials of $M^+(\lambda)$ (resp. $M^\oplus(\lambda)$).

2.5. Surface singularities.

**Definition 2.12.** Let $X$ and $Y$ be two varieties over $\mathbb{C}$. Then two points $p \in X$ and $q \in Y$ are analytically isomorphic if there is a $\mathbb{C}$-algebra isomorphism $\hat{O}_p \simeq \hat{O}_q$.

Now we see definitions of some isolated Du Val singularities which will appear in this context (for more about Du Val singularity see [12]).

**Definition 2.13.** Let $Z(f) \subset \mathbb{A}^3$ be an affine hypersurface having an isolated singularity at the origin $P$. Then $Z(f)$ has $A_n$-type singularity at $P$ if and only if $P$ is analytically isomorphic to the origin of the affine variety $Z(x^2 + y^2 + z^{n+1})$.

There are some useful techniques to calculate the type of isolated singularity at a given point, e.g. Mather and Yau [11] proved that two germs of complex analytic hypersurfaces of the same dimension with isolated singularities are biholomorphically equivalent if and only if their moduli algebra are isomorphic.

Let $\mathcal{O}_{n+1}$ be the ring of germs at the origin of $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ and $(U, 0)$ be a germ at the origin of a hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$. Let $I(U)$ be the ideal of functions in $\mathcal{O}_{n+1}$ vanishing on $U$, and let $f$ be a generator of $I(U)$. The ring

$$A(U) = \mathcal{O}_{n+1}/(f, \frac{\partial f}{\partial z_0}, \ldots, \frac{\partial f}{\partial z_n})$$

is called **moduli of algebra** of $U$.

It is well known that $U \setminus \{0\}$ is non-singular if and only if $A(U)$ is finite dimensional as a $\mathbb{C}$ vector space (see [11]). Therefore $A(U)$ is infinite dimensional if and only if $U$ has non-isolated singularity at $\{0\}$.

**Definition 2.14.** $f(z)$ is quasi-homogeneous if $f \in (\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_0}, \ldots, \frac{\partial f}{\partial z_n})$

**Theorem 2.15.** Suppose $(U, 0)$ and $(W, 0)$ are germs of hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ and $U - 0$ is non-singular. Then the following conditions are equivalent.

(i) $(U, 0)$ is biholomorphically equivalent to $(W, 0)$.

(ii) $A(U)$ is isomorphic to $A(W)$ as a $\mathbb{C}$-algebra.


Now we recall a result from [19] which will be using in some proofs of this note.

**Theorem 2.16.** Let $A$ be an integral domain and let $f^1, f^2, \ldots, f^m$ be $m$ power series in $A[[X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n]]$, $m \leq n$, such that the initial forms of the $f^i$ are linearly independent linear forms $f^1_1, f^2_1, \ldots, f^m_1$. Then the substitution mapping $\phi : g(Y_1, Y_2, \ldots, Y_m) \rightarrow g(f^1, f^2, \ldots, f^m)$ is an isomorphism of $A[[Y_1, Y_2, \ldots, Y_m]]$ into $A[[X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n]]$. If, furthermore, $m = n$, $Y_i = X_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, and the determinant of the coefficients of the linear forms $f^1_1, f^2_1, \ldots, f^m_1$ is a unit in $A$ (in particular, if $A$ is a field and the above determinant is $\neq 0$), then $\phi$ is an automorphism of $A[[X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n]]$. 
Proof. See [19], Chapter VII, Corollary 2, page-137. □

Proposition 2.17. Let \( f(z) \) be a holomorphic function in a neighbourhood of the origin in \( \mathbb{C}^3 \) defining an isolated singularity at the origin. Let \( (U, 0) = (Z(f), 0) \). Then \( Z(f) \) has

(i) \( A_1 \)-type singularity at the origin if and only if \( A(U) \cong \mathbb{C} \),

(ii) \( A_n \)-type singularity at the origin if and only if \( A(U) \cong \mathbb{C}[z]/(z^n) \) for \( n > 1 \).

(iii) If \( A(U) \cong \mathbb{C}[z] \), then \( Z(f) \) has non-isolated singularity at 0.

Proof. This result follow easily using definitions 2.13, Theorem 2.15 and Theorem 2.16 □

3. Main Results

3.1. Irreducible stable and semi-stable surfaces. In the following lemma, we see that if a surface has at most \( A_1 \)-type singularities, then it is a semi-stable surface.

Lemma 3.1. Let \( S \) be a \((2,2)\)-type surface of \( \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \). If \( S = Z(f) \) has at most \( A_1 \)-type singularities then \( S \) is a semi-stable surface.

Proof. Let \( S \in \{(2,2)\} \) of \( \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \) and \( S = Z(f) \), \( f \in \mathbb{V} = \mathbb{C}[x_0, x_1]_2 \otimes \mathbb{C}[y_0, y_1, y_2]_2 \) the space of homogeneous \((2,2)\)-type bi-degree polynomial. Then

\[
f = \sum_{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{N}^2 \times \mathbb{N}^2, |\alpha| = 2, |\beta| = 2} a_{\alpha \beta} x^\alpha y^\beta.
\]

We prove that if \( S \) is unstable, then \( S \) has a singular point which is not \( A_1 \)-type. Let \( S \) be an irreducible unstable surface. Then from Corollary 2.11(i), there exists a normalized one-parameter subgroup \( \lambda : G_m \rightarrow G \) such that \( \lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t), f = 0 \), where

\[
\lambda(t) = \text{diag}(t^r_0, t^r_1) \times \text{diag}(t^{s_0}, t^{s_1}, t^{s_2}),
\]

\( r_0 + r_1 = 0, r_0 \leq r_1; s_0 + s_1 + s_2 = 0, s_0 \leq s_1 \leq s_2; r_0 + s_0 < 0 \) (this condition corresponds the non-constancy of \( \lambda \)).

\[
\lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t). f = 0, \text{ i.e., } r \alpha + s \beta > 0 \text{ for all } a_{\alpha \beta} \neq 0.
\]

We can write \( f(x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, y_2) \) explicitly as

\[
f(x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, y_2) = x_0^2(a_{11}y_1^2 + a_{22}y_2^2 + a_{12}y_1y_2 + a_{01}y_0y_1 + a_{02}y_0y_2 + a_{00}y_0^2) + x_0 x_1(b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{22}y_2^2 + b_{01}y_0y_1 + b_{02}y_0y_2 + b_{12}y_1y_2 + b_{00}y_0^2) + x_1^2(c_{00}y_0^2 + c_{11}y_1^2 + c_{22}y_2^2 + c_{01}y_0y_1 + c_{02}y_0y_2 + c_{12}y_1y_2).
\]

As \( S \) is unstable, the coefficient of \( x_0^2y_0^2, a_{00} = 0 \) otherwise \( r_0 + s_0 > 0 \) is a contradiction, the coefficient of \( x_0^2y_0y_1, a_{01} = 0 \) otherwise \( 2r_0 + s_0 + s_1 > 0 \), implies \( s_0 + s_1 > 0 \), therefore \( s_2 < 0 \), hence there is a contradiction.

As \( S \) is unstable, the coefficient of \( x_0^2y_0y_2, b_{00} = 0 \) otherwise \( r_0 + r_1 + 2s_0 > 0 \), implies \( s_0 > 0 \), which is also a contradiction.

Now we rewrite the polynomial \( f \),
we have the following inequalities which is also a contradiction.

Hence there is a contradiction.

correspond unstable, which is a contradiction. So equation (3.1) is one of the coefficients of monomials $x_0^0 x_1^1 y_0^0 y_1^1$ are non-zero in $f$. Then at least one of the coefficient of monomials $x_0^0 y_1^1$, $x_1^1 y_0^0$, $x_1^1 y_0 y_1$, $x_0 x_1 y_1^2$, and $x_1^2 y_1^2$ is non-zero. As $f$ is unstable, $a_0 r_0 + a_1 r_1 + \beta_0 s_0 + \beta_1 s_1 > 0$.

Note that $a_0 \neq 0$ and instability of $f$ imply the following inequality

\[(3.1) \quad 2r_0 + s_0 + s_2 > 0\]

If the coefficient of $x_0^0 y_1^1$, $a_{11} \neq 0$ then $2r_0 + 2s_1 > 0$. This inequality and the inequality of (3.1) correspond $r_0 > 0$ which is a contradiction.

If the coefficient of $x_1^1 y_0^0$, $c_{00} \neq 0$ then $2r_1 + 2s_0 > 0$. This inequality and the inequality of (3.1) correspond $3s_0 + s_2 > 0$. But note that $s_0 + s_1 + s_2 = 0$. Hence $2s_0 - s_1 > 0$, implies $2s_0 > s_1 \geq s_0$, which is a contradiction as $s_0 \leq 0$.

If the coefficient of $x_1^1 y_0 y_1$, $c_{11} \neq 0$ then $2r_1 + s_0 + s_1 > 0$. This and inequality (3.1) correspond $s_0 > 0$ which is a contradiction.

If the coefficient of $x_0 x_1 y_1^2$, $b_{11} \neq 0$ then $r_0 + r_1 + 2s_1 > 0$, i.e. $s_1 > 0$. This and inequality (3.1) correspond $r_0 > 0$ which is a contradiction.

If the coefficient of $x_1^1 y_1^2$, $c_{11} \neq 0$ then $r_1 + s_1 > 0$. This and inequality (3.1) corresponds $r_0 > 0$. Hence there is a contradiction.

As $S$ is irreducible unstable surface, $a_0 = 0$. Then clearly $S$ is not smooth at the point $P = [1,0] \times [1,0,0]$. Then the tangent cone of $S$ at $P$ is

\[f(x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, y_2) = x_0^2(a_{11} y_1^2 + a_{22} y_2^2 + a_{12} y_1 y_2 + a_{02} y_0 y_2) + x_0 x_1(b_{11} y_1^2 + b_{22} y_2^2 + b_{02} y_0 y_2 + b_{12} y_1 y_2) + x_1^2(c_{00} y_0^2 + c_{11} y_1^2 + c_{22} y_2^2 + c_{01} y_0 y_1 + c_{02} y_0 y_2 + c_{12} y_1 y_2).\]

The determinant of the Hessian of $f$ at $P$, $H = 8a_{11}a_{22}c_{00} - 2a_{11}b_{02}^2 - 2a_{12}c_{00}$.

If $a_{11} \neq 0$ and $c_{00} \neq 0$ then $2r_0 + s_1 > 0$ and $2r_1 + 2s_0 > 0$ respectively. This imply $s_2 < 0$ which is a contradiction. So $a_{11}$ and $c_{00}$ are not simultaneously non-zero.

If $a_{11} = 0$, then \[f(x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, y_2) = a_{22} y_2^2 + a_{12} y_1 y_2 + b_{02} x_1 y_2 + c_{00} x_1^2\] and $H = -2a_{12}c_{00}$

If $c_{00} = 0$, then \[f(x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, y_2) = a_{11} y_1^2 + a_{22} y_2^2 + a_{12} y_1 y_2 + b_{02} x_1 y_2\] and $H = -2a_{11}b_{02}^2$.

If $a_{12} \neq 0$ and $c_{00} \neq 0$, then we have following inequalities $2r_0 + s_1 + s_2 > 0$, and $2r_1 + 2s_0 > 0$ respectively. Together they imply $r_0 > 0$, which is a contradiction. If $a_{11} \neq 0$ and $b_{02} \neq 0$ then we have following inequalities $r_0 + s_1 > 0$ and $s_0 + s_2 = r_0 + r_1 + s_0 + s_2 > 0$. They imply $r_0 > 0$ which is also a contradiction.

Eventually we get that, the tangent cone of $S$ at $P$ is either $a_{22} y_2^2 + b_{02} x_1 y_2 + c_{00} x_1^2$, or $a_{22} y_2^2 + a_{12} y_1 y_2 + b_{02} x_1 y_2$, or $a_{11} y_1^2 + a_{22} y_2^2 + a_{12} y_1 y_2$; and $H = 0$.

