Overview of topological properties of real algebraic surfaces

Viatcheslav Kharlamov

arXiv:math/0502127v2 [math.AG] 3 Jul 2005

Abstract

These notes reproduce the content of a short, 50-minutes, survey talk given at the Nice University in September, 2004. We added a few topics that have not been touched on in the lecture by lack of time.

1 Introduction

Topology of real algebraic varieties is a broad subject. Thus, it is reasonable to specify the "level" of objects and the goal of study. In what concerns the level, one may distinguish between affine, projective and abstract varieties, and, from a certain point of view, it is natural to start with abstract varieties, and then descend to projective and affine ones. As to the goal, I'll give preference to those "real results" that require "complex proofs" (even though in what follows the proofs will almost always stay behind the scenes) and, moreover, admit "complex statements".

Another major, and traditional, simplification is to consider **nonsingular** varieties, at least at the first stage. Certainly, a complete separation from the singular world is never possible. However, de facto, in all the cases when a complete understanding was achieved in the nonsingular case, it turned out that the singular case could be treated, at least in principle, by similar methods.

In such a setting, it is natural to consider not only algebraic, but arbitrary Kähler compact complex manifolds, and to call a complex manifold X *real*, if it can be equipped with a *real structure*, that is an anti-holomorphic involution $c : X \to X$. Real points are then, by definition, the fixed points of the real structure. We denote by $X_{\mathbb{R}}$ the set of real points, or the *real part*, of X. For the sake of symmetry, we often denote X by $X_{\mathbb{C}}$.

Of course, the principal source of examples is given by nonsingular varieties defined by systems of real polynomial equations; in these c is the complex conjugation. Note that by our convention a real variety is nonsingular if it does not have singular points, be they real or imaginary.

variety together with real structure. As usual, by an *elementary real deformation* of a real variety we mean a smooth, differentially locally trivial, family of real varieties (say, an equivariant deformation in the sense of Kodaira-Spencer). Two real varieties are called real deformation equivalent if there exists a chain of elementary deformations connecting them. *Topology of the real part and that of the real structure are preserved under deformation.* This phenomenon is one of the main motivations for the study of topological properties of real varieties. Note in advance that in many important cases the topology of real structure (which includes, in fact, the topology of real part) determines the deformation class.

A fundamental example of deformation is a small variation of a nonsingular system of polynomial equations (that is, a system whose Jacobian has maximal rank at each solution of the system) or, more generally, any variation which is represented in the total space of systems of a given number of equations (equal to the codimension of variety) of a given degree in a given number of variables by a smooth path in the complement of the discriminant locus, that is a smooth path avoiding singular systems. However, other deformations may exist as well; thus, surfaces of degree ≥ 5 in $\mathbb{P}^3$ have big deformations failing to be embedded in $\mathbb{P}^3$ while surfaces of degree 4 have small Kähler deformations failing to be projective. By contrast, any deformation of a surface of degree 3 is realized in $\mathbb{P}^3$.

Our choice of surfaces as the topic of this talk is motivated by the fact that this is the first nontrivial case with respect to the above equivalence relations. In fact, in dimension zero the topology is determined by the natural number $b_0(X_{\mathbb{R}})$ satisfying the following relations

$$b_0(X_{\mathbb{R}}) \leq b_0(X_{\mathbb{C}}), \quad b_0(X_{\mathbb{R}}) = b_0(X_{\mathbb{C}}) \mod 2 \tag{1}$$

(here and in what follows $b_i(\cdot)$ denotes the rank of $H_i(\cdot\,;\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})$, so that b_0 is nothing but the number of connected components). Similarly, in dimension one everything is determined by the number $b_0(X_{\mathbb{R}})$ (or, equivalently, by $b_1(X_{\mathbb{R}}) = b_0(X_{\mathbb{R}})$), and the only relations linking this number with the invariants of $X_{\mathbb{C}}$ are as follows:

$$b_0(X_{\mathbb{R}}) \leq g(X_{\mathbb{C}}) + 1, \quad \text{and} \quad b_0(X_{\mathbb{R}}) = g(X_{\mathbb{C}}) + 1 \bmod 2 \text{ *if* } X_{\mathbb{R}} \text{ *divides* } X_{\mathbb{C}}. \tag{2}$$

Here, g is the usual genus, $g(X_{\mathbb{C}}) = \frac{1}{2}b_1(X_{\mathbb{C}})$ if X is irreducible; otherwise, $g(X_{\mathbb{C}})+1$ is the sum of $g+1$ over all irreducible components. The condition that $X_{\mathbb{R}}$ divides $X_{\mathbb{C}}$ is equivalent to the orientability of the quotient $X_{\mathbb{C}}/c$. The above relations demonstrate a general phenomenon: $\mathrm{Top}(X_{\mathbb{R}}) \leq \mathrm{Top}(X_{\mathbb{C}})$ (the topology of a real variety is bounded by that of its complexification).

