

CRITERIA FOR THE AMPLENESS OF CERTAIN VECTOR BUNDLES

INDRANIL BISWAS AND VAMSI PRITHAM PINGALI

ABSTRACT. We prove that certain vector bundles (of rank two over arbitrary manifolds or rank three over surfaces) are ample if they are so when restricted to divisors, certain numerical criteria hold, and they are semistable (with respect to $\det(E)$). This result generalises a theorem of Schneider and Tancredi for rank two vector bundles over surfaces. We also provide counterexamples indicating that our theorem is sharp for rank three vector bundles over surfaces.

1. INTRODUCTION

A holomorphic vector bundle E over a compact complex manifold X is said to be ample if $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(E^*)}(1)$ is ample over $\mathbb{P}(E^*)$. Ample vector bundles play an important role in algebraic geometry because of the various vanishing theorems that follow from ampleness; these vanishing theorems have numerous geometric consequences. It is therefore of interest to find criteria for ampleness.

For any line bundle L over a projective manifold X , the Nakai-Moizeshon criterion gives a numerical criterion for ampleness of L [4]. It says that L is ample if $c_1(L)^k \cdot Y > 0$ for every dimensional subvariety Y of dimension k of X . However, no numerical criterion can exist for deciding the ampleness of vector bundles [2]. Notwithstanding this negative result, Schneider and Tancredi proved the following criterion (that is not purely numerical) for rank two vector bundles over surfaces.

Theorem 1.1 ([7, p. 134, Theorem]). *Let E be a rank two holomorphic vector bundle over a compact complex surface X . Assume that $c_1(E) > 0$ and that E is semistable with respect to $\det(E)$. Suppose $E|_C$ is ample for every closed curve $C \subset X$, and*

$$(c_1(E)^2 - 2c_2(E)) \cdot X > 0, \quad c_2(E) \cdot X > 0.$$

Then E is ample.

This result and its improvements carried out in [8] are useful in studying the ampleness of cotangent bundles [6]. They also find use in an approach of Demailly to the Green-Griffiths-Lang conjecture [1]. In this paper we aim

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14J60, 14F17, 32L10.

Key words and phrases. Ample bundle, semistability, Segre class, approximately Hermitian-Einstein metric.

to generalise this theorem to other ranks and dimensions for further possible applications.

We were motivated by the following result of Lübke [5].

Theorem 1.2 ([5, p. 313, Theorem 2.1]). *Let (E, h) be a holomorphic Hermitian rank r vector bundle over a compact Kähler manifold (X, ω) . Suppose $F_h \wedge \omega^{n-1} = -\sqrt{-1}\lambda\omega^n$, where F_h is the curvature of the Chern connection of h and $\lambda > 0$ is a constant. Assume that*

$$c_1(E, h) = \frac{r\lambda}{2\pi}\omega.$$

Suppose there exists a positive function ψ such that either of the following holds:

- (1) $n = 2$ and $c_1^2(E, h) - \frac{2r(r-1)}{r^2-2r+2}c_2(E, h) = \psi\omega^2$, or
- (2) $r = 2$ and $c_1^2(E, h) - \frac{4(n-1)^2}{n^2-2n+2}c_2(E, h) = \psi\omega^2$.

Then h is Griffiths-positively curved, i.e., $\langle v, \sqrt{-1}F_h v \rangle$ is a Kähler form whenever $v \neq 0$ is a vector in E .

The following is the main result of this paper.

Theorem 1.3. *Let E be a holomorphic vector bundle of rank r over a compact complex manifold X of dimension n . Suppose $c_1(E) > 0$ and E is semistable with respect to $\det(E)$. Also assume that E restricted to every codimension one hypersurface in X is ample. Assume that $s_n(E).X > 0$, where $s_n(E)$ be the signed n^{th} Segre class. Then E is ample if any one of the following conditions hold:*

- (1) $n = 2, r = 2, (c_1^2(E) - 2c_2(E)).X > 0$.
- (2) $r = 2, n \geq 4, (2s_n(E) - c_1(E)^n).X > 0$.
- (3) $n = 2, r = 3, (c_1^2(E) - \frac{12}{5}c_2(E)).X > 0$.
- (4) $n = 3, r = 2, c_1(E)(c_1^2(E) - \frac{16}{5}c_2(E)).X > 0$.