So if $S$ is unstable, then the determinant of the Hessian at $P$ is zero i.e., $f$ has other than $A_1$-type singularity at $P$. Hence the result follows.

In the following lemma we see that not all smooth or $A_1$-type singular surfaces are smooth.
Lemma 3.2. Let $S = Z(f)$ be a $(2,2)$-type surface of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$ having at most $A_1$-type singularities. Then $S$ is stable if and only if one of the following conditions hold:

(i) The second projection $p_2 : S \to \mathbb{P}^2$ is a finite map.

(ii) If $p_2$ is not a finite map, then it contracts some sections $\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to S$ of the first projection $p_1$ to $P_2 \in \mathbb{P}^2$. Then $\phi_{\sigma} : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}(T_{p_2,P_2})$ (see \[\text{(7.1)}\]) is a non-constant map for all such sections.

Proof. We prove that if $S = Z(f)$ is not stable, then $p_2$ is not a finite map at $P = p_1 \times P_2 \in S$. Hence there exists a section $\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}^1 \times P_2 \subset S$, $p_1 \circ \sigma = \text{id}$. Then it follows that $p_2(\sigma^{-1}(P_1)) = C_{P_2}$ is a conic passes through $P_2$. Moreover, we prove that the morphism $\phi_{\sigma} : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}(T_{p_2,P_2})$ is constant.

Let $S$ be an irreducible non-stable surface having at most $A_1$-type singularities. Then from Corollary \[\text{(2.1)}\] (ii), there exists a normalized one-parameter subgroup $\lambda : G_m \to G$ such that $\lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t).f$ exists, where

$$\lambda(t) = \text{diag}(t^{r_0}, t^{r_1}) \times \text{diag}(t^{s_0}, t^{s_1}, t^{s_2}),$$

$r_0 + r_1 = 0$, $r_0 \leq r_1$; $s_0 + s_1 + s_2 = 0$, $s_0 \leq s_1 \leq s_2$; and $r_0 + s_0 < 0$ (this condition corresponds non-constancy of $\lambda$).

$$\lambda(t)f = \sum a_{\alpha\beta}(t^{r_0}x_0)^{\alpha_0}(t^{r_1}x_1)^{\alpha_1}(t^{s_0}y_0)^{\beta_0}(t^{s_1}y_1)^{\beta_1}(t^{s_2}y_2)^{\beta_2} = \sum a_{\alpha\beta}t^{r_0+s_0}x^{\alpha}y^{\beta}$$

$\lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t).f$ exists, i.e $r\alpha + s\beta \geq 0$ for all $a_{\alpha\beta} \neq 0$. Note that if $s_0 = s_1 = s_2 = 0$, then $r_0 < r_1$. Then $r\alpha + s\beta = r_0\alpha + r_1\alpha_1 \geq 0$ if and only if $\alpha_1 \neq 0$ for all $a_{\alpha\beta} \neq 0$. Therefore, $f$ is divisible by $x_1$. But this contradicts the irreducibility of $f$. Hence $s_0 = s_1 = s_2 = 0$ is not possible as $S$ is not stable.

An explicit form of the $(2,2)$-type polynomial $f$ is

$$f(x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, y_2) = x_0^3(a_{11}y_1^2 + a_{22}y_2^2 + a_{12}y_1y_2 + a_{01}y_0y_1 + a_{02}y_0y_2 + a_{00}y_0^2) + x_0x_1(b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{22}y_2^2 + b_{12}y_1y_2 + b_{01}y_0y_1 + b_{02}y_0y_2 + b_{00}y_0^2) + x_1^2(c_{00}y_0^2 + c_{11}y_1^2 + c_{22}y_2^2 + c_{02}y_0y_2 + c_{12}y_1y_2).$$

As $S$ is non-stable, the coefficient of $x_0^2y_0^2$, $a_{00} = 0$ otherwise $r_0 + s_0 \geq 0$ is a contradiction, the coefficient of $x_0^2y_0y_1$, $a_{01} = 0$ otherwise $2r_0 + s_0 + s_1 \geq 0$, implies $s_0 + s_1 \geq 0$, but we know $s_2 \geq 0$, hence there is a contradiction , the coefficient of $x_0x_1y_0^2$, $b_{00} = 0$ otherwise $r_0 + r_1 + 2s_0 \geq 0$, implies $s_0 \geq 0$, which is also a contradiction, the coefficient of $x_0x_1y_0y_1$, $b_{01} = 0$ otherwise $r_0 + r_1 + s_0 + s_1 \geq 0$, implies $s_2 \leq 0$ is a contradiction.

Now we rewrite the polynomial $f$,

$$f(x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, y_2) = x_0^2(a_{11}y_1^2 + a_{22}y_2^2 + a_{12}y_1y_2 + a_{02}y_0y_2) + x_0x_1(b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{22}y_2^2 + b_{12}y_1y_2 + b_{01}y_0y_1 + b_{02}y_0y_2 + b_{00}y_0^2) + x_1^2(c_{00}y_0^2 + c_{11}y_1^2 + c_{22}y_2^2 + c_{02}y_0y_2 + c_{12}y_1y_2).$$

If $S$ is smooth at $P = [1,0] \times [1,0,0]$, then $a_{02} \neq 0$. Then the non-stability of $f$ corresponds the inequality

$$2r_0 + s_0 + s_2 \geq 0 \tag{3.2}$$

If the coefficient of $x_0^2y_0^2$, $c_{00} \neq 0$ then $2r_1 + 2s_0 \geq 0$. This inequality and the inequality of \[\text{(3.2)}\] corresponds $3s_0 + s_2 \geq 0$. But note that $s_0 + s_1 + s_2 = 0$. Hence $2s_0 - s_1 \geq 0$, implies $2s_0 \geq s_1 \geq s_0$ and then $s_0 = s_1 = s_2 = 0$, which is a contradiction.
If the coefficient of $x_1^2y_0y_1$, $c_{01}$ ≠ 0 then $2r_1 + s_0 + s_1 ≥ 0$. This and inequality 3.2 correspond $s_0 ≥ 0$ which is a contradiction.

If $S$ is smooth but not stable, then $c_{00} = c_{11} = 0$. Hence, $f(x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, y_2) = a_{11}y_1^2 + a_{22}y_2^2 + a_{12}y_1y_2 + a_{02}y_0y_2 + x_0x_1(b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{22}y_2^2 + b_{02}y_0y_2 + b_{12}y_1y_2) + x_1^2(c_{11}y_1^2 + c_{22}y_2^2 + c_{02}y_0y_2 + c_{12}y_1y_2).

Note that $p_2$ is not finite at the point $[1, 0] \times [1, 0, 0]$. Then this corresponds the section $\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to Z(y_1, y_2) \simeq \mathbb{P}^1 \times [1, 0, 0] \subset S$ of $p_1$.

\[
\varphi = (a_1^2a_{11} + a_0a_\alpha b_{11} + a_1^2c_{11})y_1^2 + (a_0^2a_{22} + a_0a_\alpha b_{22} + a_1^2c_{22})y_2^2 + (a_0^2a_{12} + a_0a_\alpha b_{12} + a_1^2c_{12})y_1y_2 + (a_0^2a_{02} + a_0a_\alpha b_{02} + a_1^2c_{02})y_0y_2.
\]

$p_2(p_1^{-1}([\alpha_0, \alpha_1])) = p_2([\alpha_0, \alpha_1] \times Z(\varphi)) = Z(\varphi)$ is the conic passing through $[1, 0, 0]$. Note that the coefficient of $y_0y_2$, $a_0^2a_{02} + a_0a_\alpha b_{02} + a_1^2c_{02} ≠ 0$, otherwise $S$ becomes singular at $[\alpha_0, \alpha_1] \times [1, 0, 0]$. Then $Z(y_2)$ is the tangent line of all conic $p_2([\alpha_0, \alpha_1] \times Z(\varphi)) = Z(\varphi)$ at $[1, 0, 0]$. Hence the map $\phi_\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}(T_{p_2, y_2})$ is constant.

If $S$ has a singularity at $P = [1, 0] \times [1, 0, 0]$, then $a_{02} = 0$, i.e., $f(1, x_1, 1, y_1, y_2) = 0$. Then the tangent cone of $S$ at $P$ is

\[
f(1, x_1, 1, y_1, y_2) = a_{11}y_1^2 + a_{22}y_2^2 + a_{12}y_1y_2 + b_{02}x_1y_2 + c_{00}x_1^2.
\]

Note that, from the hypothesis $S$ has $A_1$-type singularity at $P$. So the determinant of the Hessian of $f$ at $P$, $H = 8a_{11}a_{22}c_{00} - 2a_{11}b_{02}^2 - 2a_{12}^2c_{00} ≠ 0$.

If $a_{11} ≠ 0$ and $c_{00} ≠ 0$ then $2r_0 + 2s_1 ≥ 0$ and $2r_1 + 2s_0 ≥ 0$ respectively. This imply $s_2 ≤ 0$, which is a contradiction. So $a_{11}$ and $c_{00}$ are not simultaneously non-zero.

If $a_{11} = 0$, then $f(1, x_1, 1, y_1, y_2) = a_{22}y_2^2 + a_{12}y_1y_2 + b_{02}x_1y_2 + c_{00}x_1^2$ and $H = -2a_{12}^2c_{00}$.

If $c_{00} = 0$, then $f(1, x_1, 1, y_1, y_2) = a_{11}y_1^2 + a_{22}y_2^2 + a_{12}y_1y_2 + b_{02}x_1y_2$ and $H = -2a_{12}^2c_{00}$.

If $a_{11} = 0$, then $a_{12} ≠ 0$ and $c_{00} ≠ 0$ as $H ≠ 0$. Hence we have following inequalities $2r_0 + s_1 + s_2 ≥ 0$, and $2r_1 + 2s_0 ≥ 0$ respectively. Together they imply $r_0 ≥ 0$, i.e. $r_0 = r_1 = 0$ and $s_0 ≥ 0$ which is a contradiction.

Similarly, if $c_{00} = 0$, then $a_{11} ≠ 0$ and $b_{02} ≠ 0$ as $H ≠ 0$. Hence we have following inequalities $r_0 + s_1 ≥ 0$ and $s_0 + s_2 = r_0 + r_1 + s_0 + s_2 ≥ 0$. They imply $r_0 ≥ 0$, hence $r_0 = r_1 = 0$ and $s_0 = s_1 = s_2 = 0$. If the coefficient of $x_1^2y_0y_1$, $c_{01} ≠ 0$ then $2r_1 + s_0 + s_1 ≥ 0$ which is a contradiction. Then $c_{01} = 0$ and finally $f(x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, y_2) = x_0^2(a_{11}y_1^2 + a_{22}y_2^2 + a_{12}y_1y_2) + x_0x_1(b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{22}y_2^2 + b_{02}y_0y_2 + b_{12}y_1y_2) + x_1^2(c_{11}y_1^2 + c_{22}y_2^2 + c_{02}y_0y_2 + c_{12}y_1y_2).

$L' = \mathbb{P}^1 \times [1, 0, 0] \subset S$ corresponds a section $\sigma$ of $p_1$ and $p_2(L') = [0, 1, 0]$.

\[
\varphi = (a_1a_{11} + a_0a_\alpha b_{11} + a_1^2c_{11})y_1^2 + (a_0a_{22} + a_0a_\alpha b_{22} + a_1^2c_{22})y_2^2 + (a_0a_{12} + a_\alpha a_1b_{12} + a_1^2c_{12})y_1y_2 + (a_0a_\alpha b_{02} + a_1^2c_{02})y_0y_2
\]

Therefore, $p_2(p_1^{-1}([\alpha_0, \alpha_1])) = Z(\varphi)$. Except finitely many points in $\mathbb{P}^1$, the conic $p_2(p_1^{-1}([\alpha_0, \alpha_1]))$ is smooth at $P_2 = [1, 0, 0]$ and $Z(y_2)$ is the tangent of the conic $Z(\varphi)$ at $P_2 = [1, 0, 0]$. Hence the map $\phi_\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}(T_{p_2, y_2})$ is constant.

