

Explicit Noether-Lefschetz for arbitrary threefolds

ANGELO FELICE LOPEZ and CATRIONA MACLEAN

Abstract

We study the Noether-Lefschetz locus of a very ample line bundle L on an arbitrary smooth threefold Y . Building on results of Green, Voisin and Otwinowska, we give explicit bounds, depending only on the Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity properties of L , on the codimension of the components of the Noether-Lefschetz locus of L .

1 Introduction.

It is well-known in algebraic geometry that the geometry of a given variety is influenced by the geometry of its subvarieties. It is less common, but not unusual, that a given ambient variety forces to some extent the geometry of its subvarieties. A particularly nice case of the latter is given by line bundles, whose properties do very much influence the geometry.

If Y is a smooth variety and $i: X \rightarrow Y$ is a smooth divisor, there is then a natural restriction map

$$i^*: \text{Pic}(Y) \rightarrow \text{Pic}(X)$$

given by pull-back of line bundles.

Now suppose that X is very ample. By the Lefschetz theorem i^* is injective if $\dim Y \geq 3$. On the other hand, it was already known to the Italian school (Severi [18], Gherardelli [6]), that i^* is surjective when $\dim Y \geq 4$. Simple examples show that in the case where $\dim Y = 3$ we cannot hope for surjectivity unless a stronger restriction is considered.

For the case $Y = \mathbb{P}^3$, this is also a classical problem, first posed by Noether and solved in the case of generic X by Lefschetz who showed that

Theorem (Noether-Lefschetz) *For X a generic surface of degree $d \geq 4$ in \mathbb{P}^3 we have $\text{Pic}(X) = \mathbb{Z}$.*

Here and below by generic we mean outside a countable union of proper subvarieties.

Suppose now that a smooth threefold Y and a line bundle L on Y are given. We will say that a Noether-Lefschetz theorem holds for the pair $(Y; L)$, if

$$i^*: \text{Pic}(Y) \rightarrow \text{Pic}(X)$$

is a surjection for a generic smooth surface $X \rightarrow Y$ such that $\mathcal{O}_Y(X) = \mathcal{L}$.

The following result of Moishezon ([14], see also the argument given in Voisin [21, Thm. 15.33]) establishes the exact conditions under which a Noether-Lefschetz theorem holds for $(Y; \mathcal{L})$.

Theorem (Moishezon) *If $(Y; \mathcal{L})$ are such that \mathcal{L} is very ample and*

$$h_{\text{ev}}^{0,2}(X; \mathbb{C}) \neq 0$$

for a generic smooth X such that $\mathcal{O}_Y(X) = \mathcal{L}$, then a Noether-Lefschetz theorem holds for the pair $(Y; \mathcal{L})$.

Here, $h_{\text{ev}}^{0,2}$ denotes the evanescent $(2;0)$ -cohomology of X : see below for a precise definition.

More precisely, we denote by $U(\mathcal{L})$ the open subset of $\text{PH}^0(\mathcal{L})$ parameterizing smooth surfaces in the same equivalence class as \mathcal{L} . We further denote by $\text{NL}(\mathcal{L})$ (*the Noether-Lefschetz locus of \mathcal{L}*) the subspace parameterizing surfaces X equipped with line bundles which are not produced by pull-back from Y . The above theorem then admits the following alternative formulation.

Theorem (Moishezon) *If $(Y; \mathcal{L})$ are such that \mathcal{L} is very ample and*

$$h_{\text{ev}}^{0,2}(X; \mathbb{C}) \neq 0$$

for a generic smooth X such that $\mathcal{O}_Y(X) = \mathcal{L}$, then the Noether-Lefschetz locus $\text{NL}(\mathcal{L})$ is a countable union of proper algebraic subvarieties of $U(\mathcal{L})$.

These proper subvarieties will henceforth be referred to as *components of the Noether-Lefschetz locus*.

A Noether-Lefschetz theorem for a pair $(Y; \mathcal{L})$ essentially says that for a generic surface X such that $\mathcal{O}_Y(X) = \mathcal{L}$, the set of line bundles on X is well-understood and as simple as possible. A natural follow-up question is: how rare are surfaces with badly behaved Picard groups? Or alternatively: how large can the components of the Noether-Lefschetz locus be in comparison with $U(\mathcal{L})$? This leads us to attempt to prove what we will call *explicit Noether-Lefschetz theorems*. An explicit Noether-Lefschetz theorem (the terminology is due to Green) says that the codimension of $\text{NL}(\mathcal{L}) \subset U(\mathcal{L})$ is bounded below by some number $n_{\mathcal{L}}$ depending non-trivially on the positivity of \mathcal{L} . The first known example of these was the following theorem, established independently by Voisin and Green, [8], [20], which

gives an explicit Noether-Lefschetz theorem for \mathbb{P}^3 .

Theorem (Green, Voisin) *Let $Y = \mathbb{P}^3$ and $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(d)$. Let $\Sigma_{\mathcal{L}} = \bigcup (\mathcal{L})$ be any component of the Noether-Lefschetz locus. Then $\text{codim } \Sigma_{\mathcal{L}} \geq d - 3$, with equality being achieved only for the component of surfaces containing a line.*

In this theorem we see also another of the reigning principles of the study of components of the Noether-Lefschetz locus, namely that components of small codimension should parameterize surfaces containing low-degree curves.

Recently, the subject has been much advanced by the following result of Otwinowska, ([17], see also [15] and [16]) which implies an explicit Noether-Lefschetz theorem for analogues of Noether-Lefschetz loci for highly divisible line bundles on varieties of arbitrary odd dimension. (For ease of presentation, we give a weakened version of the result proved).

Theorem (Otwinowska) *Let Y be a projective variety of dimension $2n + 1$, let $\mathcal{O}_Y(1)$ be a very ample line bundle on Y and let $\Sigma_{\mathcal{L}} = \bigcup (\mathcal{O}_Y(d))$ be any component of the Noether-Lefschetz locus. Let X be a hypersurface contained in $\Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}$. For d large enough, if*

$$\text{codim } \Sigma_{\mathcal{L}} \geq \frac{d^n}{n!}$$

then X contains a n -dimensional linear space.

In fact, Otwinowska also gives a numerical criterion on d and the codimension of $\Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}$ under which X necessarily contains a degree- bn -dimensional subvariety. We recall also the results of Joshi [13] and Ein-Lazarsfeld [5, Prop. 3.4].

The aim in this paper will be to shed light on the fact that it is the *Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity properties* of a line bundle that insure that an explicit Noether-Lefschetz theorem holds, independently on the divisibility properties.

To state our first result we suppose that Y is a smooth threefold and H is a very ample line bundle on Y . We define numbers γ_Y and δ_Y as follows.

Definition 1 *The integer γ_Y is defined to be the minimal positive integer such that $K_Y + \gamma_Y H$ is very ample. The integer δ_Y is defined to be the minimal integer such that $(\gamma_Y - \delta_Y)H - K_Y$ is nef.*

We recall that, by the results of adjunction theory [19], if $(Y; H) \notin (\mathbb{P}^3; \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1))$, we have that $\gamma_Y \geq 4$ with equality if and only if either Y is a \mathbb{P}^2 -bundle over a smooth curve and the restriction of H to the fibers is $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(1)$ (we will refer later to this case as a *linear \mathbb{P}^2 -bundle*) or $(Y; H) = (\mathbb{Q}; \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}}(1))$ where $\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ is a

smooth quadric hypersurface. On the other hand $\chi_Y = 1$ with equality if Y is subcanonical and nonpositive (that is if $K_Y = eH$ for some integer $e \leq 0$). We have

Theorem 1 *Let Y be a smooth threefold, $Y \in \mathbb{P}^3$ and let H be a very ample divisor on Y . Let L be a $(-d)$ -regular line bundle with respect to H . We suppose that either $H^1(\frac{2}{Y} L) = 0$ or $d \geq 3 - \chi_Y \geq 3 - \chi_Y + 13$. Let L be any component of the Noether-Lefschetz locus $NL(L)$. The following bounds hold:*

(i) *If $(Y; H)$ is not a linear \mathbb{P}^2 -bundle then*

$$\text{codim } L = \begin{cases} d - 5 + \chi_Y - 2\chi_Y & \text{if } \chi_Y \geq 2 \text{ and } d \geq \frac{\chi_Y(\chi_Y + 5)}{2} \\ d - 6 + \chi_Y & \text{if } \chi_Y = 1 \end{cases} :$$

(ii) *If $(Y; H)$ is a linear \mathbb{P}^2 -bundle then*

$$\text{codim } L = \begin{cases} d - 2 - 2\chi_Y & \text{if } \chi_Y \geq 2 \text{ and } d \geq \frac{\chi_Y(\chi_Y + 5)}{2} \\ d - 3 & \text{if } \chi_Y = 1 \end{cases} :$$

We can do a little bit better in the case of the Noether-Lefschetz locus of adjoint line bundles.