The proof of Theorem 1.3 (in Section 2) uses the existence of approximately Hermitian-Einstein metrics on semistable bundles [3].

In Section 3 we provide examples to indicate that Lübke's Chern class inequality in Theorem 1.2 cannot be dispensed with for $n = 2$ (and arbitrary r). For $n \geq 4$ and $r = 2$, our Chern class conditions are very different from those in Lübke's theorem and it is not clear to us whether either set of conditions is optimal.

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.3. The first case is actually the main theorem in [7, p. 134, Theorem]. We shall prove the other three cases, for which the Nakai-Moishezon criterion will be used [4]. Our aim is to show that $c_1(\mathcal{O})(1)^d.Y > 0$ for every subvariety Y of $\mathbb{P}(E^*)$ of dimension d . Let

$$\pi : \mathbb{P}(E^*) \longrightarrow X$$

be the natural projection.

When $r = 2, n \geq 4$: If $\pi(Y)$ is a point, we are done trivially. If $\pi(Y)$ has dimension less than n , then since E restricted to $\pi(Y)$ is ample, we are done. So assume that $\pi(Y) = X$. Then either $Y = \mathbb{P}(E^*)$ or it is a divisor in $\mathbb{P}(E^*)$. If $Y = \mathbb{P}(E^*)$, then $c_1(\mathcal{O})(1)^{n+1}.Y = s_n(E).X > 0$ by assumption.

If Y is a divisor in $\mathbb{P}(E^*)$, then

$$[Y] = \mathcal{O}(m) \otimes \pi^*F,$$

where $m \geq 0$ and F is a line bundle on X . Akin to [7], positivity holds if $m = 0$ and that if $m > 0$, then $c_1(F^*) \cup c_1(E)^{n-1} \leq \frac{m}{2}c_1(E)^n$. Thus,

$$c_1(\mathcal{O})(1)^n.Y = m s_n(E).X - c_1(F^*).c_1(E)^{n-1} \geq \frac{m}{2}(2s_n(E) - c_1(E)^n).X > 0$$

by assumption.

When $n = 2, r = 3$: As before, we are done when $\dim \pi(Y) = 0, 1$. If $\dim \pi(Y) = 2$, then $\dim Y$ is 2, 3 or 4. We address these three cases separately.

Subcase 1: $\dim Y = 4$: In this case, we have $c_1(\mathcal{O})(1)^4.Y = (c_1^2(E) - c_2(E)).X > 0$.

Subcase 2: $\dim Y = 3$: Note that Y is a divisor in $\mathbb{P}(E^*)$. Just as above, we are done when $m = 0$, and if $m > 0$ we see that

$$c_1(\mathcal{O})(1)^3.Y \geq \frac{m}{2}(c_1(E)^2 - c_2(E)).X > 0.$$

Subcase 3: $\dim(Y) = 2$: In this case we shall compute the intersection number differentio-geometrically by choosing an appropriate smooth metric h on E and considering the Chern-Weil representative of the induced metric \tilde{h} on $\mathcal{O}(1)$. Let

$$S \subset X$$

be the Zariski closed proper subset such that $Y \setminus \pi^{-1}(S)$ is an m -sheeted étale cover of $X \setminus S$. We can find finitely many analytic open subsets $U_i \subset X$ such that

- $\bigcup_i U_i = X \setminus S$,
- E is trivial over U_i , and
- $\pi^{-1}(U_i)$ is a disjoint union of m -copies of U_i .