Now we prove the converse direction. Let us consider that $p_2 : S \to \mathbb{P}^2$ is not a finite map. After some coordinate change consider that $S$ passes through $P = [1, 0] \times [1, 0, 0]$ and $p_2$ is not finite at $P$. Then there is a section $\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to Z(y_1, y_2) \subset S$ of $p_1$ passes through $P$. Hence
We prove that if the map \( \phi_\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}(T_{P_2, \mathbf{P}^2}) \) is constant then \( S \) is not a stable surface.

Now consider \( p_2(p_1^{-1}[\alpha_0, \alpha_1]) = Z(\varphi) = Z((\alpha_0^2a_{11} + \alpha_0\alpha_1b_{11} + \alpha_1^2c_{11})y_1^2 + (\alpha_0^2a_{22} + \alpha_0\alpha_1b_{22} + \alpha_1^2c_{22})y_2^2 + (\alpha_0^2a_{12} + \alpha_0\alpha_1b_{12} + \alpha_1^2c_{12})y_1y_2 + (\alpha_0^2a_{02} + \alpha_0\alpha_1b_{02} + \alpha_1^2c_{02})y_0y_2 + (\alpha_0^2a_{01} + \alpha_0\alpha_1b_{01} + \alpha_1^2c_{01})y_0y_1) \) is a conic passes through \([1, 0, 0]\) and generic conics are smooth. Therefore \( Z((\alpha_0^2a_{02} + \alpha_0\alpha_1b_{02} + \alpha_1^2c_{02})y_2 + (\alpha_0^2a_{01} + \alpha_0\alpha_1b_{01} + \alpha_1^2c_{01})y_1) \) is the tangent line of smooth conics at the point \([1, 0, 0]\). Hence \( \phi_\sigma([\alpha_0, \alpha_1]) = Z((\alpha_0^2a_{02} + \alpha_0\alpha_1b_{02} + \alpha_1^2c_{02})y_2 + (\alpha_0^2a_{01} + \alpha_0\alpha_1b_{01} + \alpha_1^2c_{01})y_1) \) is a constant map. So with out loss of generality consider that \( \phi_\sigma([\alpha_0, \alpha_1]) = y_2 \).

Therefore \( a_{01} = c_{01} = b_{01} = 0 \), and

\[
f(x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, y_2) = x_0^2(a_{11}y_1^2 + a_{22}y_2^2 + a_{12}y_1y_2 + a_{02}y_0y_2) + x_0x_1(b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{22}y_2^2 + b_{02}y_0y_2 + b_{12}y_1y_2) + x_1^2(c_{11}y_1^2 + c_{22}y_2^2 + c_{02}y_0y_2 + c_{12}y_1y_2).
\]

Consider the 1-parameter subgroup

\[
\lambda(t) = \text{diag}(t^0, t^0) \times \text{diag}(t^{-1}, t^0, t^1).
\]

Then \( \lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t).f \) exists. Hence \( S \) is a non-stable surface.

\[\square\]

**Proposition 3.3.** Let \( S = Z(f) \) be a \((2, 2)\)-type surface. If there is a section \( \sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to S \) of \( p_1 \) such that the image is contracted by \( p_2 \), i.e. \( p_2(\text{Im}(\sigma)) = P_2 \subset \mathbb{P}^2 \) and \( \text{Im}(\sigma) \subseteq S_{\text{sing}} \), then \( S \) is an unstable surface.

**Proof.** Let us assume that \( S \) passes through \( P = [1, 0] \times [1, 0, 0] \) and the section of \( p_1 \) is \( \sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}^1 \times [1, 0, 0] \). Then

\[
f(x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, y_2) = x_0^2(a_{11}y_1^2 + a_{22}y_2^2 + a_{12}y_1y_2 + a_{02}y_0y_2) + x_0x_1(b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{22}y_2^2 + b_{02}y_0y_2 + b_{12}y_1y_2) + x_1^2(c_{11}y_1^2 + c_{22}y_2^2 + c_{02}y_0y_2 + c_{12}y_1y_2).
\]

From the hypothesis, we have \( \text{Im}(\sigma) \subseteq S_{\text{sing}} \). Hence each fibre of \( p_1 \) is a singular conic. Note that \( p_1^{-1}([\alpha_0, \alpha_1]) = [\alpha_0, \alpha_1] \times Z(\psi) \) has singularity at \([\alpha_0, \alpha_1] \times [1, 0, 0] \), where \( \psi = y_1^2(\alpha_0^2a_{11} + \alpha_0\alpha_1b_{11} + \alpha_1^2c_{11}) + y_2^2(\alpha_0^2a_{22} + \alpha_0\alpha_1b_{22} + \alpha_1^2c_{22}) + y_1y_2(\alpha_0^2a_{12} + \alpha_0\alpha_1b_{12} + \alpha_1^2c_{12}) \). Therefore

\[
f(x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, y_2) = x_0^2(a_{11}y_1^2 + a_{22}y_2^2 + a_{12}y_1y_2) + x_0x_1(b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{22}y_2^2 + b_{12}y_1y_2) + x_1^2(c_{11}y_1^2 + c_{22}y_2^2 + c_{12}y_1y_2).
\]

Now consider the 1-parameter subgroup \( \lambda(t) = \text{diag}(t^{-1}, t^1) \times \text{diag}(t^{-4}, t^2, t^2) \), such that \( \lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t).f = 0 \). Hence \( S \) is unstable. \( \square \)

In the following lemma, we see some surfaces having higher order singularities are also semi-stable.

**Lemma 3.4.** Let \( S = Z(f) \) be an irreducible \((2, 2)\)-type surface. Then \( S \) is a semi-stable surface if following conditions hold for all \( P = P_1 \times P_2 \in S_{\text{sing}} \):

(i) The tangent cone of \( S \) at \( P \) is not a pull back of a tangent cone of \( P_2 \) by the map \( p_2 \),
(ii) If the fibre over $P_1$ is non-reduced, then the fibre $p_1^{-1}(P_1)$ is not in the ramification locus of $p_2$, and

(iii) The fibre over $P_1$ is reduced but non-irreducible and let $L_1$ and $L_2$ be two components of the fibre over $P_1$. If $L_2$ is in the ramification locus of $p_2$ and if there is a section $\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}(T_{\mathbb{P}_2, P_2})$ is $\phi_\sigma(\mathbb{P}^1) \neq p_2(L_2)$ (see (3.1)).

Proof. It is enough to prove that if $S = Z(f)$ is an irreducible unstable surface, then for some $P = P_1 \times P_2 \in S_{\text{sing}}$ satisfy one of the following properties:

(i) The tangent cone of $S$ at $P$ is a pull back of a tangent cone of $P_2$ by the map $p_2$, or

(ii) if the fibre over $P_1 \in \mathbb{P}^1$ is non-reduced, then $p_1^{-1}(P_1)$ is in the ramification locus of $p_2$, or

(iii) the fibre over $P_1$ is reduced and non-irreducible and one of the components of the fibre over $P_1$ say $L_2$ is in the ramification locus of $p_2$ and there is a section $\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}(T_{\mathbb{P}_2, P_2})$ is constant and $\phi_\sigma(\mathbb{P}^1) = p_2(L_2)$.

Then from Corollary [2.11(i)], there exists a normalized one-parameter subgroup $\lambda : G_m \to G$ with $\lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t).f = 0$.

$\lambda(t) = \text{diag}(t^{r_0}, t^{s_0}), t^{r_1}, t^{s_1}, t^{s_2})$.

such that $r_0 + r_1 = 0$, $r_0 \leq r_1$; $s_0 + s_1 + s_2 = 0$, $s_0 \leq s_1 \leq s_2$; and $r_0 + s_0 < 0$.

$\lambda(t)f = \sum a_{\alpha \beta}(t^{r_0}x_0)^{r_0}(t^{r_1}x_1)^{r_1}(t^{s_0}y_0)^{s_0}(t^{s_1}y_1)^{s_1}(t^{s_2}y_2)^{s_2} = \sum a_{\alpha \beta}t^{r_0 + s_0 + \alpha \beta}x_0^{a \beta}y_0^{\beta}$

$\lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t).f = 0$, i.e $r\alpha + s\beta > 0$ for all $a_{\alpha \beta} \neq 0$.

At the end of Lemma [3.1] we conclude that the polynomial $f$ is

$f(x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, y_2) = x_0^2(a_{11}y_1^2 + a_{22}y_2^2 + a_{21}y_1y_2) + x_0x_1(b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{22}y_2^2 + b_{02}y_0y_2 + b_{12}y_1y_2) + x_1^2(c_{00}y_0^2 + c_{11}y_1^2 + c_{22}y_2^2 + c_{02}y_0y_2 + c_{12}y_1y_2)$.

having singularity at $P = [1, 0] \times [1, 0, 0]$ which is not $A_1$-type and the tangent cone of $S$ at $P$ is either $a_{22}y_2^2 + b_{02}x_1y_2 + c_{00}x_1^2$, or $a_{22}y_2^2 + a_{12}y_1y_2 + b_{02}x_1y_2$, or $a_{11}y_1^2 + a_{22}y_2^2 + a_{12}y_1y_2$.

Case-I: The tangent cone of $S$ at $P$ is $f(1, x_1, 1, y_1, y_2) = a_{22}y_2^2 + b_{02}x_1y_2 + c_{00}x_1^2$ where $c_{00} \neq 0$. Note that $a_{22} \neq 0$, otherwise it contradict the irreducibility of $f$. $c_{00} \neq 0$ and $a_{22} \neq 0$ correspond the inequality $s_0 + s_2 > 0$. If $b_{11} \neq 0$ then $s_1 > 0$ which contradict $s_0 + s_2 > 0$. Hence $b_{11} = 0$ and

$f(x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, y_2) = a_{22}x_0^2y_2^2 + x_0x_1(b_{22}y_2^2 + b_{02}y_0y_2 + b_{12}y_1y_2) + x_1^2(c_{00}y_0^2 + c_{11}y_1^2 + c_{22}y_2^2 + c_{02}y_0y_2 + c_{12}y_1y_2)$.

The fibre over $[1, 0]$ is the non-reduced conic $[1, 0] \times Z(y_2^2)$. Note that the map $[1, 0] \times Z(y_2) = p_2^{-1}(Z(y_2)) \to Z(y_2)$ is an isomorphism. Therefore the fibre over $P_1$ is in the ramification locus of $p_2$.

Case-II: The tangent cone of $S$ at $P$ is $f(1, x_1, 1, y_1, y_2) = a_{22}y_2^2 + a_{12}y_1y_2 + b_{02}x_1y_2$, where both $a_{12}$ and $b_{02}$ are non-zero. These correspond inequalities

$2r_0 + s_1 + s_2 > 0$ and

$s_0 + s_2 > 0$
$b_{11} \neq 0$ contradict the inequality 3.4 and $c_{01} \neq 0$ corresponds the inequality $2r_1 + s_0 + s_1 > 0$.
This and the inequality 3.3 imply $s_1 > 0$ which contradict the inequality 3.4. Hence $b_{11} = c_{01} = 0$ and

$$f(x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, y_2) = x_0^2(a_{22}y_2^2 + a_{12}y_1y_2) + x_0x_1(b_{22}y_2^2 + b_{02}y_0y_2 + b_{12}y_1y_2) + x_1^2(c_{11}y_1^2 + c_{22}y_2^2 + c_{02}y_0y_2 + c_{12}y_1y_2).$$

Here the fibre component $[1, 0] \times Z(y_2)$ over $[1, 0]$ is in the ramification locus of $p_2$. Note that there is a section $\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to Z(y_1, y_2) \subset S$ of $p_1$. Then the corresponding map $\phi_\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{P}^2, p_2)$, is constant and $\phi_\sigma([a_0, a_1]) = Z(y_2)$.