We now define numbers a_Y and b_Y as follows.

Definition 2 *The integer a_Y is defined to be the minimal integer such that $K_Y + a_Y H$ is very ample. The integer b_Y is defined to be the minimal integer such that $(b_Y - a_Y)H - K_Y$ is nef.*

As above, if $(Y; H) \in (\mathbb{P}^3; \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1))$, we have that $a_Y = 4$ with equality if and only if either $(Y; H)$ is a linear \mathbb{P}^2 -bundle or $(Y; H) = (\mathbb{Q}; \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}}(1))$ and again $b_Y = 1$ with equality if Y is subcanonical.

Theorem 2 *Let Y be a smooth threefold, $Y \in \mathbb{P}^3$ and let H be a very ample divisor on Y . Let*

$$L = K_Y + dH + A ;$$

where A is numerically effective. We suppose that either $H^1(\frac{2}{Y} L) = 0$ or $d \geq 2b_Y - 2a_Y + 13$. Let L be any component of the Noether-Lefschetz locus $NL(L)$. The following bounds hold:

(i) *If $(Y; H)$ is not a linear \mathbb{P}^2 -bundle then*

$$\text{codim } L = \begin{cases} d - 5 - b_Y & \text{if } b_Y \geq 2 \text{ and } d \geq \frac{b_Y(b_Y^2 + 7b_Y - 6)}{2} \\ d - 5 & \text{if } b_Y = 1 \end{cases} :$$

(ii) If $(Y; H)$ is a linear P^2 -bundle then

$$\text{codim}_{\mathcal{L}} \begin{cases} d \leq 6 & \text{if } b_Y \geq 2 \text{ and } d \leq \frac{b_Y(b_Y-1)(b_Y+8)}{2} \\ d \leq 6 & \text{if } b_Y = 1 \end{cases} :$$

We also note the following application that generalises [2] (see also [3]).

Corollary 1 *Let Y be a smooth threefold such that $Y \in P^3$ and $\text{Pic}(Y) = \mathbb{Z}H$ where H is a very ample line bundle and let $K_Y = eH$. We suppose that either $H^1(\frac{2}{Y}(d)) = 0$ or $d \geq 3e + 13$. Let $P_1; \dots; P_k$ be k general points in Y and $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow Y$ be the blow-up of Y at these points with exceptional divisors $E_1; \dots; E_k$. If $d \geq 7 + e$ then*

$$d(H) - E_1 - \dots - E_k \text{ is ample on } \mathcal{F}, \quad d^3 H^3 > k:$$

We outline our approach to the study of the Noether-Lefschetz locus.

In section 2, we will give the standard expression of this problem in terms of variation of Hodge structure of X . We will then recall the classical results of Griffiths, Carlson et. al. which allow us to express variation of Hodge structure of X in terms of multiplication of sections of line bundles on X .

We define \mathcal{T} to be the section of \mathcal{L} defining X . The tangent space of a component of the Noether-Lefschetz locus is naturally a subspace of $H^0(\mathcal{L}) = h^1$, and we will denote its preimage in $H^0(\mathcal{L})$ by T . If we suppose that $H^1(\frac{2}{Y}(\mathcal{L})) = 0$, then T has the following property: The natural multiplication map

$$T \otimes H^0(K_Y - \mathcal{L}) \rightarrow H^0(K_Y - \mathcal{L}^2) \quad (1)$$

is not surjective.

A full proof of this fact is given in section 3.

In section 3, we also explain Green's methods for proving the explicit Noether-Lefschetz theorem for P^3 using Koszul cohomology to prove that equation (1) cannot be satisfied if T is too large. Green's method does not immediately apply to our case, since it requires T to be base-point free— which is only guaranteed if the tangent bundle of Y is globally generated, hence only for a few threefolds. However, we show in section 4 that there exists $W \subset H^0(K_Y - \mathcal{L}(3))$ such that W is base-point free and

$$fT \otimes H^0(K_Y - \mathcal{L}) \otimes fW \subset H^0(\mathcal{L}(3)) \otimes H^0(K_Y - \mathcal{L}^2)$$

is not surjective. Results of Ein and Lazarsfeld [5] then imply a lower bound on the codimension of

$$fT \otimes H^0(K_Y(3)) \otimes W \subset H^0(K_Y - \mathcal{L}(3))$$

and more particularly on the codimension of

$$T = H^0(K_Y(3)) = H^0(K_Y \otimes L(3)):$$

In introducing W , we get around the base-point free problems, but introduce others. In particular, we now need a method for extracting a lower bound on $\text{codim } T$ from a lower bound for $\text{codim } (T = H^0(K_Y(3)))$. When $Y = \mathbb{P}^3$, this is a simple application of a classical inequality in commutative algebra due to Macaulay and Gotzmann. In section 5 we extend the Macaulay-Gotzmann inequality to sections of any Castelnuovo-Mumford regular sheaf. In section 6, we pull all of the above together to prove the theorem.

2 Preliminaries.

In this section we resume the classical results of Griffiths, Carlson et. al. on which our work will be based. We will show how a component Σ_L of the Noether-Lefschetz locus $NL(L)$ can be locally expressed as the zeros of a certain section of a vector bundle over $U(L)$. We will then use this expression— together with the work of Griffiths from the 60s, relating variation of Hodge structure with deformations of X to multiplication of sections of line bundles on X — to relate the codimension of Σ_L to cohomological questions on X .

2.1 NL expressed as the zero locus of a vector bundle section.

We note first that by the Lefschetz theorem the map $Pic_0(Y) \rightarrow Pic_0(X)$ is necessarily an isomorphism. It follows that the map

$$i : Pic(Y) \rightarrow Pic(X)$$

fails to be surjective if and only if the $(1,1)$ integral evanescent cohomology is non-trivial:

$$H_{ev}^{1,1}(X; \mathbb{Z}) \neq 0:$$

(We recall that the subspace $H_{ev}^{1,1}(X; \mathbb{C}) = H^{1,1}(X; \mathbb{C})$ is defined by

$$\sum H_{ev}^{1,1}(X; \mathbb{C}), \quad h_i = 0 \text{ for all } i \geq 2 \text{ } H^2(Y; \mathbb{C}) :)$$

In particular, we can therefore define $NL(L)$ as follows

$$X \in NL(L), \quad H_{ev}^{1,1}(X; \mathbb{Z}) \neq 0:$$

This is the definition of $NL(L)$ which we will use henceforth, since it is much more manageable. In particular, it is this description which will allow us to write

any component of $N\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$ as the zero locus of a special section of a vector bundle.