Moreover, over each copy of U_i in $\pi^{-1}(U_i)$ we can find a trivialisation of E such that this copy is $U_i \times (1, 0, 0) \subset \mathbb{P}(E^*)$. Denote by e_1 the section corresponding to $(1, 0, 0)$.

The following lemma, which is a pointwise assertion, will be used.

Lemma 2.1. *For all $1 > \epsilon > 0$ let Θ_ϵ be a (normalised) Chern curvature endomorphism of a Hermitian holomorphic rank 3 Hermitian vector bundle (E, h_ϵ) at a point p on a surface. Take $v \in E_p$. Suppose ω is a Kähler*

form at p and $c_1(h_\epsilon) = \omega$. Moreover, assume that there exists a constant K (independent of ϵ) such that

$$(2.1) \quad \Theta_\epsilon \wedge \omega = \frac{1}{3}\omega^2 + \frac{B_\epsilon}{2}\omega^2,$$

where B_ϵ is a tracefree endomorphism such that $|(B_\epsilon)_i^j| \leq \epsilon$ for all i, j . Then

$$(2.2) \quad c_1^2(h_\epsilon) - \frac{12}{5}c_2(h_\epsilon) \leq \frac{9}{2} \left(\frac{\langle v, \Theta_\epsilon v \rangle_{h_\epsilon}}{\langle v, v \rangle_{h_\epsilon}} \right)^2 + 27\epsilon\omega^2.$$

Proof. Since the statement does not depend on the choice of trivialisation and choice of coordinates, we can assume that h_ϵ is given by the identity matrix at this point p , in other words, h_ϵ is the trivial Hermitian structure. Moreover, without loss of generality, we assume that $v = (1, 0, 0)$. Lastly, we can choose coordinates so that

$$\omega = \Theta_1^1 + \Theta_2^2 + \Theta_3^3 = \sqrt{-1}dz^1 \wedge d\bar{z}^1 + \sqrt{-1}dz^2 \wedge d\bar{z}^2,$$

and $\Theta_1^1 = \sqrt{-1}\mu_1 dz^1 \wedge d\bar{z}^1 + \sqrt{-1}\mu_2 dz^2 \wedge d\bar{z}^2$. By the approximate Hermitian-Einstein condition (2.1) we see that