Moreover, in dimensions less than two topology, and even homology determines the deformation equivalence classes: $\mathrm{Top}(X_{\mathbb{C}}) = \mathrm{Def}(X_{\mathbb{C}})$ over $\mathbb{C}$ and $\mathrm{Top}(X_{\mathbb{C}}, c) = \mathrm{Top}(X_{\mathbb{C}}, X_{\mathbb{R}}) = \mathrm{Def}(X_{\mathbb{C}}, c)$ over $\mathbb{R}$. For example, two real irreducible curves are deformation equivalent, if and only if they have the same number of real components,

An advantage of dimension two is that algebraic topology still suffices to determine $\operatorname{Top} X_{\mathbb{R}}$, which is no more the case in dimensions ≥ 3 (that is why the dimensions ≥ 3 are still very far from being well understood; cf., however, J. Kollár's papers [13, 14] and references in [11] for some nontrivial partial results).

Many of the tools used in dimension ≤ 2 can be extended to higher dimensions, and when consideration of higher dimensions does not lead to complications we present our results in full generality.

For lack of time, we do not discuss arrangements of curves on surfaces, construction of surfaces (and curves on surfaces) with prescribed topology, or enumerative results. We also will not have time to discuss history of the subject, but it is worth mentioning that many of the results presented below emerged due to collective efforts of many insiders (in particular, a group of Russian mathematicians inspired by I. G. Petrovsky and V. I. Arnol'd in Moscow, D. A. Gudkov in the former Gor'kii, and V. A. Rokhlin in the former Leningrad; the author gratefully dedicates these notes to the memory of the latter). A reader interested to know better who, when and how discovered these results is invited to consult [5] and the references therein.

2 Topology of real varieties versus topology of their complexifications

2.1 Smith theory

Smith theory provides the following relations valid for all dimensions:

$$\sum b_i(X_{\mathbb{R}}) \leq \sum b_i(X_{\mathbb{C}}), \quad \sum b_i(X_{\mathbb{R}}) = \sum b_i(X_{\mathbb{C}}) \mod 2, \tag{3}$$

where $b_i(\cdot) = \dim H_i(\cdot\,; \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})$. Behind these relations there are such useful tools as Smith's exact sequence and Kalinin's spectral sequence, see, for example, [5]. The latter starts with

$$E^1_* = H_*(X_{\mathbb{C}}; \mathbb{Z}/2\,\mathbb{Z}), \quad E^2_* = \operatorname{Ker}(1 + c_*)/\operatorname{Im}(1 + c_*),$$

and converges to $H_*(X_{\mathbb{R}}; \mathbb{Z}/2\,\mathbb{Z})$ (here and in what follows c_* states for the homomorphism $H_*(X_{\mathbb{C}}; \mathbb{Z}/2\,\mathbb{Z}) \to H_*(X_{\mathbb{C}}; \mathbb{Z}/2\,\mathbb{Z})$ induced by the real structure $c : X_{\mathbb{C}} \to X_{\mathbb{C}}$). Already the existence of such a spectral sequence implies (3). According to the above formula for E^2_*, there is a "stronger" inequality

$$\sum b_i(X_{\mathbb{R}}) \leq \dim H_1(\mathbb{Z}/2\,\mathbb{Z}, H_*(X_{\mathbb{C}}; \mathbb{Z}/2\,\mathbb{Z})), \tag{4}$$

where $H_1(\mathbb{Z}/2\,\mathbb{Z}, H_*(X_{\mathbb{C}}; \mathbb{Z}/2\,\mathbb{Z})) = \operatorname{Ker}(1 + c_*)/\operatorname{Im}(1 + c_*)$.

There are two important classes of real varieties enjoying special features, viz.

invariant cycles in any homology class in $H_*(X_{\mathbb{C}};\mathbb{Z}/2\,\mathbb{Z})$); here M stands for "maximal";

- and *GM-varieties*, i.e. varieties for which $E_*^2 = H_*(X_{\mathbb{R}};\mathbb{Z}/2\,\mathbb{Z})$ (the extremal case of (4), which is equivalent to the existence of c-invariant cycles in any of the classes in $H_*(X_{\mathbb{C}};\mathbb{Z}/2\,\mathbb{Z})$ fixed by c_*; note that all real surfaces with $\pi_1(X_{\mathbb{C}}) = 1$ are GM); here GM stands for "Galois maximal".

In dimensions 0 and 1 the relations (3) yield (1) and (2), except for the congruence in (2) which is a mod 4 relation for $\sum b_i$. The latter can be generalized in the following way: *if X is a GM-variety of odd dimension,* $\dim X = 2k+1$*, and $X_{\mathbb{R}}$ is homologous to* 0 *in $X_{\mathbb{C}}$, then*

$$\frac{1}{2}\sum b_i(X_{\mathbb{R}}) = \frac{1}{2}\sum b_i(X_{\mathbb{C}}) \mod 2.$$

Note that both parts of the above congruence are integers. Since $X_{\mathbb{R}} \sim 0$, for any $x \in H_{2k+1}(X_{\mathbb{C}};\mathbb{Z}/2)$ one has

$$(x, c_*x) = (x, [X_{\mathbb{R}}]) = 0 \mod 2,$$

which implies that, besides the summands with constant action of c, any irreducible orthogonal decomposition of $c_* : H_*(X_{\mathbb{C}};\mathbb{Z}/2) \to H_*(X_{\mathbb{C}};\mathbb{Z}/2)$ contains only irreducible components of rank 4 (each such component is a permutation of two $\mathbb{Z}/2\,\mathbb{Z}$-planes). Thus,

$$\sum b_i(X_{\mathbb{R}}) = \dim \mathrm{Ker}(1+c_*)/\,\mathrm{Im}(1+c_*) = \sum b_i(X_{\mathbb{C}}) - 4p,$$

where p is the number of the above irreducible components of rank 4.