Henceforth, we will assume that X is contained in $N\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$ and γ will be a non-trivial element of $H_{ev}^{1,1}(X; \mathbb{Z})$. The point in $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{L})$ corresponding to X will be denoted by 0 . We will now define what we mean by the *Noether-Lefschetz locus associated to γ* , which we denote by $N\mathcal{L}(\gamma)$. Since we will be interested in the local geometry of $N\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$, we fix for simplicity a contractible neighbourhood of 0 , \mathcal{O} . Henceforth, all our calculations will be made over \mathcal{O} . We form a vector bundle H_{ev}^2 over \mathcal{O} , defined by

$$H_{ev}^2(u) = H_{ev}^2(X_u; \mathbb{C}) :$$

The vector bundle contains holomorphic sub-bundles $F^i(H_{ev}^2)$ given by

$$F^i(H_{ev}^2)(u) = F^i(H_{ev}^2(X_u; \mathbb{C})) :$$

We define bundles $H_{ev}^{i,2-i}$ by

$$H_{ev}^{i,2-i} = F^i(H_{ev}^2) = F^{i+1}(H_{ev}^2) :$$

(The fibre of $H_{ev}^{i,2-i}$ at the point u is isomorphic to $H_{ev}^{i,2-i}(X_u)$; however, $H_{ev}^{i,2-i}$ does not embed naturally into H_{ev}^2 as a holomorphic sub-bundle.) The bundle H_{ev}^2 is equipped with a natural flat connexion, the Gauss-Manin connexion, which we denote by ∇ . We now define $\bar{\gamma}$ to be the section of H_{ev}^2 produced by flat transport of γ .

We define $\bar{\gamma}^{0,2}$, a section of $H_{ev}^{0,2}$, to be the image of $\bar{\gamma}$ under the projection

$$\pi : H_{ev}^2 \rightarrow H_{ev}^{0,2} :$$

We are now in a position to define $N\mathcal{L}(\gamma)$.

Definition 3 *The Noether-Lefschetz locus associated to γ , $N\mathcal{L}(\gamma)$, is given by*

$$N\mathcal{L}(\gamma) = \text{zero}(\bar{\gamma}^{0,2}) :$$

Informally, $N\mathcal{L}(\gamma)$ parameterizes the small deformations of X on which γ remains of Hodge type $(1,1)$. Any component of $N\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$ is locally equal to $N\mathcal{L}(\gamma)$ for some γ .

The tangent space $TN\mathcal{L}(\gamma)$ at X is a subspace of $H^0(\mathcal{L}) = h^1$, where γ is the section of \mathcal{L} defining X . We will denote its preimage in $H^0(\mathcal{L})$ by T .

2.2 IVHS and residue maps.

We will now explain the classical work of Griffiths which makes the section $-0;2$ particularly manageable.

Let H_{ev}^2 be as above. For the purposes of this section we will consider the holomorphic subvector bundle F_{ev}^1 to be a holomorphic map

$$F_{ev}^1 : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \text{Grass}(f_1; H_{ev}^2)$$

where f_1 is the dimension of $F_{ev}^1 H_{ev}^2(X; \mathbb{C})$. The Gauss-Manin connexion gives us a canonical isomorphism

$$H_{ev}^2 = H_{ev}^2(X; \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{O}$$

from which we deduce a canonical isomorphism

$$\text{Grass}(f_1; H_{ev}^2) = \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \text{Grass}(f_1; H_{ev}^2(X; \mathbb{C})):$$

In particular, F_{ev}^1 is now expressed as a map from \mathcal{O} to the constant space $\text{Grass}(f_1; H_{ev}^2(X; \mathbb{C}))$, and as such can be derived. We obtain a derivation map, which we denote by $IVHS$ (for Infinitesimal Variation of Hodge Structure)

$$IVHS^1 : T\mathcal{O} \rightarrow \text{Hom}(F_{ev}^1(H_{ev}^2); H_{ev}^2 / F_{ev}^1(H_{ev}^2)):$$

Griffiths proved the following result in [10].

Theorem (Griffiths' Transversality) *The image of $IVHS^1$ is contained in $\text{Hom}(H_{ev}^{i+2, i-1}; H_{ev}^{i+1, i-1})$.*

The importance of this work for our purposes is the following lemma.

Lemma 1 *For any $v \in T\mathcal{O}$, we have that*

$$d_v(\tau^{0;2}) = IVHS^1(v)(\tau)$$

Proof. The isomorphism

$$f : T_W \text{Grass}(n; V) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(W; V/W)$$

is given by

$$f(v) : w \mapsto \frac{\partial}{\partial v}(\varpi)_{\bar{x}=w}$$

where $w \in W$ and ϖ is any local section of the tautological bundle over the Grassmannian such that $\varpi_W = w$.

In the case in hand, we choose a lifting of $\omega^{0,2}$ to a section of H_{ev}^2 , which we denote by $\omega_{\text{lift}}^{0,2}$. By definition of $\omega^{0,2}$, we then have that

$$\omega = \omega_{\text{lift}}^{0,2} \otimes F^1(H_{\text{ev}}^2)$$

and it follows that

$$\text{IVHS}^1(\omega)(\cdot) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{v}} (\omega_{\text{lift}}^{0,2})_{\bar{v}}^{0,2}$$

and now, since by definition ω is constant,

$$\text{IVHS}^1(\omega)(\cdot) = d_v (\omega_{\text{lift}}^{0,2})_{\bar{v}}^{0,2} = d_v (\omega^{0,2}):$$

We will also need the work of Carlson and Griffiths relating the residue maps to Hodge structure of varieties ([1]). Suppose given, for $i = 1, 2$, a section

$$s \in H^0(K_Y \otimes L^i):$$

This can be thought of as a holomorphic 3-form on Y with a pole of order i along X , and as such defines a cohomology class in $H^3(Y \setminus X; \mathbb{C})$. The group $H^3(Y \setminus X; \mathbb{C})$ maps to $H_{\text{ev}}^2(X; \mathbb{C})$ via residue, and hence there is an induced residue map

$$\text{res}_i : H^0(K_Y \otimes L^i) \rightarrow H_{\text{ev}}^2(X; \mathbb{C}):$$

The relevance of this map to variation of Hodge structure comes from the following theorem, which is proved by Griffiths in [11].

Theorem *The image of res_i is contained in $F^{3-i}(H_{\text{ev}}^2)$.*

Henceforth, we will denote by π_i the induced projection map

$$\pi_i : H^0(K_Y \otimes L^i) \rightarrow H_{\text{ev}}^{3-i, i-1}(X; \mathbb{C}):$$

In this representation, the map IVHS^{3-i} has a particularly nice form ([1], page 70).

Theorem (multiplication) *Consider $v \in T \otimes O$. Let \bar{v} be a lifting of v to $H^0(L)$. Then for any $P \in H^0(K_X \otimes L^i)$, we have that*

$$\text{IVHS}^{3-i}(\bar{v})(\pi_i(P)) = \pi_{i+1}(\bar{v} \otimes P)$$

up to multiplication by some nonzero constant.

The only fly in the ointment is that in general we cannot be sure that the map π_i is surjective onto $H_{\text{ev}}^{3-i, i-1}(X; \mathbb{C})$. It is precisely for this reason that we will be obliged to suppose that $H^1(K_Y \otimes L) = 0$.

The following lemma will be crucial.

Lemma 2 Consider $\gamma \in H_{\text{ev}}^{1,1}(X)$ and $\beta \in H_{\text{ev}}^{2,0}(X)$. For any vector $v \in T_O$ we have

$$\langle \text{IVHS}^1(v)(\gamma); \beta \rangle + \langle \gamma; \text{IVHS}^2(v)(\beta) \rangle = 0$$

Proof. We note that

$$d_v(\gamma; \beta) = 0:$$

We note that we can write

$$\gamma = \gamma^1 + \gamma^2$$

where $\gamma^1 \in F_{\text{ev}}^1$ and $\gamma^2(0) = 0$. Similarly, we can write

$$\beta = \beta^1 + \beta^2$$

where $\beta^1 \in F_{\text{ev}}^2$ and $\beta^2(0) = 0$. We note that for Hodge theoretic reasons

$$\langle \beta^1; \gamma^1 \rangle = 0$$

and hence

$$d_v(\gamma; \beta) = \langle d_v(\gamma^2); \beta^1 \rangle + \langle \gamma^1; d_v(\beta^2) \rangle:$$

Here, of course, it makes sense to talk about $d_v(\gamma^2)$ and $d_v(\beta^2)$ only because $\beta^2(0) = 0$ and $\gamma^2(0) = 0$. Since $\langle F^1; F^2 \rangle = 0$, we have that

$$\langle d_v(\gamma^2); \beta^1 \rangle = \langle d_v(\gamma^2)^{0,2}; \beta^1 \rangle = \langle \gamma; \text{IVHS}^1(v)(\beta) \rangle$$

and similarly

$$\langle \gamma^1; d_v(\beta^2) \rangle = \langle \gamma^1; (d_v\beta^2)^{1,1} \rangle = \langle \gamma; \text{IVHS}^2(v)(\beta) \rangle:$$

So it follows immediately from

$$d_v(\gamma; \beta) = 0$$

that

$$\langle \text{IVHS}^1(v)(\gamma); \beta \rangle + \langle \gamma; \text{IVHS}^2(v)(\beta) \rangle = 0:$$

3 Strategy and overview.

The basic idea of this proof is that used by Green in [8]. We summarise his proof and explain why it cannot be immediately applied to the situation in hand.