**Case-III:** The tangent cone of $S$ at $P$ is $f(1, x_1, 1, y_1, y_2) = a_{11}y_1^2 + a_{22}y_2^2 + a_{12}y_1y_2$. Then the tangent cone of $S$ at $P$ is pull back of a tangent cone at $P_2$ by the map $p_2$. □

Now we give a complete description of irreducible semi-stable surfaces in the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.5.** Let $S = Z(f)$ be an irreducible $(2,2)$-type surface. Then $S$ is semi-stable if and only if for all $P = P_1 \times P_2 \in S_{\text{sing}}$ satisfies each of the following conditions:

(i) The tangent cone of $S$ at $P$ is not a pull back of a tangent cone of $P_2$ by the map $p_2$,

(ii) If the fibre over $P_1$ is non-reduced, then the fibre $p_1^{-1}(P_1)$ is not in the ramification locus of $p_2$, and

(iii) The fibre over $P_1$ is reduced but non-irreducible and let $L_1$ and $L_2$ be two components of the fibre over $P_1$. If there is a section $\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}^1 \times P_2 \subset S$ of $p_1$ and $L_2$ is in the ramification locus of $p_2$, then the corresponding map $\phi_\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{P}^2, P_2)$ is $\phi_\sigma([a_1]) \neq p_2(L_2)$ (see [17]).

**Proof.** Let $S \in [2, 2]$ of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$ and $S = Z(f)$. We prove this result by negation. If $S$ is an irreducible unstable surface, then we prove that for some $P = P_1 \times P_2 \in S_{\text{sing}}$ satisfy one of the following conditions:

(i) The tangent cone of $S$ at $P$ is a pull back of a tangent cone of $P_2$ by the map $p_2$, or

(ii) the fibre over $P_1 \in \mathbb{P}^1$ is non-reduced and $p_1^{-1}(P_1)$ is in the ramification locus of $p_2$, or

(iii) the fibre over $P_1$ is reduced and non-irreducible and one of the components of the fibre over $P_1$ say $L_2$ is in the ramification locus of $p_2$ and there is a section $\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}^1 \times P_2$ of $p_1$. Then the corresponding map $\phi_\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{P}^2, P_2)$ is constant and $\phi_\sigma([a_1]) = p_2(L_2)$.

These follows from Lemma 3.4.

Conversely, we prove that if some singular point $P = P_1 \times P_2 \in S = Z(f)$ satisfy one of the following conditions, then $S$ is unstable. The conditions are:

(i) The tangent cone of $S$ at $P$ is a pull back of a tangent cone of $P_2$ by the map $p_2$, or

(ii) the fibre over $P_1 \in \mathbb{P}^1$ is non-reduced and $p_1^{-1}(P_1)$ is in the ramification locus of $p_2$, or

(iii) the fibre over $P_1$ is reduced and non-irreducible and one of the components of the fibre over $P_1$ say $L_2$ is in the ramification locus of $p_2$ and there is a section $\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}^1 \times P_2$ of $p_1$. Then the corresponding map $\phi_\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{P}^2, P_2)$ is constant and $\phi_\sigma([a_1]) = p_2(L_2)$.

After a possible coordinate change, consider that $S$ passes through $P = [1, 0] \times [1, 0, 0]$ and $P \in S_{\text{sing}}$. Then
\[ f(x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, y_2) = x_0^2(a_{11}y_1^2 + a_{12}y_1y_2) + x_0x_1(b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{22}y_2^2 + b_{02}y_0y_2 + b_{12}y_1y_2) + x_1^2(c_0y_0^2 + c_1y_1^2 + c_{12}y_1y_2). \]

If \( f \) satisfies the condition (i) i.e., the tangent cone at \( P \) is a pull back of a tangent cone at \( P_2 \), then
\[ (f(1, 0, 1, y_1, y_2))_2 = a_{11}y_1^2 + a_{12}y_1y_2. \]

Therefore \( f(x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, y_2) = x_0^2(a_{11}y_1^2 + a_{12}y_1y_2) + x_0x_1(b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{22}y_2^2 + b_{12}y_1y_2) + x_1^2(c_1y_1^2 + c_{12}y_1y_2). \]

Consider the 1-parameter subgroup \( \lambda(t) = (t^{-3}, t^3) \times (t^{-2}, t^2, t^4) \). Then clearly,
\[ \lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t).f = 0 \]

Hence \( f \) is unstable.

Now assume that the condition (ii) holds, i.e the fibre over \( P_1 \in \mathbb{P}^1 \) is non-reduced and \( \sigma^{-1}(P_1) \) is in the ramification locus of \( p_2 \). With out loss of generality consider that the non-reduced fibre over \( P_1 = [1,0] \) is the conic \( Z(y_2^2) \) and it contained in the ramification locus of the map \( p_2 \). Therefore \( b_{11} = b_{01} = 0 \). Then the polynomial is
\[ f(x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, y_2) = a_{12}x_0^2y_2^2 + x_0x_1(b_{22}y_2^2 + b_{02}y_0y_2 + b_{12}y_1y_2) + x_1^2(c_0y_0^2 + c_1y_1^2 + c_{12}y_1y_2). \]

Moreover there is a section \( \sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to Z(y_1, y_2) \subset S \) of \( p_1 \) such that the corresponding map \( \phi_\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}(T_{P_2, P_2}) \) is constant and \( \phi_\sigma(\mathbb{P}^1) = p_2(Z(y_2)). \) Then \( c_{00} = c_{01} = 0 \)

Hence, \( f(x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, y_2) = x_0^2(a_{12}y_2^2 + a_{12}y_1y_2) + x_0x_1(b_{22}y_2^2 + b_{02}y_0y_2 + b_{12}y_1y_2) + x_1^2(c_{11}y_1^2 + c_{12}y_1y_2). \)

Consider the 1-parameter subgroup \( \lambda(t) = (t^{-3}, t^3) \times (t^{-2}, t^2, t^4) \). Then
\[ \lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t).f = 0. \]

Therefore \( f \) is unstable. Hence we prove the theorem. 

**Remark 3.6.** Let \( S = Z(h) \) be an irreducible unstable (2,2)-type surface. Then from Theorem 
3.3 there exists \( f \in h.G \) such that \( f \) is a span of monomials of \( M^+((-3,3)(-2,-2,4)) \), or \( \mathcal{M}^+((-2,2)(-5,-1,6)) \), or \( 
\mathcal{M}^+((-4,4)(-10,5,5)) \).

In the next theorem we describe some criterion that when a (2,2)-type semi-stable surface precisely becomes stable.

**Theorem 3.7.** Let \( S = Z(f) \) be an irreducible semi-stable (2,2)-type surface of \( \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \). Then \( S \) is stable if and only if \( S \) satisfies following properties:

1. Either \( p_2 : S \to \mathbb{P}^2 \) is a finite map or there exist some sections \( \sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to S \) of \( p_1 \) which are contracted by \( p_2 \). Moreover, \( \im(\sigma) \) contains at most \( A_1 \)-type singular points and \( \phi_\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}(T_{P_2, P_2}) \) (see [14]) is non-constant for all such sections.
2. If \( P = P_1 \times P_2 \in S_{\text{sing}} \) which is not \( A_1 \)-type then the fibre over \( P_1 \) is reduced.
Proof. Let $S = Z(f)$ be a semi-stable irreducible surface and $S$ has singularities other than $A_1$-type. We prove that if $S$ is not stable, then one of the following conditions hold
\( (i) \) $p_2$ is not finite at $P = P_1 \times P_2 \in S$, where $P$ is either smooth or $A_1$-type singular point of $S$. Then there is a section $\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to S$ of $p_1$ contacted to $P_2$. Moreover the corresponding map $\phi_\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}(T_{p_2, p_2})$ is constant, or
\( (ii) \) the map $p_2$ is not finite at $P \in S_{\text{sing}}$ where $P$ is not $A_1$-type singular point of $S$, or
\( (iii) \) the fibre over $P_1$ is non-reduced where $P = P_1 \times P_2 \in S_{\text{sing}}$ and $P$ is not $A_1$-type singular point of $S$.

Let $\lambda : G_m \to G$ be a normalized 1-parameter subgroup, such that $\lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t) f$ exists.

$$\lambda(t) = \text{diag}(t^{r_0}, t^{r_1}) \times \text{diag}(t^{s_0}, t^{s_1}, t^{s_2}).$$

where $r_0 + r_1 = 0$, $r_0 \leq r_1$; $s_0 + s_1 + s_2 = 0$, $s_0 \leq s_1 \leq s_2$; and $r_0 + s_0 < 0$.

$$\lambda(t) f = \sum a_{\alpha \beta} (t^{r_0} x_0)^{\alpha_0} (t^{r_1} x_1)^{\alpha_1} (t^{s_0} y_0)^{\beta_0} (t^{s_1} y_1)^{\beta_1} (t^{s_2} y_2)^{\beta_2} = \sum a_{\alpha \beta} t^{r_0 + s_0 \beta_0} x^{\alpha_0} y^{\beta}$$

$$\lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t) f$$ exists, i.e. $r_0 + s_0 \beta_0 \geq 0$ for all $a_{\alpha \beta} \neq 0$.

We prove in Lemma 3.2 that if $f$ is non-stable then the coefficients of $x_0^2 y_0^2$, $x_0 y_0 y_1$, $x_0 x_1 y_0 y_1$ are zero. Then

$$f(x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, y_2) = x_0^2 (a_{11} y_1^2 + a_{22} y_2^2 + a_{12} y_1 y_2 + a_{02} y_2 y_1) + x_0 x_1 (b_{11} y_1^2 + b_{22} y_2^2 + b_{02} y_2 y_1 + b_{12} y_1 y_2) + x_1^2 (c_{00} y_0^2 + c_{11} y_1^2 + c_{22} y_2^2 + c_{01} y_0 y_1 + c_{02} y_0 y_2 + c_{12} y_1 y_2).$$

If $S$ is either smooth or has singularity of type $A_1$ at $P = [1, 0] \times [1, 0, 0]$, then we prove in Lemma 3.2 that $p_2$ is not finite at $P$. Then there is a section $\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}^1 \times [1, 0, 0] \subset S$ of $p_1$ contracted to $P_2 = [1, 0, 0]$. Moreover the corresponding map $\phi_\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}(T_{p_2, p_2})$ is constant. Now consider that $P$ is a singular point of $S$ which is not $A_1$-type. Hence, $f(x_1, y_1, y_2) = 0$ and the tangent cone of $S$ at $P$ is

$$f(1, x_1, 1, y_1, y_2) = a_{11} y_1^2 + a_{22} y_2^2 + a_{12} y_1 y_2 + b_{02} x_1 y_2 + c_{00} x_1^2.$$ and the determinant of the Hessian of $f$ at $P$ is $H = 8a_{11} a_{22} c_{00} - 2a_{11} b_{02}^2 - 2a_{12} c_{00} = 0$.

If $a_{11} \neq 0$ and $c_{00} \neq 0$ then $2r_0 + 2s_1 \geq 0$ and $2r_1 + 2s_0 \geq 0$ respectively. This imply $s_2 \leq 0$ which is a contradiction. Therefore either $a_{11} = 0$ or $c_{00} = 0$.

If $a_{11} = 0$, then $f(1, x_1, 1, y_1, y_2) = a_{22} y_2^2 + a_{12} y_1 y_2 + b_{02} x_1 y_2 + c_{00} x_1^2$ and $H = -2a_{12} c_{00} = 0$. Then either $a_{12} = 0$ or $c_{00} = 0$.

If $c_{00} = 0$, then $f(1, x_1, 1, y_1, y_2) = a_{11} y_1^2 + a_{22} y_2^2 + a_{12} y_1 y_2 + b_{02} x_1 y_2$ and $H = -2a_{12} b_{02}^2 = 0$. This implies $a_{11} = 0$. Note that $b_{02} \neq 0$, otherwise $f(1, 0, 1, y_1, y_2) = f(1, x_1, 1, y_1, y_2) = a_{11} y_1^2 + a_{22} y_2^2 + a_{12} y_1 y_2$. Therefore $S$ becomes unstable (see Theorem 3.5(i)). Therefore, either $f(x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, y_2) = x_0^2 (a_{22} y_2^2 + a_{12} y_1 y_2) + x_0 x_1 (b_{11} y_1^2 + b_{22} y_2^2 + b_{02} y_2 y_1 + b_{12} y_1 y_2) + x_1^2 (c_{00} y_0^2 + c_{12} y_1 y_2)$. If $f(x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, y_2) = x_0^2 (a_{22} y_2^2 + a_{12} y_1 y_2) + x_0 x_1 (b_{11} y_1^2 + b_{22} y_2^2 + b_{02} y_2 y_1 + b_{12} y_1 y_2) + x_1^2 (c_{00} y_0^2 + c_{12} y_1 y_2)$ then the section $\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to (y_1, y_2)$ of $p_1$, passing through $P$. Hence the condition (ii) holds.