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \mu_1 + \mu_2 &= \frac{2}{3} + (B_\epsilon)_1^1, \\ \Theta_2^2 + \Theta_3^3 &= (1 - \mu_1)\sqrt{-1}dz^1 \wedge d\bar{z}^1 + \left(\frac{1}{3} + \mu_1 - (B_\epsilon)_1^1 \right) \sqrt{-1}dz^2 \wedge d\bar{z}^2, \\ \Theta_2^2 \wedge \omega &= \frac{1}{3}\omega^2 + \frac{1}{2}(B_\epsilon)_2^2\omega^2, \\ (\Theta_i^j)_{1\bar{1}} + (\Theta_i^j)_{2\bar{2}} &= (B_\epsilon)_i^j. \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{c_1(h)^2 - \frac{12}{5}c_2(h)}{\sqrt{-1}dz^1 \wedge d\bar{z}^1 \wedge \sqrt{-1}dz^2 \wedge d\bar{z}^2} &= 2 - \frac{12}{5} \frac{\sum_{i \neq j} (-\Theta_i^j \bar{\Theta}_i^j + \Theta_i^i \Theta_j^j)}{\sqrt{-1}dz^1 \wedge d\bar{z}^1 \wedge \sqrt{-1}dz^2 \wedge d\bar{z}^2} \\ &\leq 2 - \frac{12}{5} \frac{\sum_{i \neq j} \left(-((\Theta_i^j)_{1\bar{1}} \overline{(\Theta_i^j)_{2\bar{2}}} + (\Theta_i^j)_{2\bar{2}} \overline{(\Theta_i^j)_{1\bar{1}}}) \sqrt{-1}dz^1 \wedge d\bar{z}^1 \wedge \sqrt{-1}dz^2 \wedge d\bar{z}^2 + \Theta_i^i \Theta_j^j \right)}{\sqrt{-1}dz^1 \wedge d\bar{z}^1 \wedge \sqrt{-1}dz^2 \wedge d\bar{z}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Denote $(\Theta_2^2)_{1\bar{1}}$ by α and μ_1 by μ . Using (2.3) we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{c_1(h)^2 - \frac{12}{5}c_2(h)}{\sqrt{-1}dz^1 \wedge d\bar{z}^1 \wedge \sqrt{-1}dz^2 \wedge d\bar{z}^2} &\leq 2 + \frac{12|(B_\epsilon)_i^j|^2}{5} - \frac{12}{5} \frac{\sum_{i \neq j} (\Theta_i^i \Theta_j^j)}{\sqrt{-1}dz^1 \wedge d\bar{z}^1 \wedge \sqrt{-1}dz^2 \wedge d\bar{z}^2} \\
&\Rightarrow \frac{5(c_1(h)^2 - \frac{12}{5}c_2(h))}{2\sqrt{-1}dz^1 \wedge d\bar{z}^1 \wedge \sqrt{-1}dz^2 \wedge d\bar{z}^2} \\
&< 1 + 6\epsilon^2 - 6(B_\epsilon)_1^1 - 6 \frac{-(\Theta_1^1)^2 + \Theta_2^2 \Theta_3^3}{\sqrt{-1}dz^1 \wedge d\bar{z}^1 \wedge \sqrt{-1}dz^2 \wedge d\bar{z}^2} \\
&= 1 + 12\epsilon - 6 \left(-(\Theta_2^2)^2 + \alpha \left(\frac{1}{3} + \mu - (B_\epsilon)_1^1 \right) + \left(\frac{2}{3} - \alpha + (B_\epsilon)_2^2 \right) (1 - \mu) \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{6(\Theta_1^1)^2}{\sqrt{-1}dz^1 \wedge d\bar{z}^1 \wedge \sqrt{-1}dz^2 \wedge d\bar{z}^2} \\
&\leq 1 + 12\epsilon - 6 \left(-2\alpha \left(\frac{2}{3} - \alpha + (B_\epsilon)_2^2 \right) + \alpha \left(\frac{1}{3} + \mu - (B_\epsilon)_1^1 \right) + \left(\frac{2}{3} - \alpha + (B_\epsilon)_2^2 \right) (1 - \mu) \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{6(\Theta_1^1)^2}{\sqrt{-1}dz^1 \wedge d\bar{z}^1 \wedge \sqrt{-1}dz^2 \wedge d\bar{z}^2} \\
&\leq 27\epsilon - 3\mu \left(\frac{2}{3} - \mu + (B_\epsilon)_1^1 \right) + \frac{6(\Theta_1^1)^2}{\sqrt{-1}dz^1 \wedge d\bar{z}^1 \wedge \sqrt{-1}dz^2 \wedge d\bar{z}^2} \\
(2.5) \quad &= 27\epsilon + \frac{9}{2} \frac{(\Theta_1^1)^2}{\sqrt{-1}dz^1 \wedge d\bar{z}^1 \wedge \sqrt{-1}dz^2 \wedge d\bar{z}^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Returning to the situation at hand, for every ϵ , there exists an approximate Hermitian-Einstein metric satisfying $c_1(h_\epsilon) = \omega$ and (2.1) [3]. Choose

$$\epsilon = \frac{(c_1^2(E) - \frac{12}{5}c_2(E)) \cdot X}{54 \int_X \omega^2}$$

and let $h = h_\epsilon$. In a normal trivialisation at p ,

$$(c_1(\mathcal{O})(1), \tilde{h})^2(p)|_Y = \left(\frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} \bar{\partial} \partial h_{11} \right)^2 = \Theta_1^1(h)^2.$$

Therefore, Lemma 2.1 shows that

$$(2.6) \quad \frac{9}{2} (e_1^*((c_1(\mathcal{O})(1), \tilde{h})^2)(p) + \frac{(c_1^2(E) - \frac{12}{5}c_2(E)) \cdot X}{2 \int_X \omega^2} \omega^2(p) \geq c_1^2(h)(p) - \frac{12}{5} c_2(h)(p).$$

Integrating on both sides, we are done.