First some notation. Given any pair of coherent sheaves on X , L and M we denote by $\cdot_{L,M}$ the multiplication map

$$\cdot_{L,M} : H^0(L) \otimes H^0(M) \rightarrow H^0(L \otimes M) :$$

Where there is no risk of confusion, we will write \cdot for $\cdot_{L,M}$.

The starting point of Green's work is the following lemma.

Lemma 3 *Suppose that $T \subset H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(d))$ is the preimage of $T \cap L(\cdot)$. Then the inclusion*

$$(T \subset H^0(\mathbb{P}^3; \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(d-4))) \subset H^0(\mathbb{P}^3; \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2d-4))$$

is a strict inclusion.

Proof. In the case of $Y = \mathbb{P}^3$, we have that $\cdot_i : H^0(K_Y \otimes L^i) \rightarrow H^3_{\text{ev}}(X)$ is a surjection. (See, for example, [21, proof of Thm. 18.5, page 420]). By Lemma 2, if $\forall \cdot \in T \cap L(\cdot)$ and $\cdot \in H^0(\mathbb{P}^3; \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(d-4))$ then

$$h \cdot ; IVHS^2(\cdot)(\cdot_1(\mathbb{P}))i = hIVHS^1(\cdot)(\cdot); \cdot_1(\mathbb{P})i = 0$$

from which we conclude that

$$IVHS^2(\cdot)(\cdot_1(\mathbb{P})) \subset \cdot^\perp ;$$

where \cdot^\perp is the orthogonal to \cdot , and in particular is a proper subspace.

By the multiplication theorem it follows that

$$\cdot_2(\cdot(\cdot_1(\mathbb{P}))) \subset \cdot^\perp$$

or alternatively

$$(\cdot_1(\mathbb{P})) \subset \cdot_2^{-1}(\cdot^\perp) :$$

Since \cdot_2 is surjective, $\cdot_2^{-1}(\cdot^\perp)$ is a proper subspace.

Green then proves the following theorem via the vanishing of certain Koszul cohomology groups.

Theorem (Green) *Let $T \subset H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^r}(d))$ be a base-point free linear system of codimension c . Then the Koszul complex*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \mathbb{P}^{r-1} & & \mathbb{P}^r & & \mathbb{P}^{r-1} \\ T \subset H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^r}(k-d)) \rightarrow & T \subset H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^r}(k)) \rightarrow & T \subset H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^r}(k+d)) \end{array}$$

is exact in the middle provided that $k = p + d + c$

In the case in hand, on setting $r = 3; p = 0$ and $k = 2d - 4$ we see that the multiplication map

$$T = H^0(\mathbb{P}^3; \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(d-4)) \rightarrow H^0(\mathbb{P}^3; \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2d-4))$$

is surjective if $2d - 4 = d + c$. But we have already observed that this multiplication map is necessarily non-surjective, from which it follows that $c = d - 3$.

In Lemma 4 below we will see that, provided $H^1(\otimes_Y^2 L) = 0$, it is still true that the multiplication map $T = H^0(K_Y \otimes L) \rightarrow H^0(K_Y \otimes L^2)$ is non-surjective. One might therefore reasonably entertain the hope of adapting Green's methods to arbitrary varieties. The difficulty is that in order to apply Green's result, T must be base-point free. This was immediate when $Y = \mathbb{P}^3$, since, if X was given by $F \in H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(d))$, T then automatically contained $H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)) = h_{\mathbb{P}^3}^{\mathbb{QF}}(1)$. However if T_Y is not globally generated, there is no reason why this should hold in general. The rest of this paper will be concerned with finding ways around this difficulty.

Lemma 4 *Let L be very ample and such that*

$$H^1(\otimes_Y^2 L) = 0:$$

Let $T = H^0(L)$ be the preimage in $H^0(L)$ of the tangent space to $NL(\cdot)$. Then

$$(T \rightarrow H^0(K_Y \otimes L)) \rightarrow H^0(K_Y \otimes L^2)$$

is a strict inclusion.

Proof. We note that by the argument given in the proof of Lemma 3,

$$\pi_2((T \rightarrow H^0(K_Y \otimes L))) \notin H_{ev}^{1,1}(X; \mathbb{C}):$$

Now it just remains to observe that, by [21, proof of Thm. 18.5, page 420],

$$\pi_2 : H^0(K_Y \otimes L^2) \rightarrow H_{ev}^{1,1}(X; \mathbb{C})$$

is a surjection, since

$$H^1(\otimes_Y^2 (X)) = 0:$$

So, we would now like to apply Green's argument; unfortunately, T may have base points. Our strategy for getting around this problem will be as follows.

1. First of all, we will construct $W \subset H^0(K_Y \otimes L(3))$ with the following good properties.
 - (a) W is base-point free,
 - (b) $\dim(W \cap H^0(L(3))) = 0$.
2. The result proved by Ein and Lazarsfeld in [5] then gives us a lower bound on the codimension of $(T \cap H^0(K_Y(3)))$ in $H^0(K_Y \otimes L(3))$.
3. We will then extract from the lower bound on $\text{codim}(T \cap H^0(K_Y(3)))$ a lower bound on the codimension of T in $H^0(L)$.

4 Constructing W .

We henceforth let Y be a smooth threefold, $Y \in \mathbb{P}^3$ and H be a very ample divisor on Y .

Proposition 1 *There is a subspace $W \subset H^0(K_Y \otimes L(3))$ such that*

1. *The map $\rho_2 : W \rightarrow H^0(L(3)) \otimes H_{\text{ev}}^{1,1}(X; \mathbb{C})$ is identically zero.*
2. *W is base-point free.*

Proof. We denote the image of

$$\rho_2 : W \rightarrow H^0(L(3)) \otimes H^0(K_Y \otimes L^2)$$

by $\text{Im } \rho_2$. Consider the map

$$d : H^0(\Omega_Y^2 \otimes L) \rightarrow H^0(K_Y \otimes L^2)$$

which sends a two-form on Y with a simple pole along X to its derivation. We note that for any $\omega \in H^0(\Omega_Y^2 \otimes L)$ we have that

$$d\omega \in \text{Ker}(\text{res}_2);$$

because $d\omega$, being exact, defines a null cohomology class on $Y \setminus X$.

The space W will be chosen in such a way that

$$\text{Im } \rho_2 \cap \text{Im } (d)_X = \{0\}$$

The map d is difficult to deal with because it is not a map of \mathcal{O}_Y -modules: the value of $d\omega$ at a point x is not determined by the value of ω at x . In particular, it is not possible to form a tensor product map

$$d : (L^{-1}(3)) \otimes H^0(\Omega_Y^2(3)) \rightarrow H^0(K_Y \otimes L(3)) :$$

Our first step will be to show that, even if d does not come from an underlying map of \mathcal{O}_Y -modules, the restriction

$$d_X : H^0(\Omega_Y^2(-L)) \rightarrow H^0(K_X(-L_X)) :$$

does.