If $f(x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, y_2) = a_{22} x_2^2 y_2^2 + x_0 x_1 (b_{11} y_1^2 + b_{22} y_2^2 + b_{02} y_2 y_1 + b_{12} y_1 y_2) + x_1^2 (c_{00} y_0^2 + c_{12} y_1 y_2) + c_{22} y_2^2 + c_{01} y_0 y_1 + c_{02} y_0 y_2 + c_{12} y_1 y_2)$, then the fibre over $[1, 0]$ is non-reduced. Hence the condition (iii) holds.
Now we prove the converse direction of the theorem. If $S$ satisfies one of the following conditions, then $S$ is non-stable:

(i) $p_2$ is not finite at $P = P_1 \times P_2 \in S$, where $P$ is either smooth or $A_1$-type singular point of $S$. Then there is a section $\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to S$ of $p_1$ contacted to $P_2$. Moreover the corresponding map $\phi_\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}_{P_2, P_2})$ is constant, or

(ii) the map $p_2$ is not finite at $P \in S_{\text{sing}}$ where $P$ is not a $A_1$-type singular point of $S$, or

(iii) the fibre over $P_1$ is non-reduced where $P = P_1 \times P_2 \in S_{\text{sing}}$ and $P$ is not $A_1$-type singular point of $S$.

In Lemma 3.2, we prove that if the condition (i) holds, then $S$ is non-stable. Now let $P = P_1 \times P_2$ be a singular point of $S$ which is not $A_1$-type. After a suitable coordinate change consider that $P = [1, 0] \times [1, 0, 0]$. Then

$$f(x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, y_2) = x_0^2(a_{11}y_1^2 + a_{22}y_2^2 + a_{12}y_1y_2) + x_0x_1(b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{22}y_2^2 + b_{02}y_0y_2 + b_{12}y_1y_2) + x_1^2(c_{00}y_0^2 + c_{11}y_1^2 + c_{22}y_2^2 + c_{01}y_0y_1 + c_{02}y_0y_2 + c_{12}y_1y_2).$$

and the tangent cone of $S$ at $P$ is

$$(f(1, x_1, 1, y_1, y_2))_2 = a_{11}y_1^2 + a_{22}y_2^2 + a_{12}y_1y_2 + b_{02}x_1y_2 + c_{00}x_1^2$$

and the determinant of the Hessian matrix at the point $P$ is $H = 8a_{11}a_{22}c_{00} - 2a_{11}b_{02}^2 - 2a_{12}c_{00} = 0.$

If $p_2$ is not finite at $P = [1, 1] \times [1, 0, 0]$, then the section $\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to Z(y_1, y_2)$ passes through $P$. Therefore $c_{00} = 0$ and $H = -2a_{11}b_{02}^2 = 0$. As $S$ is semi-stable, $b_{02} \neq 0$. Then $a_{11} = 0$. Now

$$f(1, x_1, 1, y_1, y_2)_2 = a_{22}y_2^2 + a_{12}y_1y_2 + b_{02}x_1y_2,$$

and the polynomial $f(x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, y_2) = x_0^2(a_{22}y_2^2 + c_{22}y_2^2 + c_{01}y_0y_1 + c_{02}y_0y_2 + c_{12}y_1y_2).$ Then $f(1, x_1, 1, y_1, y_2)_2 = a_{22}y_2^2 + b_{02}y_0y_1 + b_{02}x_1y_2 + c_{00}x_1^2.$

The Hessian at $P$ is $H = 2a_{22}b_{02} - 0$. As $a_{22} \neq 0$, $b_{02} = 0$. Thus

Now $f(1, x_1, 1, y_1, y_2)_2 = a_{22}y_2^2 + b_{02}x_1y_2 + c_{00}x_1^2$, and the polynomial $f(x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, y_2) = a_{22}x_0^2y_2^2 + x_0x_1(b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{22}y_2^2 + b_{02}y_0y_2 + b_{12}y_1y_2) + x_1^2(c_{00}y_0^2 + c_{11}y_1^2 + c_{22}y_2^2 + c_{01}y_0y_1 + c_{02}y_0y_2 + c_{12}y_1y_2).$ Let us consider the 1-parameter subgroup $\lambda(t) = (t^{-1}, t) \times (t^{-2}, t^0, t^2)$. Then clearly, $\lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t) \cdot f$ exists. Hence $f$ is not stable.

Remark 3.8. Let $S = Z(h)$ be an irreducible strictly semi-stable $(2,2)$-type surface. Then from Theorem 3.7, there exists $f \in h.G$ such that $f$ is a span of monomials of $M^\oplus((0, 0)(−1, 0, 1))$, or $M^\oplus((−1, 1)(−2, 0, 2))$, or $M^\oplus((−1, 1)(−1, 0, 1)).$

From the above theorem, it can be easily conclude that when a semi-stable surface is strictly semi-stable. In the following theorem, we have listed all strictly semi-stable $(2,2)$-type surfaces and their degenerations.

Theorem 3.9. Let $S = Z(f)$ be an irreducible semi-stable surface. Then $S$ is a strictly semi-stable if and only if $S$ satisfies one of the following conditions:

(i) There are some sections $\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to S$ of $p_1$ such that $\phi_\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}_{P_2, P_2})$ (see (1, 1)) is a constant map, where $(p_2(\sigma(\mathbb{P}^1))) = P_2 \in \mathbb{P}^2.$
(ii) \( p_2 \) is not finite at \( P \in S_{sing} \), where \( P \) is not \( A_1 \)-type singularity.

(iii) \( P = P_1 \times P_2 \in S_{sing} \) which is not \( A_1 \)-type and the fibre over \( P_1 \) is non-reduced.

In particular, \( f \) degenerates to one of the following equations:

\[
\begin{align*}
f_1 &= x_0^2(a_{11}y_1^2 + a_{02}y_0y_2) + x_0x_1(b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{02}y_0y_2) + x_1^2(c_{11}y_1^2 + c_{02}y_0y_2) \quad \text{where } a_{11} \neq 0 \text{ and } b_{02} \neq 0; \text{ and } c_{11} \neq 0 \text{ or } c_{02} \neq 0. \\
f_2 &= a_{12}c_{12}y_2^2 + x_0x_1(b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{02}y_0y_2) + c_{00}x_1^2y_0^2 \quad \text{where } a_{12}, b_{11} \neq 0 \text{ and } c_{00} \neq 0. \\
f_3 &= a_{12}c_{01}y_1y_2 + x_0x_1(b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{02}y_0y_2) + c_{01}x_1^2y_0y_1 \quad \text{where } a_{12} \neq 0, b_{02} \neq 0 \text{ and } c_{01} \neq 0.
\end{align*}
\]

**Proof.** Let \( S \) be an irreducible, semi-stable surface and with out loss of generality assume that \( S \) passes through the point \( P = [1, 0] \times [1, 0, 0] \). Then \( f(x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, y_2) = x_0^2(a_{11}y_1^2 + a_{22}y_2^2 + a_{12}y_1y_2 + a_{02}y_0y_2) + x_0x_1(b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{22}y_2^2 + b_{02}y_0y_2 + b_{12}y_1y_2) + x_1^2(c_{11}y_1^2 + c_{22}y_2^2 + c_{01}y_0y_1 + c_{02}y_0y_2 + c_{12}y_1y_2) \) where \( a_{12} \neq 0, b_{02} \neq 0 \) and \( c_{01} \neq 0 \) otherwise \( S \) will become unstable. If we take the 1-parameter subgroup \( \lambda(t) = diag(t^{-1}, t) \times diag(t^{-2}, t^0, t^2) \), then \( \lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t)f = f_3 \).

Let \( P = P_1 \times P_2 \in S_{sing} \) which is not \( A_1 \)-type and the fibre over \( P_1 \) is non-reduced. Then from Theorem 3.7 the polynomial \( f = a_{12}c_{01}x_1y_1y_2 + x_0x_1(b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{22}y_2^2 + b_{02}y_0y_2 + b_{12}y_1y_2) + x_1^2(c_{11}y_1^2 + c_{22}y_2^2 + c_{01}y_0y_1 + c_{02}y_0y_2 + c_{12}y_1y_2) \) where \( a_{12} \neq 0, b_{02} \neq 0 \) and \( c_{01} \neq 0 \) otherwise \( S \) will become unstable. If we take the 1-parameter subgroup \( \lambda(t) = diag(t^{-1}, t) \times diag(t^{-2}, t^0, t^2) \) then \( \lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t)f = f_2 \).

Let \( \sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to Z(y_1, y_2) \subset S \) be a section of \( p_1 \) such that \( \phi_\sigma : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}(T^2_{P_1}) \) is a constant map. Then from Lemma 3.2 \( f = x_0^2(a_{11}y_1^2 + a_{22}y_2^2 + a_{12}y_1y_2 + a_{02}y_0y_2) + x_0x_1(b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{22}y_2^2 + b_{02}y_0y_2 + b_{12}y_1y_2) + x_1^2(c_{11}y_1^2 + c_{22}y_2^2 + c_{01}y_0y_1 + c_{02}y_0y_2 + c_{12}y_1y_2) \).

Note that \( a_{11} \neq 0 \) and \( b_{02} \neq 0 \); and \( c_{11} \neq 0 \) or \( c_{02} \neq 0 \) otherwise it contradict the semi-stability of \( f \). Let us consider the 1-parameter subgroup \( \lambda(t) = diag(t^0, t^0) \times diag(t^{-1}, t^0, t) \) such that \( \lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t)f = f_1 \). Hence the result follows. \( \square \)

In the next proposition, we see that there are some irreducible stable (2,2)-type surfaces which have higher order singularities.

**Proposition 3.10.** Let \( S = Z(f) \) be an irreducible, singular, stable (2,2)-type surface and \( f \) be a quasi-homogeneous equation. Then \( S \) has either \( A_1, A_2 \) or \( A_3 \)-type isolated singularities or non-isolated singularities.