When $n = 3, r = 2$: When $\dim \pi(Y) = 0, 1, 2$ or when $\dim Y = 4$, we are done. We only need to consider the case when $\pi(Y) = X$ and $\dim Y = 3$. As in the case of $n = 2, r = 3$, we can assume without loss of

generality (by means of an approximation argument as in the previous case) the existence of a Hermitian-Einstein metric H such that

$$c_1(\mathcal{O}(1))|_Y^3(p) = (\Theta_1^1)^3(p), \quad \omega = c_1(H) = \sum_{i=1}^3 \sqrt{-1} dz^i \wedge d\bar{z}^i,$$

$$\Theta_1^1 = \sum_{i=1}^3 \mu_i \sqrt{-1} dz^i \wedge d\bar{z}^i, \quad \Theta_2^2 = \omega - \Theta_1^1, \quad \sum_i \mu_i = \frac{3}{2}.$$

Moreover, $\sum_{i=1}^3 (\Theta_1^2)_{i\bar{i}} = 0$.

We can now calculate as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & 15 \frac{\left(c_1^2(E) - \frac{16}{5} c_2(E) \right) c_1(E)}{\omega^3} = 15 - 48 \frac{\Theta_1^1 \omega^2 - (\Theta_1^1)^2 \omega - \Theta_1^2 \bar{\Theta}_1^2 \omega}{\omega^3} \\ & = 15 - 8 \left(3 - 2 \sum_{i<j} \mu_i \mu_j - \sum_{i<j} \left((\Theta_1^2)_{i\bar{i}} (\bar{\Theta}_1^2)_{j\bar{j}} + (\Theta_1^2)_{j\bar{j}} (\bar{\Theta}_1^2)_{i\bar{i}} \right) + \sum_{i<j} \left(|(\Theta_1^2)_{i\bar{j}}|^2 + |(\Theta_1^2)_{j\bar{i}}|^2 \right) \right) \\ (2.7) \quad & \leq -9 + 16 \sum_{i<j} \mu_i \mu_j, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is derived using the fact that $\sum_i (\Theta_1^2)_{i\bar{i}} = 0$. Now

let

$$V = \mu_1 \mu_2 \mu_3 = \frac{(\Theta_1^1)^3}{\omega^3}.$$

Since $\sum_i \mu_i = \frac{3}{2}$, if $\mu_1 \geq \mu_2 \geq \mu_3$, then $\mu_1 \geq \frac{1}{2}$. We can simplify

Inequality (2.7) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & 15 \frac{\left(c_1^2(E) - \frac{16}{5} c_2(E) \right) c_1(E)}{\omega^3} \leq -9 + 16 \frac{V}{\mu_1} + 16 \mu_1 \left(\frac{3}{2} - \mu_1 \right) \\ & = \frac{16V}{\mu_1} - (4\mu_1 - 3)^2 \\ (2.8) \quad & \leq 32V. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating on both sides, we are done. \square

3. COUNTEREXAMPLES

Consider rank r vector bundles on surfaces. In this section we provide counterexamples to show that if Lübke's condition $c_1^2(E) \cdot X > \frac{2r(r-1)}{r^2-2r+2} c_2(E) \cdot X$ is not met, then the conclusion of the theorem cannot hold in general. Likewise for semistability with respect to $\det(E)$. For $r = 2$, the counterexample for semistability was provided in [7] and the sharpness of the Chern class

inequality was shown in [9]. For the remainder of this section we assume $r \geq 3$.