Lemma 5 *Let the map*

$$r : \Omega_Y^2(-L) \rightarrow K_X(-L)$$

be given by tensoring with L the pull-back

$$i : \Omega_Y^2 \rightarrow \Omega_X^2 (= K_X) :$$

Then we have that

$$d_X = H^0(r) :$$

Proof. We calculate in analytic complex co-ordinates near a point $p \in X$. Let f be a function defining X in a neighbourhood of p and let x, y be co-ordinates chosen in such a way that (f, x, y) form a system of co-ordinates for Y close to p . If $\omega \in H^0(\Omega_Y^2(-L))$, then in a neighbourhood of p we can write

$$\omega = \frac{f_1 dx \wedge dy + f_2 dx \wedge df + f_3 dy \wedge df}{f}$$

where f_1, f_2, f_3 are holomorphic functions on a neighbourhood of p . Differentiating and restricting to X , we get that

$$d_X \omega = \frac{f_1 dx \wedge dy \wedge df}{f^2} :$$

As an element of $H^0(K_Y(-L) \otimes L)$, this is represented by

$$\frac{f_1 dx \wedge dy \wedge df}{f} \otimes 1 = f :$$

Under the canonical isomorphism $(K_Y(-L) \otimes L)_X \rightarrow K_X(-L_X)$, we have that

$$\frac{f_1 dx \wedge dy \wedge df}{f} \mapsto f_1 dx \wedge dy :$$

Hence, under the canonical isomorphism

$$(K_Y(-L^2))_X \rightarrow K_X(-L_X) ;$$

we have that

$$(d_X)_X \mapsto \frac{f_1 dx \wedge dy}{f} = r(\omega) :$$

This concludes the proof of Lemma 5.

We now proceed with the proof of Proposition 1.

The map d_X , which is a map of \mathcal{O}_Y -modules, has the advantage that we can form tensor products. We consider the map induced by tensor product with $L^{-1}(3)$

$$d_X^{L^{-1}(3)} : H^0(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(3)) \rightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{K}_X(3)) :$$

We define W by

$$W = \{ w \in H^0(X, \mathcal{K}_Y \otimes L(3)) : w|_X \in \text{Im}(d_X^{L^{-1}(3)}) \} :$$

We will prove first that

Lemma 6 *For any $w \in W$ and $P \in H^0(Y, \mathcal{L}(3))$, we have that*

$$P(w)|_X = 0 :$$

Proof. Since $w \in W$ there exists $s \in H^0(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(3))$ such that

$$w|_X = d_X^{L^{-1}(3)} s$$

and hence

$$(Pw)|_X = d_X(Ps) = d(Ps)|_X :$$

From this it follows that there exists $s^0 \in H^0(X, \mathcal{K}_Y \otimes L)$ such that

$$Pw = d(Ps) + s^0 :$$

We observed above that $P(d(Ps)) = 0$. We note that

$$\text{res}_2(s^0) = \text{res}_1(s^0)$$

and hence

$$\text{res}_2(s^0) \in F^2 H_{\text{ev}}^2(X; \mathbb{C}) ;$$

from which it follows that $\text{res}_2(s^0) = 0$. Whence

$$\text{res}_2(Pw) = 0 :$$

This concludes the proof of Lemma 6.

To conclude the proof of Proposition 1 it remains only to show that W is base-point free. Since $Y \notin P^3$ we have ([4]) that $\mathcal{K}_Y(3)$ is globally generated. Also

$$(\mathbb{C} \otimes H^0(\mathcal{K}_Y(3))) \otimes W$$

therefore the only possible base points of W are the points of X . Consider an arbitrary point $p \in X$. Now if $P^N = PH^0(Y; H)$ we have that $\frac{2}{Y}(3)$ is globally generated since $\frac{2}{P^N}(3)$ is such and there is a surjection $\frac{2}{P^N}(3) \rightarrow \frac{2}{Y}(3)$. Whence there exists a section

$$s \in H^0\left(\frac{2}{Y}(3)\right)$$

such that $d_X^{L-1(3)}(s)(p) \neq 0$. From the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow K_Y(3) \rightarrow K_Y + L(3) \rightarrow K_X(3) \rightarrow 0$$

and Kodaira vanishing we see that there exists

$$w \in H^0(K_Y + L(3))$$

such that $w|_X = d_X^{L-1(3)}(s)$. It follows that $w \in W$, and

$$w(p) = d_X^{L-1(3)}(s)(p) \neq 0.$$

Hence p is not a base-point of W . This completes the proof of Proposition 1.

To get lower bounds on the codimension we will apply the following result of Ein and Lazarsfeld, [5, Prop. 3.1].

Theorem (Ein, Lazarsfeld) *Let H be a very ample line bundle and B, C be nef line bundles on a smooth complex projective n -fold Z . We set*

$$F_f = K_Z + fH + B \text{ and } G_e = K_Z + eH + C:$$

Let $V = H^0(Z; F_f)$ be a base-point free subspace of codimension c and consider the Koszul-type complex

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathbb{P}^{n+1} \\ V \rightarrow H^0(G_e) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow V \rightarrow H^0(F_f + G_e) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow V \rightarrow H^0(2F_f + G_e) \rightarrow \cdots \end{array}$$

If $(Z; H; B) \in (\mathbb{P}^n; \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(1); \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n})$, $f = n+1$ and $e = n+p+c$, then this complex is exact in the middle.

In order to apply this to our situation, we set $p = 0$, and, in case $L = K_Y + dH + A$ we choose $f = d; e = d - 3$, $B = A + K_Y + 3H$ (note that B is nef since $K_Y + 3H$ is globally generated) and $C = A$. In the case L $(-d)$ -regular we have $L = M(-d)$ for a Castelnuovo-Mumford regular line bundle M and we choose $f = d+3; e = d - 3 + \chi(Y) - \chi(Y)$, $B = M$ and $C = M + (\chi(Y) - \chi(Y))H - K_Y$, so

that B is nef since M is globally generated and also C is nef by definition of γ_Y and γ_Y . We then have that

$$F_f = K_Y - L(3) \text{ and } G_e = L(-3)$$

and the theorem in this particular case says that:

Proposition 2 *Suppose that $d \geq 4$ and $Y \in \mathbb{P}^3$. Let V be a base-point free linear system in $H^0(K_Y - L(3))$ with the property that*

$$(V \subset H^0(L(-3))) \subset H^0(K_Y - L^2)$$

is a strict inclusion. Then the codimension c of V satisfies the inequality

$$c \leq \begin{cases} d-5+\gamma_Y & \text{if } L \text{ is } (-d) \text{ regular} \\ d-5 & \text{if } L = K_Y + dH + A \end{cases} :$$

In general, pulling together the results of sections 3 and 4, we have the following bound.

Proposition 3 *Suppose that $Y \in \mathbb{P}^3$ and $H^1(\frac{2}{Y} - L) = 0$. Then the codimension of the image of*

$$\tau : T \subset H^0(K_Y(3)) \rightarrow H^0(K_Y - L(3))$$

is at least $d-5+\gamma_Y$ if L is $(-d)$ -regular or at least $d-5$ if $L = K_Y + dH + A$.

Proof. For simplicity, we set

$$T' := W + (T \subset H^0(K_Y(3))) \subset H^0(K_Y - L(3)) :$$

Notice that the multiplication map

$$\tau' : T' \subset H^0(L(-3)) \rightarrow H^0(K_Y - L^2)$$

cannot be surjective, otherwise, as in the proof of Lemma 4, we get that

$$\dim_2 \tau'(T' \subset H^0(L(-3))) = H_{ev}^{1,1}(X; \mathbb{C})$$

and, given the first property of W , the latter equality implies the contradiction

$$\dim_2 (T \subset H^0(K_Y - L)) = H_{ev}^{1,1}(X; \mathbb{C}) :$$

Now, by Proposition 2, we get that

$$\text{codim } (T \subset H^0(K_Y(3))) \leq \begin{cases} d-5+\gamma_Y & \text{if } L \text{ is } (-d) \text{ regular} \\ d-5 & \text{if } L = K_Y + dH + A \end{cases} :$$

Therefore it will be enough to devise a mechanism for extracting codimension bounds for T from codimension bounds for $(T \otimes H^0(K_Y(3)))$. This is the subject of the next section.