**Proof.** If \( f(x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, y_2) = x_0^2(a_{11}y_1^2 + a_{12}y_1y_2) + x_0x_1(b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{22}y_2^2 + b_{02}y_0y_2 + b_{12}y_1y_2) + x_1^2(c_{11}y_1^2 + c_{22}y_2^2 + c_{01}y_0y_1 + c_{02}y_0y_2 + c_{12}y_1y_2) \) then \( S = Z(f) \) is a stable surface form Theorem 3.7 and Remark 3.8 where \( a_{11}, b_{02}, a_{12} \) and \( c_{00} \) are non-zero. Note that the determinant of the Hessian matrix at the point \( P = [1, 0] \times [1, 0, 0] \), \( H = -2a_{11}b_{02} - 2a_{12}c_{00} \). If \( H \neq 0 \), then \( S \) has \( A_1 \)-type singularity at \( P \). If \( H = 0 \), then \( S \) has other than \( A_1 \)-type singularity at \( P = [1, 0] \times [1, 0, 0] \). Consider the affine neighbourhood \( \{x_0 = 1, y_0 = 1\} \) of \( P \) and
\[ f(1, x_1, 1, y_1, y_2) = f(1, x_1, 1, y_1, y_2)_2 + f(1, x_1, 1, y_1, y_2)_3 + f(1, x_1, 1, y_1, y_2)_4 \]
\[ = (a_{11}y_1^3 + a_{12}y_1y_2 + b_{02}y_1x_2 + c_{00}x_1^2) + (b_{11}x_1y_1^2 + b_{22}x_1y_2^2 + b_{12}x_1y_1y_2 + c_{02}x_1^2y_2) + (c_{11}x_1^2y_1^2 + c_{22}x_1^2y_2^2 + c_{12}x_1^2y_1y_2) \]

The partial derivatives of \( f(1, x_1, 1, y_1, y_2) \) with respect to \( x_1, y_1 \) and \( y_2 \) are

\[ f_{x_1} = b_{02}y_2 + 2c_{00}x_1 + b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{22}y_2^2 + b_{12}y_1y_2 + 2c_{01}x_1y_2 + 2c_{11}x_1y_1^2 + 2c_{22}x_1y_2^2 + 2c_{12}x_1y_1y_2 \]
\[ f_{y_1} = 2a_{11}y_1 + a_{12}y_2 + 2b_{11}x_1y_1 + b_{12}x_1y_2 + 2c_{11}x_1^2y_1 + c_{12}x_1^2y_2 \]
\[ f_{y_2} = a_{12}y_1 + b_{02}x_1 + 2b_{22}x_1y_2 + b_{12}x_1y_1 + c_{02}x_1^2 + 2c_{22}x_1y_2 + c_{12}x_1^2y_1 \]

As \( a_{11}b_{02}^2 + a_{12}^2c_{00} = 0 \), the linear terms of partial derivatives of \( f \) are not linearly independent.

\[ g_1 = 2a_{12}c_{00}f_{y_2} + b_{02}^2f_{y_1} - b_{02}a_{12}f_{x_1} = x_1^2(2a_{12}c_{00}c_{02} + y_1(2a_{12}c_{00}c_{12} + 2c_{00}b_{02}^2) + y_2(4a_{12}c_{00}c_{22} + b_{02}c_{12}^2)) + y_1^2(-b_{11}b_{02}a_{12} - 2a_{12}b_{02}c_{11}x_1) + y_2^2(-b_{22}b_{02}a_{12} - 2a_{12}b_{02}c_{22}x_1) + x_1y_1(2a_{12}b_{12}c_{00} + 2b_{11}b_{02}^2) + x_1y_2(4a_{12}b_{22}c_{00} + b_{12}b_{02}^2 - 2a_{12}b_{02}c_{12}) + y_1y_2(-a_{12}b_{12}b_{02} - 2a_{12}b_{02}c_{12}x_1) \]
\[ g_2 = f_{y_1} = \beta_1y_1 + \beta_2y_2, \beta_1 = (2a_{11} + 2b_{11}x_1 + 2c_{11}x_1^2) \text{ and } \beta_2 = (a_{12} + b_{02}x_1 + c_{12}x_1^2) \]
\[ g_3 = f_{y_2} = \gamma_1y_1 + \gamma_2x_1, \gamma_1 = (a_{12} + b_{12}x_1 + c_{12}x_1^2) \text{ and } \gamma_2 = (b_{02} + 2b_{22}y_2 + c_{02}x_1 + 2c_{22}x_1y_2) \]
are units in \( \mathbb{C}[[x_1, y_1, y_2]] \).

Note that as \( f \) is quasi-homogeneous, \( f \in (f_{x_1}, f_{y_1}, f_{y_2}) = (g_1, g_2, g_3) \).

Let us consider a ring homomorphism \( \phi(y_1) = y_1, \phi(g_2) = y_2 \) and \( \phi(g_3) = x_1 \) of \( \mathbb{C}[[x_1, y_1, y_2]] \). \( \phi \) is an automorphism follows from Theorem 2.10 \( \alpha_1 = -\frac{\beta_1}{\beta_2} \) and \( \alpha_2 = -\frac{\gamma_1}{\gamma_2} \) are units in \( \mathbb{C}[[x_1, y_1, y_2]] \). Following equation is the coefficient of the degree two part of image of \( g_1 \) in \( \mathbb{C}[[x_1, y_1, y_2]]/(g_2, g_3) \). If

\[ \alpha_2^2 2a_{12}c_{00}c_{02} - b_{11}b_{02}a_{12} + \alpha_1^2(-b_{02}b_{02}a_{12}) + \alpha_2(2a_{12}b_{12}c_{00} + 2b_{11}b_{02}^2) + \alpha_1\alpha_2(4a_{12}b_{22}c_{00} + b_{12}b_{02}^2 - 2a_{12}b_{02}c_{02}) - \alpha_1a_{12}b_{02}b_{12} \neq 0 \]

then the image of \( g_1 \) is \( ay_1^2 \) in \( \mathbb{C}[[x_1, y_1, y_2]]/(g_2, g_3) \) where \( a \) is a unit in \( \mathbb{C}[[x_1, y_1, y_2]] \). Hence

\[ \mathbb{C}[[x_1, y_1, y_2]]/(f_{x_1}, f_{y_1}, f_{y_2}) \cong \mathbb{C}[[x_1, y_1, y_2]]/(g_1, g_2, g_3) \cong \mathbb{C}[[y_1]]/(y_1^2) \]

Therefore \( S \) has a \( A_2 \)-type singularity at the point \( P \) (see Proposition 2.17).

Note that following equation is the coefficient of the degree three part of image of \( g_1 \) in \( \mathbb{C}[[x_1, y_1, y_2]]/(g_2, g_3) \). If equation (3.5) is zero but

\[ \alpha_2^2(2a_{12}c_{00}c_{12} + 2c_{00}b_{02}^2) + \alpha_1\alpha_2^2(4a_{12}c_{00}c_{22} + b_{02}^2c_{12}) - \alpha_2a_{12}b_{02}c_{11} - \alpha_1^2\alpha_2a_{12}b_{02}c_{11} - \alpha_1\alpha_2^2a_{12}b_{02}c_{00} \neq 0 \]

then images of \( g_1 \) is \( by_1^3 \) in \( \mathbb{C}[[x_1, y_1, y_2]]/(g_2, g_3) \) where \( b \) is a unit in \( \mathbb{C}[[x_1, y_1, y_2]] \). Therefore

\[ \mathbb{C}[[x_1, y_1, y_2]]/(f_{x_1}, f_{y_1}, f_{y_2}) \cong \mathbb{C}[[x_1, y_1, y_2]]/(g_1, g_2, g_2) \cong \mathbb{C}[[y_1]]/(y_1^3) \]

Hence \( S \) has a \( A_3 \)-type singularity at the point \( P \) (see Proposition 2.17). Now consider equations 3.3 and 3.6 are zero. Then the image of \( g_1 \) is zero in \( \mathbb{C}[[x_1, y_1, y_2]]/(g_2, g_2) \). Therefore

\[ \mathbb{C}[[x_1, y_1, y_2]]/(f_{x_1}, f_{y_1}, f_{y_2}) \cong \mathbb{C}[[x_1, y_1, y_2]]/(g_1, g_2, g_2) \cong \mathbb{C}[[y_1]] \]

Hence \( S \) has a non-isolated singularity at point \( P \).
3.2. Stability and semi-stability of non-irreducible surfaces. As the arguments of the proves are same as the previous section, we skip some similar arguments.

**Lemma 3.11.** Any surface of type $(1,0)$, $(0,1)$ and $(1,1)$ of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$ is unstable by the natural linear action of the group $G = SL(2) \times SL(3)$ on the corresponding linear system.

**Proof.** We know that $X^{ss} = \{ \emptyset \}$, when $X = \mathbb{P}^n$ and the group acting on $X$ is $SL(n+1)$ (see Example 8.1 [3]). Hence any surface $S$ either from $|(1,0)|$ or $|(0,1)|$ is unstable.

Now let $S \in |(1,1)|$, and $S = Z(f)$. Upto some suitable linear change we can always consider $f = x_0y_2 + x_1y_1$. Let $\lambda = (t^{-1}, t) \times (t^{-3}, t, t^2)$ be a 1-parameter subgroup of $G$ and $\lim_{t \to 0}\lambda(t)f = 0$. Hence $S$ is unstable. □

**Lemma 3.12.** There is no stable surface in the linear system $|(2,0)|$ and $|(0,2)|$.

**Proof.** This result will follow from the fact that the space of quadrics from $k[x_0, \cdots, x_n]_2$ has no stable points with respect to the action $SL(n+1)$ (see Example 10.1 [3]). □

Let $S_1 = Z(f_1)$ be an irreducible $(1,1)$-type surface of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$ and $i : S_1 \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$. Note that any irreducible $(1,1)$-type surface is always smooth. $p_1 : S_1 \to \mathbb{P}^1$ and $p_2 : S_1 \to \mathbb{P}^2$ are natural projection maps. Also it can be checked easily that $S_1$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{P}^2$ blown up at one point, $p_2$ is the blow-up map; and $S_1 \cong \mathbb{P}^1$, $p_1$ is the projectivization map.

Now let $Z(f_1), Z(f_2) \in |(1,1)|$ be irreducible surfaces, then $Z(f = f_1:f_2) \in |(2,2)|$. Then the singularities of $S = Z(f)$ occur along the intersection $Z(f_1) \cap Z(f_2)$. So $S_{\text{sing}} \subset S_1$ is a divisor in $S_1$ which is linearly equivalent to $i^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(1,1)$. Moreover,

$$S_{\text{sing}} \sim i^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(1,1) \sim 2p_2^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(1) - E \sim 2p_1^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1) + \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{F}_1}(1)$$

where $E$ is the exceptional curve of the blow up map $p_2$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{F}_1}(1)$ is the normalized section of $p_1$.

In the next lemma and corollary we see that when $S$ which is a union of two $(1,1)$-type surfaces, is unstable and semi-stable.

**Lemma 3.13.** Let $Z(f_1), Z(f_2) \in |(1,1)|$ be irreducible polynomials. Then $Z(f = f_1:f_2) \in |(2,2)|$. $S = Z(f)$ is unstable if and only if $Z(f_1)$ and $Z(f_2)$ have common fibres over same $P_1 \in \mathbb{P}^1$.

Moreover, $f \in h.G$ such that $h$ is a span of $M^+((-4,4)(-10,5,5)$ or $M^+((-3,3)(-2,2,4))$.

**Proof.** Let $S = Z(f) = Z(f_1f_2)$ be an unstable surface and $f_1 = x_0(\alpha_0y_0 + \alpha_1y_1 + \alpha_2y_2) + x_1(\beta_0y_0 + \beta_1y_1 + \beta_2y_2)$ and $f_2 = x_0(\gamma_0y_0 + \gamma_1y_1 + \gamma_2y_2) + x_1(\delta_0y_0 + \delta_1y_1 + \delta_2y_2)$ be two irreducible polynomials. Then

$$f = x_0^2(\alpha_0\gamma_0y_0^2 + \alpha_1\gamma_1y_1^2 + \alpha_2\gamma_2y_2^2 + (\alpha_0\gamma_0 + \alpha_1\gamma_1)y_0y_1 + (\alpha_0\gamma_2 + \alpha_2\gamma_0)y_0y_2 + (\alpha_1\gamma_2 + \alpha_2\gamma_1)y_1y_2) + x_0x_1(\alpha_0\delta_0 + \beta_0\gamma_0)y_0^2 + (\alpha_1\delta_1 + \beta_1\gamma_1)y_1^2 + (\alpha_2\delta_2 + \beta_2\gamma_2)y_2^2 + (\alpha_0\delta_1 + \alpha_1\delta_0 + \beta_0\gamma_1 + \beta_1\gamma_0)y_0y_1 + (\alpha_0\delta_2 + \alpha_2\delta_0 + \beta_0\gamma_2 + \beta_2\gamma_0)y_0y_2 + (\alpha_1\delta_2 + \alpha_2\delta_1 + \beta_1\gamma_2 + \beta_2\gamma_1)y_1y_2) + x_1^2(\beta_0\delta_0y_0^2 + \beta_1\delta_1y_1^2 + \beta_2\delta_2y_2^2 + (\beta_0\delta_1 + \beta_1\delta_0)y_0y_1 + (\beta_0\delta_2 + \beta_2\delta_0)y_0y_2 + (\beta_1\delta_2 + \beta_2\delta_1)y_1y_2)$$
As $S$ is unstable, there exists a normalized 1-parameter subgroup $\lambda(t) = \text{diag}(t^{r_0}, t^{r_1}) \times \text{diag}(t^{s_0}, t^{s_1}, t^{s_2})$ with $\lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t) = f = \lambda(0). \sum a_{\alpha \beta} x^\alpha y^\beta = 0$, i.e., $r_\alpha + s_\beta > 0$ for all $a_{\alpha \beta} \neq 0$.