Smith theory helps to answer the following questions: *Is $X_{\mathbb{R}}$ non empty (existence of real solutions)? How many connected components does it have?* and, more generally, *What are the possible values of $b_i(X_{\mathbb{R}})$?*

Already the congruence part of (3) gives a simple, often useful, sufficient condition: *$X_{\mathbb{R}}$ is non-empty, if $\sum b_*(X_{\mathbb{C}})$ is odd.* Note that this condition does not depend on the choice of real structure.

Smith theory is not well adapted to work with individual Betti numbers, and so in dimensions > 2 it is hard to get more information and to answer the other questions using Smith theory alone. Hopefully, in dimension 2 it is sufficient to perform homological calculations in Kalinin's spectral sequence (or in Smith's exact sequence) and to add the information coming from the Lefschetz trace formula. In particular, in the case of real surfaces with $\pi_1(X_{\mathbb{C}}) = 1$ we get the following formulae:

$$b_0(X_{\mathbb{R}}) = \frac{1}{2}(\sum b_i(X_{\mathbb{C}}) - b_2^{-1} - a),$$

where $b_2^{\pm 1}$ are the dimensions of the eighenspaces of the involution

$$c_* : H_2(X_{\mathbb{C}}; \mathbb{R}) \to H_2(X_{\mathbb{C}}; \mathbb{R}),$$

and a is the number of nontrivial components in an irreducible $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$-vector space decomposition of $c_* : H_*(X_{\mathbb{C}}; \mathbb{Z}/2) \to H_*(X_{\mathbb{C}}; \mathbb{Z}/2)$ (each such component is generated by two elements permuted by c_*).

We recall that the above definition of GM-variety is equivalent to the existence of an equivariant cycle in each invariant $\mathbb{Z}/2\,\mathbb{Z}$-homology class, and the definition of M-variety is equivalent to the existence of an equivariant cycle in each $\mathbb{Z}/2\,\mathbb{Z}$-homology class. The latter happens, for example, if all $\mathbb{Z}/2\,\mathbb{Z}$-homology classes of $X_{\mathbb{C}}$ are algebraic and have a real representative. This is the case for projective spaces and Grassmann varieties equipped with their tautological real structures. Many other special varieties also have this maximality property. An important class of varieties for which the maximality question is open is provided by the discriminants of polynomials in three or more (homogeneous) variables. For three variables, this reduces to the question of maximality of the space of all singular plane curves of a given degree. In degrees 1, 2, and 3 discriminant is indeed an M-variety, as can be verified by a more or less straightforward calculation using the Alexander-Pontryagin duality (one should first compute the Betti numbers of the space of nonsingular curves). But already in degree 4, the question is open.

The relations (3) apply, in fact, to any finite-dimensional space with involution, and, in particular, to singular varieties. In many cases, for example in the case of projective hypersurfaces, the corresponding upper bounds are the best known one. These relations can also be applied to semi-algebraic sets; to do this, it suffices to replace such a set by its tubular neighborhood and then apply (3) to its boundary, which is a hypersurface. Y. Laszlo and C. Viterbo [15] recently addressed the following question: how to bound the total Betti number of a nonsingular real projective variety X in terms of its degree d and dimension n. Combining (3) with some inequalities due to Demailly-Peternell-Schneider they proved that

$$\sum b_i(X_{\mathbb{R}}) \leq 2^{n^2+2} d^{n+1}, \tag{5}$$

while all the previously known estimates (like those of R. Thom [20] and J. Milnor [17]) were of the type

$$\sum b_i(X_{\mathbb{R}}) \leq C d^{2n+1}. \tag{6}$$

Using Lefschetz pencil, resp. Morse function type arguments applied to $X_{\mathbb{C}}$, resp. $X_{\mathbb{R}}$, one can improve the leading coefficient in the Laszlo-Viterbo bound and get

$$\sum b_i(X_{\mathbb{R}}) \leq d^{n+1} + O(d^n), \quad \sum b_i(X_{\mathbb{C}}) \leq d^{n+1} + O(d^n) \tag{7}$$

(without appealing to Demailly-Peternell-Schneider inequalities). What is an optimal choice of $O(d^n)$? I do not know. At least,

$$\sum b_i(X_{\mathbb{R}}) \leq \sum b_i(X_{\mathbb{C}}) \leq d^{n+1} \quad \text{if} \quad d > 1, \tag{8}$$

nonsingular hypersurface in $\mathbb{CP}^{n+1}$ (cf. (12) for the case $n = 2$). The key point in the proof of (7) and (8) is a similar bound,

$$d^* \leq d(d-1)^n = d^{n+1} + O(d^n), \tag{9}$$

for the degree d^* of the variety X^* projectively dual to X (I am grateful to F. Zak who explained me how such a general bound for d^* is deduced from the, classical, computation of d^* in the special case of hypersurfaces; he also proposed to replace $O(d^n)$ by 0 in (7)). Indeed, the number of singular fibers of the pencil of hyperplane sections of $X_{\mathbb{C}}$ and, respectively, the number of singular values of the linear Morse function on an affine part of $X_{\mathbb{R}}$ are bounded by d^*, so that an induction on the dimension n of $X_{\mathbb{R}}$ gives a sequence $x_n = \sum b_i(X_{\mathbb{R}})$ (resp. $y_n = \sum b_i(X_{\mathbb{C}})$) with the property

$$x_n - 2x_{n-1} + x_{n-2} \leq d^* \quad \text{(respectively} \quad y_n - 2y_{n-1} + y_{n-2} \leq d^*)$$