Indeed, just as in [7], let M be a Riemann surface of genus at least two, and let F be a stable vector bundle of rank two on M such that $c_1(F) = 0$ and the symmetric product $S^m F$ is stable for all $m \geq 1$. Set $X = \mathbb{P}(F)$, and let $L = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(F)}(1)$. (Then $c_1(L)^2 = 0$ and $L|_C$ is positive for all curves C on X .) Let H be an ample line bundle on X , and set

$$E = L \oplus H \oplus H \oplus \dots \oplus H.$$

Note that E is not ample because its quotient L is not ample. However, E is ample when restricted to curves. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} c_1(E) &= c_1(L) + (r-1)c_1(H), \\ c_2(E) &= (r-1)c_1(L)c_1(H) + \frac{(r-1)(r-2)}{2}c_1^2(H). \end{aligned}$$

The slope of L is $c_1(L).c_1(E) = (r-1)c_1(L)c_1(H)$ and that of H is

$$c_1(H).c_1(E) = c_1(H).c_1(L) + (r-1)c_1(H)^2.$$

Therefore, semistability of E (with respect to $\det(E)$) holds if and only if

$$(r-2)c_1(L).c_1(H) = (r-1)c_1(H)^2.$$

Certainly this inequality cannot be met for an arbitrary H (and thus ampleness can fail if semistability does not hold). Suppose semistability is met. Then we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} c_1(E)^2.X &= (r-1)^2c_1(H)^2.X + 2(r-1)c_1(L)c_1(H).X = (r-1)rc_1(L)c_1(H).X, \\ \frac{2r(r-1)}{r^2-2r+2}c_2(E).X &= \frac{2r(r-1)}{r^2-2r+2} \frac{2(r-1) + (r-2)^2}{2}c_1(L)c_1(H) = c_1(E)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if Lübke's Chern class inequality is not met, ampleness cannot hold in general.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The second author is partially supported by grant F.510/25/CASII/2018(SAP-I) from UGC (Govt. of India), and a MATRICS grant MTR/2020/000100 from SERB (Govt. of India). The first author is partially supported by a J. C. Bose Fellowship.

REFERENCES

- [1] Demailly, Jean-Pierre. "Algebraic criteria for Kobayashi hyperbolic projective varieties and jet differentials." Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics. Vol. 62. American Mathematical Society, 1997.
- [2] Fulton, William. "Ample vector bundles, Chern classes, and numerical criteria." Inventiones mathematicae 32.2 (1976): 171–178.
- [3] Kobayashi, Shoshichi. "Differential geometry of complex vector bundles." Vol. 793. Princeton University Press, 2014.
- [4] Lazarsfeld, Robert K. Positivity in algebraic geometry I: Classical setting: line bundles and linear series. Vol. 48. Springer, 2017.

- [5] Lübke, Martin. “A note on positivity of Einstein bundles.” *Indagationes Mathematicae* 2.3 (1991): 311–318.
- [6] Schneider, Michael. “Complex surfaces with negative tangent bundle.” *Complex Analysis and Algebraic Geometry*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1986. 150–157.
- [7] Schneider, Michael, and Alessandro Tancredi. “Positive vector bundles on complex surfaces.” *Manuscripta Mathematica* 50.1 (1985): 133–144.
- [8] Schneider, Michael, and Alessandro Tancredi. “Almost-positive vector bundles on projective surfaces.” *Mathematische Annalen* 280.4 (1988): 537–547.
- [9] Subramanian, S. “Non-ample semistable 2-bundles which are ample over curves and have $c_1^2 = 2c_2$.” *Manuscripta Mathematica* 57.1 (1986): 49–53.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, TATA INSTITUTE OF FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH, HOMI BHABHA ROAD, MUMBAI 400005, INDIA

Email address: `indranil@math.tifr.res.in`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE, BANGALORE 560012, INDIA

Email address: `vamsipingali@iisc.ac.in`