Note that from Lemma 3.1 if $S$ is unstable, then the coefficients of $x_0^2 y_0^2, x_0^2 y_0 y_1, x_0^2 y_0 y_2, x_0 x_1 y_0^2$, and $x_0 x_1 y_0 y_1$ are zero. The coefficients of $x_0^2 y_0^2, x_0 y_0 = 0$. Assume $a_0 = 0$ but $r_0 \neq 0$. The coefficient of $x_0^2 y_0 y_1, a_0 y_1 + a_0 y_0 = 0$. As $r_0 \neq 0$ and $a_0 = 0, a_1 = 0$. The coefficient of $x_0 x_1 y_0^2, a_0 y_0 + b_0 y_0 = 0$. As $r_0 \neq 0$ and $a_0 = 0$, $b_0 = 0$. The coefficient of $x_0 x_1 y_0 y_1, a_0 y_1 + a_0 y_0 + b_0 y_1 + b_0 y_0 = 0$. As $r_0 \neq 0$ and $a_0 = a_1 = a_0 = 0, b_1 = 0$. Hence we have $a_0 = a_1 = b_0 = b_1 = 0$, which contradict the irreducibility of $f_1$. Hence our assumption was wrong. Then both $a_0 = r_0 = 0$. Now

$$f = x_0^2 (a_1 y_1^2 + a_2 y_2^2 + (a_0 y_1 + a_1 y_0 y_1) y_0 y_2) + x_0 x_1 \left( (a_1 y_1 + a_1 y_0 + a_1 y_0 y_1) y_0 y_1 + (a_2 y_2 + a_2 y_1) y_0 y_1 \right) + x_1^2 \left( b_0 y_0^2 + b_1 y_1 ^2 + b_2 y_2^2 + (b_0 y_1 + b_1 y_0 + b_2 y_0 y_1 + b_2 y_1 y_0) y_0 y_1 \right)$$

As the coefficient of $x_0 x_1 y_0 y_1$ is zero, $a_0 y_0 + b_0 y_1 = 0$. As $S$ is unstable, either the coefficient of $x_0^2 y_0^2$ or the coefficient of $x_1^2 y_0^2$ is zero. Then either $a_0 y_1 = 0$ or $b_0 y_0 = 0$. Combining these three equations either $a_0 = 0$ and $b_0 = 0$ or $a_0 = 0$ and $b_0 = 0$.

If $a_0 = 0$ and $b_0 = 0$, then

$$f = f_{1} f_{2} = (a_2 x_0 y_0 + x_1 (b_0 y_0 + b_1 y_1 + b_2 y_2)) \left( y_2 x_0 y_2 + x_1 (d_0 y_0 + d_1 y_1 + d_2 y_2) \right).$$

Hence $Z(f_1)$ and $Z(f_2)$ have same fibre over $[1, 0]$, which is $[1, 0] \times Z(y_2)$ and $f$ is a span of monomials of $M^+((-3, 3)(-2, -4, 2))$.

If $a_0 = 0$ and $b_0 = 0$, then

$$f = x_0 \left( a_2 y_0^2 + a_2 y_1 y_0 y_2 \right) + x_0 x_1 \left( a_2 y_2 + a_2 y_1 y_1 y_2 \right) + x_1^2 \left( b_1 y_1^2 + b_2 y_2^2 + b_1 y_1 y_0 y_1 + b_2 y_0 y_0 y_1 \right)$$

In this situation, $a_0 \neq 0$ and $b_0 \neq 0$ as $f_1$ is irreducible. Also the instability of $S$ corresponds that at least one of the coefficients of $x_0 x_1 y_0^2$ and $x_0 x_1 y_0 y_2$ is zero (from Lemma 3.1). Hence either $b_1 y_0 = 0$ or $a_2 y_0 = 0$ i.e., $b_0 = 0$ or $d_0 = 0$.

Now consider, if $a_0 = 0, b_0 = 0$ and $d_0 = 0$, then

$$f = f_{1} f_{2} = \left( a_1 x_0 y_0 + x_1 (b_0 y_0 + b_1 y_1 + b_2 y_2) \right) \left( x_0 (b_1 y_1 + b_2 y_2) + x_1 (d_1 y_1 + d_2 y_2) \right).$$

Note that $Z(f_1)$ and $Z(f_2)$ both have common section of $p_1$, which is $\mathbb{P}^1 \times [1, 0, 0] \subset \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$. Therefore $\mathbb{P}^1 \times [1, 0, 0] \subset S_{\text{sing}}$. But we observed that $S_{\text{sing}} \sim 2F + \sigma$ in $(1, 1)$-type surface $Z(f_1)$, where $F$ is fibre and $\sigma$ is the normalized section of the projectivization map. As the common section is a component of $S_{\text{sing}}$, common fibre also a component of $S_{\text{sing}}$. Moreover $f$ a is span of $M^+((-4, 4)(-10, 5, 5))$.

Now we prove converse of the proof. Let $[1, 0] \times [1, 0, 0] \in S_{\text{sing}}$. Then $f_1 = x_0 (a_1 y_1 + a_2 y_2) + x_1 (b_0 y_0 + b_1 y_1 + b_2 y_2)$ and $f_2 = x_0 (\gamma_1 y_1 + \gamma_2 y_2) + x_1 (d_0 y_0 + d_1 y_1 + d_2 y_2)$. 
Let fibres over $[1,0]$ are same in $Z(f_1)$ and $Z(f_2)$. Then

$$f = \left( \alpha_2 x_0 y_2 + x_1(\beta_0 y_0 + \beta_1 y_1 + \beta_2 y_2) \right) \left( \gamma_2 x_0 y_2 + x_1(\delta_0 y_0 + \delta_1 y_1 + \delta_2 y_2) \right)$$

Now consider the 1-parameter subgroup $\lambda(t) = (t^{-3}, t^3) \times (t^{-2}, t^{-2}, t^4)$ such that $\lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t) f = 0$.

\[ \square \]

**Corollary 3.14.** Let $Z(f_1), Z(f_2) \in \{(1,1), (2,2)\}$ be irreducible polynomials. Then $Z(f = f_1 f_2) \in \{(1,1), (2,2)\}$. If $S = Z(f)$ is not an unstable surface (i.e. each fibre over $[\alpha_0, \alpha_1] \in \mathbb{P}^1$ in $Z(f_1)$ and $Z(f_2)$ are different lines in $\mathbb{P}^2$), then it is strictly semi-stable.

Moreover, $f \in h.G$ such that $h$ is a span of $M^{\oplus}((-1,1)(-2,0,2))$ and $f$ degenerates to

$$(\alpha_2 x_0 y_2 + \beta_1 x_1 y_1)(\gamma_1 x_0 y_1 + \delta_0 x_1 y_0).$$

\[ \text{Proof.} \] Let $S = Z(f) = Z(f_1) \cup Z(f_2)$ such that $Z(f_1)$ and $Z(f_2)$ are $\mathbb{P}^2$ blow-up at $P_1$ and $P_2$ respectively. Then $\mathbb{P}^1 \times P_1$ is the exceptional curve in $Z(f_1)$. The fibres of $Z(f_2)$ over $\mathbb{P}^1$ correspond lines pass through the point $P_2$. Then there exist $Q_1 \in \mathbb{P}^1$ such that fibre over $Q_1$ is $Z(f_2)$ is the line joining $P_1$ and $P_2$ i.e., $p_1^{-1}(Q_1) = Q_1 \times L_{P_1 P_2}$. Then $Q_1 \times P_1 \in Z(f_1) \cap Z(f_2) = S_{\text{sing}}$. So without loss of generality assume that $Q_1 \times P_1 = [1,0] \times [1,0,0]$ and $\mathbb{P}^1 \times [1,0,0]$ is the exceptional curve of $Z(f_1)$. Then

$$f = f_1 f_2 = \left( \alpha_2 x_0 y_2 + x_1(\beta_1 y_1 + \beta_2 y_2) \right) \left( x_0(\gamma_1 y_1 + \gamma_2 y_2) + x_1(\delta_0 y_0 + \delta_1 y_1 + \delta_2 y_2) \right)$$

Moreover note that $f$ is generated by monomials of $M^{\oplus}((-1,1)(-2,0,2))$ and $f$ degenerates to

$$(\alpha_2 x_0 y_2 + \beta_1 x_1 y_1)(\gamma_1 x_0 y_1 + \delta_0 x_1 y_0).$$

Hence the result follows. \[ \square \]

**Proposition 3.15.** Let $S = Z(f)$ be a non-irreducible $(2,2)$-type surface and $f = f_1 f_2$, where $Z(f_1) \in \{(1,0)\}, Z(f_2) \in \{(1,2)\}$ and generic fibres of $Z(f_2)$ over $\mathbb{P}^1$ are smooth. Then $S$ is semi-stable if and only if $C = Z(f_1) \cap Z(f_2)$ is smooth.

Also $f \in h.G$ such that $h$ is generated by monomials of $M^{\oplus}((-2,2)(-1,0,1))$ and $f$ degenerates to

$x_0 x_1(\alpha_0 y_0 + \beta_0 y_1^2), \alpha \neq 0$ and $\beta \neq 0$.

\[ \text{Proof.} \] Let $f = f_1 f_2 = (\gamma_0 x_0 + \gamma_1 x_1)(x_0 y_0(y_0, y_1, y_2) + x_1 y_1(y_0, y_1, y_2))$, where $g_0 = \alpha_0 y_0^2 + \alpha_1 y_0^2 + \alpha_2 y_0^2 + \alpha_0 y_1 y_0 + \alpha_0 y_2 y_0 + \alpha_1 y_1 y_0 + \alpha_2 y_1 y_0 + g_1(y_0, y_1, y_2) = \beta_0 y_0^2 + \beta_1 y_0^2 + \beta_2 y_0^2 + \beta_0 y_1 y_0 + \beta_0 y_2 y_0 + \beta_1 y_1 y_0 + \beta_2 y_1 y_0 + \beta_2 y_2 y_0$, and are two conics.

Assume that $f$ is unstable. Then there exists a normalized 1-parameter subgroup $\lambda(t) = \text{diag}(t^0, t^1) \times \text{diag}(t^0, t^1, t^2)$ such that $\lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t) f = 0$ where $r_0 + r_1 = 0$, $r_0 \leq r_1$; $s_0 + s_1 + s_2 = 0$, $s_0 \leq s_1 \leq s_2$; and $r_0 + s_0 < 0$. We know from Lemma 3.11 that coefficients of $x_0^2 y_0^2$, $x_0^2 y_0 y_1$, and $x_0^2 y_0^2$ are zero. Hence $\alpha_0 \gamma_0 = 0$, $\alpha_1 \gamma_0 = 0$ and $\alpha_2 \gamma_0 = 0$ respectively.

If $\gamma_0 \neq 0$, then $\alpha_0 \gamma_0 = \alpha_1 \gamma_0 = 0$. Note that coefficients of $x_0 x_1 y_0^2$ and $x_0 x_1 y_0 y_1$ are also zero (from Lemma 3.11). Then $\beta_0 = \beta_1 = 0$. Also instability of $S$ implies that the coefficient of $x_0 v_1 y_0 y_2$ and $x_0 v_1 y_1^2$, and coefficient of $x_0 x_1 y_0 y_2$ and $x_0 y_1 y_2$ are not simultaneously non-zero. Therefore either $\beta_0 = 0$ or $\alpha_1 = 0$ and $\beta_1 = 0$.