(here $X = X_n, X_{n-1}, \ldots, X_0$ is the sequence formed by X and its consecutive hyperplane sections). Combined with (9), this yields (7). For $d > 2$ and $n > 2$ the bound (8) follows from the inequalities $y_n \leq d^* + 2y_{n-1} \leq d(d-1)^n + 2d^n \leq d^{n+1}$, and if $d = 2$ or $n = 1, 2$, then it is easy to prove the bound by an ad hoc argument.

Returning to the Smith bound, let us forewarn that it is impossible in general to replace $b_i(\cdot) = \dim H_*(\cdot\,; \mathbb{Z}/2\,\mathbb{Z})$ in the inequality (3) by the ordinary Betti numbers $\beta_i(\cdot) = \dim H_*(\cdot\,; \mathbb{Q})$. For example, there exist real Enriques surfaces X with the real part consisting of two real components, one homeomorphic to a torus and another to a connected sum of 10 real projective planes, while for such real surface $\dim H_*(X_{\mathbb{C}}; \mathbb{Q}) = 12 < 14 = \dim H_*(X_{\mathbb{R}}; \mathbb{Q})$.

2.2 Higher order congruences

Higher order congruences can be found basing on Smith theory and arithmetic of integral quadratic forms. Here is a typical example: *if* $\dim X = 2k$ *and* $X_{\mathbb{R}}$ *is* $\mathbb{Z}/2$*-homologous to the middle dimensional Wu class of* $X_{\mathbb{C}}$*, then*

$$\chi(X_{\mathbb{R}}) = \sigma(X_{\mathbb{C}}) \mod 8$$

(here χ is the Euler characteristic and σ is the signature). Its one-line proof given below is a model for finding other higher order congruences. It is based on the Lagrangian property of the real part and the Lefschetz-Hirzebruch signature formula:

$$\chi(X_{\mathbb{R}}) = (-1)^k \sigma(c) =_8 (-1)^k (\mathrm{Wu}_c, c\,\mathrm{Wu}_c) =$$

$$(-1)^k (\mathrm{Wu}_X, c\,\mathrm{Wu}_X) = (\mathrm{Wu}_X, \mathrm{Wu}_X) =_8 \sigma(X_{\mathbb{C}})$$

(here Wu_c is the Wu integral characteristic class of the quadratic form (x, cy) on $H_{2k}(X_{\mathbb{C}}, \mathbb{Z})/\mathrm{Tors}$, $\sigma(c)$ is its signature, Wu_X is an integral algebraic representative of

explicit computation of $\sigma(X_{\mathbb{C}})$ (see, for example, [5] and references therein).

There is a series of congruences refining the above one (see, for example, [5] and references therein); the two simplest of them are as follows:

if $\dim X = 2k$ *and* $X_{\mathbb{R}}$ *is a* M*-variety, then*

$$\chi(X_{\mathbb{R}}) = \sigma(X_{\mathbb{C}}) \mod 16;$$

if $\dim X = 2k$ *and* $X_{\mathbb{R}}$ *is a* $(M-1)$*-variety, then*

$$\chi(X_{\mathbb{R}}) = \sigma(X_{\mathbb{C}}) \pm 2 \mod 16.$$

Note that $\sigma(X_{\mathbb{C}}) = (-1)^k \chi(X_{\mathbb{C}}) \mod 4$ (which most easily can be seen from the Hodge decomposition), which yields an analog of congruence (2) in even dimensions:

$\chi(X_{\mathbb{R}}) = (-1)^k \chi(X_{\mathbb{C}}) \mod 4$ *if* $X_{\mathbb{R}}$ *is* $\mathbb{Z}/2$*-homologous to the middle dimensional Wu class of* $X_{\mathbb{C}}$.

2.3 An application of Hodge theory and some other inequalities

As is shown in [7], from the Hodge decomposition and the Lefschetz formula it follows that

$$|\chi(X_{\mathbb{R}}) - 1| \leq h^{k,k}(X_{\mathbb{C}}) - 1 \quad \textit{if} \quad \dim X = 2k \tag{10}$$

(where $h^{k,k}$ is the Hodge number of bidegree (k,k); various explicit computations of the Hodge numbers are found in [5]; an expression for $h^{1,1}$ in the case of surfaces in 3-space is given below in (13)). See [8, 9, 5] and references therein for an odd-dimensional version of this Comessatti-Petrovskii type inequality and for generalizations to varieties with singularities (naturally, in the singular case pure Hodge structure is to be replaced by mixed one). It would certainly be nice to find other applications of Hodge theory giving more detailed information than (10). Especially challenging is to somehow relate Hodge theory with Smith theory.