We end the section by studying the vanishing of $H^1(\otimes_Y^2 L)$.

Remark 1 *If $d \leq 3$, $\chi = 3 - \chi + 13$ and L is $(-d)$ -regular or if $d \geq 2b_Y - 2a_Y + 13$ and $L = K_Y + dH + A$, then $H^1(\otimes_Y^2 L) = 0$.*

Proof. We just apply Griffiths' vanishing theorem [12] to the globally generated vector bundle $E = \otimes_Y^2(3)$. We write

$$\otimes_Y^2 L = E (\det E + K_Y + B)$$

whence we just need to prove that

$$B = L - 12H - 3K_Y$$

is ample. By definition of a_Y, b_Y, χ_Y and χ_Y we can write

$$K_Y = (a - b)H + A^0$$

where A^0 is nef and $a = \chi_Y, b = \chi_Y$ if L is $(-d)$ -regular, while $a = a_Y, b = b_Y$ if $L = K_Y + dH + A$. Hence

$$B = (d - 12 - ub + ua)H + A^0$$

where A^0 is nef and $u = 2$ if $L = K_Y + dH + A$, $u = 3$ if L is $(-d)$ -regular. Therefore B is ample.

Remark 2 Notice that if Y is a quadric hypersurface in P^4 , since $K_Y = -3H$, if $L = (d - 3)H$, we have that $H^1(\otimes_Y^2 L) = 0$ for $d \geq 7$, whence

$$\text{codim } T \geq d - 5:$$

5 Macaulay-Gotzmann for CM regular sheaves.

We start by reviewing the situation for P^n , which we will then generalise to arbitrary varieties.

Definition of $c_{\langle d \rangle}$ and $c_{\langle d \rangle}$. Given integers $c \geq 1, d \geq 1$, there exists a unique sequence of integers k_d, k_{d-1}, \dots, k_f with $d \geq f \geq 1$ (f is uniquely determined by c and d) such that

$$1. k_d > k_{d-1} > \dots > k_f = f,$$

$$2. c = \prod_{i=d}^f k_i.$$

Here and below we use the convention $\binom{m}{p} = 0$ if $m < p$. We define

$$c^{<d>} = \prod_{i=d}^f \binom{k_i+1}{i+1}$$

$$c_{<d>} = \prod_{i=d}^f \binom{k_i-1}{i} :$$

When $c = 0$ we set $c^{<d>} = c_{<d>} = 0$.

We have the following result of Macaulay and Gotzmann, which can be found in [7], pages 64-65.

Theorem (Macaulay, Gotzmann) *Let $V \subset H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(d))$ be a subspace of codimension c . Then the subspace*

$$(V \subset H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(1))) \subset H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(d+1))$$

is of codimension at most $c^{<d>}$.

Gotzmann proved the Macaulay-Gotzmann inequality using combinatorial algebraic techniques. Green gave a geometric proof in [9]. We will now generalise the argument given by Green in order to prove that the Macaulay-Gotzmann inequality is valid for arbitrary Castelnuovo-Mumford regular sheaves.

Theorem 3 *Let \mathcal{M} be a Castelnuovo-Mumford regular coherent sheaf on a projective space \mathbb{P}^N . For $d \geq 1$ let*

$$V \subset H^0(\mathcal{M}(d))$$

be a subspace of codimension c and define $V^{d+1} \subset H^0(\mathcal{M}(d+1))$ by

$$V^{d+1} = (V \subset H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^N}(1))) :$$

Then

$$\text{codim } V^{d+1} \leq c^{<d>} :$$

The Theorem will follow from the following proposition.

Proposition 4 Suppose that V, M and d are as above. Let H be a generic hyperplane of \mathbb{P}^N and denote by M_H the restriction of M to H . We further denote the restriction of V to $H^0(M_H(d))$ by V_H . Then

$$\text{codim } V_H \leq d :$$

Proof. We shall proceed by a double induction on the dimension of the support of M and the number d . We assume now that $d \geq 2; \dim \text{Supp } (M) \geq 1$. The proof of the Proposition for $d = 1$ or for sheaves with zero-dimensional supports is to be found in subsections 5.0.1 and 5.0.2.

Let H and H^0 be two generic hyperplanes. We define the spaces V^H (respectively V^{H^0}) in the following way. Let L_H (resp. L_{H^0}) be a linear polynomial defining H (resp. H^0). We define

$$V^H = H^0(M(d-1))$$

by

$$v \in V^H, \quad L_H v \in V :$$

(Similarly, V^{H^0} is defined by $v \in V^{H^0}, \quad L_{H^0} v \in V$.) We now consider the following exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow H^0(M(d-1)) \xrightarrow{L_H} H^0(M(d)) \xrightarrow{\text{res}} H^0(M_H(d)) \rightarrow 0 :$$

Here, of course, we have right exactness of the sequence only because M is a Castelnuovo-Mumford regular sheaf. There is an induced exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow V^H \rightarrow V \rightarrow V_H \rightarrow 0$$

whence we see that

$$\text{codim } V = \text{codim } V^H + \text{codim } V_H :$$

We now consider the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & 0 & & 0 & & \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & (V^{H^0})^H & \longrightarrow & V^{H^0} & \longrightarrow & (V^{H^0})_H \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow L_{H^0} & & \downarrow L_H \setminus L_{H^0} & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & V^H & \longrightarrow & V & \longrightarrow & V_H \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \text{res} & & \downarrow \text{res} & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & (V_{H^0})^H \setminus H^0 & \longrightarrow & V_{H^0} & \longrightarrow & (V_{H^0})_H \setminus H^0 \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ & & 0 & & 0 & & \end{array}$$

In the above diagram, all the rows are exact (since M_H is Castelnuovo-Mumford regular on H), as is the middle column. It is not immediate that the right-hand column is exact, but we will be able to show that it is close enough to exact for our purposes.

More precisely,

$$(V_{H^0})_{H \setminus H^0} = V_{\tilde{H} \setminus H^0} = (V_H)_{H \setminus H^0}$$

and hence the restriction map $V_H \rightarrow (V_{H^0})_{H \setminus H^0}$ is a surjection. We have automatically that

$$(V^{H^0})_H \rightarrow (V_H)^{H \setminus H^0}$$

and hence the composition of the maps $L_{H \setminus H^0}$ and res is zero. It follows that

$$\text{codim } V_H = \text{codim } (V_{H^0})_{H \setminus H^0} + \text{codim } (V^{H^0})_H :$$

We denote by c^0 the codimension of V_H for generic H . Hence, since H^0 has been chosen generic, $\text{codim } V_{H^0} = c^0$. We have that

$$\text{codim } V^{H^0} = c - c^0 :$$

We note that

1. $V^{H^0} \subset H^0(M(d-1))$ and hence by the induction hypothesis

$$\text{codim } (V^{H^0})_H \leq (c - c^0)_{<d-1>} :$$

2. The dimension of the support of M_{H^0} is strictly less than the dimension of the support of M and hence by the induction hypothesis

$$\text{codim } (V_{H^0})_{H \setminus H^0} \leq c_{<d>}^0 :$$

It follows that

$$c^0 \leq c_{<d>}^0 + (c - c^0)_{<d-1>} :$$

Green shows in [9], pages 77-78, that this inequality implies that $c^0 \leq c_{<d>}$.

It remains only to prove the Proposition for zero-dimensional sheaves or for $d = 1$.