If $\beta_0 = 0$, then $f = f_1 f_2 = (\gamma_0 x_0 + \gamma_1 x_1)(x_0(\alpha_1 y_0^2 + \alpha_2 y_0^2 + \alpha_1 y_1 y_0 + \alpha_2 y_1 y_0 + x_1(\beta_1 y_0^2 + \beta_2 y_0^2 + \beta_1 y_1 y_0 + \beta_1 y_1 y_0), \text{where all fibres are non-smooth.}$

If $\beta_0 \neq 0$, then $\alpha_1 = \beta_1 = 0$. Therefore $f = f_1 f_2 = (\gamma_0 x_0 + \gamma_1 x_1)(x_0(\alpha_2 y_0^2 + \alpha_1 y_1 y_0 + x_1(\beta_2 y_0^2 + \beta_2 y_0 y_2 + \beta_2 y_1 y_2), \text{where all fibres are non-smooth.}$
If \( \gamma_0 = 0 \), then with out loss of generality \( f = f_1f_2 = x_1(x_0g_0(y_0, y_1, y_2) + x_1g_1(y_0, y_1, y_2)) \). Note that coefficients of \( x_0x_1y_0^2 \) and \( x_0x_1y_0y_1 \) are also zero (from Lemma 3.1). Hence \( \alpha_{00} = 0 \) and \( \alpha_{01} = 0 \). Then \( g_0 = \alpha_{11}y_1^2 + \alpha_{22}y_2^2 + \alpha_{02}y_0y_2 + \alpha_{12}y_1y_2 \). If the coefficient of \( x_0x_1y_1^2 \), \( \alpha_{11} \neq 0 \) and the coefficient of \( x_0x_1y_0y_2, \alpha_{02} \neq 0 \), then \( s_1 > 0 \) and \( s_0 + s_2 > 0 \) respectively which are not possible simultaneously from the construction of \( \lambda \). So either \( \alpha_{11} = 0 \) or \( \alpha_{02} = 0 \) or both are zero. But for any of this cases \( g_0 \) is non-irreducible. Hence \( Z(f_1) \cap Z(f_2) = Z(g_0) \) is not smooth.

Now we prove the converse part. Let \( Z(f_1) \in |(1, 0)|, Z(f_2) \in |(1, 2)|, f = f_1f_2; C = Z(f_1) \cap Z(f_2) \). Then we prove if \( C \) is non-smooth, then \( Z(f) \) is unstable. After a suitable coordinate change, we can consider that \( f_1 = x_1 \) and \( f_2 = x_0g_0(y_0, y_1, y_2) + x_1g_1(y_0, y_1, y_2) \). We are given \( C = Z(g_0) \) is a non-smooth curve. Then after some coordinate change \( g_0(y_0, y_1, y_2) = y_2(\alpha_{02}y_0 + \alpha_{12}y_1) \) or \( g_0(y_0, y_1, y_2) = \alpha_{22}y_2^2 \) when \( g_0(y_0, y_1, y_2) \) is non-reduced or reduced polynomial respectively.

Then consider the 1-parameter subgroup \( \lambda(t) = (t^{-3}, t^3) \times (t^{-2}, t^{-2}, t^4) \) such that \( \lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t)f = 0 \) and \( f \) is unstable. Hence we complete the proof of the first part of the proposition.

Let \( f \) be a semi-stable polynomial. Now if \( g_1 \) is irreducible, then after some coordinate change \( g_0 = \alpha_{11}y_1^2 + \alpha_{02}y_0y_2 \), where \( \alpha_{11} \neq 0 \) and \( \alpha_{02} \neq 0 \), and \( f = f_1f_2 = x_1(x_0(\alpha_{11}y_1^2 + \alpha_{02}y_0y_2) + x_1g_1(y_0, y_1, y_2)) \).

Let us consider the 1-parameter subgroup \( \text{diag}(t^{-2}, t^2) \times \text{diag}(t^{-1}, t^0, t) \) and \( \lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t)f = x_1x_0(\alpha_{11}y_1^2 + \alpha_{02}y_0y_2) \). Therefore \( Z(f) \) is a strictly semi-stable surface.

In the following theorem we calculate all non-irreducible semi-stable \((2, 2)\)-type surfaces. We see that non-irreducible surfaces never be stable. Also all strictly semi-stable surfaces are either surfaces described in Corollary 3.14 or surfaces of Proposition 3.15.

**Theorem 3.16.** Let \( S = Z(f) \) be a non-irreducible \((2, 2)\)-type surface of \( \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \). Then \( S \) never be a stable surface.

\( S \) is strictly semi-stable if and only if one of the following holds:

1. \( f = f_1f_2 \), where \( Z(f_1) \in |(1, 0)|, Z(f_2) \in |(1, 2)| \) and generic fibres of \( Z(f) \) over \( \mathbb{P}^1 \) are smooth. Then \( S \) is semi-stable if and only if \( C = Z(f_1) \cap Z(f_2) \) is smooth. Also \( f \) degenerates to \( x_0x_1(\alpha_0y_0y_2 + \beta y_1^2), \alpha \neq 0 \) and \( \beta \neq 0 \); or
2. \( f = f_1f_2, Z(f_1) \in |(1, 1)| \) and \( Z(f_2) \in |(1, 1)| \). Moreover each fibre over \([\alpha_0, \alpha_1] \in \mathbb{P}^1 \) in \( Z(f_1) \) and \( Z(f_2) \) are different lines in \( \mathbb{P}^2 \) and \( f \) degenerates to \((\alpha_2x_0y_2 + \beta_1x_1y_1)(\gamma_1x_0y_1 + \delta_0x_1y_0)\).

**Proof.** Let \( S = Z(f) \) be a non-irreducible \((2, 2)\) type surface of \( \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \). Then \( f = f_1f_2 \) where either \( Z(f_1) \in |(1, 0)| \) and \( Z(f_2) \in |(1, 2)| \); or \( Z(f_1) \in |(2, 0)| \) and \( Z(f_2) \in |(0, 2)| \); or \( Z(f_1) \in |(1, 1)| \) and \( Z(f_2) \in |(1, 1)| \); or \( Z(f_1) \in |(2, 1)| \) and \( Z(f_2) \in |(0, 1)| \).

**Case-1:** \( Z(f_1) \in |(1, 0)| \) and \( Z(f_2) \in |(1, 2)| \). This case is studied in Proposition 3.15 which correspond strictly semi-stable surfaces of (2) in this theorem.

**Case-2:** \( Z(f_1) \in |(2, 0)| \) and \( Z(f_2) \in |(0, 2)| \). After some coordinate change \( f_1 \) is either \( x_0x_1 \) or \( x_1^2 \) when \( f_1 \) is non-reduced and reduced respectively. Up to some coordinate change \( f_2 \) is either \( a_{02}y_0y_2 + a_{11}y_1^2 \) or \( y_2(a_{02}y_0 + a_{12}y_1) \) or \( a_{22}y_2^2 \) when \( f_2 \) is irreducible, non-reduced and reduced respectively.
If \( f_1 \) is reduced then \( f \) is unstable and the 1-parameter subgroup \( \lambda(t) = (t^{-3}, t^3) \times (t^{-2}, t^{-2}, t^4) \) is responsible for the instability of \( f \). If \( f_2 \) is not irreducible then \( f \) is unstable and the 1-parameter subgroup \( \lambda(t) = (t^{-3}, t^3) \times (t^{-2}, t^{-2}, t^4) \) is responsible for the instability of \( f \).

Now if \( f = x_0^2(x_1(a_{02}y_0 + a_{11}y_1^2)) \) then from Case-1 \( f \) is strictly semi-stable.

**Case-3:** \( Z(f_1) \in (1,1) \) and \( Z(f_2) \in (1,1) \), where \( f_1 \) and \( f_2 \) are irreducible.

This case follows from Lemma 3.13 and Corollary 3.14 which correspond strictly semi-stable surfaces of \( 1 \) in this theorem.

**Case-4:** \( f_1 \in (2,1) \) and \( f_2 \in (0,1) \)

Performing some linear changes, \( f = y_2(y_2x_0x_1 + y_1g_1(x_0, x_1) + y_2g_2(x_0, x_1)) \). Consider the 1-parameter subgroup \( \lambda(t) = (t^{-1}, t) \times (t^{-3}, t^{-1}, t^4) \) such that \( \lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t)f = 0 \). Hence \( f \) is unstable.

**Remark 3.17.** Let \( S = Z(h) \) be an unstable \((2,2)\)-type surface. Then from Remark 3.16 and Theorem 3.16, there exists \( f \in h.G \) such that \( f \) is a span of \( M^+((-3,3)(-2,-2,4)) \), or \( M^+((-4,4)(-10,5,5)) \) or \( M^+((-1,1)(-3,-1,4)) \), or \( M^+((-2,2)(-5,-1,6)) \) which are distinct subsets of \( M \).

**Remark 3.18.** Let \( S = Z(h) \) be a strictly semi-stable \((2,2)\)-type surface. Then from Remark 3.16 and Theorem 3.16 (or Corollary 3.14 and Proposition 3.15), there exists \( f \in h.G \) such that \( f \) is span of \( M^\oplus((0,0)(-1,0,1)) \), or \( M^\oplus((-1,1)(-2,0,2)) \), or \( M^\oplus((-1,1)(-1,0,1)) \) or \( M^\oplus((-2,2)(-1,0,1)) \). Note that these are distinct subsets of \( M \).

### 3.3. Compactification of the moduli space

Let us denote \( |(2,2)|^s \) (resp. \( |(2,2)|^{ss} \)) as the set of stable (resp. semi-stable) \((2,2)\)-type surfaces by the \( G = \text{SL}(2) \times \text{SL}(3) \) action. \( |(2,2)|^s/G \) is called the moduli of \((2,2)\) surface and \( |(2,2)|^{ss}/G \) is its natural compactification which is also a projection space. Due to Theorem 2.25, the categorical quotient

\[ |(2,2)|^{ss}/G \cong \text{Proj}(R^G) \]

where \( R = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} H^0(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}_n(n)) \) and the geometric quotient \( |(2,2)|^s/G \) is an open subset of \( \text{Proj}(R^G) \). As the orbit of the strictly semi-stable surfaces are in the boundary of the compactification, maximal elements of sets \( M^\oplus((r_0, r_1)(s_0, s_1, s_2)) \) (see Remark 3.18) correspond boundary elements. In the next theorem, we explicitly write boundary elements of this compactification.

**Theorem 3.19.** The closed subset \(|(2,2)|^{ss}/G\backslash|(2,2)|^s/G\) consists of the images of following points of \(|(2,2)|\) in \(|(2,2)|^{ss}/G\):

\[
Z(f_1) = Z(x_0^2(a_{11}y_1^2 + a_{02}y_0y_2) + x_0x_1(b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{02}y_0y_2) + x_1^2(c_{11}y_1^2 + c_{02}y_0y_2)) \text{ where } a_{11} \neq 0, b_{02} \neq 0 \text{ and either } c_{02} \neq 0 \text{ or } c_{11} \neq 0.
\]

\[
Z(f_2) = Z(a_{22}x_0^2y_0y_2 + x_0x_1(b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{02}y_0y_2) + c_{02}x_1^2y_0^2) \text{ where } a_{22} \neq 0, b_{11} \neq 0 \text{ and } c_{02} \neq 0.
\]

\[
Z(f_3) = Z(a_{12}x_0^2y_0y_2 + x_0x_1(b_{11}y_1^2 + b_{02}y_0y_2) + c_{01}x_1^2y_0y_1) \text{ where } a_{12} \neq 0, b_{02} \neq 0 \text{ and } c_{01} \neq 0.
\]

\[
Z(f_4) = Z(x_1x_0(b_{02}y_0y_2 + b_{11}y_1^2)) \text{ where } b_{02} \neq 0 \text{ and } b_{11} \neq 0.
\]

Moreover, if \( Z(h) \) is a strictly semi-stable surface, then there is a \( f \in h.G \) such that \( f \) is a span of either \( M^\oplus((0,0)(-1,0,1)) \), or \( M^\oplus((-1,1)(-1,0,1)) \), or \( M^\oplus((-1,1)(-2,0,2)) \), or \( M^\oplus((-2,2)(-1,0,1)) \).
Proof. We know that if two orbit closure of two distinct points meet then their images in the quotient space are same (see Lemma 2.3). Then this result follows from Theorem 3.9, Theorem 3.16 and Remark 3.18. □
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