Let me indicate here only a very special amusing application of (10) to the case of odd dimension. It concerns plane curves, and, more specifically, line arrangements. We consider a generic configuration of $2k$ real lines in the projective plane. The number of connected components, called cells, of the complement of the arrangement is equal then to $2k^2 - k + 1$. Since the number of lines is real, the cells can be chessboard colored, and an application of (10) shows that an upper bound for the number of projective cells of one color is $\frac{3}{2}k(k-1)+1$, so that a bound from below for the other color is given by $\frac{1}{2}k(k+1)$.

More special inequalities, not directly related to Hodge theory, can be obtained using the Lagrangian property of $X_{\mathbb{R}}$. Thus, in the case of surfaces one can easily show that

$$p_- \le \frac{1}{2}(\sigma^+(X_{\mathbb{C}}) - 1)$$

(*where* σ^+ *is the positive index of inertia of the intersection form*).

Note also that in the case of surfaces the inequality (10) can be extended to non-Kähler surfaces in the form

$$2 - \dim H^2(X_{\mathbb{C}};\mathbb{R}) + 2h^{2,0}(X_{\mathbb{C}}) \le \chi(X_{\mathbb{R}}) \le 4 + \dim H^2(X_{\mathbb{C}};\mathbb{R}) - 2h^{2,0}(X_{\mathbb{C}}),$$

which is weaker than (10), but differs from it only by 4 in the left- and right-hand parts. This difference is due to the absence of a Kähler class in H^2 and the asymmetry $H^{1,0} = H^{0,1} - 1$ in H^1.

It would be interesting to find analogs of (10) for the signature $\sigma(X_{\mathbb{R}})$ instead of $\chi(X_{\mathbb{R}})$, of course under the hypothesis that $X_{\mathbb{R}}$ is orientable. The best bound known to me does not involve Hodge theory. It says that

$$|\,\sigma(X_{\mathbb{R}})| \le \frac{1}{3}\,c_2^2(X_{\mathbb{C}}), \tag{11}$$

and follows directly from evaluating an algebraic representative of the second Chern class of $X_{\mathbb{C}}$ on $X_{\mathbb{R}}$, viz. $\mathrm{inj}_*\, c_2(X_{\mathbb{C}}) \cap [X_{\mathbb{R}}] = p_1(X_{\mathbb{R}}) \cap [X_{\mathbb{R}}] = 3\sigma(X_{\mathbb{R}})$. This bound holds under an additional hypothesis that the tangent, or cotangent, or some other vector bundle of $X_{\mathbb{C}}$ with the same c_2 is generated by its sections (this moving condition allows to put an algebraic representative of the second Chern class in a general position with respect to $X_{\mathbb{R}}$ and thus to get (11)). More general and considerably more subtle bounds for arbitrary Pontryagin numbers can be found in a recent paper by Y. Laszlo and C. Viterbo [15].

2.4 Special surfaces

The above tools allow to understand thoroughly the topology of $X_{\mathbb{R}}$ for many special types of surfaces. For example, they lead to a complete topological classification of $X_{\mathbb{R}}$, and even of $(X_{\mathbb{C}}, c)$, for cubic and quartic surfaces in $\mathbb{P}^3$. We describe it in terms of generators: each topological type generates a list of its Morse simplifications, that is the topological types obtained from the initial one by series of Morse surgeries decreasing the total Betti number (removing a spherical component or contracting a handle).

There are 5 *classes of nonsingular cubics generated by* $\#_7\mathbb{R}P^2$ *and* $\mathbb{R}P^2 \sqcup S^2$ (here and in what follows # stands for a connected and $\sqcup$ for a disjoint sum)*, and* 66 *classes of nonsingular quartics generated by three* M-surfaces $\#_{10}(S^1 \times S^1) \sqcup S^2$, $\#_6(S^1 \times S^1) \sqcup 5S^2$, $\#_2(S^1 \times S^1) \sqcup 9S^2$, *two* $(M-2)$-surfaces $\#_7(S^1 \times S^1) \sqcup 2S^2$, $\#_3(S^1 \times S^1) \sqcup 6S^2$, *and a* pair of tori $2(S^1 \times S^1)$.

Surfaces in $\mathbb{R}P^3$ can also be studied up to different equivalence relations, such as: *ambient isotopy in* $\mathbb{R}P^3$, *rigid isotopy* (i.e., isotopy in the class of nonsingular or,

The difference between the last two relations is due to the fact that the group $PGL(4;\mathbb{R})$ of projective transformations of $\mathbb{R}P^3$ has two connected components. Of course, the transformations in the component of unity transform a surface into a rigidly isotopic one. To what extent the classifications up to rigid isotopies and up to rough projective equivalence are topological is an open question for surfaces of degree 5 and higher, cf. the discussion in 3.1.

Topologically, the non-spherical component of the real part of a nonsingular cubic surface is embedded in $\mathbb{R}P^3$ as the standard $\mathbb{R}P^2$ with unlinked and unknotted handles attached. Moreover, for cubic surfaces not only the isotopy equivalence relation, but all the other relations mentioned above coincide with the purely topological one.