5.0.1 The case $d=1$.

We have that for any $c \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$c_{<1>} = c - 1 :$$

We suppose first that $V \notin H^0(M(-1))$. If for generic H

$$\text{codim } V_H > c_{1>}$$

then for generic H

$$V^H = H^0(M):$$

In other words, for generic H

$$L_H = H^0(M) \cap V:$$

It follows that

$$(H^0(M); H^0(\mathcal{O}_{P^N}(-1))) \cap V:$$

Since M is Castelnuovo-Mumford regular, it follows that $V = H^0(M(-1))$ which contradicts our supposition that $V \notin H^0(M(-1))$.

But if $c = 0$ then $c_{1>} = 0$ and Proposition 4 is immediate. This completes the proof of the Proposition in the case where $d = 1$.

5.0.2 The case where the dimension of the support of M is zero.

In this case, for generic H , $H^0(M_H(d)) = 0$, and hence $\text{codim } V_H = 0$. This completes the proof of the Proposition in the case where the dimension of the support of M is zero.

This completes the proof of Proposition 4.

We now show how Proposition 4 implies Theorem 3. We proceed by induction on the dimension of the support of M . We consider the following exact sequence, where H is once again a generic hyperplane in P^N ,

$$0 \rightarrow (V^{d+1})^H \rightarrow V^{d+1} \rightarrow (V^{d+1})_H \rightarrow 0$$

from which it follows that

$$\text{codim } V^{d+1} = \text{codim } (V^{d+1})^H + \text{codim } (V^{d+1})_H:$$

We note that $V = (V^{d+1})^H$ and $(V_H)^{d+1} = (V^{d+1})_H$ from which it follows that

$$\text{codim } V^{d+1} = c + (c_{d>})^{<d>} - c^{<d>}:$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 3.

6 Proof of the main theorems.

We will now show how all this ties together to give a proof of the main theorems.

We henceforth set

$$a = \begin{cases} \gamma & \text{if } L \text{ is } (-d) \text{ regular} \\ a_Y & \text{if } L = K_Y + dH + A \end{cases}; b = \begin{cases} \gamma & \text{if } L \text{ is } (-d) \text{ regular} \\ b_Y & \text{if } L = K_Y + dH + A \end{cases}$$

where γ ; γ ; a_Y and b_Y are as in Definitions 1 and 2.

It is now that we will use the supposition that $(Y; H)$ is not a linear P^2 -bundle, hence $K_Y(3)$ is very ample, or, alternatively, that $a \geq 3$ (the case of the quadric is done by Remark 2). The case $a = 4$ will be dealt with at the end of the article.

We start with the following lemma.

Lemma 7 *Suppose $d \geq 5$ and let $T = H^0(L)$ be of codimension $c = d - 4$. Define*

$$T^0 := (T \otimes H^0(\mathcal{O}_Y(3 - a))) \otimes H^0(L(3 - a)):$$

Then

$$\text{codim } T^0 = c$$

Proof. When L is $(-d)$ -regular we can write

$$L = M(-d);$$

where M is a Castelnuovo-Mumford regular sheaf. Also when $L = K_Y + dH + A$, since $M := K_Y + 4H + A$ is Castelnuovo-Mumford regular, we can write

$$L = M(-d - 4);$$

where M is a Castelnuovo-Mumford regular sheaf. Applying $(3 - a)$ -times Theorem 3, we obtain the result.

We denote now by n the integer $b \frac{d+3-a}{b} \leq 4$. We will also denote the very ample line bundle $K_Y(a)$ by P , and the bundle $L(3 - a)$ by L^0 . We have the following lemma.

Lemma 8 *The line bundle L^0 can be written in the form*

$$L^0 = M_P + nP$$

where M_P is a sheaf which is Castelnuovo-Mumford regular with respect to the projective embedding defined by P .

Proof. We know by definition of a and b that there is a nef line bundle N such that

$$bH = K_Y + aH + N$$

from which it follows that

$$(d+3-a)H = (n+4)P + (n+4)N + rH$$

for some $r \geq 0$, hence

$$(d+3-a)H = (n+4)P + A^0$$

where A^0 is a nef line bundle. Now

$$M_P \otimes L^{\otimes n} = \begin{cases} 4P + A_1 & \text{if } L \text{ is } (d-1) \text{ regular} \\ K_Y + 4P + A_2 & \text{if } L = K_Y + dH + A \end{cases}$$

for some nef line bundles A_1, A_2 . This clearly implies, by Kodaira vanishing, that M_P is Castelnuovo-Mumford regular with respect to P in the case $L = K_Y + dH + A$. But also in the other case, for each $1 \leq i \leq 3$, we can write

$$M_P \otimes iP = K_Y + aH + (3-i)P + A_1$$

whence again we have Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity by Kodaira vanishing since now $a = a_Y > 0$ by definition.

We are now in a position to prove the following proposition.

Proposition 5 Suppose $d \geq 5$ and let $T = H^0(L)$ be of codimension $c = d - 4$. Define

$$\overline{T} = (T \otimes H^0(K_Y(3))) \otimes H^0(K_Y - L(3)):$$

Then

$$\text{codim } \overline{T} = c^{<n>}:$$

Proof. With T^0 as in Lemma 7, we note that

$$(T^0 \otimes H^0(K_Y(a))) \otimes \overline{T}:$$

We know by Lemma 7 that $\text{codim } T^0 = c$. We know further by Lemma 8 that

$$L^0 = M_P + nP$$

and hence Theorem 3 applied to the map

$$: T^0 \otimes H^0(P) \rightarrow H^0(K_Y - L(3))$$

gives us that

$$\text{codim } (T^0 \cap H^0(K_Y(A))) \leq c^{<n>} :$$

From this it follows that

$$\text{codim } \overline{T} \leq c^{<n>} :$$

By Proposition 3 we know that

$$\text{codim } \overline{T} \leq \begin{cases} d-5+\gamma & \text{if } L \text{ is } (d) \text{ regular} \\ d-5 & \text{if } L = K_Y + dH + A \end{cases}$$

and hence either $c \leq d-3$ or

$$c^{<n>} \geq \begin{cases} d-6+\gamma & \text{if } L \text{ is } (d) \text{ regular} \\ d-6 & \text{if } L = K_Y + dH + A \end{cases} :$$

The following elementary lemma will allow us to control the growth of $c^{<n>}$.

Lemma 9 *If there exists an integer $\epsilon \geq 0$ such that*

$$c \leq \sum_{i=0}^{X^\epsilon} (n+1-i)$$

then $c^{<n>} \leq c + \epsilon$

Proof. The Lemma being obvious for $c = 0$ we suppose $c \geq 1$ and $c = \sum_{i=n}^F k_i$.

Observe that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{X^\epsilon} (n+1-i) = \frac{(n+1)(n+2)}{2} :$$

Now suppose $k_i = i$ for $f-1 \leq i \leq f_1$ for some $f-1 \leq f_1 \leq n$, $k_i = i+1$ for $f_1+1 \leq i \leq f_2$ for some f_2 such that $f_1 \leq f_2 \leq n$ and $k_i = i+2$ for $f_2+1 \leq i \leq n$ (the case $f-1 = f_1$ simply means that no k_i is equal to i , and similarly for f_2). Then, if $f_2 < n$, we have

$$c \leq \frac{k_n}{n} \cdot \frac{n+2}{2} = \frac{(n+1)(n+2)}{2}$$

contradicting the hypothesis. Therefore $f_2 = n$ and

$$c^{<n>} = c + n - f_1$$

and it remains to show that $n - f_1 \leq e$. Since we can write

$$c = \sum_{i=0}^{f_1-1} (n+1-i) f$$

if $n - f_1 \leq e+1$ we deduce the contradiction

$$c = \sum_{i=0}^{f_1-1} (n+1-i) f$$

In particular, it follows that

Lemma 10 Suppose $L = K_Y + dH + A$, $b_Y \geq 2$ and

$$d \geq b_Y < \sum_{i=0}^{b_Y-1} (n+1-i) f$$

Then

$$\text{codim } T \geq d - b_Y f$$

If $b_Y = 1$, then

$$\text{codim } T \geq d - f$$

Proof. By Lemma 9, if $b_Y \geq 2$,

$$d \geq b_Y < \sum_{i=0}^{b_Y-1} (n+1-i) f$$

and

$$c = \text{codim } T - d + b_Y f$$

then, by Proposition 5,

$$\text{codim } \overline{T} \leq c^{<n>} - d + b_Y f$$

But this is impossible by Proposition 3. If $b_Y = 1$ and $c \geq d - f$ we have $c \leq n$ hence

$$\text{codim } \overline{T} \leq c^{<n>} = c - d + f;$$

again impossible by Proposition 3.