The embedding of quartic in $\mathbb{R}P^3$ is also simple: it is isotopic to a union of ellipsoids and hyperboloids with unknotted and unlinked handles. With one exception, the components are outside each other; in the exceptional case the real part consists of two nested spheres. In all other cases the isotopy type of the real part $X_\mathbb{R}$ of a real quartic surface in $\mathbb{R}P^3$ is determined by its topological type and contractibility or noncontractibility of $X_\mathbb{R}$ in $\mathbb{R}P^3$. It turns out that in the case of degree 4 surfaces all the four classifications (topological, isotopic, rough projective, and rigid) are different. Note that the only difference between rough projective equivalence and rigid isotopy is in chirality which tells whether or not a surface is rigidly isotopic to its mirror image. Rough projective equivalence is discussed in [19] and chirality in [10].

Any nonsingular degree 4 surface in P^3 is a $K3$-*surface*, that is a compact complex surface with $\pi_1 = 1$ and $c_1 = 0$. Other examples of $K3$-surfaces are given by double coverings of a nonsingular quadric in P^3 branched in a transverse section by a quartic, by double coverings of a nonsingular cubic in P^3 branched in a transverse section by a quadric, by transverse intersections of three quadrics in P^5, etc. Classification of all the real projective $K3$-surfaces up to rough projective equivalence can also be found in [19].

The methods used in the study of real $K3$-surfaces are based on the above tools, including Hodge theory, as well as the Torelli theorem which plays a key role. In what concerns rigid isotopies and rough projective equivalence, using the surjectivity of the period map, one can reduce the study of real structures to a study of arithmetic properties of integral lattices. Similar methods can be used to study $K3$-surfaces with simple singularities, but this problem has never been treated systematically.

Starting with degree 5, our knowledge is much more limited. It is not even known what are the extremal values of the Betti numbers of nonsingular quintics. We only know that the maximal number of connected components is somewhere in between 23 and 25 and that the maximal first $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$-Betti number is either 45 or 47 (for the surfaces in the same deformation class one has $\max b_1 = 47$). The best known general bounds for the Betti numbers are those given by the inequalities described in the previous sections. For a surface in $\mathbb{P}^3$ and, more generally, for a transversal complete intersection X in $\mathbb{P}^q$, the complex ingredients of these bounds can easily

$$b_1(X) = 0, \qquad b_2(X) = \chi(X) - 2,$$

$$h^{1,1}(X) = \frac{1}{2}[b_2(X) - \sigma(X)] + 1$$

$$\chi(X) = \mu_{q-2}\left(\mu_1^2 - \mu_2 - (q+1)\mu_1 + \tfrac{1}{2}q(q+1)\right),$$

$$\sigma(X) = -\tfrac{1}{3}\mu_{q-2}(\mu_1^2 - 2\mu_2 - q - 1),$$

where μ_i is the i-th elementary symmetric polynomial in $(m_1, \ldots, m_{q-2})$. In particular, for a surface of degree m in $\mathbb{P}^3$

$$\sum b_i(X_{\mathbb{C}}) = \chi(X_{\mathbb{C}}) = m^3 - 4m^2 + 6m, \tag{12}$$

$$h^{1,1}(X_{\mathbb{C}}) - 1 = (m-1)^3 - \frac{1}{3}m(m-1)(m-2). \tag{13}$$

As it was already noticed, the same tools can be applied to singular objects as well (see, for example, [9] and [21]). For instance, one can use them to bound the number of real double points in the following very simple way. In the case of surfaces there are two types of such points, viz. solitary points and nodes (in local coordinates their equations are $x^2 + y^2 + z^2 = 0$ and $x^2 + y^2 = z^2$ respectively). One can resolve the nodes (which is differentially equivalent to replacing a neighborhood of a node by its perturbation $x^2 + y^2 = z^2 + \epsilon^2$) and replace the solitary points by spheres (which means replacing a neighborhood of a solitary point in $X_{\mathbb{C}}$ by its perturbation $x^2 + y^2 + z^2 = \epsilon^2$). As a result, we obtain a 4-manifold diffeomorphic to the minimal desingularization $\tilde{X}_{\mathbb{C}}$ of $X_{\mathbb{C}}$ and an involution on it such that the fixed point set is diffeomorphic to a disjoined sum of the minimal desingularization $\tilde{X}_{\mathbb{R}}$ of $X_{\mathbb{R}}$ and S spheres, where S is the number of solitary points of $X_{\mathbb{R}}$. Now, applying the Smith inequality, one gets

$$2S + \sum b_i(\tilde{X}_{\mathbb{R}}) \leq \sum b_i(\tilde{X}_{\mathbb{C}}).$$

Thus in the case of surfaces of degree m in $\mathbb{P}^3$

$$2S \leq 2S + \sum b_i(\tilde{X}_{\mathbb{R}}) \leq m^3 - 4m^2 + 6m.$$

This implies, in particular, that $S \leq \frac{1}{2}(m^3 - 4m^2 + 6m)$. Using the congruences mod 16 described in 2.2, this can be improved to a sharp bound: *the number of solitary points of a real quartic and, more generally, of any real singular $K3$-surface, is* ≤ 10. (This may be worth comparing with the upper bound 16 for the number of complex nodes of a complex quartic. This bound, which is probably due to R.W.H.T. Hudson, was extended to any singular $K3$-surface by V. Nikulin [18] who used arithmetic of integral quadratic forms. As is well known, probably since Fresnel and Kummer, real quartics with 16 real nodes do exist.)

Let me notice that the frontier of our knowledge of surfaces in $\mathbb{P}^3$ is similar to the frontier between special surfaces and surfaces of general type in the Enriques-Kodaira classification of compact complex surfaces: surfaces of degree ≥ 5 are of

surfaces in various Enriques-Kodaira classes.

3 Deformation classes

Even the above very sketchy discussion shows that a thorough topological study of surfaces leads unavoidably to their study up to variation of equations and then to their study up to deformation (see Introduction for the definition; recall that we have chosen to work with Kähler surfaces).

3.1 Quasi-simplicity

As is pointed in 2.4, two nonsingular real cubic surfaces are real deformation equivalent if and only if their real point sets are homeomorphic. Furthermore, the real structures of two real nonsingular cubic surfaces are diffeomorphic if (and only if) the real point sets of the surfaces are homeomorphic. This is a manifestation of what we call the quasi-simplicity property: a real surface X is called *quasi-simple* if it is real deformation equivalent to any other real surface X' such that, first, X' is deformation equivalent to X as a complex surface, and, second, the real structure of X' is diffeomorphic to the real structure of X.

In fact, all rational real surfaces are quasi-simple. For $\mathbb{R}$-minimal (i.e., minimal over $\mathbb{R}$) rational surfaces this result is essentially due to Comessatti, Manin, and Iskovskikh (see e.g. the survey [16]). In full generality this is proved in [6], where, in addition, it is shown that the real deformation type of a real rational surface is determined by certain homological data.

Ruled $\mathbb{C}$-minimal surfaces of any genus are also quasi-simple, see [22]. Another class of surfaces whose real deformation theory is well understood is formed by minimal surfaces of Kodaira dimension 0. This class consists of Abelian, hyperelliptic, $K3$-, and Enriques surfaces. They are all quasi-simple (see [2] and [1]; recall that, by definition, hyperelliptic and Enriques surfaces are respectively quotients of Abelian and $K3$-surfaces by free involutions). Furthermore, quasi-simplicity of hyperelliptic and Enriques surfaces extends to quasi-simplicity of the quotients of Abelian and $K3$-surfaces by certain finite group actions, see [3].

Whether elliptic surfaces and irrational ruled non $\mathbb{C}$-minimal surfaces are quasi-simple is, as far as I know, an open question.

It is natural to expect that for surfaces of general type there is no quasi-simplicity: there should exist examples of real deformation distinct real surfaces with diffeomorphic real structures. A challenging problem is to find convenient deformation invariants which are not covered by the differential topology of $(X_{\mathbb{C}}, c)$.

Existence of non quasi-simple families of surfaces of general type does not prevent certain particular classes of surfaces of general type from being quasi-simple. And

in $\mathbb{C}^2$, see [12]. (Note in passing that in [12] it is also shown that there exist diffeomorphic, in fact complex conjugated, Bogomolov-Miyaoka-Yau surfaces which are not real and thus, being rigid, are not deformation equivalent as complex surfaces. These surfaces are counter-examples to the so called Diff = Deff problem in complex geometry, see [12] for precise definitions and references to counter-examples not related to the complex conjugation. This problem is a kind of substitute of quasi-simplicity for complex varieties. The existence of Diff $\neq$ Deff examples explains why we need to fix complex deformation class in the definition of quasi-simplicity of real varieties.)[1]

3.2 Finiteness

While the problem of quasi-simplicity is solved for rational surfaces and is essentially open and very difficult for surfaces of general type, the situation with finiteness is an opposite one: finiteness holds both for each complex deformation class of surfaces of general type (deformation finiteness) and for any fixed surface of general type (individual finiteness).

To wit, since the composition of two real structures is a biholomorphic automorphism and since the group of automorphisms of any variety of general type is finite, there are only finitely many real structures on a variety of general type (the same argument works for nonsingular hypersurfaces of degree ≥ 3 in projective space of dimension $n \geq 3$ with the exception of $n = 3, d = 4$). This is what we call *individual finiteness*, which we understand as finiteness of the number of conjugacy classes of real structures on a given variety (note that individual finiteness understood in this way extends to hypersurfaces of degree 4 in projective spaces of dimension 3, see [2]).

On the other hand, the Hilbert scheme of varieties of general type with given characteristic numbers is quasi-projective, which implies *deformation finiteness:* real structures on the varieties which, as complex varieties, are deformation equivalent to a given variety of general type split into a finite number of real deformation classes (where, according to our definitions, both variety and real structure are subject to deformation).

Unlike surfaces of general type, a rational surface may have a huge automorphism group, and, as far as I know, the problem of individual finiteness for rational surfaces is open. The situation is different with regard to deformation finiteness of rational surfaces which is an easy consequence of their quasi-simplicity.

In fact, *the deformation finiteness holds for any type of surfaces.* Indeed, the only birational classes of surfaces for which such a result is not contained in the literature,

[1] *Added in proof.* When this paper had been already finished, we with Vik. Kulikov have constructed examples of non quasi-simple real surfaces of general type.

a conceptual proof dealing with all types of surfaces in a unified way.