Similarly we have

Lemma 11 Suppose L is $(-d)$ -regular, $\gamma \geq 2$ and

$$d \leq 6 + \gamma - 2\gamma < \sum_{i=0}^{\gamma} (n+1-i):$$

Then

$$\text{codim } T > d \leq 6 + \gamma - 2\gamma:$$

If $\gamma = 1$, then

$$\text{codim } T > d \leq 7 + \gamma:$$

We now require only the following lemma.

Lemma 12 If $b_Y \geq 2$ and $d \leq \frac{b_Y(b_Y^2 + 7b_Y - 6)}{2}$ then

$$d \leq 6 + b_Y < \sum_{i=0}^{\gamma} (n+1-i): \quad (2)$$

If $\gamma \geq 2$ and $d \leq \frac{2}{\gamma}(\gamma + 5)$ then

$$d \leq 6 + \gamma - 2\gamma < \sum_{i=0}^{\gamma} (n+1-i):$$

Proof. We note first that $n \leq b_Y \frac{d}{b_Y} \leq 4$ and it follows that

$$b_Y(n+1) > d \leq 4b_Y:$$

Hence we have that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\gamma} (n+1-i) > d \leq 4b_Y + (n+1) \leq \frac{b_Y(b_Y + 1)}{2}:$$

In particular, if

$$d \leq 6 + b_Y \leq d \leq 4b_Y + (n+1) \leq \frac{b_Y(b_Y + 1)}{2}$$

then (2) is immediately satisfied. This inequality is equivalent to

$$7 + 3b_Y \leq n \leq \frac{b_Y(b_Y + 1)}{2}$$

and since $n \leq b_Y \frac{d}{b_Y} \leq 4$, (2) will be satisfied provided that

$$7 + 3b_Y \leq b_Y \frac{d}{b_Y} \leq 4 \leq \frac{b_Y(b_Y + 1)}{2}$$

which is equivalent to

$$3 + 3b_Y + \frac{b_Y(b_Y + 1)}{2} - \frac{d}{b_Y} c$$

which is equivalent to

$$\frac{b_Y(b_Y^2 + 7b_Y - 6)}{2} \leq d:$$

The second assertion of the Lemma is proved similarly.

Completion of the proof of Theorems 1 and 2.

The results proved so far (together with Remark 2) give a proof of the Theorems under the hypothesis that $(Y; H)$ is not a linear \mathbb{P}^2 -bundle. In the latter case since $K_Y(4)$ is very ample, repeating verbatim the whole proof replacing everywhere $K_Y(3)$ with $K_Y(4)$ and using $a_Y = c_Y = 4$ we get the desired bound.

Proof of Corollary 1.

This is a straightforward generalisation of [2] given the following two facts :

1. a lower bound on the codimension on the components of the Noether-Lefschetz locus $NL(\mathcal{O}_Y(d))$ that insures that they have codimension at least two (our hypothesis $d \geq 7 + \epsilon$);
2. the fact that, on a general surface X not in $NL(\mathcal{O}_Y(d))$ we have that if a complete intersection of X with another surface in $\mathcal{D}_Y(d)$ is reducible then its irreducible components are also complete intersection of X with another surface in $\mathcal{D}_Y(s)$ for some s (this is needed in the proof of [2, Prop. 2.1] and is insured, in our case, by the hypothesis $P_{ic}(Y) = \mathbb{Z}$).

References

- [1] J. Carlson, P. Griffiths. *Infinitesimal variations of Hodge structure and the global Torelli problem*. Géométrie Algébrique, ed. A. Beauville, Sijthoff-Noordhoff, Angers 1980, 51–76.
- [2] F. Angelini. *Ample divisors on the blow up of \mathbb{P}^3 at points*. Manuscripta Math. **93**, (1997), no. 1, 39–48.
- [3] E. Ballico. *Ample divisors on the blow up of \mathbb{P}^n at points*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **127**, (1999), no. 9, 2527–2528.
- [4] L. Ein. *The ramification divisors for branched coverings of \mathbb{P}_k^n* . Math. Ann. **261**, (1982), no. 4, 483–485.

- [5] L. Ein, R. Lazarsfeld. *Syzygies and Koszul cohomology of smooth projective varieties of arbitrary dimension*. Invent. Math. **111**, (1993), no. 1, 51–67.
- [6] F. Gherardelli. *Un teorema di Lefschetz sulle intersezioni complete*. Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei. Rend. Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Natur. **28**, no. 8, (1960), 610–614.
- [7] G. Gotzmann. *Eine Bedingung für die Flachheit und das Hilbert polynom eines Graduierten Ringes*. Math. Z. **158**, (1978), no. 1, 61–70.
- [8] M.L. Green. *A new proof of the explicit Noether-Lefschetz theorem*. J. Differential Geom. **27**, (1988), no. 1, 155–159.
- [9] M.L. Green. *Restrictions of linear series to hyperplanes, and some results of Macaulay and Gotzmann*. Algebraic curves and projective geometry (Trento, 1988), 76–86, Lecture Notes in Math., 1389, Springer, Berlin, 1989.
- [10] P. Griffiths. *Periods of integrals on algebraic manifolds, II. Local study of the period mapping*. Amer. J. Math. **90**, (1968), 805–865.
- [11] P. Griffiths. *On the periods of certain rational integrals I, II*. Ann. of Math. **90**, (1969), no. 2, 460–495; *ibid.* **90**, (1969), no. 2, 496–541.
- [12] P. Griffiths. *Hermitian differential geometry, Chern classes, and positive vector bundles*. Global Analysis, Papers in honor of K. Kodaira. Princeton University Press: Princeton, NJ, 1969, 181–251.
- [13] K. Joshi. *A Noether-Lefschetz theorem and applications*. J. Algebraic Geom. **4**, (1995), no. 1, 105–135.
- [14] B. G. Moishezon. *Algebraic homology classes on algebraic varieties*. Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR **31**, (1967), 209–251.
- [15] A. Otwinowska. *Monodromie d’une famille d’hypersurfaces; application à l’étude du lieu de Noether-Lefschetz*. Submitted for publication.
- [16] A. Otwinowska. *Composantes de petite codimension du lieu de Noether-Lefschetz: un argument asymptotique en faveur de la conjecture de Hodge pour les hypersurfaces*. J. Algebraic Geom. **12** (2003), no. 2, 307–320.
- [17] A. Otwinowska. *Sur les variétés de Hodge des hypersurfaces*. Preprint arXiv.math.AG/401092.
- [18] F. Severi. *Una proprietà delle forme algebriche prive di punti multipli*. Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei. Rend. Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Nat. **15**, (1906), no. 5, 691–696.

- [19] A.J. Sommese, A. Van de Ven. *On the adjunction mapping*. Math. Ann. **278**, (1987), no. 1-4, 593–603.
- [20] Voisin, Claire. *Une précision concernant le théorème de Noether*. Math. Ann. **280**, (1988), no. 4, 605–611.
- [21] Voisin, Claire. *Théorie de Hodge et géométrie algébrique complexe*. Cours Spécialisés, 10. Société Mathématique de France, Paris, 2002.

Addresses of the authors:

Angelo Felice Lopez, Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Roma Tre, Largo San Leonardo Murialdo 1, 00146, Roma, Italy.
e-mail `lopez@mat.uniroma3.it`

Catriona Maclean, UFR de Mathématiques, UMR 5582 CNRS / Université J. Fourier 100, rue des Maths, BP74, 38402 St Martin d’Heres, France.
e-mail `Catriona.MacLean@ujf-grenoble.fr`