Some finiteness results are also known for Klein actions of finite groups on $K3$- and Abelian surfaces. In particular, *the number of equivariant deformation classes of $K3$- and Abelian surfaces with faithful Klein actions of finite groups is finite*, see [3].

Another, higher-dimensional, generalization of finiteness of real structures on $K3$-surfaces extends it to so called holomorphic symplectic (hence hyperkähler) manifolds: *the number of equivariant deformation classes of real structures in a given deformation class of compact holomorphic symplectic manifolds is finite*, see [4].)

The differential topology of $(X_{\mathbb{C}}, c)$ is preserved under deformation, and therefore deformation finiteness implies topological finiteness. Another, more direct, approach to topological finiteness was recently developed by Y. Laszlo and C. Viterbo. They proposed to study finiteness of diffeomorphism types of real forms on complex projective varieties of a given degree. Here one should distinguish between the real and complex degree. For example, there exists a sequence X_n of complex $K3$-surfaces of degree 4 (quartics in $\mathbb{P}^3$) such that, for appropriate real structures c_n on X_n, their real degrees (the minimal degree of a real projective embedding $X_n \to \mathbb{P}^{q_n}$) converge to infinity (so that these real structures are not induced from $\mathbb{P}^3$ and, moreover, can not be induced from $\mathbb{P}^q$ with bounded q). Of course, varieties of a given real degree split into a finite number of families. Whether the same is true for real varieties of a given complex degree is still an open question of utmost importance. But, thanks to Y. Laszlo and C. Viterbo [15], we now have some explicit bounds for the Pontryagin numbers of varieties of a given real degree and, as a consequence, some explicit bounds for the number of cobordism classes of such varieties.

References

[1] Catanese, F., and Frediani, P.: Real hyperelliptic surfaces and the orbifold fundamental group. *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu*, **2** (2003), 163–223.

[2] Degtyarev, A., Itenberg, I., and Kharlamov, V.: Real Enriques Surfaces. *Lecture Notes in Math., Springer, Berlin*, **1746** (2000).

[3] Degtyarev, A., Itenberg, I., and Kharlamov, V.: Finiteness and quasi-simplicity for symmetric $K3$-surfaces. *Duke Math. J.*, **122** (2004), no. 1, 1–49.

[4] Degtyarev, A., Itenberg, I., and Kharlamov, V.: Finiteness for real hyperkähler manifolds. *in preparation.*

[5] Degtyarev, A., and Kharlamov, V.: Topological properties of real algebraic varieties: Rokhlin's way. *Russ. Math. Surveys*, **55** (2000), no. 4, 735–814.

[7] Kharlamov, V.: Generalized Petrovskii inequality. *Funkz. Anal. i Priloz.*, **9** (1974), p. 50–56.

[8] Kharlamov, V.: Generalized Petrovskii inequality II. *Funkz. Anal. i Priloz.*, **10** (1975), p. 93–94.

[9] Kharlamov, V.: Topology of real algebraic varieties. *in Collected Papers by Petrovskii, Nauka*, 1986, p. 546–598.

[10] Kharlamov, V.: On non-amphicheiral surfaces of degree 4 in $\mathbb{R}P^3$. *Lecture Notes in Math.* **1346** (1988), p. 349–356.

[11] Kharlamov, V.: Variétés de Fano réelles (d'après C. Viterbo). *Astérisque, Séminaire Bourbaki*, **276** (2002), p. 189–206.

[12] Kharlamov, V., and Kulikov, Vik.: On real structures of rigid surfaces. *Izv. Math.*, **66** (2003), no. 1, p. 133–150.

[13] Kollár J.: The topology of real and complex algebraic varieties. *Mathematical Society of Japan. Adv. Stud. Pure Math.* **31** (2001), p. 127–145

[14] Kollár J.: The Nash conjecture for nonprojective threefolds. *Contemp. Math.* **312** (2002), p. 137-152.

[15] Laszlo, Y. and Viterbo, C.: Estimates of characteristic numbers of real algebraic varieties. *preprint* (2004), 1–24.

[16] Manin, Yu.I. and Tsfasman, M.A.: Rational varieties: Algebra, geometry and arithmetic. *Russ. Math. Surv.*, **41** (1986), no. 2, p. 51–116.

[17] Milnor, J.: On the Betti numbers of real varieties. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **15** (1964), 275–280.

[18] Nikulin, V.: Kummer surfaces. *Math. USSR - Izv.*, **9** (1975), no. 2, p. 261–275.

[19] Nikulin, V.: Integer symmetric bilinear forms and some of their geometric applications. *Math. USSR - Izv.*, **14** (1979), no. 1, p. 103–167.

[20] Thom, R.: Sur l'homologie des variétés algébriques réelles. *in Differential and Combinatorial Topology. Symp. Marston Morse* (1965), 255–265.

[21] Varchenko, A.N.: On a local residue and the intersection form in vanishing cohomologies. *in Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR, Ser. Mat.* **49**, (1985), p. 32–54.

[22] Welschinger, J.Y.: Real structures on minimal ruled sufaces. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, **78** (2003), p. 418–466.